LUTHERAN CHURCH–CANADA
ÉGLISE LUTHÉRIENNE du CANADA

Responses to Lutheran Church–Canada's National Survey on Restructuring

SURVEY SECTION	PAGE
Section 1: Restructuring LCC Services to the Members of the Synod – Congregations, Pastors and Deacons (Questions 1-14)	1
Section 2: The Restructuring Process (Questions 15-21)	278
Section 3: Restructuring the Relationship of Congregations, Pastors, and Deacons in Convention (Questions 22-31)	380
Section 4: Restructuring Synodical Leadership (Questions 32-36)	503
Section 5: Restructuring the Training of Pastors and Deacons (Questions 37-43)	562
Section 6: Restructuring the Relationship between the Synod, Districts, Auxiliaries and Listed Service Organizations (Questions 44-55)	637
Section 7: Feedback on this Survey (Questions 56-60)	744
Section 8: General Comments	805

March 29, 2016

Section 1: Restructuring LCC Services to the Members of the Synod – Congregations, Pastors and Deacons

1. Ecclesiastical Supervision of doctrine and practice is effective.

1. I do not really know if it is effective, but it is needed.
2. What is meant by Ecclesiastical supervision? Doctrine? Practice? What exactly.
3. We have pastors visit us just recently four pastors came.
4. We have had four pastors come to our tri parish meetings and other times too.
5. Earlier intervention needed when disagreements arise between pastor and congregation.
6. District President does not always attend important congregational matters, disputes. No visits!
7. Let it go and maybe the problem will go away seems to be the policy for many years.
8. Not sure, that as a lay person I would see this at work (until perhaps an issue arose)
9. These activities aren't apparent to most lay people. The only time in my many years as a member I saw calling process - vacancies, Int. min.
10. But in my years of experience, Circuit Counselors have inadequate time to serve busy parishes plus adequate work with other congregations' needs.
11. Do we need this
12. "Supervision" appears to be seriously lacking in actual authority where action is warranted. Clearly written job descriptions either provide or negate authority and boundaries. Those who supervise must be confident in their authority to address all matters with pastors e.g. consult - counsel - plan for change in pastors' actions, addictions.
13. Occasionally slow in addressing issues in congregations.
14. "Supervision" appears to be seriously lacking in actual authority where action is warranted. Clearly written job descriptions either provide or negate authority and boundaries. Those who supervise must be confident in their authority to address ALL matters with pastors e.g. consult - counsel - plan for change in pastors' actions, addictions.
15. The "supervision" component appears to be seriously lacking in actual authority where action is warranted. Clearly written and specifically detailed job descriptions are absolutely necessary. For example: 1) A pastor with an "addiction" has to have his needs addressed and acted upon -> consult, counsel and -> rehab ->reassess and so on 2) a pastor who counsels for abortion needs to have this practise addressed.
16. Some pastors and congregations are more liberal!
17. Too much non-Lutheran contemporary songs.
18. Agree in most situations but then are some deviations.
19. There is too much non-Lutheran contemporary worship.
20. If the doctrine and practice would have been better supervised the High Church movement would never have been allowed to get started.
21. All church workers are not in total agreement
22. some issues remain unresolved or I haven't understood how they've been resolved.
23. Question too vague, I cannot answer it.
24. The LCC calling process needs extensive change. It is outdated!

25. I've attended congregations across Canada where this is true, and I have attended congregations across Canada where this is not true. Most congregations of LC-C and their pastors seem more or less okay in doctrine and practice, which I think reflects well on Ecclesiastical Supervision in general. However, I've attended or visited or know some congregations (through friends who are either pastors or deacons or laypeople) that confuse the role of the pastor and the role of deacon. I've attended some congregations that have replaced sound doctrine for entertainment or popularity (e.g. offering Alpha Course without correcting problematic teachings; song lyrics that make people feel good but lack Law & Gospel or any real substance, and often teach decision theology or other bad theology; pastors who talk more about themselves, sports, etc. than what God has to say to sinners who need to hear Law & Gospel). I've also known a few LC-C pastors who have turned aside from sound teachings (due to personal questions, doubts, or mental illness), which gradually came through in their sermons and Bible Studies (although not too noticeably at first) but went mostly unnoticed for months or years before they left LC-C or Christianity.
26. had to ask family to fill this out, elderly don't use computer and don't understand the term above, beyond the schooling I have as I am an original Lutheran of many generations from Russia.
27. Ecclesiastical supervision can be effective but is inconsistent. Generally, doctrine is fairly consistent. At times practices vary -- sometimes regarding doctrine, but generally related to preferences and contexts. It is important to clarify what practices are free to vary and which are directly related to doctrines.
28. If it were, we would not have the mess we have with CEF and spiritual practices, of walking the talk. You never spend more than you have and ensure you save and pay everything off in short terms, before acquiring more. Never over mortgage your home. I had to ask relative what you meant as I am a 400 PLUS yr. old descendant of German Lutherans and am one of the typical elderly that saved everything to be in this country and support my Church, shamefully now experiencing the outcomes. You are not using basic English for us.
29. There is a consistency in the delivery of teaching and preaching across our churches that is the result of a structured organization with good oversight and strong leadership.
30. We recently had a situation at our church that was not handled properly and the Ecclesiastical Supervision did not clearly take control of the situation but let a few power hungry people make a decision that should have been made by the Synod
31. District officials do not have sufficient authority to require workers or congregations to change practices that are contrary to our agreed standards.
32. My experience has been that church officials are reluctant to discipline the erring (if not in some cases connivent with them), and heterodox pastors and congregations exploit that inertia to consolidate their teaching/practice over time.
33. At Immanuel Lutheran Church, Lethbridge, Ab, a Pastor was wrongfully removed.
34. If there were "effective supervision" of practice, we wouldn't be subjected to all of this silly chancel prancing by far too many pastors - it's sickening.
35. I'm a layman
36. I have not seen where or how if it is effective.
37. We are well known for it - and should remain so.
38. Two questions posed here - is there ecclesiastical supervision and is it effective? Uncertain what am I basing it on?

39. It would be better if Synodical/District President's had more authority when it come to supervision of doctrine and practice. Often presidents leave matters to a congregational level for fear of overstepping, which is not helpful.
40. It's effective in terms of doctrine, but not necessarily in terms of explaining and applying the doctrine to the modern age. It's frustrating when we expect the doctrine to be able to support itself and somehow be more appealing than any other teaching (either secular or from other denominations) simply based on the fact that it is right doctrine. Although the doctrine should not change, the presentation and explanation certainly ought to.
41. I am uninformed.
42. Though ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine may be active, in practice it has no effectiveness, given that congregations can do what they want, with little ability of LCC to curb behavior.
43. LCC supervision is based on a subjective response by those in positions of leadership who use personal experience and personal biases to formulate decisions that will reinforce their ideas of interpretation and praxis. Potentially new ideas for incorporation into the polity of the Synod or for introduction to liturgical practice or educational curricula are too often dismissed or demeaned as inadequate for Confessional Lutheran imprimatur.
44. Always room for improvement however.
45. To be effective should have a single governing body with a single training centre and program.
46. What does the word "effective" mean in this context?
47. If all with authority exercise it fully fine. That is not always the case.
48. Practice differs from Pastor to Pastor. While we do not want all services to be of a cookie cutter format, why do some Pastors conduct services with such pomp & circumstance? e.g. chanting, including all items in service while LSB says: 'Introit, Psalm or Entrance Hymn, Psalm or Gradual (OR becomes AND), numerous times of genuflecting, especially during a Communion Service, etc.
49. I assume you mean ecclesiastical from our Lutheran perspective.
50. LCC has completely failed at ecclesiastical supervision. The Lord’s Supper is “celebrated” with grape juice and generally treated as an optional snack that could just as well be skipped, unbelievers are “confirmed,” our children are removed from the Lord’s actual presence to paste and glue crafts with “Sunday school teachers” who never attend Divine Service, openly unrepentant sinners are “communed,” our pastors who are orthodox Lutherans are held in contempt by large numbers of their so-called “brothers,” our Divine Services are attended by people who have no idea why they have come together, some pastors are more interested in money-lending and bureaucracy than in shepherding their flocks (e.g. CEF investment handlers, mission executives, committee chairs), our members exhibit hardly any concern for true spirituality, our married couples have the same divorce rate as the wicked and adulterous generation outside of our doors, our pastors are thrown on the streets like bums and the bishops stand aside (“the will of the people”), a visitor attending an LLC church is not guaranteed to hear the Gospel in the sermon, our men have acquiesced to the feminization of what was supposed to be proclamation in preaching, our fathers have little regard for the spiritual education of their children, our zealous singers of Lift High the Cross hardly engage in any real outreach among our neighbours (just a bit of post-modern “relationship” building), and our elder statesmen consider laying bricks in foreign lands (preferably island nations near the equator) to be mission work, and – in spite of all this –

those who know better stay quiet and do nothing, focusing instead, it seems, on gathering more treasure for the latter-day bonfire.

51. Since there is no unity of doctrine and practice within the LC-C, its Districts, its Circuits, and its pastors, the supervision of doctrine and practice is clearly ineffective!
52. My response is made with respect to wide variations between congregations regarding close(d) communion practice.
53. I do not have enough knowledge to answer this question.
54. I have a strong bias on this issue because I presently belong in a congregation which is having challenges with its pastor. There are problems in the preaching, and in the manner that he treats people. We in LCC (and in LCMS too, for that matter) operate in this peculiar Congregationalist structure, where congregations (that is, laypeople) are left on their own to deal with problems. This is not fair to laypeople, especially in hurting congregations or congregations where the leadership is not discerning enough. There is also the very real fear that ecclesiastical supervisors will automatically side with the pastor, regardless of circumstance, leaving struggling/wounded laypeople to fend for themselves. I cannot remember the last time our congregation was visited by a circuit councillor or district president. It is as if supervisors presumed that there won't be any problems in doctrine or practice because the pastor is a LCC company man. This should not be! It is the duty of every Christian to rightly judge doctrine. And it should be the duty of ecclesiastical supervisors to ensure that doctrine/practice is correct, and to exercise discipline when it is not. Church discipline is extremely weak (or even non-existent) in our congregations, presumably because we are afraid to do the difficult work of confronting people in their sin. But this illness also affects the synod as a whole, in how it supervises its pastors. Do we, as a synod, permit pastors to be on our roster who do not honour the holy office with a holy life? Do we permit simplistic, empty, vacuous preaching from our pulpits, simply because there's no blatant "false teaching"? Do we permit pastors (or even district officials) to treat others in the church with contempt, thinking that one has to knock a few heads in order for the church to fulfill its so-called "mission"? I think we, as a synod, do tolerate these things. We need to repent and turn away from such sinfulness! Where a man has shown himself to be ill-fit for the ministry, supervisors need to exercise disciple. And that may mean removal from office. While this prospect may seem frightening and painful in the moment, it is better than letting bad pastors cause harm (possibly eternal harm!) to our parishioners and communities.
55. Our congregation has been under an extreme amount of duress and there has been very little interaction from our ecclesiastical supervisor. My general opinion is that our leaders are burying their heads in the sand in hopes that the problems will go away on their own. There has been no leadership or guidance.
56. I believe a review with each congregation would help to insure the practices are done to the best of abilities. Perhaps an interval of one or two years for each congregation would help to answer questions or help the congregation understand things even better. Sometimes a sit down with the upper body can help a congregation be stronger in both its' faith and outreach.
57. In terms of communion practice (e.g., open/closed communion), it's wider depending on the congregation. It must be supervised more effectively.
58. there is a wide gap in ministerial interpretation, and an even wide gap in lay interpretation of doctrine & practice - from VERY conservative to fairly liberal
59. supervision is quite laid back from my perspective and should be more effective

60. Professors of Theology should be involved re: Doctrine Issues. Church related issues should be left to District of Circuit Counsellors.
61. Seems to be less rigidity of doctrine amongst Pastors trained in Edmonton, as compared to Pastors trained in St Catharines.
62. Calling process needs change
63. There seems a greater emphasis on "Lutheran" than Biblical teaching.
64. This question is too foggy and vague for lay people -- or even for pastors! (I asked one his opinion of the wording.) Why begin with it? Poorly designed, poorly written, it sets an ominous tone for the survey as a whole -- it indicates that this survey has NOT been carefully prepared to elicit thoughtful answers from the laity. It confuses rather than clarifies. For instance, what IS "ecclesiastical supervision"? A committee of pastors vetting the church's "doctrine and practice"? Who ELSE would supervise doctrine? Does it mean pastors supervising how individual congregations interpret "doctrine" and conduct their "practice"? "Effective" in the sense of being helpful to congregations, acceptable to other theologians, or simply efficient?
65. Some LCC are more modern with hymns and others don't want to change.
66. What does effective mean. Unable to answer - lacking information.
67. How would I know this?
68. From this layperson's perspective, it seems to work.
69. Pastors need to have pastoral discretion but it seems that some practices go counter to what lay people have been taught. For example, I was taught that confirmation should be for those who can study the doctrine we believe in and then truly examine themselves. I question whether eight-year-olds have this capacity and yet I know there are LCC pastors confirming children this young. This practice, however, continues.
70. Doctrinal stand with respect to various worldly changes is supportive, Marriage, euthanasia....
71. Over time statistics could be monitored such as number of vacancies, number of calls refused per vacancy and length of vacancies.
72. I believe LCC is diligent in using God's Word as the basis for preaching and practice.
73. because of what happens in the individual congregations, each one is different, that should NOT be.
74. Over the 40 years of parish ministry that I served, I can remember many times when the District President or Counselors visited the parish by request or for special occasions. What I do not recall is leadership sitting down one-- on-- one for an extended conversation: "How's it going in your ministry? What are your joys? What are your sorrows? How specifically can we keep you and your family in our prayers? etc.
75. Please continue as is
76. I'm not in a position / or have knowledge of this aspect of church life.
77. Providing the person doing the supervision is in support of our doctrine and practice and not focused on making their legacy great with other people's money.
78. Very important
79. I have no knowledge about this.
80. Unfortunately, I have been involved with 2 LCC Churches with Pastor issues and the direction given by the district in both cases was almost non existent.
81. I have not encountered conflict over doctrine and practice personally, therefore, it is difficult to respond to this question. The position Lutheran Church-Canada takes regarding Scripture

and the confessions and how they inform practice has been a deterrent to those with broad Christian backgrounds (coming from another denomination or multi-denominational experiences). I sometimes wonder if our congregations (maybe even some of our pastors) truly grasp the purpose and intent of our Lutheran confessions and the subscription we take to uphold them. We are called to remain grounded in Scripture and our Confessions are a bold stand on what Scripture teaches!

82. Doctrinal supervision and consistent support and practical application to the ministry and daily needs of parishioners is inconsistent and there is no structure to support and continually guide our parishes or pastors.
83. There should be more effective and competent intervention, guidance, and mediation available to pastors and congregations to resolve conflict/prevent abuse.
84. Very Important
85. We have not rec'd even bi-yearly contact from our former district president and the current district president has not shown his face either since assuming office. The district is large, but surely he could have contacted us to see how our congregation was doing. I do not count the annual Christmas card " a contact", or a "reaching out", as identical cards are sent to all churches.
86. Our pastor has good sermons, preaches the Word of God, and conducts or leads a lot of Bible classes - I have no idea how good his Ecclesiastical Supervision of Doctrine is.
87. You seem to train the ministers to be put on a pedestal about all lay people and that they can quote scriptures to prove they are correct
88. LEGALISM sometimes rules
89. Practice differs widely between pastors and congregations confusing the parishioner
90. Close communion and joint services with other denominations not always pro-practiced
91. It is effective when it takes place.
92. The doctrinal element is very powerful to a point where brotherly love is lost in doctrine and ritual.
93. Not sure how well this is done currently. I think it could be improved with a new structure as a Synod without the Districts.
94. As long as it is supervision and not dictation the structure should function effectively to meet the needs of the Church.
95. The general processes of filling vacancies and the calling process work well with our current structure. However, the ecclesiastical supervisor provided by synod for ABC district has not been a positive, or useful, addition to ABC. The synod should answer to district, the district should be supported by synod, not controlled.
96. Don't know enough to give an opinion
97. I don't have enough knowledge of how pastoral supervision works to comment here.
98. There seems to be at times a bit of a division in the Church with respect to how the doctrine is applied. I have found from first hand experiences with my family how this impacts Church life. For example, there are a number of pastors that seem to align with a high Church movement from chanting and other practices more commonly associated with Roman Catholics. This has gone as far as I have witnessed Latin writings above a doorway in an LCC Church. This is a clear example of what Luther did not intend to happen that being that a worship service should be in the language of the land. This is but one example where I feel we should strike a better balance between the application of sound doctrine and modern

expectations in a worship service. This has caused divisions with in congregations and families.

99. I do not believe the call process is effective in all cases. In some cases, Pastors have stayed too long in one congregation because there is no way to enforce a move.
100. As far as I know.
101. The supervision is very lacking. Complaints regarding what core business is vs. what has been practiced has been telling in the CEF crisis. Pastors have not focused on their core business, congregations have suffered and continue to and will continue until the court matters settle. Also there has been no neutral spiritual supervision, many are related to others or don't have courage to deal with the matters, by using Doctrine to deliver spiritual consequence.
102. The supervision of doctrine and practice will change from Pastor to Pastor and to me, it is more a reflection of my Pastors commitment than someone's supervision and how would I know the difference?
103. As a lay person I have no idea how 'Ecclesiastical Supervision" is handled so therefore can not state any opinion. I am certainly surprised that this was chosen as the first question in this survey since you are soliciting information from both clergy and lay people.....
104. I feel that too often practices that are not true to our doctrine are simply overlooked. If a pastor or congregation practice open communion or use grape juice, for example, not much really ever happens about it. This undermines our unity and walking together in doctrine.
105. I am unable to answer. (I do not know how pastors are supervised.)
106. As a lay person how would I know if it's effective or not
107. need more info
108. Without this supervision the church could fall away from its doctrinal practice of following Scripture first.
109. I am the Pastor of a Congregation that voted to remove my call. As it was a ballot vote, I can't speak for everyone's motives. But prior to the vote, some congregation members argued that I should be removed because they felt they that I wasn't "the right fit" for the congregation, which contradicts the doctrine of the divine call. Others, such as the elders wanted the female chairman to be involved in pastoral oversight which contradicts the biblical role of women in the church. Some in the congregation said that wanted to commune Christians of other denominations, which is also against sound biblical doctrine. As certain members openly spoke at the meeting to remove me for unbiblical reasons, the Circuit Counselor--(who was present and chairing the meeting and witnessed everything) --and the Ecclesiastical Supervisor--(who was absent but aware of these issues and did address the congregation in a letter) --neglected to identify and rebuke the church's unbiblical remarks and practices. They also neglected to indicated that it would be sinful for a congregation to remove their divinely called pastor for such reasons. When the Ecclesiastical Supervisor remains silent in the face of false doctrine, it is tantamount to approval in the eyes of the laity. A criminal has a good case for pleading ignorance if a police officer stands idly by and watches him commit a crime without saying anything. The bottom line is, the Ecclesiastical Supervisors did not do their job or use the authority given them in their office. Instead they stood there and assured us how much they've prayed and how "difficult" a situation it is. It's like calling up the fire department when your house is on fire, and when they arrive they don't fight the fire. Instead they simply stand next to you and watch, shaking their head in sympathy as your house continues to burn to the ground. Better off having no fireman at all

then to have the false security of firemen that don't do their job. I'm not sure this is a problem with the constitution though. It's a problem with DPs, Circuit Counselors and synod officials in general not using the authority they have been given. Rewriting a constitution will not do anything in this matter if those given authority in the synod run roughshod over it with impunity. The constitution could, however, establish certain specific duties and safeguards to ensure the DPs and CCs do their job. For example, the constitution could require the DPs to annually review the communion statements of each congregation to be sure that they do not open the communion table to Christians of other denominations. If the Pastor is practicing it and refuses to align with right practice, the DP should initiate an investigation with charges of false doctrine. Pastors should not have to "work with the congregation" to establish proper communion practices as it says in the COP guidelines; they should simply do it while providing proper teaching and instruction. Synod should not allow a congregation to call a pastor if it practices less than closed-communion; nor should such pastors who practice open communion be tolerated. Same goes for role of women in the church and Divine Call issues which are clearly contentious in our current church context. Though contentious, these are not open questions, nor are they matters of adiaphora. We have a clear synodical position on these matters as drawn from holy writ. If they are going to take the job, DP's should be supervising congregations and enforcing these things. By enforce, I mean file charges towards expulsion from the synod. Perhaps DPs should have the authority to put congregations on restricted status, thus prohibiting them from calling LC-C pastors (or practically speaking, prohibiting rostered LCC pastors from taking a call there if issued) until they return and submit to sound biblical doctrine and practice. "I appeal to you, brothers, to watch out for those who cause divisions and create obstacles contrary to the doctrine you have been taught; avoid them" (Romans 16:17). I should also add another example from personal experience. I had constitutional standing before the Commission on Adjudication regarding my case of being fired by the congregation. I appealed and they opted not to try my case. They could have reviewed it; they even led on that they were going to do so, until they saw my legal brief. Then all of a sudden, I got notification that they had chosen to refuse to hear my case after all, but without explaining why. Eventually, they said that my case was in essence a civil matter, thus tempting me to take it to secular court before unbelievers against 1 Corinthians 6:1-8. What constitutional recourse is there if the adjudication panel escapes their duty to handle church matters so they don't end up in court? None, but there should be. These synodical officials were elected to a particular duty to which the greater synod decided it had a responsibility. To adjudicate such matters as this is important, and yet the Commission simply opted out of doing their job. This dereliction of duty has left myself, my congregation and the rest of the Synod in limbo over how to regard my removal. In my experience, Ecclesiastical Supervision of doctrine and practice in our synod is a legal fiction.

110. pastor is almost always " right" and lay people are the ones with the problem and had better smarten up
111. I’ve seen a congregation disband because of lack of interim support So many congregations can't afford their own pastor
112. Many churches, missions are using novelties or promoting heterodox doctrines and practices, and no action is taken. Presidents at Synodical and District level are negligent or reluctant to do their duty to call the erring to repentance. The same happens in some places

where pastors abuse their authority and are left untouched because no false teaching on their part can be easily demonstrated.

113. Ecclesiastical Supervision is the only thing elected pastors should be doing -Pastors should stay out of the business side of LCC and LCC congregations -The lay members support seminaries to train Pastors to TEACH, PREACH AND ADMINISTER THE SACREMENTS AND VISIT -CEO' are plentiful good pastors are not
114. On the one hand, I can't really answer this question in that I do not inhabit a sphere to watch how supervision of Pastors takes place within LCC...but I have lived in several provinces in Canada and travel a lot and whenever I travel I go to an LCC church (i.e. I have attended A LOT of different LCC churches and I do find that there is quite a range of church practice and have sadly attended on more than one occasion churches that were not very Lutheran in doctrine or practice, (e.g. open communion, open criticism of traditional church practices, suggestions that all denominations are really the same....) and it seems like many pastors who teach or practice these things are not really being supervised...I know it is hard to be everywhere and there is lots going on behind the scenes but are level of supervision is such that so to speak "Lone Ranger" pastors are allowed to do whatever they like and are not being held to the vows they took at ordination/installation regarding church practices, Augsburg confession, etc.
115. what is that??
116. There seems to be a large disparity between congregations and districts in terms of practice. I believe there needs to be stronger and more centralized ecclesiastical supervision.
117. It is as good as it can be.
118. I am not knowledgeable
119. Do not know enough to make an informed answer.
120. Sometimes follow through is lacking when doctrine and practice stray from Lutheran teachings and it is publicly known. When gentle reminders are needed and congregation members see varying practices not being addressed by for example a DP or VP, it creates confusion.
121. Our congregation has not been visited by the Circuit Counsellor or the District for many years. (Pastor Gimbel from CLS has attended a few times). Attendance at the pastors' circuit meetings is not mandatory and is apparently sporadic.
122. I agree for the most part. This is a challenging area, especially for small rural congregations and multi-point parishes.
123. I am not sure I have a clear enough picture of how this works to make a fair assessment.
124. One should see district or synod officials in the local parishes more.
125. I believe that this is not only foundational but will become increasingly more challenging and be tested more often.
126. Too many aberrant practices are allowed
127. As a lay person, I am informed about the above.
128. I have only been a member of LCC for two and a half years, but from what I see I think it is effective.
129. I HAVEN'T EXPERIENCED THE NEED FOR INTERVENTION IN MY CONGREGATION OR OTHERS, SO I DON'T KNOW
130. While the criticism of the current system is that the District/Synodical President has no real "teeth" I believe the authority is delegated appropriately as it does not lead to one member of the church expressing their will upon all others. While the majority of presidents will use

their authority in a manner they deem to be correct and right, all humans are flawed and can be wrong or make mistakes. In addition, the document "A Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope" confirms that no one apostle should have supremacy over the others. I only agree and not strongly agree because I feel that those with the responsibility of ecclesiastical supervision should have the ability to share with a congregation when they believe the minister of that church is errant in doctrine or practice. This so to enable the congregation to determine for themselves the path forward.

131. I'm not a pastor so I am not aware of how the synod supervises doctrine and practice in the church. I don't recall our congregation being visited by anyone from LCC head office or the district for that matter.
132. Not sure what this refers to. The authority should remain with the congregation.
133. I see little evidence of ecclesiastical supervision in my congregation. There is next to no communication from the Circuit Counselor (please change the name to Circuit Visitor, and then the role should be more clear), or from the District President, or regular (i.e., non-emergency/crisis) visitation by anyone. There has been very little if any interaction between the synod/district and the university--which is one reason that Concordia's administration has acted to weaken and now sever the formal relationship between the university and LCC.
134. the definition of "supervision" can be interpreted a number of ways - ensuring adherence to the biblical and confessional truths of our synod is too often expanded to include choice of music, service style and even association with other Christian denominations. I don't believe either the bible or Luther forbad the use of guitars or commanded the use of organs in worship. That said, there is a tension between freedom for our pastors and church workers to respond to the needs of each parish and yet remain faithful to our doctrine.
135. Too much reading of book words and believe statements without our overhead projected words to understand rather than say meaning from memory with no new revelation Did not know 80% of outreaches!
136. I have no idea what the ecclesiastical supervision is like in our district.
137. Not knowledgeable
138. Sometimes I get the feeling that such supervision is too effective, choking off new ways of thinking about Christianity. There is a tendency to think that what is doctrine and practice at this moment is pure and true and cannot be deviated from in any way - until it next changes. Take for example, women not being able to vote; then being able to vote; not being able to hold most offices; then holding more offices; not being allowed to preach; likely being allowed to preach in the future. Or the rule over liturgy by the authors of the hymnal in eliminating the Sign of Peace, which no one was asking for.
139. At my current congregation I have no issues doctrinally with the pastor(s) BUT if there were an issue no one would find out unless I or a congregation member reported it to someone. I think it would be a good idea to have someone who visits the congregations annually to assess how our church leaders are doing.
140. If you are really serious about lay input, you would have to define Ecclesiastical Supervision. If you are asking about District Presidents or circuit counselors supervising our congregation, I don't think we have seen either in the last 10 years.
141. A lack of Ecc. Supervision has resulted in huge inconsistencies among Lutheran Service Practices
142. No changes required.
143. There is no communication to the member level. It is all top down.

144. The church appears to be drifting towards a general protestant theology and practice.
145. I don't understand the question; or is it a statement? Cold this be put in lay terms?
146. don't know
147. I would lean to the side of “agree”, in that, doctrine seems to be pretty consistent in any LCC church I have attended. I believe this has been aided largely in part by the hard work and efforts that were put into assembling, and implementing the Lutheran Service Book hymnals, which seems to have unified LCC congregations on my fronts. I can’t really agree or disagree however, as I haven’t bore witness to how ecclesiastical supervision has played itself.
148. Out in cases of doctrine/practice that is not in line with LCC values.
149. I have done this survey once so will not complete it again but wanted to add a comment after allot of thought and talking to other member of my church. The survey I feel is making one incorrect assumption and that is that all members know and understand how the synodical and district levels interact and who controls what. You are asking laypeople to comment and make decisions on something they have little knowledge about. The many members I talked with did not use the "NO Opinion" and felt they should say something even if they lacked sufficient knowledge or understanding. If it was possible to withdraw my survey, I would gladly do that. It is a little like forcing people to take Communion if they do not know why or understand the consequences of their action. I feel that this survey will lead the district staff in a direction that will not truly represent the wishes of LCC members. Sometimes a little knowledge or more to the point a lack of knowledge is a dangerous thing.
150. It is difficult to know unless you attend other Lutheran churches and compare practices.
151. Attention to doctrine and practice is not a negative thing - but a focus on this will not make us a church that reaches out to nonbelievers or even non-Lutherans. We need to stop circling the wagons and reach out.
152. I believe too much energy goes into this, at the expense of reaching out to others who are non-Christians. We tend to circle the wagons too much.
153. I believe that there have been some inconsistencies in the area of Ecclesiastical Supervision of practice. In a couple of situations 2 pastors who had caused great harm to the faith of the members of the parish they were serving were not helped with their issues to the best of my knowledge, but went on to serve other parishes. This has been very distressful for the congregation that they have left behind hurting, broken, and confused. I can speak to this issue, first hand, because for the last 9 months I have tried to promote healing in the congregation I am serving.
154. It is unclear to the average layperson the extent of ecclesiastical supervision exercised by district/synod presidents over pastors/deacons/congregations. Part of the problem is the terminology of "president" itself. Most laypeople don't understand what a "president" is or does. Is it a political office? A business term? LCC should seriously consider using ecclesiastical terminology more easily understood by laypeople, like bishops and archbishops.
155. It is not immediately clear to most laypeople what ecclesiastical supervision, if any, is actually being wielded by district presidents and synodical presidents. The majority of our congregations seem to be teaching in accord with faithful Lutheran doctrine; however, further clarification of the extent of presidential supervision would be helpful. Part of the problem is that no one knows what a church "president" is or what they do. Using more clear ecclesiastical terminology, like "bishop", might help to clarify to laypeople the relationship

between district/synod presidents and pastors--and might help them to understand who to turn to when there are problems in their congregation.

156. Whose ecclesiastical supervision, and of whom? I have no idea to what extent Pastor is supervised by the district or the synod. I cannot answer this question.
157. Call process is flawed, not ensuring a good match of talent with congregational needs. Poor accuracy on pastoral information, poor information from District on possible candidates, and inability to get sufficient clarity on pastoral gifts/talents before a call.
158. Restructure with the knowledge of existing electronic communication that was not present when the current structure was put into place.
159. It seems to me that ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine and practice is done mostly behind the scenes, out of public view. In some, perhaps most, cases this is appropriate. However, it also means that the vast majority of people in the synod have no knowledge whether it is effective or not. I suspect, but cannot know, that most situations are dealt with by the reconciliation process rather than a discipline process. This has at least a potentiality of letting questionable doctrine or practice be swept under the proverbial carpet.
160. I have not encountered conflict over doctrine and practice personally, therefore, it is difficult to respond to this question. The position Lutheran Church-Canada takes regarding Scripture and the confessions and how they inform practice has been a deterrent to those with broad Christian backgrounds (coming from another denomination or multi-denominational experiences). I sometimes wonder if our congregations (maybe even some of our pastors) truly grasp the purpose and intent of our Lutheran confessions and the subscription we take to uphold them. We are called to remain grounded in Scripture and our Confessions are a bold stand on what Scripture teaches!
161. In the present structure, I believe that this could be more effective if the District Presidents were not encumbered by the corporate responsibilities placed upon them at present. This I hope would allow them to give greater attention to the ecclesiastic care including supervision of doctrine and practice.
162. But would like to know what this supervision of doctrine and practice consists of.
163. At the ABC District level at present, it is practically non-existent. Are the pastors who are involved in lawsuits with CEF being "supervised" by the ecclesiastical supervisor appointed by the Synod. If not, why not? In the past, when the supervision was carried out at the district level, it was, for the most part, effective.
164. I don't believe the ordinary church member know anything about this. I don't. How can a church member grade this? Each one has a personal agenda.
165. I don't understand
166. Where parish pastors deviate from Confessional doctrine and/or practice, the onus is on the laypeople of the congregation to "make the case" to the Circuit Counsellor or District President (after having confronted the pastor unsuccessfully). There is legitimate fear that brother pastors will "protect their own", and there's reluctance to act because of the time and energy required. Therefore, unfaithful pastors are allowed to continue harming congregations and Christ's kingdom. I believe a culture shift is needed, so that brother pastors not only *may* but *are expected to* admonish each other and so care for the Church as a whole.
167. There is no apparent ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine or practice, which is evident from the wide range of heterodox doctrine and practice taking place rampantly.

168. Every LCC church that I have attended throughout Canada share the same doctrine and practice.
169. On 3 occasions I heard false doctrine preached in an LCC church
170. I believe we are effective regarding our doctrine but not so effective in our practice.
171. Many are doing their own thing. Confirmation and Holy Communion are often not done in the Lutheran way.
172. From what I understand this is regulated through approved training through our accredited programs and equivalents. As far as particular instances go, pastors are given authority to make decisions without consultation from the synod unless they are unsure how to proceed. In these cases, I have observed that proper instruction and support can be given through our current channels.
173. We know of several pastors who seem to have forgotten their role as a servant of the church. We know of several congregations who are experiencing difficulty with their pastor in certain practices. They have forgotten their role as servants.
174. It is difficult to hold fellow church workers to account doctrinally because it can bring personal consequences in regard to the relationships on a Circuit, District or Synod level. Also, it appears that many church workers regard formal doctrinal statements, like Walther's Thesis on Kirche und Amt as merely advisory and not our official doctrinal position.
175. I see no evidence of ecclesiastical supervision of the Synod in our local congregation.
176. I don't know how I would know this. What does it look like? I am assuming that is, but don't really have a basis for it.
177. However, because of the congregation's autonomy and the reluctance of people in a congregation to "speak up" and take action -- there is much laxness and inactivity in this area. Congregational members (especially leaders) need to know much more in this area.
178. Some pastors and congregations don't always carry through on doctrine and practice, i.e. close communion.
179. Not even Christ or his disciples could be members of LCC or have communion in our current structure. Way too conservative in our practices. Where was LCMS (and the current LCC which used to be LCMS before 1988) in the Lutheran homes when girls who became pregnant out of wedlock were sent away to have their babies and then often forced to give them up for adoption? This was a travesty of the home, and ministers encouraged this whole practice. Mothers and grandparents never got to know their offspring.
180. There is no real ecclesiastical supervision. This would require a visit from District or Synodical representatives. This is also seen in that there are churches practicing things (e.g. open communion) which go against the position of Scripture, the Confessions and the official position of Synod with no observable repercussions. Often, only once there is a problem in a congregation does the District or Synod get involved.
181. Synodical officials seem to be unable to effectively deal with lay/clergy conflicts with the result often being that the lay people leave.
182. Modernize doctrine to include women in spiritual leadership, pastors, elders, etc. make steps to unify LCC and ELCIC We collectively need it
183. Not enough information available
184. Those who want a more rigid supervision would not agree.
185. By who for whom?
186. There is more involved with the above. There is also care of full-time workers and families and pastoral care for the people of the Church.

187. District president does not check in or touch base with congregational pastors.
188. I have heard no complaints, but wonder if the LCC thinks it is effective and would like change. Since a lay person does not know if it is effective or not, it makes one wonder.
189. Far too often the DP or SP has acted as if they are only advisory, that they have no right to bind anyone or any congregation to a certain action. However, they have the Word of God, our Confessional standard in the Book of Concord, and rarely declare that any individual or congregation acting contrary to those standards would face any synodical or district repercussions.
190. Supervision is effective. However, some pastors want/expect "policing," a much more rigid and Law-oriented type of supervision.
191. Unknown - however confidence in both Synod & District Presidents
192. I understand that some Pastors historically have been disapproved of, and even disciplined, for their participation in local inter-church or ecumenical programs - I believe that the church should support Pastors to make these local decisions, and to actively participate in faith and social justice activities in their communities. This is the Christian message and position. I know the LC-C has strong positions about pastors preaching in other churches or forums, or someone from another Christian denomination preaching in ours - again, more discretion needed.
193. While the criticism of the current system is that the District/Synodical President has no real "teeth" I believe the authority is delegated appropriately as it does not lead to one member of the church expressing their will upon all others. While the majority of presidents will use their authority in a manner they deem to be correct and right, all humans are flawed and can be wrong or make mistakes. In addition, the document "A Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope" confirms that no one apostle should have supremacy over the others. I only agree and not strongly agree because I feel that those with the responsibility of ecclesiastical supervision should have the ability to share with a congregation when they believe the minister of that church is errant in doctrine or practice. This so to enable the congregation to determine for themselves the path forward.
194. agree, but as a new (relatively) only about 4 years, and a woman, I feel that there seems to be no method for me to further my theological studies, other than personally borrowing books. Is there some plan for online studies for women in the church?
195. It happens occasionally at the circuit level but I have not experienced much supervision.
196. This is of earth shattering importance to the church locally and also as an example to the church at large, who are throwing doctrine overboard to attract lightweight Christians who have no substance to their faith.
197. I think that there was too much top-down supervision - For instance, at one time, district wanted to evaluate each praise song (as opposed to hymns). I thought that each pastor could evaluate as the professional in the congregation.
198. I don't think we have been very effective here at all. Many pastors and congregations appear to have wandered far from our Lutheran confession and practice with little to any constructive discipline offered. Those in authority need to exercise it more consistently. However, I also believe that our church structure may be partially to blame. Perhaps our Synod and District Presidents and Circuit Counselors need more authority.
199. Supervision is minimal.
200. Ecclesiastical supervision seems to be inconsistent across the synod as evidenced in a variance in practices such as closed communion.

201. This statement is unclear. I can not render an opinion because I do not know what it is asking. Yes, I agree the concept of "Ecclesiastical Supervision" is effective. In practice, at the present time and in our midst, we have an extremely "hands off" laissez faire attitude toward this. I have not experienced or witnessed effective ecclesiastical supervision.
202. I do know that synod came to the rescue when the ABC district needed support. I assume they would do this for others.
203. Given the current size of the districts, it is impossible for the district president to know what is taught and practiced in any individual congregation, never mind supervise anything.
204. As a lay person, I have no idea; how would I know?
205. A (now-disbanded) congregation within LCC - ABC District had been non-Lutheran in both doctrine and practice for a number of years, including within the past decade.
206. I find there to be very little "supervision".
207. Not sure it is as essential or not.
208. It seems in our congregation that it is overzealous.
209. -I think that the average person taking this survey from a congregation would have no clue what you are talking about.
210. This and many similar questions, I mark as 6 because I just do not know. No one approached me.
211. Supervision really does not exist apart from circuit meetings and conference interactions. I feel DPs do not let their yes be yes and their no be no. They are governed by fear; primarily, fear that more people will leave the church by the wrong action, either by supporting the pastor or the church or neither.
212. After travelling through BC and Alberta and visiting many LCC churches at times one would not recognize some churches as LCC except for the sign out front. We need to follow what our doctrine states in all churches.
213. Effective is an ambiguous word. The District Presidents and the circuit counselors are limited in what they can do because they are dependent on the congregations and church workers willingness to be supervised which may include correction and accountability. I think the District Presidents are doing a very job, certainly that has been the case in the ABC District. The ABC District has utilized Ambassadors of Reconciliation very well in dealing with conflicted congregations and church workers.
214. If anything, the supervision could be more applied to congregations and pastors alike, to have us behave more as 'synod' walking together.
215. Does it require as much administration as current?
216. There is too much control which doesn't allow for diverse approaches.
217. I don't know where to go to get this information. I attended 2 call meetings and there was some information presented about the pastors we were looking at. I don't know if there is supervision of our pastor, his teaching and practice
218. so is good complete and honest communication
219. I don't have enough involvement or knowledge of this to even say
220. There are too many pastors and congregations that are not walking together in unity and doing their own thing when it comes to close communion in particular. This creates an unnecessary challenge to pastors and congregations that are walking together in unity and holding to the Biblical/LCC understanding.
221. Travelled extensively in Canada and have found many congregations practice open communion. Liturgical practices vary hugely. Some not recognizable as Lutheran. Difficult

for the district president alone or even with the circuit councillor to enforce or supervise doctrine. Being Congregationalist clergy do what they want and in some instances against the laity who have a better understanding of sound doctrine. In other provinces there has been no mention of Christ in the sermon.

222. Communications of Districts and Synod has to be improved to congregations so they can feel they are playing a much bigger part in service to God in having one body Lutheran Church Canada with just the Synod
223. doctrine needs to change, be more with todays world. should be only concerned with serving Jesus.
224. LCC Constitution Art. II:7 encourages "congregations to strive for uniformity in church practice..." This should be our primary aim. "Exclusive use of doctrinally pure agenda, hymn books, and catechisms in church and school" (Art. VI:4), serve our members well by fostering unity, making clear our confessional stance in LCC, and positioning our members for effective outreach. Services which abandon Lutheran hymnals foster may confusion and encourage a different confession of doctrine and practice. Where is the mechanism to supervise innovation in worship services when a congregation no longer follows "responsible practices and customs which are in harmony with our common profession of faith" (Art. III:7)? Where do we draw the line? Who enforces it?
225. Although I take issue with the word "supervision". Why is a question of "supervision" and the next question on "authority" the first two questions of this survey? I know you had to start somewhere, but really??? It sets a tone right off the starting block. Not healthy to start this way....
226. We need to "wake up the church" and bring in lots of young people...while still maintaining sound doctrine. I think a balance of the two is important...but please realize that churches are closing and who will be there to keep our churches going in 10-15 years? It can only be our youth, which in most congregations are almost non existent
227. I don't know what is meant by "Ecclesiastical Supervision.
228. There is way too much political and good old boy school mentality here. It is hard enough to have people that want to enter the ministry and then they have to jump through all of your hoops. It is very hard for young families to support themselves uproot their families so that they can go to your seminary schools.
229. "Effectiveness" depends on the integrity and ability of the men charged with such supervision, and on the willingness of pastors and people to submit to it. Mere change of structure will not itself produce any improvements.
230. This question is unclear. Do you mean that the current Ecclesiastical Supervision ministry is doing its job well? Or does the question mean that this (Ecclesiastical Supervision, as opposed to other forms of Supervision) is/are an effective way to supervise doctrine???
231. How would I assess this? How could I know what supervision is being done?
232. In some cases, yes - in some cases no.
233. Generally speaking, though not in all cases.
234. I don't think that the LCC leadership or as a whole denomination has hedged itself enough to protect against the challenges currently threatening other denominations, i.e. homosexual clergy, women's ordination, closed communion, etc. The large amount of leniency and the fear of defending our doctrines will ruin the LCC.
235. I simply don't know enough about how this supervision is occurring.

236. Pastors all seem to teaching correct doctrine. Concern that there is apathetic behavior taking place with a lot of Pastors in carrying out the practise.
237. Better use of the national church workers conferences would help.
238. Both District and Synod seem far from the parish. I would like to see a pastoral leader more in contact with pastors and congregations instead of a more "administrative" model as it seems to have been over the past number of years in our District.
239. Have not seen any evidence
240. Difficult for layman to know this
241. Incompetence and arrogance, narcissism and vindictiveness caused the fiasco in ABC; if there was adequate supervision there would be at least two defrocked individuals including one now bearing the title DP.
242. Supervision is completely absent and I have personally witnessed cases "supervisors" mistreated the pastors under their so-called supervision or allowed the church to mistreat the pastor to the extent he had to leave.
243. We need to change regarding the role of women in the church. Women should be allowed to become pastors, elders, chairperson, etc. I know of several cases where women refuse to join our congregation because of our current rule.
244. Church supervision is not often talked about but I have talked to a number of pastors over the years and quite often they have little differences in their beliefs. We are all sinners and who is to say what is right and wrong. How do you deal with openly gay people or divorced parishioners co-habituating? These are difficult times even trying to stay relevant.
245. I believe we could do a better job of applying our doctrine in more pastoral and practical ways that do not push people away. However, pastors are fearful of acting contrary to our doctrinal position.
246. Although I disagree with some of the rigidity and some issues, I do believe the supervision of our doctrine is effective.
247. While I do not agree with our position on several issues, I do believe that our clergy are effectively practicing and articulating the doctrine of our church. I think that in many cases, some of our clergy are rigid, not flexible and not listening to their parishioners.
248. As a layperson, I have no first hand evidence that this is or is not effective.
249. I see a disturbing trend, albeit slow and subtle, toward liberalism and contemporary social attitudes.
250. Who does this? Is someone supervising our Pastor. When and how is this done?
251. -there are divergent practices across the Synod, even about such important things as closed communion -not sure how these issues would even be addressed
252. Include women
253. While I believe that we need to trust in the Lord to help answer the prayers and the needs of the church, I do believe that there also needs to be an opportunity for a congregation to interview the pastor and the pastor should be able to interview the church to see if this is right for both.
254. This is a core power and responsibility of Synod.
255. The challenge is in supervising their practice. How do congregations participate? Does this participation need to be expanded?
256. This is not an area that people tend to see in action often. However, I do believe that LCC is strong in doctrine and strong in supporting that doctrine.
257. The laity should not have a say in either doctrine or practice.

258. There have been too many occasions when pastors have nearly destroyed congregations. What I mean by this is that a pastor will show up in a congregation that is healthy and thriving and that over a course of a 3-5 years you see 80 % or more of the congregation leave - some to go to other church bodies; some do not go back to church because their faith has been destroyed. The reason that congregation members have left are varied - for some it an near Catholic practise of high liturgy; for others it is the pastor who takes over responsibilities that are not rightly part of the office of the ministry - i.e. finances - a pastor needs to understand what happens financially but the pastor should not have direct oversight of the finances, nor should he be spending huge amounts of time on financial matters. That is not what he is trained to do; our theology has always specifically left those roles in the hands of the lay people. The other thing I see happening is adoption of more and more business paradigms. I am not apposed to learning from business paradigms whenever we can. But we need to be very careful that we don't take those paradigms too far. We need to trust God above all things. We need to be people of prayer - people who believe that God listens to our prayers and responds. We need to stop trusting in business solutions - we need to trust in God and wisely make use of business skills that can better equip us for the work of the gospel. The oversight is not seen by most of us laypeople; but I do think that oversight ought to exist not solely for heresy; but also for practices that get us into trouble occasionally. I think that the help that is offered here or in terms of spiritual care is too voluntary. Way too many workers are of the edge of blowing up before the district or synod (or in most cases even the congregation) is aware that there is a problem. Other than passing through seminary there is virtually no accountability in a worker's life. In the cases where workers have had a crisis - major healthy issue (heart attack); or a nervous break-down - they don't get the help they've needed until they've done something that wounds lots of people and sometimes destroys their ability to be in the ministry again.
259. As a lay person what does this mean.
260. Vacancies are difficult to fill in many rural locations, and many congregations have stopped calling.
261. Why was Rev. Astley appointed to do the 'ecclesiastical supervision' in our district when "the District President performs this function on the local or district level"?
262. how do I know
263. how do I know for sure as a lay person?
264. While there seems to be some care being taken to watch for straying on the liberal side of things, there seems to be very little watching over legalism, moralism and traditionalism amongst pastors. There is also evidence that overlooking these things and pitting pastors against lay people and congregations is practiced.
265. It seems LCC fails to discipline pastors and / or congregations that are legalistic and Pharisaical in applying doctrines and practices. LCC seems to be scared to death of Liberalism (which we need to be) but oblivious and even supportive of the other spectrum
266. supervision .... "would seem to be" effective. There are two components here: how effective the practice of supervision is can only be rated by comparison to the doctrine.
267. I'm not sure what you mean by this statement. I think it would depend on the individual Pastor in each congregation as they all have different strengths and opinions.
268. In my experience, there is little to no ecclesiastical supervision, and no desire to provide such a service. My congregation has had several pastors that have abused their position and when we went to district for resolution, nothing was done. It wasn't even acted upon. It is to

the point we don't even bother now, and we've got it worse than we ever have. For example, our current pastor feels it is acceptable to use a devotion as a time to single out a member and deal with an issue they have. Pastors seem to think they are infallible, and above the rules. I am sick of this attitude and don't think anything will change.

269. The Synodical President has not been able to rein in the "black shirts" 2. There have been a handful of pastors who have ruined congregations or poisoned the waters in relations within and/or between congregations. There has been no disciplinary action from Synod or District. The main action/reaction has been Church members moving to another church or leaving LCC forever.
270. Holding true to the bible's facts without wavering in today's society is a difficult message at times but must continue in strength.
271. The liturgical practice of the church does much to ensure doctrinal uniformity and consistency of teaching but I cannot ever remember seeing ecclesiastical supervisors visiting our congregation(s) for the purpose of seeing what is actually being taught or practiced in our place of worship.
272. To clarify: for the most part, I do "Agree". However, in regard to lay people "stocking" our church's library or leading a Bible study, I feel that not all materials undergo thorough vetting as to theologically and doctrinally sound content.
273. The practical application of doctrine and practice/Gospel seems to be overshadowed by law. It seems like the joy and spread of the Gospel is not as important as following the letter of the law.... not the greatest commandment which is to love! Word and Sacrament to empty pews is acceptable and is more important than finding out where people are at in their faith and working God's Word and love with them.
274. DPs are far removed from the circuits...circuit counselors are brothers in the ministry and find it difficult at times to work with a congregation and pastor.
275. Not sure I understand the statement. We need strong leaders, well spoken and clear and concise (Bugbee is a wonderful example).
276. There is very little supervision regarding doctrine or practice in LCC. Pastors and congregations use heterodox and heretical materials for worship, Sunday school, confirmation and Bible study and no one does anything or says anything about it.
277. We would probably only know that "Ecclesiastical Supervision of doctrine and practice" is effective from the situations where a Pastor or congregation has been publicly disciplined or removed from office/membership. In such cases the supervision would be effective in removal but not in achieving repentance and change. I am aware of several situations in each District where such discipline has occurred for both pastors and congregations. The effectiveness of "successful" supervision would most likely be unknown except to those involved in the discipline process. Given the evidence I have seen and heard I believe Ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine and practice is effective.
278. Ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine has, in my experience, been fairly effective. However, there are still many churches who operate outside of proper church doctrine that should be properly supervised. Regular visits from ecclesiastical supervisors and circuit counsellors need to be enforced.
279. Procedures outlined in Handbook are sufficient. Effectiveness depends on those responsible for supervision.
280. Ecclesiastical supervision would have called upon ABC District leaders for resignation and repentance because they have lost credibility in LCC. What I knew and believed LCC to be

as a member of our congregation was not what was being practiced at our District level who had followed a fad and engaged in a theology of glory in creating the PoP development and hiding this exposure to congregations and their fund donors.

281. Procedures outlined in Handbook are sufficient. "Effectiveness" varies, depending on how those responsible actually do what is required of them.
282. I think that we have the best of intentions, but I also see great diversity at times in how strictly certain practices are followed (such as closed communion) and how strictly particular leadership issues are interpreted (can women read lessons? Can any lay people read lessons? Is it permissible for a female deacon to give a children's message or not? etc.) Such diversity leads to confusion when members move between congregations. I don't know the solution. Perhaps it is less an issue of "supervision" than of education. Still, it is a struggle.
283. if ecclesiastical supervision were actually followed, it would be highly effective. Ecclesiastical supervision is the most essential aspect of synod. However, it is no secret that many congregations practice open communion, follow so called contemporary worship formats, choose songs that contain false doctrine and/or come from a false understanding of the doctrine, etc. Until we as a synod come to understand that our practice cannot be considered in isolation from doctrine (read The Fire and The Staff, available from CPH) and follow ecclesiastical supervision we are not truly walking in synod. so do I answer, yes it is greatly effective when followed, or no it is not effective when not followed? with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
284. Congregations are autonomous as are the educational institutions, service organizations and auxiliaries of the church.... in many cases those ordained pastors heading or involved with any of the above quietly lead their congregations, organization, institution relatively independent of ecclesiastical supervision by the district and/or synodical presidents.
285. I am not sure of the practical distinctions between items 1 and 2.
286. I do not know about this topic as it is not spoken of in church. I would like to know about what happens
287. e.g. a number of LCC churches practice open communion
288. Depends on the minister
289. Theology experts should be involved also.
290. We have found that ministers receiving their education in St Catherine's have very narrow understanding of scripture and in some cases what is preached is not from scripture. Many ministers are not relating scripture lessons to every day life and therefore relevance is often not understood by those attending church. I have left church many, many times and explained the actual relevance to my family that the minister either did not portray or portrayed in an incorrect way.
291. There is a wide range of doctrine and practice, and unlike other church bodies, we have not (yet?) opened a range of doctrine and practice.
292. I am thankful for the unity we enjoy in doctrine and practice, but I don't think it's due to direct ecclesiastical supervision, and sadly, there have been cases in which ecclesiastical supervisors have been a source of disunity.
293. The average parishioner would have no way of knowing, apart from any relevant content that might be found in the Canadian Lutheran.
294. It is not effective in all jurisdictions.
295. I am concerned about the growing " High Church " practices in some of our churches and there seems to be little response when these are raised.

296. There is always room for improvement.
297. Yes, but to the detriment of hearing the message and enjoying the service. There are not enough men to do this appropriately.
298. I am not exactly sure how this function is carried out. I would assume that the District Presidents are the people most responsible for this function. However, what process does it involve? Are there scheduled appraisals? Do pastors have to submit their sermons from time to time? Is the process more ad hoc in that a complaint from a parishioner must be lodged before a pastor's doctrine and practice is examined?
299. Not certain if urban and rural congregations receive similar "supervision".
300. It seems from traveling from one LCC church to another that we hear different theology preached from the pulpits. Who supervises this and where is the accountability?
301. Ecclesiastical Supervision is less effective (largely lacking) in long term vacant parishes that are geographically on the periphery.
302. I am aware of a small but critical number of pastors that I do not feel are presenting solid doctrinal teaching in their care for their congregations
303. I don't actually even know of any supervision taking place other than the presiding pastor being responsible for all materials that are presented in the local parish.
304. I don't know, I have never seen it in action
305. There is too much emphasis on congregational autonomy. There is too little acceptance of the supervision offered from duly elected synod and district officers. It is often ignored by pastors and congregations. There are too many "lone wolves"
306. How do we know if he is being supervised?
307. sometimes we get to involved in doctrine and rules we become like the Pharisees....we need to follow Christ, his teaching...being careful not to become religious but Christ followers
308. I do not know
309. There is an old-boys network amongst the pastors that protects them when they are ineffective and in my opinion stops the people in charge of ecclesiastical supervision from offering assistance soon enough to help pastors in trouble (i.e. in terms of health; overwork etc.). This also means that lay people brave enough to come forward are not heard with the same weight as pastors. In cases where there is tension between the deacon or church worker and the pastor the district executive almost always sides with the pastor; meaning effectively that the deacons are without protection. Statistics prove that pornography is rampant in our culture - including most men and if the statistics are believable than 85-90% of pastors also have or still participate in some form of pornography. But we don't do anything that I'm aware of that would help improve this statistic in our synod. Even if only 1/2 our pastors are involved in pornography then it is impacting our congregations with huge underlying effects. It is evil and I don't think we are addressing it. Because we don't talk about it at the leadership level then most pastors ignore the issue in the parish because they don't have any idea how to effectively address it.
310. Call process is flawed, not ensuring a good match of talent with congregational needs. Poor accuracy on pastoral information, poor information from district on possible candidates, and inability to get sufficient clarity on pastoral gifts/talents before a call.
311. In the current system, it's physically impossible for a District President to provide adequate care to all those under his charge.
312. Information should be more extensive considering pastors when presented at a call meeting. Re: Will pastor fit in?

313. Need to update and modernize our approach.
314. My congregation is blessed with caring, loving, hard working pastors who preach the true word of salvation and provide Bible Studies & activities for all their people. They make many visits to shut ins, hospital visits and visit the homes of their congregation. But that is no true in all congregations. LCC & district have not confronted the pastors who do "as little as possible to get by"! What a shame! Why are you not concerned about what all your pastors are or are not doing?
315. Incompetence and arrogance, narcissism and vindictiveness caused the fiasco in ABC; if there was adequate supervision there would be at least two defrocked individuals, including one bearing the title DP
316. In the past in asking district to help settle doctrinal differences they were totally unhelpful and seemed to want to keep the peace rather than stand FIRMLY on scripture. However, Pastor Astley has shown deep interest and is willing to act on matters that need spiritual attention and I appreciate that and EXPECT that from our leadership.
317. Other denominations suffer in public opinion 1) because they believe and 2) because some congregations differ in opinions with their stated 'national' and 'international' views. I prefer a faith statement that is bible-based, clear and consistent - even if everyone in the 'world' doesn't (yet) agree with us.
318. I believe there isn't enough supervision in the districts. Some pastors are on the edge of violating the LCC constitution in their thinking and practice.
319. I'm not sure there is any supervision at all. If so, who is in charge and how often?
320. Not sure if there is any supervision.
321. Unaware of specifics upon which to base an opinion.
322. If it is done in relationship to the people in the church.
323. I believe that our LCC churches should only teach and preach the pure Word of God as found in Scripture
324. I have no idea what the question is asking.
325. Synod and district supervision is generally good. At times I feel local pastors criticize and intimidate other pastors and congregations with whom they disagree.
326. Our Doctrine and Practice have changed.
327. I have no way of monitoring or measuring this parameter.
328. Require closer supervision from the lay person members of LCC
329. Call process, although effective, should it be expanded to have potential call pastor and congregation get better acquainted prior to a call being placed.?
330. In what form is supervision occurring currently? Who conducts performance reviews?
331. Often the District Presidents seems very removed from doctrinal or practice issues in parishes, which may explain for too much diversity in practice in our churches.
332. The advisory nature of the Synod provides for the flexible nature of doctrine and practice according to the mission requirements of each congregation in its community setting. This relies on the integrity of Pastors and Lay Leaders to maintain correct doctrine and practice. Occasional problems arise when individual Pastors take it upon themselves to criticize and correct the practice of others with whom they do not agree. This is usually done without respect for the fact that occasionally different local needs may require differing responses in practice and often ignores that the doctrine involved is not different at all.
333. I haven't seen any one from district or synod at our church for a long time

334. Perhaps my concern is not the effectiveness of the current system, but the degree to which supervision is prioritized. It seems that other concerns may occupy the attention of those who are elected to supervise in these areas. We need to decide what is more important, managing districts/synod or supervising doctrine and practice.
335. Our district president is not able to adequately supervise all the pastors and church workers, as he is not in a position to actually see what they are doing. I am unaware of a formal review process, nor is there a written standard of quality that defines what is expected. Also, congregations, when they have concerns, don't have a healthy way to address them (process or a standard) so too often the conflict ends up in passive-aggressive interactions that damage individuals, congregations, and the proclamation of the gospel.
336. I don't know If "effective" is the word I would use, more like "necessary". If we don't have our doctrine, what are we? The next Anglican church. Our doctrine must be protected.
337. Under the current model, the District President is responsible for supervising all pastors and deacons in the district, but does not have much opportunity to actually see the pastors/workers in action. I am unaware of a formalized review process, nor is there a clear specific definition of the expectations of what quality ministry looks like, and without that standard predetermined, it is hard to hold our pastors/workers accountable to their work. Congregations call the workers but are not equipped or supported in holding their called workers accountable, and again there is no specific description of what is expected, so when problems emerge, it too often leads to conflict and passive/aggressive (i.e. unhealthy) ways of dealing with the conflict between workers and their churches. All suffer.
338. However, do we require 4 Presidents
339. In my 12 years of ministry I have seen little to no supervision of doctrine and thus no 'effect'.
340. I feel that the seminarian placement process and supervision of Pastors could be better overseen by the District.
341. Don't see it being addressed in any intentional manner.
342. I know of at least two churches in one circuit that have openly preached decision theology and nothing has been done-in part because one of the pastors doing said preaching is the circuit counsellor and the DP is highly interested in missional church growth, so there is no point in trying to get the problem taken care of, because both the circuit counsellor and DP are involved or encourage such preaching and teaching.
343. The Presidium has tended to be more bogged down with administrative functions than with episcopal duties relating to ecclesiastical oversight in my experience.
344. the definition of "supervision" can be interpreted a number of ways - ensuring adherence to the biblical and confessional truths of our synod is too often expanded to include choice of music, service style and even association with other Christian denominations. I don't believe either the bible or Luther forbad the use of guitars or commanded the use of organs in worship. That said, there is a tension between freedom for our pastors and church workers to pursue their calling and a need to ensure synod - our walking together - is not broken, especially in the age of pluralism and individualism.
345. Practice is not sufficiently supervised to convey and sustain unified doctrine e.g. weekly communion, insistence on confirmation as condition for participation in Holy Communion, close communion; divorced-remarried pastors
346. I think that direction on doctrine needs to be given more blunt from Ecclesiastical Supervision. As when it gets to the point that doctrine is being questioned, a beat around the bush approach creates room for the incorrect doctrine to continue. Example: Situation X is

how LCC states we should do things, but supervision says others do it this way because of (blank)

347. Too much emphasis is devoted to this
348. Advisory Pastors seem to be reluctant to deal with rogue Pastors until the damage is too great. Congregations suffer. Pastors in general and congregations in particular fin it difficult to wield the anvil of God's law to their own people. But advisory Pastors are elected to do that for the sake of the ministry and the well-being of the Church. We elect "nice guys" to positions of authority. its nice, but its not effective. Leaders have to lead. More authority has to be given to those who oversee to supervise, not just doctrine, but especially practices that are harmful
349. I feel that when a congregation has a problem the District level does not properly work to rectify the problems but only acts as a mediator of sorts. There should be guidelines to follow for congregations and District officials, so no one feels in limbo.
350. Experience with this supervision is extremely limited.
351. I do find that the scriptural practice of closed communion is not uniformly practiced by any stretch of the imagination. How this can be effectively overseen, I am not sure.
352. A layperson has no idea of the effectiveness of this supervision.
353. Standardization is required with support as all congregations need to be strong. relationships between congregations to support each other needs to be encouraged - to gather and socialize and pray for each other when other churches are becoming weak or straying.
354. Sometimes I feel that the hands of the supervisors are tied by others
355. Some supervision creates division among congregants and other parishes. Doctrine and practice supervision should cover things that stray from biblical doctrine, or things that are heretical only. i.e. ecclesiastical supervision should have no say in how a church decides to worship, but should take action on songs that go against biblical doctrine.
356. Deuteronomy 13:1-3; Matthew 7:15-16; Acts 20:27-31; Romans 16:17-18; 2 Corinthians 6:14-18; Galatians 1:8-9; Galatians 5:9; 2 Timothy 3: 12-4:5; Titus 3:10; 1 John 4:1; Revelation 18:4
357. It was NOT effective enough in ABC District - Church Extension Fund - how else could it have gone sooo bad?
358. There have been instances where conflict between pastors and congregations has been allowed to fester to the point where deep hurt and division has occurred.
359. When congregations and pastors engage in practices contrary to the Objectives and Conditions of Membership of the LCC constitution (i.e., contracting of pastors rather than a regular call to serve so-called "non-calling" congregations; not using doctrinally pure agenda and hymn books; lack of uniformity in church practice) . . . and nothing is virtually said or done about this; then we have a problem with ecclesiastical supervision (or the lack thereof).
360. Sadly, the practice does not reflect our Church's confession so there is room for improvement.
361. Additional help could be given congregations and pastors, as currently LCC is advisory and struggling-hurting people are not always ready to call the District in to help.
362. As a member of our congregation we felt not heard during times crisis.
363. Have witnessed numerous examples of overly legalistic pastors destroying congregations. There is not harmony in the doctrine taught by the east and west seminaries. Some graduates of the eastern seminary come away with an almost Catholic view of the role of the pastor in the congregation - pope instead of servant.

364. I believe the calling process is effective to some degree, but I also believe promoting/publishing current vacancies also encourages thoughtful and prayerful consideration to serve in those parishes and communities. I believe that the calling process does not provoke the prayerful consideration it should and too many pastors are simply accepting a call due to the advantages living in certain communities provides or due to location only, rather than heeding to where God is leading them to serve.
365. Though a lot is allowed to "slide" there is still the awareness that one could be called to account
366. Men that earn a M.Div. from a Lutheran seminary are, by the nature of the seminary status, well grounded in doctrine and other skills allowing them to be effective ministers in our churches. However, it seems to me that when colloquy is the root, they are less supportive on what I would call "true Lutheran doctrine" and sometimes miss the "essentials" (e.g. Law and Gospel) of the Lutheran Church rather than some "aside" matters in other denominations
367. "Effective" would require specific guidelines to compare it to.
368. Incompetence and arrogance, narcissism and vindictiveness caused the fiasco in ABC; if there was adequate supervision there would be at least two defrocked individuals including one bearing the title DP. Where is our leadership in this mess?
369. some pastors have taught and gone against LCC doctrine with NO censoring. Like doctors, pastors will close ranks and protect their brothers in spite of their doctrinal errors.
370. Keep focus on Jesus. Layperson wouldn't know the answer to this question.
371. not nearly enough supervision of communion attendance - almost anyone may commune at most congregations I am aware of
372. Currently I believe the supervision of pastors, deacons and congregations by District/Synod President is good.
373. It's effective, as long as the doctrine and practice do not keep people from coming to church - such as having closed communion and not permitting people of other Christian denominations, who are active in their churches, from taking communion. This can discourage people from coming back to an LCC church when they desire to come. Snowbirds may be in this category of people.
374. The CTCR does a good job, and the Presidents likewise do when they publish officially on issues in our culture. However, the supervision of doctrine and practice within the Synod is not effective. There are major issues such as closed-communion and worship in which we are not "walking together" and no oversight seems to be taking place.
375. This would depend on who is doing the supervising
376. I trust that clergy are best equipped to monitor this activity.
377. I believe that this could be improved if the offices of District and Synod President were somewhat depoliticized. While it should make no difference, longer terms for these offices would allow for those holding these offices to act in these matters without concerns regarding re-election.
378. Subject to gender bias. This attitude does not reflect church demographics and make-up and has either disenfranchised or disillusioned women.
379. Don't understand
380. Ecclesiastical supervision over practice = Somehow it didn't work well in practice with: (1) CEF (2) DIL (3) Keeping Concordia college (4) Keeping facilities for congregations across BC and AB. (5) Keeping Synod offices (6) Administering the POP projects and their

affiliates. (7) The truth (8) Hiding information and keeping it from members. Ecclesiastical Supervision over doctrine = OK

381. I'm a lay person. I don't know enough about ecclesiastical supervision to have an opinion. I'm happy with the doctrine and practice at my own congregation.
382. I am very confident in the leadership provided by President Bugbee in this regard. I believe that he and the other senior pastors who lead Synod are very competent in this area and demonstrate both the love of Christ and a particular understanding and commitment to the Lutheran Confessions and the doctrines and practices of Lutheran Church Canada.
383. Calling process is very slow and frustrating, as each call must be completed before any other consideration can be made. 2. District can very much influence calling process and Pastoral assignment. This should be done by elders according to the same selection process and requirements.
384. Too much emphasis is placed on CLOSE(D) COMMUNION to the extent that the pastor occasionally questions people at the communion rail, sometimes denying an individual communion, thereby turning them away from the church. I believe the acceptance of communion should be a conscience decision with the Lord, not with the Pastor. If the Pastor feels that an individual is taking communion to their detriment, he should try to speak to them after the service.
385. After being in the ministry for 15 years, I haven't once been visited by our District president to check on my faithfulness to our Doctrine or practice.
386. so important to stay true to doctrine. The world is constantly attacking, more than ever, stand firm.
387. The congregation of which I am a member, is quite contemporary. I think we have a good grasp on this, but since I'm retired from actual teaching, I'm not sure how good we are at this.
388. There does not to be any actual oversight of pastors who go in wrong directions and need correction.
389. I have attended various churches and have observed that not all of them adhere to the church's policies on several different matters.
390. Seeing it has not been happening and everyone is doing what's right in their own mind, it's important that we take the aspect of circuit visitors seriously.
391. If bankrupting a District & leaving church members $50plus million dollars short is not cause for removal from the clergy roster, what is? Why is there no ecclesiastical discipline of Pastors & congregations who use non-approved hymns/songs/liturgies? I have attended services @ Kelowna BC LC & it is not recognizable as a service of LCC.
392. What does this mean?
393. Already, I have to comment that lay language would be more appropriate, with a little explanation attached to the above statement.
394. Short example - Large Catechism - Eighth commandment - All this has been said regarding secret sins. But where the sin is quite public so that the judge and everybody know it, you can without any sin avoid him and let him go, because he has brought himself into disgrace, and you may also publicly testify concerning him. For when a matter is public in the light of day, there can be no slandering or false judging or testifying; Loss of 40 Mil would be "quite public" sin and there has been a year gone by with out any action by the leaders of this church body.

395. There is little unity in doctrine and practice in LCC sadly due to a lack of Ecclesiastical Supervision.
396. I wish it was effective, but my experience is that we assume we have unity in doctrine and practice, but in reality we do not. Congregations significantly differ in doctrine and practice in Canada. We could use a lot more ecclesiastical supervision to address this great need.
397. Currently, and I believe this has been an on-going issue, our Church has suffered from a lack of supervision in matters of doctrine and practice. Our appointed leaders have failed to hold our pastors and congregations accountable to the Confessional Standard, but has on numerous occasions ignored controversies and turned a blind eye to false teachings and practice. The lack of accountability at all levels is, in my opinion, one of the foremost issues that our Synod must address in this restructuring process.
398. A wide variety of worship practices in our congregations shows that we are not as unified as we could be. I agree that our practices should be somewhat flexible so that each congregation can engage in mission and ministry where they are situated. However, some practices should not be permitted in Lutheran churches due to our allegiance to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions (like open communion at some of our altars).
399. In a church body where each congregation/pastor can pretty much 'do their own thing' in practice, supervision of doctrine and practice is irrelevant. This is one of the biggest problems facing LCC - unity in doctrine and practice.
400. I am not in a position to have an informed opinion on this matter.
401. In the past, too much time of the ecclesiastical supervisor role of the DP was spent managing the CEF. I sense that this will be getting better.
402. I've only known one Circuit Counselor, let alone DP or Synodical President who actually visited a church worker other than at an official function. The "three-year rule" for circuit counselors is totally disregarded.
403. No impact on our congregation.
404. I believe this to be one of the biggest areas of weakness in our Church. I believe there is a lack of accountability in our Church at all levels. The District Presidents have failed to provide adequate supervision. In my own District we have a congregation up north that is being served by a rostered ELCIC pastor and although this has been going on for years it seems to be ignored by our President and Board of Directors. Our District Presidents seem to have been reduced to "ribbon-cutters", only visiting congregation when there is an anniversary or when they close their doors. There have been several incidents where the District President has failed to visit congregations that have struggled with controversy and it has led to several members leaving the church. I believe our Supervisors need to be more active, visiting our pastors and congregation and holding them accountable to our confessional standard. I also believe our leaders need more authority so that they can hold our people accountable, but I also believe we need a structure with checks and balances so that our people will also have the authority to hold our supervisors accountable.
405. My pastor has some pretty wacky doctrines sometimes... But what can you do.
406. More emphasis should be laid on the work of circuit counselors in terms of visitation of congregations and pastors within their jurisdiction. The office of "circuit counselor" has the potential to practice ecclesiastical supervision effectively. This would require changes in our handbook.
407. Once past seminary and/or colloquy, there is very little ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine and practice.

408. Open communion practised without comment or correction. Constitution approved by ABC district substituted with a different mode of operation (no elders) without district approval.
409. This question is a little ambiguous. Do you mean ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine and practice at the present time? Then I would have to disagree. There are many Lutheran congregations in our Synod that have forsaken Lutheran doctrine and practice and everyone turns a blind eye, or tacitly approved of these congregations and pastors.
410. practise? in the church building, yes...in our lives - mine anyway...lacking
411. Although I have volunteered for many different positions within the church over the years, I have not really seen any evidence of this. Perhaps our pastor has seen this and been provided with supervision, but as an involved layperson, I have not. Because I have not seen evidence of this supervision, I would have to disagree with this comment.
412. In general, I believe the supervision is effective; however, it is frequently hampered due to workload and time-commitments on the part of ecclesiastical supervisors, who are also expected to be business managers of their respective divisions (national church or districts).
413. I'm aware of congregations that practice open communion for example. I'm not aware of any mechanism to determine if the doctrinal position of pastors, deacons, or lay people has changed since the vows they made at ordination, installation, or by signing the constitution of Synod.
414. There should be stronger enforcement on key issues such as close communion
415. Support, if any, needs to be more local/regional in nature. The basic unit in our Synod is the congregation. Supervision is by human right only, and needs to be honoured as such.
416. The congregations should be accountable to Synod - in present practise, they're not.
417. Somewhat, but not fully.
418. For the most part I believe it is effective, however, I am not so sure that we are all in agreement as to what good doctrine and practice includes. Ecclesiastical supervisors may, therefore, not always be acting in the best interest of the Church.
419. I think LCC does an excellent job keeping pastors from going either too far to the "left" (e.g., pastors who want to practice open communion) or too far to the right (e.g., pastors who want to minimize the role of women in the church).
420. LCC supervision is based on a subjective response by those in positions of leadership who use personal experience
421. and personal biases to formulate decisions that will reinforce their ideas of interpretation and praxis. Potentially new ideas for incorporation into the polity of the Synod or for introduction to liturgical practice or educational curricula are too often dismissed or demeaned as inadequate for Confessional Lutheran imprimatur.
422. In my experience, circuit counsellors have not been asking specific questions regarding the elements used in Holy Communion at each congregation in their circuit on a regular basis.
423. There is a perception that pastors and congregations can depart fairly substantially from accepted practise as long as they do it quietly and make no outward disturbance.
424. I feel like the approach has been "let's supervise by hoping we don't really have to" or "let's look for reasons to assure ourselves that we don't need to correct anyone".
425. There has been little or no leadership in this District for almost 20 years. There has been bullying but no real positive leadership

2. The Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) has the right amount of authority in matters of doctrine and practice.

1. Since I am a lay person I do not know this, therefore I cannot agree or disagree.
2. It has no authority, its findings cannot be enforced unless ratified and accepted at convention, and even then they have no actual authority to enforce it themselves afterwards.
3. I disagree on practice, as it is very different to carry on with the same liturgy in a small church as with a large church with choirs and musical instruments, if not done well it turns young people away to other churches more uplifting churches/
4. Interpret scripture with scripture. Maintain "By grace are you saved and not by works so that no one can boast". We are saved by faith in Jesus Christ as our saviour not works. Good works are done as come from true faith. True faith produces good works. Do not alter from the foundation of the Lutheran Church's belief and Martin Luther's teachings!
5. They have the authority but do not do much with it.
6. I am unsure exactly how much authority they have at this time.
7. I haven't got a clue what authority they have or how they exercise it. This is coming from one who reads every Can. Lutheran and all material that comes my way.
8. Sometimes I think it has overstepped its authority, at least in wordings put on the website.
9. Do not understand
10. Job descriptions must spell out boundaries of authority and stipulate change planning. NO MORE VAGUE components in job descriptions.
11. Job descriptions must spell out boundaries of authority and stipulate change planning. NO MORE VAGUE components in job descriptions.
12. How are we to know if they have the right amount of authority?
13. Maintain efforts to be consistent.
14. It needs People on it that are well educated the Bible and Lutheran Theology.

have not the time to address doctrinal concerns that arise - do not answer correspondence at times

15. This question is leading and vague, I cannot answer it in good conscience.
16. Authority is not a good choice of words. We have too much 'authority' in our church and few examples of God's love for us.
17. I'm aware of some of the documents and studies that have been done by LC-C's CTCR. Aside from those few documents and studies, LC-C's CTCR gives the impression that it doesn't really exist. If it does exist, then the CTCR team must be like the Ghostbusters, lounging around and reading books or staring at a ceiling, waiting for someone to call upon them to do something useful. I think most people who have questions are more likely to visit the abundant resources found on LC-MS's CTCR web links than the significantly lacking resources found on LC-C's CTCR web link. Do they have authority in matters of doctrine and practice? I have no idea. Should they?
18. again had to get this translated, language is not for the average elderly Lutheran.
19. Most of the CTCR work in the recent past has been vague and misunderstood. The CTCR does not have
20. authority to determine doctrine, but could take a stronger initiative and role in guiding discussion and informing the church. For example, the CTCR should have initiated a process of theological and Biblical study before this survey was released.
21. I am unfamiliar with CTCR.

22. As far as I can see there is no reason to even have a synod if that governing body does not even do its job
23. It is advisory to congregations and pastors, which I think is appropriate.
24. PPC is run by a Chair Person that at one time considered having this congregation leave LCC.
25. They have no authority in matters of doctrine. They are advisory and report to the National Convention to accept or reject their reports. This should stay as it is.
26. Who knows?
27. Do not know.
28. It appears so.
29. Who are they? I have not seen one in church. A commission sounds like a compromise group.
30. The recent emphasis on production of CTCR material as a basis for conversation and discussion in congregational settings restores a proper raison d'etre to the rationale of doctrinal exploration and compilation of Synodical questions.
31. I don't believe the CTCR should be able to dictate doctrine and practice but inform and clarify.
32. There needs to be more input from the church level
33. S/B 2 elected from each District; 2 from a singly seminary and Synod President.
34. What does the word "authority" mean in this context?
35. Need more individual church input
36. But the authority is not always properly or fully utilized.
37. They have authority, but appear not to exercise it. At least the bishops are clearly not interested in enforcing any uniformity in doctrine and practice, so CTCR opinions are nothing but cries in the wilderness.
38. Perhaps in doctrine the CTCR does have the right amount of authority, but from my perspective the CTCR has very little authority in matters of practice!
39. Not familiar with CTCR guidelines
40. I am not aware of this commission.
41. I've never heard of this commission.
42. I think the premise of this question is mistaken. Therefore, I have to click on "Neither Agree or disagree". As I understand it, the CTCR serves the synod president in providing guidance on matters of theology and church relations. The CTCR is not the "supreme court" of doctrine/practice in our synod, and it does not have the authority to "make a ruling." We, as a synod, could ask ourselves if the CTCR should be given such authority. That may be a worthwhile discussion. I fear that the CTCR may be used by some as an authority to appeal to. They imagine that, if a "ruling" from the CTCR is satisfactory to them, one could take that "ruling" and use it to "win" arguments against one's Christian brother. (I have witnessed some pastors talk in this manner myself.) My response to this question is conditioned based on those opinions. We as LCC want to "walk together" as a synod. When there are differences, we need to work them out together in light of the Scriptures and the Confessions. If there are disputes in the church where one is unable to win-over their brother (I'm thinking particularly of pastors at the moment), then this is where ecclesiastical supervision comes in. (See Question #1) If a pastor or a congregation is teaching/behaving wrongly, then we need those in authority to exercise church discipline. I don't think the current functioning of CTCR requires any change. It seems adequate. The only thing that

needs to change is to correct the misunderstanding of how CTCR currently operates, and to use churchly authority in mature ways when resolving disputes.

43. They have the authority but don't use it and would just prefer issues disappear.
44. The CTCR should be given an appropriate level of authority to direct congregations.
45. not sure who is "CTCR" but appears that "an "old boys club" decides the doctrine, practice and interpretation of scripture
46. not used often?
47. think so, but they do not seem to exercise their authority
48. They have the authority but don't use it, and pretty well would like problems to just disappear rather than have to deal with them.
49. I'm a Layman ... so don't know.
50. It has no authority outside of convention resolutions.
51. What "authority" does the commission actually have? I agree there needs to be major restructuring but my fears are that this may mean more "man made, Lutheran" instead of taking us more into Biblical teachings.
52. Again, not a question for laypeople at all. How many among us know exactly how much power this committee has, or whether it is the "right amount"? What does CTCR specifically DO? Is this a continuation of Question 1 -- is CTCR the embodiment of "Ecclesiastical Supervision"? Disappointing to begin a supposedly "healing," "inclusive" and "soul-searching" survey this way.
53. Communication is important. Information's to be disseminated to lay people on a regular basis.
54. What is "the right amount of authority"?
55. How would I know this?
56. There has to be more flexibility on special circumstances, not a rigid one method fits all. The LCC has to be more accepting and inclusive to other churches, closed communion is a very unfriendly, discriminating attitude. How can we gather more to our church, when we exclude them from the Lord's Table?
57. As long as the voting members are not stacked leaning either toward conservative or liberal practices. As long as the doctrine remains the same, practices should be able to evolve with the times.
58. At this time, I am not familiar enough with the current needs/mandate of the committee to know if authority is adequate. I expect that continued social decay could require more intensive mandate and greater authority in future (i.e., preparing documents that address issues in light of God's Word as has occurred in the past).
59. As a lay person I feel I have no knowledge on what the CTCR is and what it does.
60. I don't know since I don't have that information.
61. I don't know.
62. I don't know.
63. I have no knowledge about this.
64. To my understanding the CTCR works to inform the members of Synod in matters of doctrine and practice. They have the authority to give theological statements concerning doctrinal positions on church and ministry issues, moral issues, etc., but not the authority to carry out church discipline or to set authoritative doctrine or practice. If this is the case, then I believe the CTCR has the right amount of authority.

65. Right amount of authority, or a matter of the right amount of practical understanding of the needs of parishioners in every parish, not use urban and inner city?
66. Biggest concern is conflict resolution/accountability. When ignored always lead to unfruitfulness.
67. Don't know what kind of authority they have now.
68. You place to much authority with ministers, they cannot possible be totally more knowledgeable in every aspect of the church
69. don't know what the authority is
70. Only if Doctrine is Scriptural.
71. The practice in L.C.C. is not the same in all congregations. One congregation may instruct non-members before allowing them to partake of communion, another congregation has open communion.
72. It is apparent that the church has authority in matter of doctrine and practice.
73. Don't know how much authority the Commission has.
74. They make recommendations to the church's they serve and cannot enforce the doctrine they research. This is a good thing. They are servants to the church as they should be with this amount of authority.
75. this may not be the right spot for my comment but I feel our church is too stuck on all the trappings of show. For example, for years laymen assisting the Pastor would wear suit whereas the last 15 years or so the persons have to be gowned when assisting the Pastor with communion etc. Also you are teaching the new Pastors for many years to chant a lot of the liturgy. How close to you want to get us to the "catholic" way!!! Our church used to be considered the "layman's" church but over the last 20 years we have become structured into a "high" catholic church whereas they are becoming more common in their appearance.
76. I agree to an extent. If the average layman knew what the CTCR is, it would be much easier to answer this question. However, if any report is completed by the CTCR it should be run by a committee ensuring its accuracy to what our synod is built upon - Walther's thesis on church and ministry. If the church chooses to step away from his theology, we can no longer call ourselves the same LCC.
77. I don't have enough knowledge of how the CTRC works to comment here.
78. Unknown to me. However, refer to comments in answer 1 on authority and what should be happening from the top down.
79. I believe this question needs to be answered by a Pastor.
80. I'm not aware of the exact amount of authority they have.
81. The right amount of authority is to "guide the Synod" as noted in the glossary of terms. Guiding is carrying or leading the discussion, suggesting change where needed etc.
82. Again, a lay person would have no information on the CTCR on which to base an opinion. Is the purpose of these questions to frustrate lay people into believing that they don't know anything and should leave church business to the leaders?
83. I have never had anything to do with the above commission. (I never knew it existed.)
84. Does the commission have authority? My understanding is the commission recommends to synod in convention for approval of such matters of doctrine and practice.
85. need more info
86. Perhaps the Synod President should sit on this board as well.

87. As the constitution stands, CTCR seems to have the right amount of authority. Whether they use that authority is another question and I don't know enough to answer. DPs ought to enforce CTCR rulings.
88. I do not really know how much authority they really exercise.
89. The CTCR is like the Queen: while it has a protocol role, it is mostly ignored or disregarded.
90. not sure what the CTCR does never heard of them
91. Difficult to assess as LCC CTCR does not inform the lay members how they exercise authority -In the past Pastors have strayed from LCC doctrine, with no apparent consequences
92. I know nothing about how CTRC functions/asserts itself so I just can't answer this and I have feeling this is going to be true of a bunch of questions in this category.
93. have no clue what authority it has
94. My understanding is the CTCR has authority only to comment and recommend. There needs to be greater authority in implementation.
95. Can work under suggestions from convention. Activities and resolutions.
96. Don't know enough.
97. Don't know.
98. Zero auth. It is voted on at convention
99. I have been a member of LCMS and LCC for nearly six decades and this is the first time I have ever heard of this commission--so I feel a bit under-informed as to the efficacy of its authority.
100. As above, I don't feel adequately informed about this commission to assess its impact fairly.
101. Don't have enough info to answer.
102. I am not sure if this is the Commission that could have had opportunity to deal with the Situation recently regarding Concordia University in Edmonton. If not, how unfortunate as I see this as a blemish.
103. The question is confusing
104. I do not know what amount of authority they presently have, but I think they should have an authoritative voice. If their reports do not carry some amount of weight, their purpose for existing seems weak.
105. I don't know the measure of the CTCR's authority
106. It is excellent to have the CTCR and their guidance on doctrinal issues. I do not advocate for strengthening of their authority to have the ability to modify church doctrine, this should continue through a vote at convention and adoption by 2/3 of the congregations. However, in issues of discipline of church workers, the CTCR could have more strength. As the CTCR consists of more than one individual they have a better ability and oversight to determine proper actions for errant ministers. If they have more authority in these matters it may be possible to unify the teachings between parishes and control deviant behaviour. I also think, as mentioned in question 1, that informing or teaching the individual congregation about deviant behaviour may be an effective way to control it.
107. I am not aware of how much authority this commission has been given.
108. I have no idea how much actual authority the CTCR carries in these matters.
109. Not sure what this refers to. The authority should remain with the congregation.
110. The CTCR seems to fulfill its function of serving the Synod by issuing theological opinions that can then be endorsed (or not) by the Synod.

111. I believe the CTCR is clear in its direction and it should remain the prerogative of the district presidents to apply discipline where called for. The idea of the CTCR as a disciplinary board, calling workers to account for their action, would neither encourage open discussion and frank honesty or build a trusting and safe relationship. Without honest discourse, we can not hope to wrestle with the issues the world continues to put before us as a church.
112. I feel as long as that authority is based on the bible as a whole, being the true word of God.
113. Not knowledgeable
114. Based on my experience with doctrinal purity, I suspect they have too much
115. Not aware
116. What authority? Who makes up the Commission?
117. As a lay person I have no awareness of current work of the CTCR.
118. How is a lay person to know the type and extent of authorities granted to CTCR?
119. Don’t know. Never has been an issue.
120. I think it would be better if the publications were given more respect.
121. I am not familiar with the commission's work
122. don't know
123. Actually, a primary function is only to provide advice. The only real authority comes when there is doctrinal review of material.
124. Don't know
125. What is the current amount of authority?
126. If not the right amount of authority, one would certainly think the teeth are long enough, lest a pastor/deacon/lay leader think to speak out-of-line against LCC doctrine/practice/values.
127. Difficult to know unless you compare their recommendations with actual practice.
128. Members of my congregation speak only French. To my knowledge, no members of the CTCR are fluent in French and would be capable of making a decision regarding doctrine and practice of my congregation.
129. I appreciate their position
130. The reports of the CTCR offer good guidance to the church at large, but it is right that their authority be primarily advisory in nature.
131. The CTCR is effective in providing good guidance, but I agree that its reports and conclusions should be remain advisory and no binding.
132. I have never heard of the CTCR. I cannot answer as to its authority.
133. I don't know enough about the authority CTCR has to make an informed decision.
134. The CTCR should be abolished and theological opinions should be sought from our seminaries and results, including dissensions, should be circulated in the synod. Church relations should be the responsibility of the Council of Presidents in consultation with our seminaries. By the way I believe this is a poor question since if one disagrees with the statement they may believe the CTCR has too much authority or too little with no distinction between two polar opposite views. It is also probably meaningless to 90% of our members who have likely never heard of the CTCR, let alone the Synodical Handbook that outlines their duties.
135. As the constitution stands, CTCR seems to have the right amount of authority. Whether they use that authority is another question that I can't answer.
136. To my understanding the CTCR works to inform the members of Synod in matters of doctrine and practice. They have the authority to give theological statements concerning doctrinal positions on church and ministry issues, moral issues, etc., but not the authority to

carry out church discipline or to set authoritative doctrine or practice. If this is the case, then I believe the CTCR has the right amount of authority.

137. I see no need to increase the authority of this commission.
138. Don't know the parameters.
139. Don't know anything about this. What is it???
140. The Glossary of terms states: "They GUIDE the Synod in matters of doctrine and practice . . ." I heard Dr. Kettner, former chair of the CTCR, say unequivocally, "The CTCR has no authority."
141. Who is the CTCR? Who are the persons on this committee? If they are the committee who monitor our pastors' doctrine & practice. They don't know what each pastor is doing if the congregation doesn't tell what is going on in each congregation.
142. Since the CTCR consists of people who are not called teachers of the church, they should have no more authority than giving opinions, as is the case.
143. Yes, if the doctrine is based more on scripture than tradition. Where can I go to raise my concerns?
144. Scripture is to be the main authority
145. Not clear on what this commission is but by name it sounds as if part of its task is same as Ecclesiastical Supervision. Is there a duplication of service?
146. See above statement. Not overly involved but available.
147. I don't have any experience with CTCR.
148. The statements are only seen as "if you feel like it" documents and don't appear to be taken as our church's stance even when they have been accepted by Convention.
149. To be honest I do not know what the Commission on Theology and Church Relations is.
150. When has the church seen such authority exercised and reported in any dealing with an important matter?
151. In view of my response for #1, I believe our LCMS and LCC church bodies have been railroaded without the common folks having a say in the direction of the church. The Bible does not give the direction that I find the church body directs. You can't respond that the church body decides direction in the Synodical conferences, since two things were wrong, and one thing remain. 1) Lay people were not part of the Synodical Conferences until about 3 to 4 decades ago. 2) Any overture prepared by a congregation is usually modified so that the conference voters are not even voting on the submitted overture, but a regurgitated document that the Synod has prepared for the vote that often bears little resemblance to the original overture. This is totally unacceptable.
152. This too would require the District President to visit the congregation and with the pastor on a more regular basis than pastor's conferences or installation services. Same goes with regard to Circuit Counsellors and District Vice Presidents as they too should visit each congregation at least once every 3 years.
153. This is a nonsensical question since the CTCR has no constitutional authority in matters of doctrine and practice. The Synod has reserved that right for itself. Currently no CTCR document made by the LCC CTCR has gone through that process. Thus they have merely given an opinion. Some of which have been commended to the Synod for study. Our circuit unanimously pointed out some serious doctrinal errors in some of these documents and we were assured by the Synodical president that they were only "Study" documents or "Reports." To date the only documents in our Synod which have authority are "Church and

Ministry", "13 Theses on Predestination", "Brief Statement" (reaffirmed twice by us), and "A Statement." THIS QUESTION SHOULD BE STRUCK FROM THE SURVEY.

154. There is not enough information available to make a proper comment
155. Unknown
156. No idea.
157. The CTCR has no authority to tell anyone to do anything. All they have the power to do is state what Holy Scriptures say on a topic, how the Book of Concord has handled an issue, or how the Church history or Fathers of the Church have dealt with the questions the CTCR is asked. There is no authority with the CTCR to enforce the positions or answers they give.
158. A very silly statement. The Commission does its work based on the only authority that matters: God's holy Word.
159. Unknown as to their authority
160. I would like to see more local autonomy as long as the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached. Local decisions also in decisions about open or closed Communion, as ours is a congregation which brings people in from various Christian denominational backgrounds, and Believers need to be welcomed to the table - as Jesus would have. Also children who have been prepared to Commune and are believers, should be welcomed. Local church decision making on this, could be encouraged within practice guidelines.
161. Don't know the parameters.
162. It is excellent to have the CTCR and their guidance on doctrinal issues. I do not advocate for strengthening of their authority to have the ability to modify church doctrine, this should continue through a vote at convention and adoption by 2/3 of the congregations. However, in issues of discipline of church workers, the CTCR could have more strength. As the CTCR consists of more than one individual they have a better ability and oversight to determine proper actions for errant ministers. If they have more authority in these matters it may be possible to unify the teachings between parishes and control deviant behaviour. I also think, as mentioned in question 1, that informing or teaching the individual congregation about deviant behaviour may be an effective way to control it.
163. have absolutely no experience to comment on
164. dumb question
165. Their authority is not widely recognised.
166. Too much
167. I'm not aware of any authority that they have.
168. I know very little about the work of the CTCR.
169. The CTCR has no authority. It studies topics or recommendations and provides a response (usually for further study).
170. As much as I am currently aware.
171. This survey is a good example of the work they do.
172. I agree but with limited knowledge in this area. How does a lay member get confirmation hat this is so?
173. As a lay person, I have no idea; how would I know?
174. I cannot have an opinion on this statement since I do not know what the commission's mandate is. I have never seen the document.
175. This applies on a case by case basis.
176. No idea, doctrine seems to be fine, practice gives too much power to pastors.

177. CTCR documents are open to being implemented or ignored. I feel strongly that they remain advisory. Since faith and practice in church and ministry is governed by Scripture and the Confessions, the CTCR documents should have no more and no less weight that advising the church on current issues.
178. This is a curious question in light of the fact, the CTCR produces opinions which are not binding on congregations or church workers. They serve in an advisory capacity which is probably for the best.
179. Consider fewer members
180. There is too much authority and rigidity. As there is only one way mentality in matters of doctrine and practice excludes and shuns many people, thus depriving them of even hearing the word of God. They don't feel welcome in our churches.
181. Again, I don't know where to go to get this information - I have read position statements - is this what you are asking? Position Statements are written at too high of a comprehension level - most Grade 8 students I know don't read at that level
182. I don't have enough involvement or knowledge of this to even say
183. I believe the Commission on Theology and Church Relations has the authority, but whether they use it or not is questionable
184. The CTCR only has a role of suggestion or advisory. I don't recall any of the CTCR documents being presented for study and then approval. To be clear though, I don't think CTCR documents should be placed at the same level as our Confessions.
185. Information and access to the papers is not encouraged or provided by the pastors.
186. The Commission should have this information passed down to congregations, so each member could be more knowledgeable about theology and church relations
187. How much authority does it have?
188. What kind of authority does it have?
189. According to a previous CTCR chairman, the CTCR has no authority. They recommend. Keep it that way.
190. I don't really know what they do.
191. I am not aware of the interactions LCC have
192. The Commission has no intrinsic authority, but does a good job given the realities and constraints within which it operates. How do the Ecclesiastical Supervisors (heads of the ministerium both nationally and regionally) and the seminary faculties relate to the CTCR? If both of these were in good working order, there is no absolute need for the CTCR as such, except that representative involvement of parish clergy and laity of Church is fitting.
193. unsure
194. I don't know what amount of authority the CTCR has. How would I measure whether it's the 'right' amount?
195. I do not know what authority the Commission has.
196. Their role ought to remain advisory. Synod & District officials have authority in these matters.
197. The speed at which work is being done takes too long however.
198. I think the church should have the authority in matters of doctrine and practice, likely with the advice of the CTCR or perhaps ad hoc committees set to work on a particular issue or need.
199. Like many questions this is thoughtless, if I have read the Handbook correctly the CTCR advises and sends out for consideration and the members in convention decide. LCC also

provides the following "All matters of doctrine and of conscience shall be decided only by the Word of God"

200. By what measure? Is there a yardstick for this?
201. I had never heard of this organization before this survey.
202. As I understand it, they make recommendations to the church, which does not allow them to "set" doctrine, but provide guidance for the church in its efforts to understand pertinent issues and concerns
203. The real question is, do they use that authority or are they too afraid of rocking the boat or losing generous parishioners? Let's face it the number of different churches has grown because of disagreements within the church. Some how Jesus is lost in these situations.
204. They cannot and should not have "power" to force a matter of doctrine, only give an informed recommendation.
205. As a layperson, how would I know this since I am not involved in it.
206. No idea
207. I would hope that they also take into account member church concerns before issuing any decree.
208. does the CTCR even have any binding authority currently? -also, how would the average layperson even know this?
209. Include women as lay pastors and able to read gospel.
210. The overseeing of this responsibility is difficult to achieve over such a large area by a central body. It is a responsibility that needs to be shared by a more localized authority.
211. Does the existing authority allow the CTCR to achieve its goals? Suggest the mandate be reviewed with lay leadership involvement, and authority to make changes.
212. Until reading this information I was not aware of the existence of the CTCR. I will say however that I am a strong believer in central authority in matters of doctrine and practice.
213. Congregations and especially Ministers should be made to subscribe to their decisions.
214. In a church where lay-people grow increasingly less 'loyal' to a church body perhaps we don't have the right amount of authority. On the other had I'm not sure what that would look like! I'm not altogether certain I know what the amount is.
215. What authority and practice do they have now???
216. how do I know
217. how do I know for sure?
218. I don't know, but it seems that so much time is used up studying issues that they are irrelevant by the time a decision or opinion is presented and then the enforcement of it seems to be spotty.
219. I don't really know but it seems that they spend forever studying issues before issuing an opinion which is usually not followed up in practice anyway
220. Never heard of them.
221. see comment #1
222. Authority should be greater.
223. I know nothing about the CTCR
224. Do they have authority? Having heard very little of the CTCR until now, I looked it up on the LCC website. It reads on the website like they make recommendations and publish position papers on whether we can play with other churches. Heavens. Christians are Christians, and I am frankly sick and tired of people acting superior because we are Lutheran.

225. I can't think of any ruling/position of the CTCR that has had any impact on my life as a Christian. While it needs to exist, it also would help to be relevant.
226. There has been a lot of talk but no action to either disciple and/or defrock the small percentage of bad apples.
227. I cannot speak to this as I do not have a proper understanding of those levels of authority.
228. They have no power. They provide studies for guidance and discussion.
229. we are unclear as to exactly what the CTCR does and what authority they actually have
230. Whomever is in charge needs to be in charge, i.e. take control and hold firm to our belief, back to Luther's catechism. I have no idea who is control of what but politics are the devil.
231. It should not be up to the CTCR, but to our presidents, synodical and district presidents to remind and enforce Lutheran doctrine and practice upon those who agreed when they became members of synod to be Lutheran and conform to our practices and doctrine.
232. What is the right amount? Is this a subjective determination? To my knowledge I don't believe the CTCR has any "authority" in matters of doctrine and practice. Very few of the documents have been accepted as "official LCC positions." Typically, the documents are for comment and study. However, if this question is trying to answer whether or not the CTCR should serve as an inquisition body with the powers of Ecclesiastical Supervision I would say "No." This body should remain one that studies theological and practical issues in order to foster study and discussion within the church body. This body might also serve as a part of a delegation in ecumenical endeavors.
233. No contact with this need at all.
234. The statements the CTCR issues from time to time have no authority. The restructuring process should either provide it or give it back to the synodical ecclesiastical supervisor whence it came.
235. I don't have enough information on the activities of this body.
236. It might be more helpful for congregations to be made more aware of the CTCR statements. The authority of the CTCR and its advisory role are appropriate and should be maintained.
237. The CTCR has NO authority in matters of doctrine and practice. It "assists" the president and provides "guidance." Check the Handbook.
238. The recommendations that stem from the CTCR is good, though there is little communication between the congregations
239. Instead of being purely advisory I think the CTCR matters should be brought to a vote and ratified.
240. This is not a good question. Does it have too much or too little authority and the results of asking it are meaningless.
241. The CTCR has NO authority in matters of doctrine and practice. The Handbook says it shall "assist the president..." and "provide guidance...."
242. Under the current structure of our synod the CTCR has no authority except to publish and present opinions to the synod. I believe the CTCR should actually have more authority, however if I was of the opinion that it should have less, I would also answer the same way - so how does answering this question make my stance known? - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
243. What authority do they have? My experience with them has been in an advisory role.... if a pastor is teaching outside our church doctrine, they only act when invited. Members of the commission are pastors with their own congregations and little time for work outside of that calling.

244. I am not sure of the practical distinctions between items 1 and 2.
245. See last comment.
246. Too much. It's like an annoying watch dog.
247. not familiar with CTCR
248. my knowledge of this is limited
249. See comment Item 1
250. The authority is not always practised equally in all areas.
251. God should have the ultimate authority.
252. Our church has two Sundays of Lay Led services. There are not enough Lutheran men to conduct the service (read the gospel and give the sermon)
253. I would agree strongly...except for the matter of the University of Concordia in the recent development that they have taken Jesus Christ and God out of their mission statement.... without any notification to the LCC national clergy and officials. Very troubling.
254. Their task is to assist and advise - authority rests with president(s)
255. What authority does the CTCR have? They come out with papers...statements that are to clarify doctrinal stances but how do they have authority to enforce them?
256. However, the CTCR seems to lack hands-on application/supervision in geographically remote and/or disconnected regions.
257. CTCR at times should not be suggestions but required action
258. I would like the roll of the CTCR more clearly defined and perhaps expanded. Simply putting out position papers that are not remotely binding to any congregation or one's understanding of the matter is not as helpful. They should have an increased roll within the church body.
259. I do not know what their authority is so I don't know if it is the right amount.
260. The documents they produce are all too often received at convention and then forgotten. They are produced for "study" but there is often no follow up. They in effect have very little authority. And they should have more.
261. They could be more involved in current matters and letting the church know what they are doing.
262. We have had know experience with this
263. Some information has filtered out (i.e. published in Lutheran magazines) that has been getting too theological and has had several lay people to question "what is going on? - is that what we are to believe ""NOW""?"
264. I do not know
265. I'm not sure - I'm guessing no but I may be wrong because I could not fully describe what their authority is.
266. They are a commission of Synod for providing counsel. They aren't a decision-making body, nor should they be.
267. What authority is there?
268. Your authority & practices do not appear to be all that obvious--how are lay people to know. What about the various practices--open communion--it is happening- only one example. What is your authority doing about these things?
269. Perhaps if they did their job there would not be contemporary Worship and other forms of diluting doctrine and practice therefore letting the Synod drifting down the slippery slope into irrelevance.
270. the commission results have not been shared at the congregation level so I have no opinion

271. Don't know what their degree of authority is. However, if Scripture and our Lutheran understanding of doctrine aren't upheld totally then we are in big trouble.
272. How much authority do they have?
273. With a title like that, it 'sounds' like it should have the authority. We, the congregation of LCC, must make sure they are provided with the necessary support.
274. I really haven't seen any authority practiced in there is a problem in a district and a problem that has been reported.
275. I am not familiar with the CTCR, so don't know how to answer this statement
276. We do not know the authority they have so we cannot comment
277. Here I am not knowledgeable enough on this matter but I certainly hope they do.
278. Women do a great deal in the church but still can't really fill a role of leadership.
279. too much
280. Too top down. More effort to find a way to better communicate with lay persons (parishioners)
281. Not sure how to answer this one.
282. CTCR issues opinions on matters of Theology and Church relations and allows congregations to discuss and plan. CTCR opinions should not be taken as law.
283. There is much disagreement
284. Once again, as a lay member I have no way of monitoring or measuring this.
285. Most lay persons have little idea of what this is or understand it's purpose. The CTCR does a poor job of seeking local church and lay input. Perhaps that is a pastoral shortcoming.
286. How does the work of the commission become disseminated through to congregational members?
287. CTCR should not just be advisory role, but should have more authority in matters.
288. The CTCR should remain a body of excellent thinkers who offer the church guidance through carefully crafted opinions of matters of theology as requested. The CTCR should NEVER be a body that issues decrees, directives, or ecclesiastic laws.
289. I see no evidence that the work of the CTCR has impacted the identity or practice of our church body. It seems irrelevant.
290. Needs more lay input and modern day thought.
291. I don't see evidence of the CTCR having made any significant impact on LCC's practice or ability to carry out its mission.
292. Perhaps reduce to 5 members
293. I have seen too many statements from or about the CTCR that what they say is not official doctrine of the Synod and thus they appear to have no authority or little.
294. I don't know what it is now, so I can't suggest more or less authority.
295. Because who else knows about this?
296. I believe the CTCR is clear in its direction and it should remain the prerogative of the district presidents to apply discipline where called for. The idea of the CTCR as a disciplinary board, calling workers to account for their action, would neither encourage open discussion and frank honesty or build a trusting and safe relationship. Without honest discourse, we can not hope to wrestle with the issues the world continues to put before us as a church. We would not walk together; we would march to a committee law or else.
297. I do not think most church members care about this commission or its authority at present.
298. My understanding is that the CTCR has not authority in matters of doctrine and practice. It can report and advise but cannot enforce or even officially adopt a particular stance, doctrine

or practice. Synod in convention can adopt a practice and affirm a doctrine. The synod president with the council of presidents can enforce a practice or present/adopt a stance in keeping with Scripture and the Confessions.

299. Have no idea what authority the CTCR has
300. I have no idea what is in place nor how it is working to be able to give an opinion on if they have "the right amount" of anything.
301. The views on communion are not in line of what Christ would want. We have gone back to Catholic practices.
302. Your views on communion are not in the teachings that Christ would do.
303. I have yet to encounter the CTCR as a lay person (but have likely seen in someway the effects on the decisions that they make).
304. The authority is adequate - however the time and resources they are given is not. It takes too long for them to produce the documents we need. It is difficult for the members of the CTCR due to their other vocations and the infrequent meetings that are held.
305. I hope so.
306. At present does not seem to be very effective. I am thinking about issues like "willow creek".
307. Actually, the CTCR has no authority. It serves at the request of the President. While it has produced timely and excellent theological papers on this or that issue, such are often ignored or disregarded by the comment that this is just the opinion of the CTCR.
308. I think that there needs to be well informed lay members in the CRTC practice/doctrine discussions. Especially in matters that are neither commanded not forbidden, the people in the pew have an invaluable perspective that pastors are not even aware of -- especially if they are not serving in a growing congregation that is exhibiting growth and fruit.
309. it is to be advisory only.
310. Yes - if they are diligent in their roles
311. Again, how does one determine the 'right amount of authority'.
312. I know nothing about the Commission on Theology and Church relations.
313. Perhaps if they did their job there would not be contemporary Worship and other forms of diluting doctrine and practice therefore letting the Synod drifting down the slippery slope into irrelevance.
314. Again how would the normal church goer know the answer to this
315. I am uncertain about the required number.
316. Maybe I'm wrong, but it seems like Lay people in the congregations should have more input and play a bigger part in expressing their opinions and asking questions, in matters pertaining to doctrine and practice in individual LCC churches. I think the CTCR has more authority in this area than they should have.
317. not enough is known about this commission to comment
318. While I agree with this statement, I believe that they either do not have the tools nor the will to exercise this authority.
319. Not sure what their job is
320. Don't understand
321. As a lay person, I'm not aware of how much authority the CTCR has. I like the idea of preserving the unity of faith within the Synod. (And thanks for the Glossary in the written version of the survey. Very helpful.)

322. I am concerned that few LCC members have sufficient appreciation for the important work of this Commission and its work should be explained/promoted better within LCC
323. Does this control the church's position on abortion, women's rights in the pulpit and LBGIT integration in the church? 2. Does this control holding the same line on the church's stance on the criminality of the financial mess re CEF and DIL in ABC
324. I do not remember what this commission is.
325. The CTCR may have the right amount of authority in matters of doctrine and practice, but this doesn't always translate into sermons on Sun. mornings that are easy to follow and memorable. When members don't feel spiritually fed, they tend to drift away and visitors only come a time or two and don't return. I get the feeling that there isn't enough emphasis on effective sermon delivery at the seminary level. Rather than utilizing a collection of others' written material, the message would be easier to follow if it came more from the heart. Also more is not necessarily better. I believe a shorter, to the point message would be more effective as well.
326. Don't really know what authority they have
327. More local autonomy needed
328. I am thankful this Commission is advisory, over against the NCC (ELCiC)
329. I understand their role is to act as guidance, so I am not really sure how that translates to authority.
330. The majority of congregations view the CTCRs documents as opinion only, so the question is moot.
331. There is great disunity in practice across the country. All kinds of service books & hymnals are in use with no supervision/discipline of same.
332. Again, who knows?
333. I honestly do not know what authority it has.
334. Provided the leadership exercises its responsibilities.
335. They merely guide the church in helpful study. They ought not to have authority in matters of doctrine and practice. I would suggest that we eliminate the CTCR, and start using the Seminary faculties in its place.
336. there is not sufficient authority to stop negative acts by pastors and congregations who are not following the LCC
337. They need MORE authority!
338. Completely agree. They offer helpful studies, but they are not LCC's papal authority, nor would they desire that.
339. Sadly, due to the amount of issues that our brought (or at least proposed to be brought) to our CTCR several pertinent matters must be either shelved for a later date or turned aside. It may well be worth expanding the CTCR's numbers by including more qualified theologians and learned laypersons.
340. No one commission should have ultimate authority but it is a great place to start asking the questions.
341. I am not in a position to have an informed opinion on this matter.
342. Timely advice on Marriage and Divorce, LBGTQ, Cults/Sects, Abuse does not trickle down to the local level.
343. No impact on our congregation.
344. Besides being a body that clarifies doctrine, I don't see that they have any authority.
345. I am not familiar with this and therefore cannot respond to the question.

346. I don't know how much authority they have, despite a lifetime as a member of LCMS and LCC.
347. See comments regarding Ecclesiastical Supervision above. Similar comments would apply here as well.
348. Never heard of it
349. I'm not aware of how they now use their authority.
350. Many congregations disregard CTRC, e.g., the statement that readings are a part of pastoral office is often disregarded to allow lay readers
351. The CTCR is an advisory commission. It shouldn't carry any authority, though it can be a valuable resource.
352. I believe there is too little accountability to Synod.
353. I believe that opinions given in doctrinal matters should issue forth from the seminaries of our synod.
354. I do not believe the CTCR has been given any authority. They research and present findings, but have no authority to enforce compliance with any doctrinal positions.
355. The recent emphasis on production of CTCR material as a basis for conversation and discussion in congregational settings restores a proper raison d'etre to the rationale of doctrinal exploration and compilation of Synodical questions.
356. I don't know what the "right" amount of authority would be, but I do know that the paper presented regarding lay readers in the church was so weak that it was largely ignored by otherwise reasonable congregations and pastors.
357. They really are out of touch with the rank and file of the pastors of our church and have tended to adopt statements that show more of what we are against but less what we stand for

3. Pastors and Deacons receive the appropriate quality of spiritual care from LCC.

1. Again, this is something only pastors and deacons can answer.
2. I feel that the quality of support received is adequate though more social support and occasions to interact with other pastors would be appreciated.
3. Much more could be done in this area.
4. Question for Pastors, Deacons.
5. I've seen some pretty "sad" pastors that could have used counselling or rerouting to other work. In our area they seem to be "on their own".
6. I have noticed areas where needs slipped through the cracks (at least seem to have).
7. Different students require varied degrees to develop special skills.
8. Additional help should be provided for a church worker in need. e.g. outside psychological help.
- Pastors with problems are avoided and left to sort their problems out themselves
9. It doesn't appear to be - how often does President of a district come to circuit?
10. How as a lay person, am I supposed to know, also you said my Pastor cannot help with the survey
11. Most of the pastors that I've met suffer from severe depression. Many of these pastors are isolated in the middle of nowhere, ministering to struggling 2-point or 3-point congregations, but don't have easy access to (much-needed) LC-C pastors, etc. to help them with their own spiritual (and mental health) needs. Some have even conveyed feeling trapped and unable to

find respite; they feel torn between serving the congregations they love and are called to serve, and feeling abandoned by the synod to fend for themselves and provide their own spiritual (and mental) self-care while struggling to offer the same to others. A wise counsellor once said that people in the business of helping others can only do so insofar as they themselves have been helped.

12. if they did they would not have done what they did in our District. care means accountability and consequence goes with that. there is none.
13. It is time to take a look at a bishop concept to give more opportunity to supervise mediocre pastors
14. This varies with the districts, the pastors, and the context. The variation alone is not bad, but it is very difficult to gauge what is appropriate ... in some cases, there is a dramatic need for care and very few qualified resources.
15. If they did, the result would not have been CEF outcomes on our culture. Their pride and greed overcame their abilities to work in what they knew.
16. We are fortunate to have two pastors who support each other and have close relationships with the leaders in the church. From my viewpoint as a member of the church family, they appear to be well supported. I have no background to know how other pastors and deacons are supported.
17. Our Pastor was wrongfully removed from his office and has received almost no support at all. I have been involved in many organizations and worked in many different offices and have never seen such an awful display of evil in my life. It would have been thrown out of court if it had been done in the secular world as it did not follow proper Roberts rules in running any meeting
18. I do not see an intentional visiting effort by DPs. It's hard to care for people by emails and letters.
19. There were no top end representatives from the Alberta/BC Synod at this vote to remove the pastor. There was no concrete evidence to support his removal. The allegations had no substance. There have been no top Synod representatives checking on congregations to see if LCC doctrine is practiced. As a result of this negligence about 25 to 30 members are holding worship at Cornerstone Funeral Home with Pastor Nathan Fuhrer and pastor is not getting paid. We are known as the Immanuel Lutheran Assembly.
20. Who knows?
21. Do not know what an appropriate degree of quality is.
22. The average lay person does not have knowledge of this.
23. probably not as teachers and principals did not in my experience in a Lutheran School
24. Could be more visitations to congregations.
25. Pastors and Deacons could do with more spiritual oversight. This could be improved if Presidents took on the ecclesiastical role of Bishops with spiritual oversight of Pastors/
26. I would hope so
27. As a deacon I am thoroughly frustrated by the attempts to provide spiritual care. The last endeavor that I can recall was focused on family care, but with a spouse who has a career and a young family, I would have had to spend time away from my family in order to receive the benefit of this service. Speaking again specifically as a deacon, I feel as though I am quite overlooked in the care that is being put forward for the ministerial. Most of the resources and topics of discussion during (mandated) conferences are directed towards the pastoral ministry and I leave these conferences feeling as though my position has been

completely overlooked and is not worthy of acknowledgement. With the dissolution of the church work program at Concordia in Edmonton I have yet to see an alternate training program arise and it makes me wonder why LCC is so willing to let the entirety of this program fade away. The diaconate in this synod are some of the hardest working people that I know and to see their training go to waste and not be acknowledged at all makes me feel as though LCC is only willing to recognize professional church workers when they have a pastoral calling. One of the greatest times of spiritual care that I've received is from the Sabbath Professional Church Workers conference which is put on independently of the synod and sponsored and run by the diaconate workers in the synod.

28. Pastors and Deacons are quite hands off from LCC.
29. Those that need special care can use EAP
30. As a Lay Person I have no idea
31. Don't know.
32. I have heard lack of support from District to clergy in all Districts
33. At present - no real spiritual care is offered from synod to the average pastor/deacon.
34. can more Skype or Facetime group meetings be held with a cluster of Pastors/Deacons.
35. Scripture puts the primary duty of caring for pastors on the hearers (1 Cor. 9:14, Gal 6:6, etc.). The bishops should be providing strong support in cases when the hearers stop being interested in God's Word - when they stop obeying them that have the rule over them and stop submitting themselves to their shepherds (Heb. 13:17).
36. Spiritual care of pastors encompasses several aspects. The areas in which LCC should provide spiritual care are (1) the support of pastors in hostile situations where congregations are unwilling to submit to the preached Word and the faithfully carried out pastoral office, and (2) continuing education and ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine and practice.
37. Not sure what spiritual care is being provided to our pastor and we don't have a deacon.
38. could be a lot better
39. This answer is based on comments from some young pastors at the ABC Convention 2015 at which I was a lay delegate.
40. Ideally, I would like to see ecclesiastical supervisors function as a "pastor's pastor." I fear that LCC does not have that kind of spiritual care for her pastors/deacons at present. Certainly the huge size of Canada contributes to the challenges of this, but I think we must do better.
41. Our recently removed Pastor has received little or no advisement, in my opinion from LCC.
42. Do not know
43. Although I agree sometimes I see Pastors do not receive as much care from above as they need.
44. The role of the president of a district in particular should more be pastoral so as to provide a good quality of spiritual care to pastors and deacons.
45. The last two former Pastors of our Congregation had serious personal struggles ... and I am not aware of any
46. Do circuit counselors receive adequate training in dealing with concerns of church workers?
47. LCC, beginning at Seminary level, does not adequately care for its workers' spiritual health. It does not even pretend to address crucial emotional issues, such as balancing family/pastoral life -- it provides platitudes and looks the other way.
48. What is appropriate quality now?
49. Due to lack of information, I can't answer.

50. As a lay person I'm not qualified to express my opinion one way or other - but I have heard of at least one other denomination who encourages sabbaticals for their Pastors which might be beneficial.
51. They need MORE spiritual care!
52. My husband badly needed some spiritual care and counseling and no one from district office would even talk to him. This affected our whole family but no one cared or could be bothered with us, as a result my husband left the ministry for a time just to try to find himself. This happened several years ago, but at the time we didn't know what to do or who to turn to.
53. I think deacons do not receive such care.
54. Supportive and genuinely concerned.
55. During their time in the ministry, some lifetime training should be mandatory.
56. I know of Pastors who are hurting and I know of congregations who are hurting. There doesn't seem to be support for the victim or accountability for the bully/controller.
57. Once again, this question is near impossible for the average lay person to answer unless they've had personal conversations regarding this topic with a pastor or deacon. I do however believe more can be done to offer spiritual care, support and encouragement to our pastors and deacons. It seems that unless one seeks out support, no one from LCC is touching base with them to see if there are any concerns.
58. Deacon program seems unsupported.
59. I have no experience or info on these first 3 questions.
60. I'm not qualified to comment on this as I am not privy to the care they get or are getting.
61. The role of District President, if it continues, must have a greater emphasis of 'Pastor to the pastors'.
62. I haven't heard anything to the contrary.
63. I don't know.
64. in my experience there does not appear to be spiritual care for deacons. They are often tacked on as an afterthought with pastors for their meetings and conferences (especially in the Central District). They frequently cannot go because the events are during the week when pastors are available but the deacons may not (teachers). If they need assistance or advice, it is non existent.
65. As a lay person I have no knowledge about this.
66. I am not sure what "spiritual care" I am supposed to receive from LCC. I receive necessary care from my circuit counselor as needed and participate in the circuit winkle. I have received visits from representatives of the district. I know that my family and I are prayed for by some of our broader church family when we face life issues.
67. Pastor and care workers are left to blow in the wind especially in rural parishes. LCC position is to consolidate and starve out rural congregations that cannot support themselves?
68. I just don't know
69. Depends on the leadership of individual churches, especially the elected Elders.
70. I have no clue it they are provided with the appropriate quality of spiritual care. Seems a silly question to ask of a lay person
71. When service is God first, His people second.
72. Pastors where serving a congregation do not receive enough support and encouragement. After retirement they are ignored and forgotten.
73. It depends on the person responsible for serving them.

74. Some pastors do, some don't.
75. I have not seen evidence of good quality spiritual care given the pastors in our congregation over the past 30 years.
76. if corrective measures are required, there must be a process for this
77. There can always be more spiritual care for pastors and deacons, but as a servant to the districts and their pastors they can only allocate so much resources to spiritual care.
78. In most cases. Sometimes I think some of the pastoral counsellors are not fully understanding in their counselling. Some tend to repeat the church's position on situations instead of being understanding to religious leaders who are having difficulty.
79. When help is needed, help is provided. However, the current ecclesiastical supervisor of ABC does not appear to be fulfilling this role, especially since he is declaring the district dead. We, however, the members of ABC district, do NOT believe it is dead.
80. AS a lay person, we are not privy to the amount of spiritual care our Pastor receives from LCC
81. The Pastors that I know have not commented one way or the other to me on this matter.
82. Again this question needs to be answered by the people involved.
83. I'm not aware of the exact spiritual care they are getting.
84. The ones who have spoken up on matters that are challenging LCC or district are shamed, ostracized, threatened etc. or discounted.
85. And yet we should be willing to help and support our Pastors and Deacons even more, for we, the lay people ask and expect much of our Pastors and Deacons.
86. Unless we have a close personal relationship with our pastor/deacon and they share this type of information, a lay person would certainly not have any opinion on this. Will the number of No Opinion "votes" on these type of questions be misinterpreted as apathy?
87. It would be nice, however if we would spend as much time on this as we do on day to day practical things.
88. By past experience I believe that there should be a greater amount of spiritual care for the pastors in our synod. When problems arise, there needs to be more than just our own pastors looking at the matter. Suggestions would be Christian councillors or a psychologist to be used in more difficult problems.
89. I do not know.
90. Have no idea would hope so
91. would like to think so
92. I do not know how much spiritual care these individuals get from LCC.
93. I received no personal spiritual care from LCC officials until my church started to have internal conflict. Then they came on the scene, prayed for us and told us how important it is to reconcile. Then they told the Parish Planning Counsel that I "lacked manifest love for the people" a personal subjective judgment of theirs that they were not even authorized to make. Reconciliation does not empower synodical officials to assign guilt based on their own reading of people. Our synod has a notorious problem with it's officials not doing the job that their given and instead making up new roles for themselves. Had I been guilty of some objective offense, that would be one thing, but allowing synodical officials to simply size up pastors and situations and shoot blame and personal recommendations from the hip as they see fit is despotic.
94. What do the pastors & deacons think?

95. I can't imagine this being a constant synod wide. I see some pastors who seem to have a good sense of balance, and have done well in juggling their God-given vocations with the demands of family living, while others have poured their lives into the church, at the expense of their train-wrecked families. I don't say this to be harsh or overly critical; the fact remains that needs in our world are great, and a lot of that burden oft falls on pastors. And they need the care and support to keep them going. Again, I suspect some get better care than others. I'm not really sure how one can measure this, and thus manage it.
96. Because I am neither Pastor nor Deacon, I cannot comment one way or the other.
97. Hard to know unless there are complaints by the Pastors/Deacons. I'm not sure how open a Pastor would be to laymen on these matters.
98. We have seen the fallout. Pastors need to have more care taken of THEIR spiritual and emotional health.
99. I have seen too many instances of pastors not receiving effective spiritual care and literally burning themselves out. Far too often, this has had a devastating effect on their families. It is often very hard on the congregation. In our congregation, we have lost dozens of members as a result.
100. The reception of quality spiritual care from LCC for pastors and deacons is somewhat subjective and may depend on the perception of each individual pastor and deacon and also may depend on which district, circuit, and church where they are serving.
101. Internally from one another yes. Externally this is an area that needs work. Please don't forget Pastoral care for pastors and deacons which is just as important, if not more at times.
102. As I am neither a pastor nor a deacon, I cannot answer this question with confidence.
103. I am not a pastor or deacon and cannot speak to this question.
104. I really couldn't say. I am neither a pastor nor a deacon. They have not shared with me what kind of spiritual care they receive from LCC. No opinion.
105. I have received appropriate spiritual care from my fellow pastors in my current circuit. At least in so far as I have been willing to share with them. Contact with District staff and Synodical staff is very limited, usually casual greetings at convention, church work conferences, etc.
106. I agree with "quality", but in certain instances "more" or "different" or "accompanied by" should be considered.
107. I am not sure what "spiritual care" I am supposed to receive from LCC. I receive necessary care from my circuit counselor as needed and participate in the circuit winkle. I have received visits from representatives of the district. I know that my family and I are prayed for by some of our broader church family when we face life issues.
108. Again, a structure in which the two-fold responsibilities of the District President are divided allowing their corporate work to be carried out by a qualified CEO and the ecclesiastical work to be accomplished by an elected LCC pastor would improve this.
109. Don't know the details.
110. Don't know as no one has mentioned this. How do they receive this quality? They should have spiritual core but do they? How do we know.
111. The support pastors et al presently get from Synod does not address their spiritual needs which more often than not are affected by their professional and personal struggles. Again, this function would best be carried out at the District level where personal relationships required for such care can more readily be formed than at a national level,
112. If we aren't a Pastor or Deacon how can we answer this.

113. Deacons have pastors, but I am unaware of any spiritual care for pastors from LCC.
114. I am not privileged to know this information.
115. I've been retired for 9+ years but I recall that district and circuit people were available when needed.
116. I am not familiar with the present amount of care provided
117. I have no idea what care programs LCC offers to Pastors or Deacons.
118. I believe there is room for improvement in this area, something akin to the Employee Assistance Plans in the public sector.
119. My experience has been that pastors and deacons are not checked in with on a regular basis from a member of synod unless things reach a level of crisis. It's more a putting out of fires than a caregiving and supporting role. I would like to see more consistent care given, even an offer to pray for them over the phone.
120. I'm a layperson, no hands on experience with spiritual care of workers.
121. We have a healthy Circuit and trust one another. I can see that unhealthy Circuits would not have that same level of spiritual care.
122. In my own work experience there was an EAP (Employee Assistance Program) available anonymously for support of employees. If there is such a program available for pastors and deacons in LCC, I have not heard of it.
123. Many pastors and families are left like "islands in a storm" -- and it must be stated that there are many who refuse to acknowledge issues/problems and seek help.
124. There is not enough one-on-one communication between them and circuit counselor/District President. They don't always get to talk about personal problems and difficulties.
125. Perhaps in the larger centers they do, but not in outlaying distant communities.
126. Don't see any care for ours - no interest from LCC
127. Unknown
128. I believe the quality is there, but the quantity could be increased. Church workers (as are most people) are prone to withdraw inwards as difficulties arise, and so a better job could be done reaching out to workers before crises arise.
129. It depends on the effectiveness of the DP and/or the current Circuit Counsellor
130. No idea
131. DP's and SP are all very busy with the administration of the District and Synodical entities to make sure that the circuits operate as theological groups, that pastor's Winkels are not just business but also times of theological discussion and reflection. to encourage continuing education for pastors and church workers. The entity seems to be primary while the theological importance of the role is left undone.
132. As with everything in the church, more could be done with unlimited time and resources.
133. Unknown but know District President is approachable.
134. I don't know.
135. How would a layman have that information?
136. I do not know how much care is received by Pastors and Deacons and therefore cannot form an opinion.
137. again, as above
138. At the circuit level, but it is inconsistent from one circuit to another, and hampered by long distances.
139. I believe that LCC does not have the manpower available to provide the proper quality or amount of spiritual care necessary in some cases.

140. Need more
141. I don't feel like this really happens very well, but I am also not sure how to realistically change this.
142. I don't expect spiritual care from district or synod presidents. I find spiritual care around me in my own congregational context and with other people I've come to trust in my life.
143. As a lay person, I have not information on which to comment about this.
144. There is NO spiritual care from the President of Synod, the District President or the Circuit Counselor.
145. Given the current size of the districts, it is impossible for the district president to know what sort of quantity of spiritual care is needed by every member of his district. Thus appropriate spiritual care cannot be provided on any regular basis. Appropriate spiritual care is the exception rather than the rule. This is not the fault of any individual. It is simply the result of our current maladroit organisation.
146. I again agree, because I believe this is happening. Other than by confirming this with the Pastors or Deacons, how would a lay member know this is in fact happening?
147. As a lay person, I have no idea; how would I know?
148. I think that LCC can and should do more to support our church workers.
149. Some pastors (new to ministry) may need more. Seasoned pastors learn a lot by doing.
150. No idea of the qualify of spiritual care, I am not a pastor or deacon. I have heard no complaints.
151. -My circuit counsellor didn't even know I was still working at the church. I do not receive invites to meetings/Winkels.
152. In a situation in our district it seemed that the spiritual care that might have been given to the pastor didn't fully address all of the points of view in terms of the needs and issues of the congregation.
153. Spiritual care is LACKING deeply in LCC. Our miniscule church is still a closed club for the so-called Lutheran "in-crowd" with preferential treatment to LCC "family".
154. There has been too much control given to some district presidents regarding discipline to pastors and leaves the pastor feeling as though he has no where else to turn if there is a disagreement within the district circles.
155. They are well served through their District President, District Board, and Circuit Counsellors. This framework is very important, as it is through these LCC representatives that the spiritual needs of Pastors and their families are made known and are met. ABC District: Circuits & Ministry Wives Committee
156. Our church workers are very well served in that the District Presidents are always ready and willing to visit with them and the District President's regional representative, the circuit counselor are also available to provide spiritual care. They often have pastors living near them who can provide spiritual care. The ABC District has also encouraged and financially pastors to be involved in Doxology, Pastoral Leadership Institute, Wiki Five Two and have formed Transforming for Missions learning communities. In the ABC District there an active Ministry Wives Committee that provides support for the spouses of church workers. Of course, more can always be done.
157. This could be strengthened, and a mentoring program for new pastors would be very helpful during those first few years in the parish.
158. Pastors and Deacons need to be opportunity for upgrading particularly in Social matters

159. If a Pastor or Deacon wished to veer or simply did not fit the mold from the approved way of thinking they would not get quality spiritual care.
160. In long relationships with my pastors, I know they have not felt supported at times.
161. Deacon training is lacking in taking a more active role in service presentation.
162. I don't have enough direct experience or feedback from others in these offices to say one way or another
163. There is little spiritual care to pastors except what might come from a winkel.
164. Spiritual care should be ongoing and not only when there is a problem with irreconcilable differences. Spiritual care is there if requested but may not always accessed. There should be a separate body that is highly trained, and confidential, in counselling that ministers to pastors individually.
165. I am unable to reply to this as I'm unaware as to what they receive.
166. We could always benefit from more. But, we are a small church with limited resources.
167. How long did it take President Bugbee to send a "pastoral" letter to Paul Schoepp? Not the only example I could come up with. The Synod's current treatment of Glenn Schaeffer.... there is more.
168. Both need closer care and supervision and ability to work together more effectively.
169. I don't think there is enough spiritual care or support offered or provided to our Pastors at either the district or Synod level. Our pastors, as our shepherds, need to be cared for appropriately so they can better care for their flocks.
170. but continue to live in the past...not enough "lightening up" to make church attendance interesting. Stay too much in the old ways. Let’s get some of the new music.
171. I have heard through the grapevine, that some pastors don't feel supported enough.
172. Here I see a breakdown of the current system: who is pastor to the pastors? Paul placed Timothy in such a role in the Church of Ephesus. A District President as CEO is not automatically pastor to the pastors.
173. I'm sure we could find ways to support our Pastors and Deacons even more.
174. By 'LCC' do you mean to include even Circuit Counselors? My CC is great and is very helpful. But that doesn't have anything to do with LC-C. He would be good regardless of the structure.
175. Aside from pious platitudes - care of individual workers is dismal.
176. Aside form pious platitudes they receive next to nothing.
177. As a deacon, I have appreciated receiving yearly cards from the LCC staff but most of the spiritual support I have received has come from my District staff. The circumstances regarding CEF have impaired this support as the full time staff member in charge of Parish and School support has been terminated.
178. Too many hurting pastors. No one is checking. The Bowen family systems should be discarded. Use of DOXOLOGY should be provided as the first place to start.
179. I have not seen much in the past in terms of spiritual care. I have appreciated the thought and effort put forward in the temporary ecclesiastical leader for ABC.
180. I hope they receive sufficient support & appropriate quality of spiritual care.
181. I expect they do, but have no way of knowing for sure.
182. How would the average layman know this????
183. From what I saw read and experienced, pre and post convention after the CEF tragedy, I was appalled by the lack of ministry for our pastors in the parish and the members of the District

Office. Every thing that was communicated through the written word from the LCC office to the congregations was lacking spiritual care. There were and still are many hurting leaders.

184. Is this the same question as Q1? The answer is the same. When those in leadership can continue with a theology of glory, twist the sacred Scriptures when convenient and then ditching them when also convenient and do this for years without fraternal admonition, there is a serious lack of spiritual care.
185. Anyone with eyes to see can determine that the Synodical President is doing everything he can to avoid getting his hands muddied with the ABC/CEF problem.
186. As long as the Pastors come forward when they have need
187. I must disagree and again I'm talking through my hat but shouldn't the presidents or vice presidents visit each church and see what is going on. Pray with our Pastors.
188. Don't know what you mean by spiritual care.
189. Always a challenge but I do believe we do our best.
190. Again, how would I know being a layperson?
191. I feel that there should be more visits by LCC District leaders to the congregation Pastors and leaders.
192. It would be helpful if our news bulletins mentioned any specific programs or activities.
193. No
194. I feel that there should be more follow up by the District President every second year to ensure that these positions are following and adhering to LCC policy and procedures.
195. -most pastors are not even well known by, nor well cared for by their District President or Circuit Counsellor, to say nothing of the Synodical President; because of this, who is the pastor to the pastors?
196. Same comments as above. The largeness of our country and the need for touching Pastors and Deacons on a regular basis requires that the "toughing" take place whenever it is needed. This in my opinion is not possible if not available on a regular and both informal as well as formal basis.
197. As an observer, I believe that a fair amount of spiritual care happens through the relationships that pastors have with each other. I really can't comment on whether or not this support is 'from LCC' or happens informally. I do believe that pastors are sorely in need of spiritual care. Members of congregations lean quite heavily upon their pastors and the pastors do an amazing job of responding. There are also members that attempt some of that care for their pastors but having care coming from outside their flock is critical in my mind.
198. I believe that Pastors could benefit from care.
199. I am unaware of the care they get.
200. they should receive care on at least a yearly basis.
201. Our benefits program is great in terms of offering assistance when Pastors/Deacons need it. But as the saying goes - you can lead a horse to water - but you can't make him drink. I think there is way more need than there are people taking advantage of the services. For a person dealing with an issue - the need is often greater than the amount of visits the plan can sustain.
202. Four-point parish in Central District was overlooked when LCC was looking to combine parishes. (ABC District was used as a guide and our parish was left out. Feelings were hurt.
203. Hopefully that is available to all in need of quality of spiritual care from LCC!
204. how do I know
205. how would we know

206. It seems that Winkels and conferences are supposed to provide spiritual care, but most often they are theological sessions or social affairs. Specific professional development is left up to individuals and spiritual care is not usually available or safe to access. After trouble strikes, is when spiritual care is offered.
207. There is practically no time or effort spent on professional and personal development and " spiritual care " only kicks in AFTER trouble erupts.
208. I think most of them probably do, but certainly some who are struggling have not received appropriate quality of care.
209. As I am neither a pastor or deacon I cannot comment on this statement but I'm sure there is a need.
210. If they received the proper level of support, I believe we would have fewer self-aggrandizing pastors who believe that because they completed a graduate level degree, are now above their congregation. This attitude has been pervasive in pastors as long as I can recall; having been a lay delegate to national conventions and served on convention floor committees, I have observed this in multiple areas. with proper spiritual care, I believe the blinders may come off.
211. Hard for a layperson to have visibility here. However, my gut reaction is that our Pastor-centric orientation, in the context of a de-Christianizing Canada places a lot of stress on Pastors that likely leads to burnout.
212. It appears our Pastors are paid well and have good accommodations, benefits, etc. which is as it should be. Spiritually, I am hopeful they have support from all areas within and outside their local church and the LCC body.
213. Often I feel that Pastors and Deacons in the field are left without ongoing mentorship and support for their own spiritual care. They are responsible for their flocks but seem isolated themselves. I know our Pastor benefits from the monthly circuit winkles but this is more peer relation than spiritual care.
214. I think that there is appropriate quality of spiritual care but it is indicative for the pastor and or deacon to ask for spiritual care when he or she is in need.
215. Not all pastors have the priority of pastoral care and ministering to peoples needs where they are... (or those pastors are getting their support from other pastors rather than synod/district which promotes their justification by works...) A few pastors' emphasis seems to be priestly duties only.
216. I'm not sure what this means... from Synodical President and Vice Presidents are one step removed...District level could be better.
217. assume they do, but not sure
218. No idea who provides support to our loving pastors however, it should be strong and wise and ongoing and continual...i.e. public speaking and engaging skills.
219. There is very little to no spiritual care for the Pastors and Deacons within our Church. Only if you demand help incessantly do you receive a pittance of spiritual care and concern.
220. The benefit package provided for Pastors and Deacons is very weak in terms of the coverage for professional psychological counselling services compared to other benefit packages.
221. What is an appropriate level or quality of spiritual care? To the extent that I am aware, Pastors and Deacons who have requested spiritual care or who have been open to spiritual care from LCC (including its Districts) have received help. Help is available from multiple sources within the LCC network including the congregational and circuit level. Without

creating a mandatory spiritual "check-in" system it would be difficult to ensure that anyone who might be artfully avoiding help is detected and assisted.

222. No evidence
223. I am relatively new.
224. Could be more communication in the spiritual care.
225. It's my personal experience that in general, pastors of the synod must be proactive to receive this. Ordinarily, they do not receive ongoing pastoral care from the various levels of synodical ecclesiastical supervisors.
226. That info should come from them and be communicated to their congregation.
227. District has been effective in this area. However, it has often failed to appeal to Pastors in a timely fashion. There is little long-tern aid in regard to spiritual care for pastors and/or deacons.
228. Impossible to generalize. I, personally, believe I have received an "appropriate quality of spiritual care."
229. What is provided is good, though there appears to be a lack of communication regarding needs.
230. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
231. What does this question mean? Again what are the results of this going to tell you because the question is not specific. It is important for Pastors and Deacons to be cared for and I see this happening for Pastors through circuit meetings and from their individual pastors.
232. Impossible to generalize. I, personally, have received "appropriate quality of spiritual care."
233. Do pastors and deacons receive assistance in their specific problems?
234. I think there is room for improvement. It may be that we provide what we are able to with our limited resources, but I think that our leaders would benefit from more care, especially the sort of care that could prevent a crisis rather than simply responding to one when it develops.
235. Even as a pastor, I can only answer this question for myself and a few brothers who have shared with me (even then I am not sure what is meant by the question. Am I happy? yes Could our leaders be more active as pastors for pastors? of course, though I fail to see how they would have time. Perhaps we should go back to visitation - the regular visiting of supervisors who make sure the pastor and congregation are following confessional practice and at that time to offer confession/absolution to the pastor as well as counselling.
236. Those who seek the assistance of a circuit supervisor, district president or synodical president will receive help. Do we have professional counsellors, seminary professors, other clerics available and skilled in assisting appropriately?
237. Have not seen any evidence of this.
238. I’m not a pastor, I cannot judge.
239. I do not think that there is a uniform level of spiritual care from LCC. I would like to see signs of support, especially when members of a congregation start to attempt to remove a pastor.
240. There should be more care from the district office with vacancies to avoid disputes.
241. For spiritual care, I look mostly to my circuit counselor.
242. Leaders hide behind their computers instead of being on the ground visiting the people out in the field. I had an occasion where a pastor asked me Are you my Pastor?
243. my knowledge of this is limited
244. Very often there seems to be no spiritual care.

245. I have insufficient knowledge of this to comment.
246. Everyone has enough care. Willingness to receive it is questionable.
247. Our minister is just too busy serving five congregations to be able to have a good spiritual relationship with his congregants.
248. I would argue that LCC, as an organization, does not assume any responsibility or role in this area. From my conversations with pastors, I would say that it is the local community of pastors that are most responsible for spiritual care. They lean upon each other and seek out each other when challenged in a spiritual manner.
249. Comments made at ABC District Convention workshops indicate that rural congregations receive less support than urban congregations.
250. As a lay member.... how would I know?
251. I am troubled as to how "today's" pastors are being trained at the seminaries. Worrisome as to how many are not completing their SEF's on a yearly basis...especially when congregations have to call a pastor. Laziness. Not being trained in financial awareness (congregational budgets) and not preaching on Stewardship at some point in the church year is not acceptable and leads down the path of congregational deficits...and ultimately...in church closures.
252. Only if a pastor/deacon seeks it out on their own or the district president is visiting their pastors in the congregations in their district. Even then, we have such a high burnout rate and I never hear how LCC is helping.
253. In some regions there is a disconnect that leaves church workers struggling alone, in need of spiritual care.
254. I don't think pastors and deacons have the quality of spiritual care that they need. However, I also do not think that pastors (especially) seek out and avail themselves of what is available to them. This probably is more of cultural shift that needs to happen among clergy that it is 'ok' to need and ask for help.
255. If LCC you mean the care that is provided at the District level for the church workers in the ABC District. I can't speak for the other two districts.
256. Don't know what they receive so don't know if it is appropriate
257. Always opportunity for more
258. Almost none. If it wasn't for Winkels and circuit councillors, there wouldn't be any.
259. ask the pastors and deacons
260. Never have seen this if so we don’t see it.
261. Having been personally involved in a couple of (GTA) Pastors 'quitting their calls' I can see a definite weakness in this area. This needs addressing from the top down. (with training on how to give additional (crisis) support and not just what is derived from the secular benefits/support received through the Workers Pension and Benefits Plan ...i.e. focused Christian guidance
262. I do not know
263. In the current system, it's physically impossible for a District President to provide adequate care to all those under his charge.
264. I have never seen any care from LCC
265. Some congregations have not been approached in any form by the District President.
266. I feel that more spiritual care and direction must be given by the district leadership.
267. I expect they do but have no way of knowing.
268. How are lay people suppose to know! But from all the other information I doubt it.

269. Is this the same question as Q1? The answer is the same. When those in leadership can continue with a theology of glory, twist the sacred Scriptures when convenient and then ditching them when also convenient and do this for years without fraternal admonition, there is a lack of spiritual care.
270. I believe some pastors and deacons are isolated from ongoing care.
271. I am not aware of the spiritual care provided
272. We, as lay members, hear very little about this. As a member of Church Council I hear about the pension plan (Pastors never retire) and the suggested salary ranges. We don't hear about spiritual care except for mention of pastor meetings and appointment of district councillors.
273. Pastors and Deacons may have appropriate quality spiritual care available, however, whether to choose to receive it is another question.
274. Do not know how much spiritual care our Pastor receives. Have not heard of or seen any reports.
275. I think in most cases they are very well or overly well compensated
276. We cannot make an informed decision as we don't know what they already receive
277. 2/14/2016 5:01 PM
278. Pastors need sabbaticals to renew, refresh and re purpose.
279. I don't really know if they do or not - I would like to believe they do and should
280. Many Pastors don't have a strong group of elders in their congregations and need more help with their spiritual care. Maybe allowing more women in this are would strengthen elder groups. Our pastor told us that women couldn't tell him how to do his job.
281. I have found LCC extremely reluctant to confront and deal with situations where Pastors and Church workers are being bullied and treated badly.
282. I don't have enough information
283. Once again, as a lay member I have no way of monitoring or measuring this.
284. Pastors can feel alone and with out support as they serve a parish. Seems to me the circuit meetings often have theological skirmishes.
285. it would be nice to see more support among the pastors themselves.... sometimes it appears more of a competition, how free do pastors feel about bringing up sensitive issues
286. LCC, both at the national level and at the district level, are often totally out of touch or uninformed as to the spiritual needs of congregational workers at the local level. Pastors and Deacons are most often left to seek out persons or groups they feel they can trust to find the type of supports for which they feel the need.
287. This is a poor question. The real issue is where should the care of pastors and workers come from? Workers receive it from their congregations and pastors, and the appropriateness or quality of that care will depend on the pastor and congregation providing it. Where should pastors receive their spiritual care? Circuit councillors? District President? The pastors will have to say if they are cared for.
288. This is a poor question. The real question is where the pastors and deacons should receive spiritual care. Deacons receive it from their pastors and congregations (whether it is of appropriate quality will depend on the effectiveness of the pastor and congregation). Where pastors receive their care is another question... circuit councillors? District President? Peers? Again, whether their experience is one of quality or "appropriate quality" will depend on a case-by-case experience.
289. Pastors & Deacons should have opportunity to upgrade both in Spiritual and Social matters

290. If spiritual care is supposed to be coming from the circuit counsellors or the District President, it isn't happening. Too much time is spent on reports and little time is left for actual care. Someone needs to do this as a separate role from a pastor of a congregation. Said pastor has little time to care for other pastors out of the time they need for their own congregation.
291. I can't say that I know enough about this to comment on.
292. I'm not aware of what quantify my pastor receives at the present time. I know he has some meetings with other pastors in the district from time to time.
293. This is difficult to gage since it is not a topic that is discussed too much. I believe that it is an area that we need to develop in order to build a stronger spiritual identity (not just social one) among the clergy of our church.
294. Spiritual care?
295. I strongly believe spiritual care for church workers should come from the congregations. That said, this is often not the case. There is a need for ongoing education for congregations in the "care and feeding" of their workers and there is also a need for synod level support for workers, especially those workers who are without a call. I'm not convinced that any worker benefit program can offer support for church workers in their physical needs, never mind their spiritual needs. How this need can be met...one could establish a whole department that deals only with congregation education and worker support but that is an expensive reality for our little LCC. But the consequence of a lack of support is so great, perhaps there needs to be at least some investigation into this.
296. If the church workers reach out, there is normally excellent support; however, a few "disagreeable" workers are marginalized by LCC, adding to their woes and distress
297. I understand circuits meet on a regular basis, however I would question how deep they dive into each pastor's particular spiritual need.
298. Pastors and Deacons have a lonely job, especially if they are prophets. So they seek spiritual care from their peers. That would likely happen whether or not from LCC. Forced fellowship is a good thing. if it wasn't mandatory many would not go, but there is no discipline for those who don't go, save a bad reputation.
299. Your question is to vague: Do Pastors and Deacons receive appropriate quality spiritual care, WHILE BEING TRAINED IN EITHER SEMINARY? Yes, they do. DO PASTORS AND DEACONS RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SPIRITUAL QUALITY CARE AFTER GRADUATING? No they don't. Maybe in and around the bigger centers can meet with each for spiritual guidance from each other. However, in the smaller congregation and in the more remote communities, pastors and church works are more or less left to flounder around on their own.
300. TOO MUCH DOCTRINE IS OLD SCHOOL FOR TODAYS SOCIETY.
301. It should be compulsory for all pastors and deacons to attend all circuit and district meetings.
302. From my personal experience yes within the District I currently serve yes. Having heard first hand from several pastors, in the ABC District, under Presidents Ruf and Schiemann, pastors often experienced being poorly used/supported by their congregations with the District President giving little or no support to the pastor and serving more as a supporter for the congregation rather than as the Seelsorger for both pastor and congregation.
303. Have no idea what Synod does in this regard
304. How does one measure appropriate care?

305. A know that our Pastor strives to be active in such things, supporting other pastors around him. I get the feeling that we are particularly blessed with a Pastor that is connected and plugged in to what is available through LCC but I don't believe that all of the Pastors are that active that way.
306. No one has ever come out to our church to talk to pastor or Elders
307. I think there should be budget line items that are allotted to Pastors and deacons where they can continue to learn. i.e. a free distance learning Concordia class each year.
308. This is done chiefly by the Synod through the Conferences and the Winkels. Conventions serve another purpose. However, this is primarily through my personal relationships with brother pastors.
309. I am not aware of what spiritual care Pastors and Deacons receive.
310. Pastors and deacons have sometimes been unsupported in their professional and personal lives.
311. In some cases, the District President and Circuit Counselor do provide such care of pastors. In other cases, the care of pastors is almost non-existent. And in still other cases, the DP and CC come across as adversaries of pastors.
312. Again, I believe that there is room for improvement here. Spiritual care is generally addressed on an individual basis, yet often this care is not commonly available for a pastor or deacon unless they search it out. Individual Confession and Absolution should be encouraged--preached about, practiced, made available to parishioners. A pastor, would be wise to be the penitent and receive this sacrament as well. In the boarder sphere of the church, spiritual care is given when an ordained man at the circuit level or district level (a bishop) exercises care for the flock and guides them in the process when a congregation calls a pastor.
313. Additional help could be given struggling pastors.
314. I have not heard any complaints about it.
315. We get good value for the $$$ invested. If more $$$ were available improvements could be made.
316. This is light, though it still happens
317. I am not aware that they receive any!
318. I know of pastors and Christian teachers that have had serious personality flaws with immoral actions involved. There was no counselling or help, but they were simply moved to another area to be hidden to continue their work (and hurtfulness to others in congregations). This is not only not in accordance with scripture, but it doesn't show Jesus' love to the individual.
319. With our vast country of Canada, it's difficult except where there are cities on fair size to provide the care "needed" - again because of expense, time, and distance
320. As above, 'appropriate' as compared to what?
321. I feel that the majority of spiritual care comes from within the congregation, board of lay ministers or the circuit council they are a member of.
322. Is this the same question as Q1? The answer is the same. When those in leadership can continue with a theology of glory, twist the sacred Scriptures when convenient and then ditching them when also convenient for years without fraternal admonition there is a lack of spiritual care.
323. How much do they receive?

324. Three areas of concern are: 1. Mentorship of new pastors. 2. care of pastors after a crisis. 3. Care of CRM pastors.
325. not in Alberta /BC District
326. Some do, some do not (based on my experience). Spiritual care for our Pastors and Deacons though, must begin with support in their leadership rolls in their congregations by District and Synod.
327. Not sure how much they receive, so I cannot answer
328. Not enough attention to care of pastors' wives in this district
329. What do you mean by "spiritual care"? Could you have listed what LCC does in that area? Maybe this survey should have branched off, so that Pastors and Deacons could answer this question, and not lay people.
330. This may be available to the Pastors and Deacons, but not compulsory in order to become effective for them.
331. The skills and abilities in addition to the spiritual gifts of District Presidents and Circuit counsellors vary widely in terms of providing spiritual oversight to all professional church workers. I believe some circuit counsellors do not feel as gifted in providing ecclesiastical support to their fellow pastors and we should strive not merely to rotate the circuit counsellor function but should consider specifically charging the most gifted pastors with this role
332. 1.The synod and district does a very inadequate job of supporting congregation concerns should the occur with pastors and congregations. Prayers may not be sufficient. 2.Deaconess positions appear as a workaround the get females near but not into pulpits 3. Once qualified ministers, that may have left and return should still be qualified and be able to present themselves as ministers, minister assistants or deacon(s) 4. Appears different rules re leaving and returning, and separation / divorce status of minister and their ability to preform in LCC
333. As a lay person, I'm not sure if Pastors & Deacons receive the appropriate quality of spiritual care from LCC.
334. Don't see much happening at all
335. Pastors can burn out, or succumb to sin even when spiritual care is extended them - in the same way people will succumb to tragedies that support organizations are designed to mitigate.
336. particularly rural workers have little to no contact with other workers on a regular basis. I think that fellowship, worship services (winkel, etc.) and bible study with fellow workers is important. I do understand the difficulty in getting workers together either regularly or otherwise, but I do see the value in it. I know that some attempt has been made to use internet or social media to address this need but it is not the same thing as person to person contact.
337. Though I lean towards agreement there needs to be in this post church age a better way to help pastors and deacons walk much more closely together to buoy one another up and spur one another on spiritually all so that congregations might be a much greater forces in our world storming the gates of hell!
338. Spiritual care? What is that???
339. only on an emergency/triage basis, when it's likely already too late.
340. How would laity know this?
341. I really hope so.

342. All spiritual care can be "spotty" or differing due to the relationship between leaders and Pastors and Deacons.
343. DPs #1 task ought to be caring for their pastors. Sadly, they are not able to regularly visit the pastors and their families. The DP should know the struggles and fears of each of the pastors. It is no wonder many pastors feel isolated, burned out, and emotionally drained. They have little support. Perhaps the DP is expected to make other things a priority, but care for the pastors ought to be a top priority.
344. District Presidents struggle to make spiritual care a top priority for those under their care. Often, DPs will know very little of pastors, deacons, and their families. DPs rarely visit the pastors/deacons regularly. Without regular visits, how can spiritual care be provided? DPs will not be aware of pastors/deacons struggles until it is too late. Is it any wonder that many pastors/deacons suffer burnout, and emotional distress? It may not be the DP's fault because sadly, they are expected to have other priorities.
345. I believe this depends on the church worker's geographical region. Personally speaking, I had served a long term vacancy, along with my other duties, which proved to be a very taxing responsibility, and not once did I receive even a phone call from the District President asking about my well-being or if there was anything he could pray for. I believe this is one example, of many, that exposes the poor pastoral and spiritual care that is provided in many areas of our Synod. With that said, I've also experienced adequate pastoral and spiritual care in other regions of LCC, and so I believe the answer to this question would depend upon location.
346. The greatest care I have received has been through our local winkel. In more trying circumstances, I have been grateful for the wisdom, care and support that I received from our district staff.
347. In my experience, Pastors and Deacons receive spiritual care as long as they are important enough to the leaders of LCC to merit it. Those in smaller, out-of-the-way congregations tend to be generally ignored. They become considered trouble makers if they speak too loudly and are deemed irrelevant by most.
348. I am not in a position to have an informed opinion on this matter. However, if our Pastor would have a concern regarding this matter I feel he would bring it to the attention of those in charge.
349. I believe with today’s technology more support could be given in a cost effective manner
350. If by LCC, you mean my congregation then yes. However, if by LCC you mean a synodical structure then strongly no.
351. Refer back to question #1; you have to visit in homes, not offices.
352. The District president has never once come to visit me or my congregations of his own free will. There is currently zero spiritual care for LCC. When I was in the ABC district it was the same situation. Highly disappointing.
353. No LCC people called when our pastor needed spiritual care due to health problems.
354. Our pastor received NO calls or spiritual care from LCC when he had life threatening health problems.
355. Support seems to correlate with church size and contributions
356. Deacons in particular receive no care from LCC other than what they offer to each other. Many are not encouraged, nor even allowed to go to circuit meetings.

357. Pastor severely handicapped by depression allowed to continue serving to the serious detriment to the congregation. more hands on counseling needed for pastors serving rapidly shrinking congregations.
358. From my observations, deacons don't receive adequate spiritual care from LC-C
359. As a lay member I may not know of the quality of care for Pastors and Deacons.
360. I feel that only the pastor/church workers can accurately respond to this question.
361. As long as we are putting our Synod/District leaders in the role of CEO, this will always fall to the wayside. I want my DP/SP to be my pastor, yet I've found that, especially my DP, has been absent and negligent of the pastoral side of his job. One example: I went to the closing service of the Revelstoke congregation. I was serving the congregation in Golden, BC at the time and I was the only other pastor to be at the closing service. I wasn't even in the same circuit. The DP didn't show, the circuit counsellor didn't show, nobody from his circuit showed up to support the pastor, or the people of this congregation. I found that level of pastoral care to be deplorable. It's completely unacceptable. I don't want a CEO as my DP, I want a pastor.
362. I believe our pastors are under tremendous pressure and temptation, and they should receive much more training in effective personal prayer, emotional wellness, and family wellness.
363. See comments regarding Ecclesiastical Supervision above. Similar comments would apply here as well.
364. In many cases, indeed they do. In other cases, the "time-stretched-thin" for district presidents makes this difficult. Our circuit counselors may be under-utilized.
365. On the circuit level, it's good. I think these more local regional ties need to be strengthened.
366. We do not have strong structure in this area. The closest we come is the Circuit structure, but the quality of spiritual care here is minimal. We are structured for communication and information sharing, but we are not presently structured for deep caring.
367. The spiritual care of deacons and pastor's wives and families is an area where more help is desperately needed. Pastors have their district president, circuit counsellor and other brothers in the ministry to talk with during times of crisis, but who spiritually cares for pastors' families in times of crisis? I strongly believe that there needs to be a designated pastor in each circuit (perhaps a retired pastor?), who can routinely touch base with pastor's families and can lend spiritual support during crisis.
368. Pastors are supported well but their wives and families are not. If the pastor is in crisis the wife and children need a person who is responsible for their spiritual care. We need a designated individual who does not change every three years who makes sure they contact pastors' wives to ask if they need help in each locale.
369. Care of our workers has been a disgrace in our church body. Too many workers have simply been left by the wayside. We seem to have several classes of workers.
370. personally when and where I need support I call on pastor(s)

4. The Church Workers Pension and Benefits Plan is an important service to the Church.

1. Without this, you might not have any church workers.
2. Yes, I do, though I fail to see the significance of this question in terms of restructuring our synod.

3. I agree it is important for the staff that it benefits, therefore the workers have a pension and benefits.
4. Seems fair Employer and employee should pay. Funds should be insured.
5. It helps but in today's economy, it has not kept up.
6. Allows workers to concentrate on work vs trying to find best supplier for self and planning future.
7. As a comfort zone so they can practice their calling.
8. Yes, it takes away the concern of the ability to provide for your personal need.
- they can also be a huge burden on smaller, struggling congregations
9. Church worker position is difficult and there should be something.
10. How does this question tie into restructuring?
11. Existing pension and benefit plans are causing financial problems in small congregations.
12. don't know we are in the dark but expected to pay, kind of like the Catholics pay and don't ask or receive answers.
13. Not sure, not enough info given to average members. Were in the dark, intentionally, as we are finding out on many financial matters even when asking.
14. A pension and benefit plan is a tangible demonstration that we care for our workers. Denying these important supports for our shepherds and their families would be against our call to provide loving care of our brothers and sisters in Christ.
15. Pensions and benefits have eroded considerably in the last decade, especially with the shift from DB to DC pensions, which was a catastrophe. Further erosions are NOT acceptable.
16. Itis not an ideal solution, but I don't see any other way of ensuring a dignified retirement for our pastors.
17. It's important...BUT...far too expensive with too many frills included...AND not enough financial contributions by the participants.
18. Pastors need support through the benefit plan and some income in retirement.
19. Is the church worker necessary? Can a lay person do that job somewhere, sometime? There are a lot of volunteer workers in our church.
20. These days it is necessary and we must keep up to the world around us.
21. I had to pay into it and never received a dime or anything else. How is it serving the church? It is serving the workers.
22. I imagine all professions who have put in years of study have the benefit of compensation when needed.
23. Expensive for smaller congregations
24. Having these group plans helps to reduce costs for churches and enables individual workers have benefits they
25. I really appreciate the benefit plan as well as pension plan.
26. While it is wonderful to offer our Pastors a substantial pension plan - it is very expensive for smaller congregations to afford - they may choose to stay vacant as this along with the wage required is just not in their budget - Consider having the pastors pay a portion of this cost.
27. S/B a contributory fund with workers and LCC contributing equally to each individual’s pension.
28. Church workers are not generally overpaid and this is needed as care for church workers.
29. the one drawback is it is very expensive for the individual churches
30. Sorry, financial planning has no place at the synodical level. These programs need to be abolished. Congregations need to pay their pastors properly so they can provide for their

families and save for their own retirement. Keep the money-changing far, far away from the synod.

31. Congregations need to take care of their pastors. The synod can and should establish guidelines for this, and congregations should be encouraged and expected to provide for their pastor at a standard equal to the average standard within that congregation. Whether or not that includes a pension or other retirement savings plan and other benefits, and how that is implemented, should depend on the individual congregation.
32. While I feel it is important, I feel that it should be a 'guideline' not 'law'
33. Certainly for the pastors and their families.
34. Especially for the Pastors.
35. Yes. This is one of those things that synod can do together that would be very difficult for congregations to do on their own.
36. I would think that any employee would need it.
37. This is something that should not ever change.
38. may be to the employees but not to the Church -
39. workers need a pension plan for their senior years
40. I believe only those involved in the pension benefits plan should be responsible for funding it.
41. Pension and benefits plan is a very big burden for small parish
42. Yes, however the pension/benefit /salary should not be the primary drawing card for church work.
43. Again, a flawed and leading question. How is this a SERVICE? Isn't LCC required by law to provide pensions and benefits? And "important" -- in what sense? Of course it's important that all workers (church or not) be adequately provided for by their employers. Do you mean "important" in the sense of "benevolent"? That it's a good thing the Church does this, or that the Church does it especially well? Or that it takes up a lot of the Church's time and assets? It sounds as though this question is simply designed to elicit an "agree."
44. Don't know the plan.
45. Needs to be administered properly
46. Although some may question the cost it does provide an incentive to those considering the ministry as a vocation.
47. Unfortunate for the current economic situations, but response is as best as can be expected.
48. Just as the people of Israel were given direction by God to care for the Levites in their priestly roles, we as congregations have an obligation to take care of our pastors. I see this as including pensions and benefits.
49. Yes, but it should perhaps be contracted out to a financially strong & reliable carrier.
50. While it is important that we care for our church workers, I am not sure that the worker pension and benefit plan is meeting that need. The quality of benefits has decreased over the last many years, while the cost continues to increase. In some cases, it is possibly more beneficial to the church worker to seek their own plans elsewhere or through a financial planner.
51. Yes, a Good benefit package will have a better chance competing with other opportunities
52. I believe the Church Workers Pension and Benefits Plan is an important service to the Church, and yet I am concerned that the Pension and Benefits Plan is expensive and unsustainable by small congregations and a shrinking church body. Our congregation (perhaps others) is struggling financially. The Pension and Benefits Plan is 20-25% of our

congregational budget excluding other Pastoral Expenses. By the time Pastoral Expenses (including salary, housing allowance, and benefits), property/utility costs, and mission commitments to the District and Synod are covered, there is almost nothing left for other ministry and outreach needs in our congregation.

53. for every pastor in every parish and is the equal if not primary responsibility of LCC, not the sole responsibility of the congregation. Pastors and their family should not retire in poverty.
54. For with out a good benefit plan it would be hard to keep clerical positions filling with other more attractive opportunities
55. Yes, one most take care of church workers but not at such a cost that churches cannot exist because the amount having to be paid to LCC out balances everything
56. Typically ministers exhibit poor financial skills. Probably a good case for pension plan! The Church's work is to spread the gospel. Every minister should care more about worship attendance than their salary and benefits.
57. Over paid workers should pay own pensions
58. Pastor should not be on the committee working on the Pension and benefits plan.
59. L.C.C. pension's not indexed. I am receiving less than when I retired over twenty years ago. A retired Pastor sometimes finds it hard to make ends meet.
60. Employee should pay their share.
61. The premium should be shared between worker and congregation.
62. Pension Benefits are away too rich.
63. It is important but it is crucial!!! that it be reduced by a significant amount. Our small rural congregations cannot afford the high price we are currently charged for this.
64. It is important for the Church to support those who serve it.
65. I think it would do better in it's performance and growth if it was run entirely by laymen with good financial background. NO CLERGY SHOULD BE ON ANY COMMITTEES HAVING TO DO WITH FINANCE. Historically clergy are poor business managers of money. Also having known one or two who have sat on this committee, they tend to push their agenda even though they have limited knowledge in the "big" picture.
66. Yes, but not to the point of taking money from each depositor of CEF to cover any shortfall the board did not foresee or work to cover.
67. some form of benefit package is needed but it may not need to be this package. Perhaps joining with another group would prove to be practical especially for the non-pension benefits
68. I believe this is very important.
69. Although other employers may be eroding pensions and benefits at this time, full time workers in Canada often expect pensions and benefits. I'd go so far as to say that it is part of "Canadian values". Pastors in our church body often provide service well into their retirement years.
70. This will be impacted in ABC District. Churches will have to pay out to support the funds that are not now there for the future.
71. We do need to care and support the well-being of our church workers as they serve and when they retire.
72. The benefit plan is important in both the church and lay work place. The Church workers plan is way too expensive and needs to have some kind o adjustment so that congregations are not penalized with the outrageous costs. I would suggest looking to a different carrier/provider.

73. I'm not a Church Worker so I don't feel I should offer an opinion. I would imagine it is but a Church Worker would be better qualified to answer this question
74. A worker should be fairly paid and that includes access to benefits that are readily available in a secular occupation
75. We need to show the proper care for the called servants and other workers the Lord of the Church places among us.
76. Pastors and church employed workers should have amounts deducted from their wages.
77. Every worker today needs to have a Benefit Plan. Things are too expensive for individuals to afford the services (example dental services) without a Benefit Plan.
78. These things are good I suppose, but I'd do without them in exchange for a Synod that would supervise doctrine and practice of congregations. In fact, I am beginning to feel that the less the district and synod has to do with handling money on other people's behalf, the better.
79. Caring for a pastor includes giving him a dignified retirement so his family does not have to beg in the streets in his old age.
80. It is very important that our shepherds are well looked after financially.
81. Does not relate to church restructuring.
82. But maybe these services could be done more efficiently by merging with some other entity to pool the pension/health benefits.
83. It is a good gift to give to workers. Is it as cost effective as possible?
84. We do need to take care of our pastors and their families.
85. could be better funded.
86. I think that this is one area that we can assist in taking opportunity to provide stability for the Called workers in our midst.
87. Very expensive
88. I believe benefits are a worthy and important service to Church workers. I am not entirely sure if pensions benefit the Church or not. For example, do pensions encourage healthy, able bodied pastors to retire from service, when in reality they are still fit to serve the Church? I do not no the answer to this, merely asking the question. I am checking agree, because my vocation offers good pension and benefits, and I am certainly grateful for them. I am sure that Church workers would be grateful for pension and benefits as well.
89. It is very important that church workers have access to a pension plan in order to attract people to serve the church.
90. You mean to the employees of congregations, right? As a layperson, I am also the church. Yes, I feel that it is important for congregations to have some sort of pension and benefit plan for church workers but I'm not sure if it has to be done through LCC. I would like to know if there are other options that are more cost effective for congregations.
91. I think its a bit much. Its quite a financial burden on the smaller congregations
92. I strongly agree as it allows Pastors to preach the Word and administer the sacrament without worrying about what will happen to their family when they retire.
93. Congregations are in no position for the most part, to undertake such a program on their own. It also provides continuity of benefits as church workers move from one call to the next. The only alternative would be for workers to enroll in their own private health care and pension plans which would need to be encouraged at ordination. However, I'm not convinced that any worker benefit program can fully support church workers mental, physical and spiritual needs. In a perfect world, there should be a support network of people focused only on the care of church workers and the education of churches in this care.

94. Yes, there should remain a support system to help church workers & associated family members.
95. This benefit is way to expensive, no industry provides this rich a pension benefit
96. The cost of the plan has gotten to expensive for most congregations to support. Maybe it's time to look at a new plan.
97. I don't know what the pension and benefits plan does or the details of it.
98. It is an important source, but the cost of benefits, particularly retirement benefits is a huge disincentive to churches in acquiring additional, specialized help. If you have a need in a church, and a person working 3 days a week could make a real difference, the requirement to provide full benefits, including retirement benefits at a huge cost makes it very difficult to fill that need
99. Contracting to Sunlife (etc.) may be effective with well defined terms of reference.
100. Motherhood question.
101. poorly managed should be overhauled too expensive for small congregations
102. Should be mandatory for calling congregations.
103. Church Workers also need to plan for their retirement just like lay people.
104. These things are good I suppose, but I'd give it up in a heartbeat for a Synod that would supervise doctrine and practice of congregations. Without that, these earthly things are chaff filling in a straw-man.
105. absolutely but the cost to administer the plan is nonsense. Speak to anyone with experience with these type of benefits and they will tell you that this plan is much, much too costly. waste like this does reflect on the amount some people give
106. Admittedly, I know little about this. But a worker deserves his wages. A retired worker, I believe, has a right expectation to believe that a church synod that he has dutifully and whole-heartedly served for years should look after him in his final years before returning to the LORD.
107. Of course it is important but I am disgusted along with a lot of people as to the way it is implemented. Anyone that has had any experience with these type of plans agrees that the cost of THIS plan is WAY, WAY too HIGH. My wife who has hands on experience with these plans shakes her head every time she looks at our budget and this reflects on how much she is willing to give
108. Don't know how cost effective the benefits plan is compared to other private plans. Pensions are now rare in the private sector, so a church workers pension plan appears to be out of step with the experience of the laity. On the other hand, it is a good way of enforcing financial discipline on Pastors who may not be skilled in financial matters.
109. It would be cruel and inhumane not to offer pension and benefits to our church workers.
110. It is important, but it is also unaffordable with a shrinking membership base, and the stresses faced by all pension plans due to low rates of return.
111. This service simplifies much of the employment duties of congregations for their pastors/deacons.
112. Having this sort of centralized pension/benefits plan simplifies this matter for congregations.
113. It's very important for church workers to have benefits. Having a centralized plan is nice, so congregations don't have to muddle through this.
114. Certainly true from my personal experience. As LCC Church workers generally receive substantially less compensation than equivalent secular workers, having a good medical and dental plan is a great comfort, indeed might I say a necessity. As a recently retired pastor

who no longer can afford extended health care premiums, I appreciate my former benefits even more. Don't mess this up!

115. I believe the Church Workers Pension and Benefits Plan is an important service to the Church, and yet I am concerned that the Pension and Benefits Plan is expensive and unsustainable by small congregations and a shrinking church body. Our congregation (perhaps others) is struggling financially. The Pension and Benefits Plan is 20-25% of our congregational budget excluding other Pastoral Expenses. By the time Pastoral Expenses (including salary, housing allowance, and benefits), property/utility costs, and mission commitments to the District and Synod are covered, there is almost nothing left for other ministry and outreach needs in our congregation.
116. ??? The plan benefits the workers; therefore, it is an important service to them.
117. Definitely an administrative function and in this case, one that can be more effectively carried out at the national level than district level.
118. If I was a Church worker I'm sure I'd answer strongly agree.
119. Important to Pastor, not the church.
120. Plan provides uniformity plus savings
121. Many dedicated elderly pastors may retire or reduce their valuable services if attracted by a substantial pension.
122. In most cases, pastors are not paid as educated equals in the secular world, benefits help close that gap.
123. I think this is entirely necessary for the care of the worker, however, I would like more information on where this money is invested, and hope to avoid another CEF situation.
124. it is a very important service to workers that are members of the benefit plan. One system across Canada is fair and less work for each individual member church of LCC.
125. However, it should only be supported by the plan members themselves, rather than making creditor's claims with the CEF plan, which includes many depositors who are not members of the plan.
126. Our church workers need to be supported in this area. An adequate pension and benefit plan should work to retain experienced and committed workers.
127. I have been a recipient of good service in such matters.
128. Providing they contribute
129. Synod plan provides uniformity and should also provide savings compared to individual plans.
130. I rated this agree, and not "strongly agree" for a reason. It is important, but let's not let it become something that gets in the way of accomplishing a stronger, more united church body. I don't think that's necessarily the case, but I would hate for it to become a "golden calf" in these discussion.
131. To some extent this is subject to the financial status of the church itself.
132. Workers are worth their wages; it is appropriate that the synod help local congregations take care of their workers. But again, should these things sap all the time of our theological supervisors?
133. Synod plan creates uniformity and should also provide savings.
134. only if it is affordable
135. "important service"? to the recipient maybe.
136. It is very important that church workers have access to a pension plan in order to attract people to serve the church.

137. many other professions have pension benefits, so should pastors
138. Is it administered by LCC or is it contracted out?
139. Haven't education / experience to know
140. I think they do outstanding work but I worry if I'll have a pension when I retire. I don't see how the current model is sustainable when the synod is shrinking back. Fewer and fewer are paying into it... what will there be when I'm retired. I am thankful for the current benefits that I receive as an active pastor.
141. All church workers should have these plans in place.
142. Essential to the care and wellbeing of those who commit their working lives to the Church.
143. Our Church workers need this.
144. Our church workers need to be cared for, now and in retirement.
145. However, this can be very onerous to small congregations given its price tag.
146. Within limits as it is one of the large items on budget or congregations who are struggling.
147. These individuals dedicate themselves to service. It is only right that they be taken care of after they retire so that they can have a comfortable life and receive fair benefits while working.
148. The Pension Plan liability is a well-kept secret that is an existential threat to the existence of both the LCC bureaucracy and the congregations. The pension plan is set up to transfer tens of millions of dollars from congregations to pastors. Given the fact the 4 of 7 members of the pension board are direct beneficiaries of the pension plan and the other 3 members are selected by the Board which is at least 50% pastors and the 50% of the Board that are non-pastors are elected by a convention that is 50% pastors, it is not hard to see why the LCC pension plan pays benefits over 2.5X greater than the Alberta teachers.
149. It's important but I imagine it's hard to spread diminishing dollars to cover all the bases to keep everyone happy and still proclaim the Gospel.
150. Pastors need their benefits and retirement finances.
151. Keeping costs reasonable to the congregations is also an important service to the Church.
152. Church workers should be given the best possible Pension and Benefits Plan.
153. We must care for our Church workers - they work for little enough money as is - we must care for them, their families and their retirement.
154. Church workers need a pension and benefits plan but this should be handled at arm's length from Synod.
155. Looking after those who serve the church is an important service to the church
156. Without a Church based plan each church worker would be fending for oneself. Care for the church workers includes helping to provide for health during working years and health and pension during retirement years.
157. Pastors with their level of education and job description should be entitled to all benefits that the general public has access to.
158. I understand that these benefits compensate for the lower wage bracket they are in.
159. ...but are expensive for the churches and may be in danger with the number of retirees increasing, CUCA out of it, and fewer churches having their own pastor
160. .... but it is very expensive to the congregations and the future of it is questionable as workers are aging and fewer are starting into the plan
161. Worker Pension and Benefits are legally necessary, but I wouldn't call them an important service to the Church.

162. As a treasurer for a few years the total cost to the congregation was such that our congregation could not contribute to the mission and sometimes to the district financial needs as we struggled to support our full time pastor as our congregation members aged.
163. I agree. It is a great way to compensate our workers in the church and bring down some of the unexpected costs of living - i.e. dental, medical, etc. while providing for their retirement. In terms of cost for the congregation, it is rather expensive to provide and workers have to ensure they are using all of the benefits to utilize all the money they put into it as well. So yes, I completely support the benefit and pension plan. It would be great if a cheaper plan/source could be found for our Synod. One frustration I did have with the benefits program though was the cost of it when one did not have many dependents. It was difficult to receive back the value of what was put in by both congregation and worker. As well, workers who were married to people with their own very good benefit program were not allowed to back out of paying into the program. If possible, I believe the best approach would be to have a policy where all congregation must provide a pension and benefits plan to the workers (up to a certain standard). The Synod could offer an optional program or the congregation could find their own. I understand however this may be less cost effective for some congregations and may ultimately only support congregations with sizable schools.
164. Lets not let these get of hand.
165. Our pastors and church workers do require a pension and benefit coverage for them and their families. In recent years we have already had to reduce both pension and benefit coverage to workers due to decreasing congregational revenues and a shrinking communicant membership. Our current program is competitive in the market place but should not be viewed as overly generous despite the reality of the current pension cost. The program needs to be maintained to look after the physical needs of our pastors and other workers. It can however be administered without church staff if outsourcing proves to be more cost effective.
166. Needs overhauling and better explanations.
167. It provides a service, but all of its services could have been done in an individual manner rather than in a corporate structure.
168. It is important to offer Pastors dental/medical coverage & pension option, but the current CWP&BP is outrageously expensive. I think congregations would be better off having other coverage (Manulife, Sunlife ...) for the Pastor & then also offering that coverage & benefits to other paid church workers within the congregation.
169. Don't know how good/poor it is
170. I believe the monies that congregations put into the pension fund should rather be put into a RSP for the pastors and deacons to take with them when they move on. It would not only be cheaper for the congregations, it would provide a better retirement nest egg for the worker.
171. I believe the ministry would have been better off to receive monies from their parishes that were RSP contributions and the pastors and deacons could have taken those with them wherever they went. This fund has been mishandled.
172. I would assume [yes I do know what that really means] that LCC has and will continue to provide for the long term (now and in retirement) care of Pastors and Deacons, both in pension and health benefits. I also assume that you are documenting the unfunded liability payments properly as well; so that the Pastors, Deacons and Congregations know exactly what the payments breakdowns are. If you actually did this many Pastors, Deacons and Congregations would be shocked.

173. We need to take good care of the practical needs of our church workers so they can focus on ministry.
174. I believe benefits are important to everyone. Pensions are great but who can afford them. Instead matching RRSP's should be purchased. Example Church put in 3% and the worker puts in 3%. This way they are responsible for their own futures and the Church will not go bankrupt.
175. This is a critical component of a pastor's family's future. As it is it is inadequate but should not be further eroded.
176. It is very expensive per person, there maybe better ways
177. Workers need benefits in all sectors of society.
178. Not sure if I missed it somewhere, but an annual update including audited financial report should be distributed, either in Canadian Lutheran, or made available at a Congregational Voters meeting so that we can verify our Church Workers are being taken care of.
179. We are a small church so we only see the benefits that would apply to a Pastor. It should be extended to other paid workers such as secretary, etc.
180. Wages are not high enough to make it possible for workers to put away resources for their retirement. Having a program to look after them is critical to their security and long term health.
181. The future care of Pastors and other church workers is of the utmost importance. However, the cost to the congregations is unbearably high.
182. As a person nearing retirement I absolutely agree!
183. I agree with benefits.
184. this is one way to take care of our pastors & church workers
185. fees seem high, hopefully contracted service to an appropriate body
186. We must look after those who look after our spiritual needs!
187. A careful balancing act needs to be maintained between the benefits provided to Pastors, and the costs that congregations are required to bear.
188. This is one thing that we do correctly; to support church workers and their families in the here and now and provide for retirement.
189. However, at recent congregational meetings the integrity of this plan's management has come into question. If it fails, like ABC District CEF did, how much is our congregation liable in monies to be paid?
190. This is one thing the synod does right to support church workers and their families
191. However, in the last several congregational meetings I have attended there is concern that the Church Workers Pension and Benefits Plan is being mismanaged and in danger of going insolvent, much like the CEF program in the Alberta-British Columbia District. The fear is that our congregation would then be liable for a substantial amount of money.
192. This is a huge blessing for the support of our professional church workers.
193. money is not the answer.
194. As most professional people in the work force have some sort of plan, it would be a disgrace if we didn't.
195. We need to care for our workers.
196. It may be important to the Pastors, not clear why the function can't be contracted out.
197. A pension and benefits plan is important but perhaps not the one LCC offers.

198. Every member of every congregation needs to educated about the importance of proper wages, pension, and benefits for pastors and church workers. Here the Church must lead by example.
199. While expensive, we need to provide care for our Pastors during and after their years of service in the church. If a percentage contribution/share from their salaries is viable, perhaps this could be reviewed or alternatively, a reduction in coverage, for example, from 100% to 90%, etc.
200. Most large employers provide their employees with health benefits and pension assistance. Church workers are very dedicated and hardworking people and justly deserve this assistance similar to their secular counterparts.
201. Important but costs should reflect financial position of congregation.
202. It is very important however it can be a burden to a congregation.
203. As long as it is effectively run and sustainable.
204. Many individuals do not have the advantage of a pension, benefits, etc. however, I believe it should be a 'reasonable' package provided to our working individuals. But, they should also be 'coached' and educated on how to provide for themselves in retirement, etc. The statistics on how many people have so much debt should never be situation for our workers, thus they also have to be smart and frugal.
205. This is one of the few things that is extremely important to me and my family, without it we would be impoverished on my Pastor's salary.
206. Which Pension and Benefits plan? We have two of them with many options. Thankfully, LCC recognized the incompatibility of the Defined Benefits plan with our church culture, history and future demographics and shifted to a more sustainable Defined Contributions plan. However, the current plan might still lack some of the necessary flexibility needed in order to deal with future increased variety of church worker "job descriptions." As well, the costs to those congregations who are still in ministry that are associated with carrying the Defined Benefits to completion are a significant (and possibly increasing) burden.
207. If there is concern for a future generation of pastors, the benefits plan is an important aspect to consider. If congregations want full-time pastors who care for the people full-time, proper care needs to be given to said pastors.
208. The LCC needs to find a way to keep this solvent and running in the future to protect pastors and other workers.
209. Only when managed properly and when it does not become a burden to the Church. It dismays me greatly that the unfunded portion of LCC pension was taken from funds that would have otherwise paid back depositors. This is a service of the Church and should have been funded by congregations, not CEF depositors. Perhaps another option to explore as an alternative to this costly benefit is that Pastors, like self employed people, would be required to invest their own funds personally for RRSPs and purchase health care benefits.
210. I see more benefits from using a third party pension and benefits provider.
211. I think it is important that we offer one. I also think it is reasonable to ask the worker to pay a portion of the cost. Very few employers provide free benefits today and very few provide pensions that the worker hasn't also invested in during their time as an employee (like a defined contribution plan).
212. This I can answer. Yes. It is hard enough for pastors to get by on salaries far lower than average for other professionals (those who need post-graduate training to enter their chosen

field - such as doctors, lawyers, etc.). These services offered are of much greater help than many imagine.

213. Through its benefits and this plan, our church workers are receiving an adequate umbrella of pension and other benefits. I thank the synod for implementing this care.
214. We need to have a strong financial base, to be able to encourage people to this area. wither we like it or not, financially {to start} this is not a job that will attract many of the young adults.
215. I'm happy we have a plan. I don't know, though, whether it would be more affordable not to have a church-administered plan and then have church workers enroll as individuals.
216. I am concerned that congregations are not aware of their debt caused by how far this pension is off side. I believe that each congregation should be aware of the $$$ they are responsible for at this time.
217. It is an important service but is more than some congregations can afford.
218. They must be paid accordingly like any other profession.
219. I do not know enough about this. Thank goodness that I did not have any money invested in this.
220. I do not want my Pastor to work forever because he cannot afford to retire. Just because a person works as a Pastor does not mean that he should work for less. He has obligations just like the rest of us. We should be
221. A little pricy for most congregations.
222. I agree that it is an important service but I do not think that it has been managed properly as we can attest with the deficit recovery fee we all have to pay.
223. Are Church Worker Pensions and Benefit Plans in some jeopardy, considering 1) the economic downturn in Canada? 2) as a result of what is happening in the ABC District (reduced contributors)?
224. It's nice to have as a pastor, but is it really important as a service in the church; I do not think that it is essential.
225. I agree that any pension and benefit plan is important for the employees and needs to continue. Does it have to be done the way it is now? No. I think that there are much better programs available at a lower cost that we are paying for our pension plan and benefits plan. The administrative cost of $75 per worker per month is ridiculous and we have yet to see a benefit of paying this much for each church worker enrolled in the program.
226. But it also can easily become a burden to the congregations and/or the pastors as costs for the benefit package rises beyond the ability of many congregations to afford it.
227. This Pension is underfunded at this time and all contributors need to review the entire Plan and recreate to meet the future, adjust to what is an accepted norm for most working Canadians. At present Vacant Congregations are being expected to continue contributions for services not received to a pension that far an exceeds any pension that congregation members might receive on retirement.
228. In a world where most people no longer have the luxury of benefits I believe this is an important part of our synod - especially in light of the fact that many pastors are not even following the guidelines for salaries and salaries are often much too low. I know that synod cannot dictate the actions of our congregations but I do think something a little more weighty than the guidelines should be offered - although it would be challenging to figure how to do that.

229. Church workers need security and peace of mind to know their future is well take care of in retirement.
230. It is right to keep the pastors provided for. I don't know how necessary it is for other church workers.
231. possibly having an outside provider of pension and benefits would be more appropriate
232. Provision for pensions and benefits are important. That it be an LCC-only plan isn't as important.
233. Benefit are too much and are causing financial difficulties to small congregations
234. Where do the funds come from? Do the workers participate?
235. But it must be properly managed by professionals, not our LCC & District executives & officials.
236. I would assume [yes I know what that means] that you have and will continue to provide for the long term (now and in retirement) care of Pastors and Deacons, pension and health benefits. I also assume that you are documenting the unfunded liability payments as well, so that the Pastors, Deacons and Congregations know exactly what they are paying for.
237. Making sure that professionals in that area make the decisions, not just well-meaning laypeople.
238. I trust it will remain safe in light of everything that is going on with the ABC CEF situation.
239. Congregations, when setting their budgets, need a reference target.
240. It is not an important service to the Church, but it is an important service to the Church Worker.
241. Question the financial expertise required to properly manage the plan.
242. They may as well become unionized; it is getting to the point where a lot of congregations can't afford to pay these luxuries
243. As long as the church worker also contributes a portion to the plan the same as other organizations have in place
244. The Church Workers Pension and Benefits Plan is too costly. While it is an important service, I feel that it could be overhauled to make it more cost effective.
245. It is a very expensive plan for small congregation to support. Is there any way to reduce costs?
246. It needs to be taken out of the Church and run by someone experienced with it, but should definitely be provided. PS This may have already taken place?
247. This is a very expensive plan for churches. It would benefit congregations if a more affordable plan were found or if congregations were given the option to opt out of the benefits portion of the plan (remain in the pension portion as otherwise pastors' pensions would be affected) in order to find a more affordable option on their own.
248. As a pension plan this may be a valuable service. Due to the number of congregations that are allowed to opt out of this plan, the burden of cost is very heavy to those congregations that stay the course. This is especially true for smaller congregations that suffer costs out of proportion to a larger congregation. The medial coverage was wonderful for those who started with the program, but numerous rule and eligibility changes cheated some pastors and their families out of the benefits they expected to get. This created hardships for some who receive no benefits in spite of years of contributions.
249. We need to support our workers
250. LCC must have Pension and Benefit Plan that pastoral workers feel are safe and secure for their future.

251. I believe we need this to support our Pastors.
252. The Benefit Plan may serve an important service as a pension benefit. It usefulness is greatly diminished in that congregations and agencies are allowed "opt out" thereby placing an impossible burden on those who "opt in." The smaller the congregation the more difficult this burden becomes. Recently, small congregations have been "Bullied" by threats that LCC will "place a lien on your property if you do not choose to stay in the program." The Benefit Plan as a Medical support is totally useless in that it offers a type of "gold plated" support to some and nothing to others. This difference is usually based on a certain arbitrary retirement date. If the worker did not retire before the set date the worker gets nothing in spite of contributions made in good faith.
253. It is important to support our workers.
254. It's important to support our workers.
255. Can the Plan be combined/linked with other Institutions thereby increasing the number participating in the Plan? Perhaps decreasing the premiums and improved benefits?
256. Yes, it should be mandatory for congregations to support their pastors and deacons in this plan.
257. The Church could be better off without it.
258. Not sure.
259. Not all Church workers are participants in the LCC pension plan. For example, my Church elementary school discontinued participation in the LCC pension plan, leaving school workers without pension coverage. Compensation (salary) was not adjusted to reflect this cut.
260. Congregations are in no position for the most part, to undertake such a program on their own. It also provides continuity of benefits as church workers move from one call to the next. The only alternative would be for workers to enroll in their own private health care and pension plans which would need to be encouraged at ordination.
261. As long as the Pension and Benefit Plans are administrated properly by an outside source who specializes in this line of work. Pastors are not financially trained. We don't need another CEF FIASCO
262. It is very expensive.
263. While I benefit from the Church Workers Pension and Benefits Plan, it is not an important service. The church militant survived nineteen centuries without the plan and, as much as I may be shooting myself in the foot by saying this, it will survive without a pension plan. Quite frankly, I have grave concerns that many of my fellow pastors treat the Plan as sacrosanct, rather than trusting the Lord for providing for them and their families in their retirement. Sadly, I also understand the plan as a necessary evil, as it were, because, as we see already from many of the letters of Dr. Martin Luther, congregations, being composed of saint/sinners, sadly too often have neglected the Scriptural admonition to care for those who feed them with the Gospel. I do believe that we should seriously consider getting out of the Pension business. The Benefits plan might be continued if it is mandatory for every congregation and entity of synod for all rostered church workers.
264. It is an important matter but should not be run by the church.
265. It is important to the well being of the Pastors and workers, which of course then important to the church and the services provided to them by these servants of God.
266. your plan is more expensive than most companies.
267. Your plan is better than and more expensive than most companies have.

268. A pension period is important; whether it is through CWP or another benefits and pension plan. I don't think it is necessary for church workers to have a dedicated pension - there are many pension plans that have members from all different industries that are more secure than a pool of less than 300 paying into the CWP.
269. Church workers and their families do require pension and benefits for their well being. Administration of pension benefit program does not need to be handled by LCC staff. More effective to outsource.
270. To much coverage. When Pastors receive housing, utilities, car allowance, etc. They should be able to contribute more to their retirement funds
271. It is a biblical injunction that congregations provide for the welfare of their pastor and his family. Whether such pension and benefits can be provided in a less expensive way is something that always needs to be addressed and considered.
272. With all the troubles that our synod and districts are undergoing, THIS is the type of question that you feel a need to ask of the entire congregation? A pension is just the business. If a worker doesn't like it, or the congregation doesn't feel it is effective, they can opt out. The real service to the church is presenting the gospel to those who are lost and in danger of hell... Presenting it and our church body in a language and format to a world that sees no relevance of it or us.
273. We need to keep this benefit BUT most congregations can't afford to pay for these plans.
274. It must be administered by a 3rd party organization specializing in pensions.
275. Church workers deserve to have a good pension and benefits plan.
276. If a pastor is called it is not because of financial reward. If this the most important thing, then it is only a job and we are hiring the pastor. The current defined benefit plan and increases to make up short falls are placing a great strain on many congregations.
277. Pastors need to be able to retire with some comfort. They can not be expected to take this concern upon themselves, and focus upon their Callings to Word and sacrament ministry.
278. For bygone years I would say this is true but with all the options available "on line or similar" it is less true.
279. "A labourer is worthy of his hire"
280. Our church workers need to be taken care of in terms of pension and benefits.
281. I would assume [yes I know what that means] that you have and will continue to provide for the long term (now and in retirement) care of Pastors and Deacons, pension and health benefits.
282. Since my husband is a retired Lutheran pastor, the pension and benefits plan has been of great help to us.
283. this service is very important in any career
284. Our pastors need to be taken care of.
285. Financial literacy is a weak aspect of most Canadians and this is more acutely observed among pastors and our Worker Benefits and Pension plan is a critical element of support to all our pastors. That said, it should also be ensured that Pastors learn to independently contribute toward their retirement savings.
286. 1. The church (PPC or elders) not ministers or workers within the church as this is paid by the congregation. 2. The pastor (or worker) must contribute, as well as the c congregation, to generate some feeling of ownership and obligation. Rather than just saying I want the best, but I want to contribute nothing and the church owes me this. 3. Benefits plans do not allow for efficient direction for claims. Should be between patient, congregation and insurer. 4.

Benefits plans do not cover unless fully incapacitated 5. Short term coverage should be contracted within the employment contract 6. A baseline coverage should be established by the church - any further enhancements should be responsibility of the employee (pastors, deacon(s), secretaries, etc.)

287. If the smaller congregations can afford the recommended salaries and benefit packages.
288. Our congregation payed +/- $17,000.00 for these benefits.
289. without the benefit plan and pension plan, I would think most of LCC workers would be unable to afford benefits or a private pension.
290. I so very much appreciate this now, especially in my senior years.
291. While the benefit package is helpful to pastors and their families, it is viewed on the whole as just another financial burden to the congregation.
292. A payroll preparation service would be a great benefit to Treasurers & Pastors.
293. Assume this means that we are taking care of our pastors, so it would be important to them
294. I do think it is a little rich.
295. Not when it keeps changing so much and Pastors are getting less and less out of the plan. Plus, the cost keeps rising which means more is coming out of the Church's and Pastors pockets. Not to mention, I don't think there will be anything left to GIVE in the pension plan for retired Pastors because of total mismanagement of funds!
296. Yes, the church needs to care for the church worker and his/her family with a pension and benefits plan.
297. Although I'm content with the coverage I receive, I'm very concerned about the number of congregations who either struggle to cover the costs of the plan or feel they cannot Call a pastor of their own because of the costs.
298. Without it, where would our church workers be? They certainly do not get paid competitive wages compared to other jobs. The pension and benefits plan is the only thing making being a pastor even remotely viable in this day and age.
299. Our congregation and its district should take good care of the Pastors and other church workers who are taking care of our spiritual needs and well being.
300. Qualified and trained experts continue to be needed; otherwise it would be better to ally with FaithLife.
301. In its current incarnation the pension and benefits plans are too expensive and unsustainable.
302. I know of some congregation who feels they cannot afford a pastor because the benefit plan is too much of a financial burden. I believe this issue needs to be address. Our pastors should be cared for, but at the same time our struggling congregations need pastoral care. And so I hope we can find a solution to this problem.
303. If you want church workers, you have to have competitive wages and benefits.
304. Both benefits and provisions has been eroded
305. I agree but feel it has been a strain on congregational finances while being assessed partly for past losses. People in private pension plans have not had this privilege.
306. My experience is this is no longer "standard" practice in the world - I have no pension or benefits.
307. Although I agree, I am 'stuck' with the changes that have been made over the past years. If I had known when I graduated from Seminary in 1994 that this would be the state of the plans and the tax positions of Canada and the US I would have requested a call to the states at graduation. What I would have gotten at retirement as the plan was at graduation would have been sufficient. Now it is not and it prevents me from moving home.

308. I agree, but it must be at least, if not more cost effective as compared to other products in the marketplace. One thing I disagree with is that all full time employees must participate in the program if the senior pastor participates. I believe it should be available on an individual opt-in basis. What may also be useful is if a health and dental plan could be developed for congregational members. I believe that the average age of the membership in Lutheran Church Canada is increasing. I also believe that many of those members are retired and as such, no longer belong to or have the benefits of a health and dental plan. I believe this group would be large enough to warrant the development of such a plan.
309. Pension and benefits are very important. Why we run our own benefits office is beyond me. However, this needs to examined and perhaps a new plan examined and implemented.
310. They are helpful, but they have been getting worse over the years. As a younger worker, I have little confidence that they will continue to be valuable. As well, my congregation is starting to find our plan a burden in terms of cost. They are seriously considering other options.
311. The Pensions and Benefits Plan would be more effectively administered if it were contracted to a private firm.....consider integrity, reliability, cost.
312. There is a lot of cheaper and better benefit packages.
313. Too bad, though, that the synod could not have done something to keep the benefits from being reduced.
314. But too generous.
315. It is an excellent plan that provides post-service benefits and assistance.
316. Too generous
317. I don't know if we need a pension plan (i.e., whether we should move towards having pastors invest directly in RRSPs, or something similar). However, I suspect many pastors aren't really qualified or interested in thinking about their financial futures, so perhaps a "forced" pension plan is the way to go.
318. It is an important service to the employees that puts them on even footing with workers in other industries. Without these benefits many might not be able to afford to work for the Church
319. Pastors begin serving the church after eight years of post-secondary education at present and that involves entering the ministry with student debt. This adversely affects retirement savings and the pension plan is a great help for this. The benefit plans offer a broad range of coverage with affordable deductibles.
320. Without good pensions and coverage for members and families" workers would find it difficult to make ends meet. The dropping of medical coverage for retired pastors was helpful to the older generation but not for younger ones who now are on their own.

5. Church Extension Funds should be discontinued.

1. I know what happened in Alberta, but I do not know enough about this business to agree or disagree.
2. Again, I don't understand why this question is being asked in a restructuring survey.
3. It seemed very good until recently perhaps it should have only been for churches.
4. If they continue, purpose must be strongly defined and followed. Having large pots of money just sitting there is not good.
5. if continued - then each district separate and managed by properly trained business person.

6. Because we used this program several times I am in favour of CEF.
7. District ones should be and synod ones set up like credit union. i.e. insured funds NOT to have synod libel - should "stand alone" legally.
8. It is in desperate in need of change
9. As presently structured. It should never have been used outside congregational use or offered unsustainable interest rates.
10. L.C.C. is not in the banking business. We don't need another situation like A.B.C.
11. It serves the purpose of providing means for new developing missions.
12. Very disappointed in how the money was looked after.
13. This is a valid organization however stricter practices should be made.
14. I fail to see how this ties into restructuring.
15. This is providing it is properly structured and supervised by professional personnel.
16. As part of AB-C District, it's tempting to agree that CEF should be discontinued. However, if we learn from our errors, and if better safeguards are in place, and if CEF is managed properly on all levels, and if investments are made wisely, and if CEF was less laid back in demanding what's owed to be repaid on time, then I see no reason why CEF's cannot be beneficial for everyone. However, as I said, it's tempting to vote to discontinue CEF because of the unfathomable loss that so many investors suffered.
17. only church mortgages should be granted, that is what our ancestors set up and we believed to have. until 132 million was abused as we have been abused with our $.
18. The premise of the funds is not wholly flawed. However, the guidelines and practices needed closer monitoring and professional guidance.
19. Look at the results, only if qualified non pastors take this over do we even think of what it is to do and be used for. False representation of mission use.
20. My understanding is that our mission congregations and other key projects would never have a start without these funds. Our congregations that have great gifts and resources should share with others in our church family through the extension fund.
21. They must, however, be competently managed-- and at arm's length from District operations. In my understanding both the Central and East CEFs are completely satisfactory, and provide valuable service to the church.
22. Churches need resources to allow expansion or building of facilities. The problem was not with the Fund itself, but with the total lack of capable management (I'm speaking about ABC only). Put qualified people in place to manage CEF and it will be a blessing to churches. However much damage has occurred and potential depositors are likely reluctant to contribute.
23. They still fund many church projects and, if well managed, they can serve us well.
24. Finance needs to be dealt with by competent professionals.
25. CEF has been very useful over the years, but it needs to be more professionally managed to avoid the situation the ABC CEF had in Calgary. CEF's mandate should be limited to worship and education facilities and specifically exclude retirement homes and other real estate developments.
26. I do not think a church body should be in the financial business.
27. Too complicated to manage.
28. What funds? Where are they now?
29. Pastors are not trained in financial expertise.

30. It was a good plan for along time, but must have more experienced people in charge. Also must always not spend what they don't have in savings.
31. Too much money has been wasted on bad investments like an old leaky building to make Grace Lutheran School in Petawawa.
32. The church should not operate as a lending agency. I think we're in great danger of "turning the temple into a market" as it were when we're turning a profit on those borrowing money from the Church.
33. I take seriously the words of Jesus Christ when he cast the moneychangers out of the temple, and for follow up, Deuteronomy 23:19-20, Exodus 22:25, Psalm 15:5, Romans 13:8. Letting scripture interpret scripture, it seems to have a dim view of lending and collecting interest.
34. However, as recent ABC District and past Central District events demonstrate, Board members must be made to understand that they have a vital role to play as INFORMED and QUALIFIED active trustees of the Synodical members' invested resources. The members must have intentional training as governance board participants and understand the personal responsibility and liability they carry as fully functioning board members.
35. These funds have a long history of providing a means for churches to have reasonable rates for loans to continue to grow their church as building projects are undertaken and new churches are planted with history still growing
36. there is likely a limited role for this so it should be maintained.
37. In their current format; they MUST be administered via a 3rd party financial management firm e.g. Deloitte & Touche.
38. I answered "Agree" - only if the present church extension funds learn a valuable lesson from the collapse of the CEF in the ABC District, whereupon, very competent and credible lay leaders manage the funds.
39. not many churches are being built - more and more are folding
40. CEF in the East District seems to be working well, could this process be duplicated in other Districts?
41. I see the CEF as a valuable service however there needs to be certain restrictions placed on any invested money. For example, there is no need to hold significantly more money than would ever be lent out in a reasonable manner.
42. Eliminate the CEF completely. Let's turn those tables over as quickly as we possibly can. They cloud and confuse the ministry Christ has given His Church. The Church is not a bank.
43. The base idea of what CEF was conceived to be sounds good to me. However, obviously, adequate controls need to be in place; and governed by sound financial practices. On further thought, perhaps with the demographics of the church being weighted so heavily on our older ages, the CEF base of "yesterday" is not as viable as it once was. In which case, if inadvisable, then I certainly understand a decision to discontinue them.
44. The Church Extension Funds need to be re-evaluated to ensure that they are functioning on a path that guarantees their funds over the long-term.
45. After the horrible mismanagement of the A-BC CEF, yes, all CEF should be discontinued.
46. Must be properly managed. Not sure, should the church be in the investment business?
47. I disagree but it has to be managed better. Fund management should be done by a separate fund management company.
48. The Church Extension Fund is an important service but should be managed by a third party fund management company.
49. Kept only if not run by church

50. This applies to District CEF.
51. I'm reluctantly agreeing to this. It seems that few of our congregations are buying or constructing buildings these days. Perhaps the CEF has past its usefulness? In its operation, did CEF cause some congregations to over-build? Possibly. In the current environment in Canada, with church attendance on the decline, it seems unlikely that this need will continue in the same way. Perhaps we can challenge to see this as a healthy setback. The evangelical non-denominational churches have shown that it is possible to hold Sunday worship in rented facilities without needing to buy a building. Often, the worship attendance at these evangelical churches is greater than the attendance at the local LCC church. The church is holy believers, lambs who hear the voice of their shepherd. Having a dedicated building for Divine Service and for church functions is a wonderful blessing for a congregation. But it is not a necessity. We, as a synod, also need to have an honest look at the very use of CEF. Are we being faithful to God's Word when we get involved in such investments/loans? I think we need to have this discussion.
52. Although there have been some very bad outcomes over the past few years this fund is something essential for helping expand the word to more people. The extension fund should have very strict rules for spending such as never more than a certain percentage of funds spent in any one project to insure its' viability and needs to be regulated much better. That being said restructure should be the only option. Properly set up this can be a valuable tool to help send the messages we need and help bring people to and back to the Lord. In the end we need to make sure we fully understand the role this plays in our church and whether it follows doctrine in its' use.
53. It depends on how we use it.
54. why would this question be asked - because of the botched job in the west? do we not think that we will want to help fund efforts to grow the church? this will take funds - what would we do with funds already on "deposit"? give them back so that banks can invest rather than the church?
55. basket case, cannot be saved
56. is bankrupt and has resulted in severe stresses, losses in our congregation, may be able to bring some members back
57. The concept is sound.
58. But it certainly needs much more effective governance ... as evidenced by the recent huge problems in Alberta - British Columbia ... Lay People with strong Accounting credentials, and with a solid understanding of the Fiduciary Responsibility due to Lenders.
59. Is it being used effectively by the congregation? Do we still need it?
60. Only in ABC District because of the current dilemma we are in. As a depositor, my funds have been shamefully mismanaged. I feel a sense of betrayal, a loss of trust. This inexcusable mess and disaster demands accountability and retribution.
61. In view of the financial fiasco in regards to ABC - CE it would be prudent to discontinue.
62. If continued should have insurance like banks and credit unions. Perhaps it should be a credit union
63. I believe at this point there is NO alternative to discontinuing the Church Extension Fund.
64. The premise is commendable but the fund must be managed by professionals and not tied to other funds. Investors must understand and accept risks of losses.
65. Just be more careful with how it is invested.

66. requires better oversight by Board Members - see ABC problems - such Funds can be very helpful.
67. Keep, but not in present governance.
68. but must have proper "over-sight"
69. Unless there is a responsible administrative body in charge of it.
70. Thought they already were.
71. The church has no business in the banking system. Not qualified or insured as a real bank.
72. We need the instrument that CEF was when it wasn't being mismanaged, for the sake of continued growth, without the name - given what it has become in ABC district.
73. These funds must be invested to minimize risk and be reviewed and reported on at least quarterly.
74. Access to these funds have allowed many congregations to build and/or keep their church buildings in good repair. However, I am concerned that we have the financial expertise to manage the funds correctly.
75. Synod should identify special needs. Members should respond in form of NO interest debentures.
76. The miss management of the current funds has killed the trust of our church managing another.
77. It cannot continue in ABC because of very, very poor management
78. They could continue on a synodical basis under very carefully controlled and qualified lay leadership as there may be persons who want their financial blessings to assist others on some form of ministry. In our church body we have many lay persons who are qualified financial experts. In my personal opinion Pastors are not trained for this type of leadership.
79. As long as church extension funds are used with the purpose of 'extending' the church (i.e. church buildings, missions - NOT building suburban retirement villages!) they can be a great investment option for the mission minded people of the church.
80. LCC members need to be better informed as to its function
81. Financial investments are not the expertise or focus of church personnel.
82. The Church Extension Funds as they are presently in each district should be discontinued.
83. The Church Extension Fund has been very valuable to some congregations building or expanding or renovating their building therefore I think, if it is possible to have some kind of fund, it would be beneficial but I definitely think that it should not be administered by the church who are trained in ministry but by a financial institution who are trained in financial matters. This should be synodical not district.
84. If the Fund is used for its original purpose of building churches to God's glory and providing housing for church workers, then it is a worthwhile fund. When it is used to glorify District Officials in what they are doing for the church, then it is a waste of money.
85. There needs to be a way for struggling congregation to access financial help from an endowment fund or some other such fund.
86. I believe Church Extension Funds have an important place in our church body, however, I would be concerned with how CEFs are governed, used, and the size of projects they cover. If we are going to use left-hand kingdom means to provide for the church, then they need to be governed and administered with left-hand kingdom wisdom and knowledge.
87. Agree, the funds should be redirected to the support of our pastors, their salary, pensions, and our commitment to missions.
88. need better management, supervision & accountability.

89. Church Extension Funds have been beneficial to churches starting up or to improve, expand or renovate a church so it would be good if such funds could be continued but only if they are administered by a financial institution not by the church.
90. Another mechanism should be in place to assist congregations in need. Perhaps mission oriented without expectations of return on investments.
91. While there was mismanagement of the church extension fund in the Alberta - British Columbia District, it still can be a very good way to generate funds if overseen properly. The big question: Is there too much risk involved in continuing this practice or should it be managed by financial specialists.
92. CEF needs to be handled properly. The willy-nilly way A-BC District did business was (verging on) fraudulent or at best appears to be of the same quality as an 8th graders math notebook! It doesn't have to be that way. Other denominations run similar investment funds and appear to do business in a businesslike way.
93. Properly managed it should work, but should not be managed by ministers! Should be managed by a panel of knowledgeable persons who work in the field, should have one token minister only on the board that is it!
94. Investments become for "Profit" not for good works - selfishness can backfire
95. This question is here perhaps because of ABC District situation. Let us learn from this tragic mistake.
96. Church Extension helped numerous congregations. There should be stringent guidelines so CEF does not invest in real estate, hoping for great gain. Also should not grant such large loans to congregations where interest is not fully paid.
97. Should continue as long as they are administered properly
98. In principle, if they are used for the intended purpose of building schools and churches, yes. However, we all know of the recent abuses.
99. Management of these funds needs work.
100. The way the Districts are set up currently, they do not have the expertise, training or skills to be handling finances. This is what caused the crisis in ABC District. This has caused great harm and suffering in our District and should not be continued.
101. Especially in the way they have been in spending too much money on insolvent operations/missions. If we return to a 1960 or 1970's model where CEF is used for helping purchase property and to help congregations as before then I see CEF can have a role to play in the life and ministry of LCC.
102. Church Extension Funds have helped all the congregations to pool their money to help build churches that would otherwise be unable to obtain such a loan from banks. This is an important role for the ministry and growth of the church. However, the funds should not simply collect money for the sake of gaining money and find things to spend it on later. There should always be a clear goal for the money in mind before it is amassed.
103. I think they are a great source of capital to be used to help out our congregations. Likewise, the profits they can create from funds not being loaned to individual churches can be used to offset shortages in District budgets. Likewise, these committees need to be manned by laymen with financial backgrounds with no interference from clergy. That is why the western CEF failed, too much clerical interference. there wasn't enough independence on the committee.
104. I believe the building of churches by churches is a positive thing, however, it needs to be revised so there are more checks and balances and that it does not become a business

venture. The districts should confer on what has worked in the past and what hasn't for each separate group.

105. Should be under one administration
106. Was glad to have a church related investment fund into which to invest in the past.
107. insufficient information to make a decision
108. They have served a wonderful purpose, but need to be carefully managed.
109. Clearly with the present issues in the ABC district they need to be completely revamped.
110. If they can be provided in a responsible manner and are well-managed, I don't necessarily see anything wrong with them particularly if similar services are being denied (or are too expensive) by the financial industry which as far as I know is why these funds were started.
111. I am a member of ABC District and an investor both at a personal level and a congregational level. The problem was not the fund but rather how the fund was structured and administered. The biggest problem was that it was that it was not clearly separated from the work of the Church in the view that it was an investment fund first with a mandate to build the Church. The funds were not given to the church they were 'loaned' to the church and I think that difference was not clearly evident in decision making compared to monies given for mission. This type of fund is really beneficial and important to congregations and their growth.
112. Track record speaks for itself
113. While Church Extension Funds have often been in the side/background of church life, it seems to be an aspect that was explained to a previous generation with an expectation that the next generation would know what they are about.
114. If CEF's are to continue, the Boards that run them must be lay people and not pastors. The lay people must have some kind of back ground in Financial matters and be very aware of the laws of Can. Rev.
115. The funds should not be discontinued. If possible, the funds, and the profits, and gains made through investment should be used in a manner which allows our synod to ensure fair and equitable salaries, and pay for our pastors. Either through the CEF or through a different fund that is established, we can find a way to centralize payroll. so we don't have some congregations paying below scale, or not at all, and some above, or paying numerous pastors.
116. After what has transpired over the last 12 to 14 months I can't see a proper level of trust returning for several years
117. With what happened in BC district, we need to remove our selves from these type of services. We don't have enough quality to make good judgements on this type of money.
118. If they continue they need to be properly managed in a financially responsible and prudent manner.
119. CEF Should be discontinued after they pay back 100% of members’ money that was invested which they (the board of directors) totally mishandled.
120. This is a ridiculous statement. In light of the ABC District mismanagement and loss of depositors' funds entrusted to them via CEF this is like asking whether the barn door should be shut after the animals have all fled.
121. Although there are some definite issues, especially in a part of our Synod, CEF still have a role. It may be that the purpose shifts to more of an endowment role.
122. Already is
123. the old system worked just fine

124. These funds if properly allocated were a great help to congregations when in need.
125. In order to do Gospel ministry, Congregations don't need a loan for a building. If they think they do, then their own appreciation of the gospel should lead to free giving that fills the need. We shouldn't think we need earthy things, --a certain amount of money, loans, buildings, etc.--before we can enjoy and spread the heavenly treasure of the gospel. We shouldn't act as though the gospel needs money before it can be preached. The preaching of the gospel, if done according to sound doctrine, sends the holy Spirit to create faith and also hearts generous to give. I am personally disgusted that our once financially stable district engaged in venture capitalism within the world under the aegis of spreading the gospel. God is not mocked.
126. only until a method of proper management can be put in place
127. Experience has shown that it has failed the 'seniors' who put their trust into the understanding of helping the church in its ministry, but they are now suffering because of lack of due diligence on behalf of the administration in not providing qualified financial people to administer the funds of trusting LCC members. this is a serious offence, particularly because we are a reputable church of our LORD.
128. The church needs to have resources to invest in mission. Just because there has been mismanagement in the past, it does not follow that it has to be abandoned in the future. The church must learn not to put its trust in money and funds, as if they were our fortress and our refuge in times of trial. There will be losses because we live in a sinful world, whether we stow the money in the mattress, waste it away, or invest in stock markets.
129. needs to be managed better, more like a bank. not such big loans
130. Make use of established banks, or private credit union, instead of leaving matters to unqualified people.
131. CEF should continue under sound business lay management
132. I again don't know enough about the ins and outs of this to really comment and I assume these questions are being asked to avoid future financial crisis such as being experienced in ABC district but for myself, I have been glad the CEF existed in the past as a place other than the bank where I could invest savings where it was safe but could be doing some good to the church until I needed it.
133. Requires professional & diligent management
134. fait accompli!
135. The funds should be administered by qualified personnel. Money used to invest in Church and missions should be monitored by responsible personnel, not Pastors
136. Get qualified individuals on these boards. Pastors are shepherds not financial advisors.
137. Not sure
138. The synod should not be taking the place of banks who far better understand risk and have the proper governance and expertise in the matter of loaning money.
139. It should be used for the purpose for which it was created, to support the building of churches, not real estate development.
140. Many of our church buildings, ministries, and servants in the church would not be present if CEF had not been there helping to support these efforts through finances.
141. Churches will continue to require outside financing. Banks and other lending institutions may not always be willing to help.
142. Definitely in ABC district, but if the other two districts are functioning under proper financial supervision by qualified auditors, and are achieving their objectives, they should

remain as they are, providing that proper accountability and auditing is done to protect ALL investors.

143. ABC District problems have shown that the church should not be in the business of managing money and giving any type of interest on loans. We should not benefit for lending money to congregations. Congregations need to be fiscally responsible.
144. It depends on its format. In its current state, no it should not continue. In a state where it facilitates the acquisition of funds for congregations to build or add to churches, then yes, it should continue.
145. Church Extension Fund should always have professional representation on its board i.e. CA, and CEF should always seek professional opinions when launching new large projects over 500,000.00.
146. We just can not take on large projects. We also must take care not to have too many small churches in close proximity.
147. As it was, yes- better have financially trained people running it. Good intentions don't count.
148. These next few questions are very difficult in light of what has happened. I do see the value of having these funds available to assist in growth. I also see that we did not have people in place with the necessary gifts to administer these funds let alone do the disbursements and provide accountability.
149. No opinion. I do not know enough about this to comment on it at this time.
150. I believe there may be a place for church extension funds but there needs to be a whole different structure. Something more along the lines of the Australian Lutheran church. Over the years I have known people who were made to feel less worthy as Lutherans because they chose not to invest in the Church Extension Fund. And there has been too much power and control by one individual.
151. They should continue but not in their present form. There needs to be some changes made so there is more transparency and accountability to prevent another crisis.
152. Not enough information on this.
153. The corporate and legal model for the CEF in the ABC District was obviously a disaster and resulted in a crisis. But a distinct legal entity could be developed by the synod or its districts. As in the LCMS the CEF must be a distinct legal corporation, not an entity of a district or synod.
154. Until a replacement source of funding for church expansion can be found, CEF provides a useful service to churches.
155. After the ABC District debacle, I have my doubts as to whether the church should continue to be in the "banking" business. I would need more information as to the pros and cons to make an informed decision.
156. I don't think the issue with the ABC CEF means all CEFs in principle should be discontinued.
157. The church has NO place in banking. If necessary, then under strict control, i.e. loans for church buildings only and limit on the size of the loan. There have been to many horror stories in the past.
158. CEF should definitely be kept but at "Arms Length" of LCC Head office. If a committee must/should be present to discuss matters re investment...financial experts from outside the Head Office officials.... Lay representation present!
159. Not withstanding the catastrophe in ABC District, it is not necessary to completely eliminate CEFs, which would unnecessarily limit the flexibility and financial stability of the church

districts. There are, however, lessons to be learned and reforms that need to be implemented. To date, there has been no public discussion of what those lessons are and what reforms are required. Perhaps we are yet too close to the situation, and involved in legal proceedings to undertake such a review. However, it needs to be done. And it needs to be done independently. Perhaps the East District or the Central District could be commissioned to lead such a review, with recommendations to be shared across the church.

160. I think that this fund is a necessary part of LCC BUT that it needs to be run not by Pastors but by certified financial advisors of some kind.
161. If continued more due diligence.
162. Funds should be used to a higher level to spread the work of God, to encourage the future of LCC our youth, new programs to work with young families, utilize new technologies to spread God word.
163. Not as the way it is currently structured.
164. Combine them?
165. Confusing question. CEF as it presently exists must be discontinued -- gross incompetence if not criminal wrong-doing has resulted in a breakdown of all trust. The Concept of Lutherans helping Lutherans to build new churches was great and worked well for many years until dishonest spiritually bankrupt Pastors / Laymen took charge.
166. If continued more due diligence.
167. It should continue with changes, separate from the district and more supervision and safe guards
168. The management of the CEF has been tragic. What will happen to the elderly and the student education funds that families have put in. They have put their trust in the Church leaders who were administering it. There is almost nothing left for them.
169. Not discontinued but made more conservative in their applications.
170. Financial problems and losses in the Alberta-British Columbia District Church Extension Fund will curtail Church Extension investments. Superintendent of Insurance has made changes in Church Extension Funds that have me confused and likely lay people too. The overspending in the A-BC District Church Extension Fund has hurt people. Can you imagine having your retirement funds being cut in half?
171. Congregations don't need a loan for a building or an annex to do ministry. If they think they do, then their own appreciation of the gospel should lead to free giving that fills the need. The moment we think we need earthy things, --a certain amount of money, loans, buildings, annexes--before we can enjoy and spread the heavenly treasure of the gospel, then we are blind guides and children of the world. The moment we think the gospel needs money in order to make money is the moment we betray our ignorance of the gospel. I am personally disgusted that my district engaged in venture capitalism within the world under the aegis of spreading the gospel. God is not mocked.
172. I only know of the problems here in ABC. I understand it is working fine in the other 2 districts. Perhaps better accountability is required.
173. Because of what has happened in the recent past, I feel it would not be appropriate to continue this.
174. Extension Funds should be part of the strategic plans of Synod and Districts.
175. Church extension funds were a good idea in their original conception - providing funding for churches that wanted to build or acquire property. Adding Christian schools to this fit our mission statement. But our churches in the Lower Mainland were offended when prospective

church property in Walnut Grove was sold off to build seniors' housing in Alberta. That latter project proved to be so complicated that it should not have been attempted by people whose training was not in that area - the church body had no business venturing there and we now have hurt many of our faithful seniors very deeply. Some of them may be alienated from the church as a result.

176. The ABC fiasco shows that these are not adequately overseen.
177. District Church Extension Funds and synodical Church Extension Funds should not be a part of LCC. Our mission isn't to provide financial services to individuals, churches, or schools. There are many financial institutions, care facilities, and housing cooperatives that are immensely better equipped and significantly more skillful at doing these things.
178. If they are not discontinued, they should be restricted solely to projects related to church/seminary buildings themselves (as opposed to projects with less clear ministry applications, like senior's assisted living).
179. If they are not discontinued, they should at least be reworked so that giving funds is restricted solely to projects building new churches (and not projects like seniors' assisted living centres).
180. Extension funds should at the very least be made separate from the church, as has been done in the Central district. However, their usefulness is questionable. Most legitimate projects should qualify for bank loans.
181. We need to help each other if we are to survive.
182. Given the recent ABC District CEF debacle of real estate speculation, I will resist the temptation to be entirely negative toward CEFs in general. No doubt they have been very beneficial in the past, even in ABC. What we now should learn is that CEFs must be at arms length from church structures, be utterly transparent in their operations, and employ/consult experts for their operation.
183. What might be put in place instead, or would it just be gone?
184. I believe Church Extension Funds have an important place in our church body, however, I would be concerned with how CEFs are governed, used, and the size of projects they cover. If we are going to use left-hand kingdom means to provide for the church, then they need to be governed and administered with left-hand kingdom wisdom and knowledge.
185. I do not favour this approach, at least not as a reaction to the ABC District's CEF failure. A careful analysis of the need for CEF should be undertaken before this decision is made. There certainly needs to a "firewall" between any future fund and the church, and better administration.
186. continue with careful trained financial management and clear understanding to investors of the lack of government support in crisis
187. Again what does the church extension fund do.
188. The church should not be in the investment business nor in lending and borrowing money. Times have changed and are continuing to change. Congregations will have to find other ways of funding their budgets besides depending on the Church Extension Fund. If they are unable to do so, borrowing money from the CEF isn't going to keep them viable. Presently the Districts are supporting too many comatose congregations.
189. Who gets to use Church Extension Funds?
190. Use a group that already is there. i.e. have a building fund and have it run by the (BOD)
191. I don't believe that L.C.C. should be in the banking business, i.e. A.B.C. problems

192. As a preschool teacher in a Lutheran Preschool, I value the grants given by the Church Extension Fund.
193. Should be maintained but better controls -
194. With proper administration CEF becomes a tremendous asset. The only down side I see is that members can become too dependent on these funds and neglect their duty to tithe their financial gifts.
195. After I get my money
196. If it is managed by trained financial professionals.
197. Continue CEF but limit its use to loans for church building upkeep and capital improvements and mission congregation church building. Avoid all other programs.
198. East District CEF is run effectively.
199. While the spirit behind this fund was not malicious, it grew to an area of pride that appealed to the greed of our members looking for a return on investment rather than donation to grow our church. Let's try something new that can support our local churches looking to expand without trying to be a financial institution appealing to our desire for wealth as well.
200. They just need to be used for what they were intended. We are called to serve one another and by providing an avenue of financing for our sister churches to expand or build, we all work for the greater good.
201. Liability of running such a fund has got too high.
202. Or they need to be seriously limited in their purpose. Lower interest rates than banks = sacrificial giving. Only to partially supplement costs with the majority of financing through banks etc. That the ABC District would entice people and congregations to "deposit" with higher interest rates than the banks was scandalous, in my opinion.
203. They should be set up as separate corporations and only used for the building and enlarging of churches and schools, but they are very necessary as a source of mortgages for churches.
204. Many church congregations benefited from the CEF funds to build their churches since the 1921. I recently read that a Lutheran church in southern Manitoba burnt down in the late 1890's. It was rebuilt by the congregational members and their funds in ONE year. I feel CEF should be used for church purposes, i.e. building and capital improvements and mission congregation buildings.
205. They serve a purpose when qualified people are elected to serve in this area-- and the church puts people, by election or appointment, who are not really qualified for the task into such roles. Checks and balance are necessary even in a church run activity. There must be adequate and qualified supervision on an on-going basis.
206. A way needs to be made possible by working CEF from the Synodical level even though it cannot function in the ABC District anymore.
207. When managed well, there's nothing wrong with a Church Extension Fund on principle. On the other hand, after what happened in the ABC district I'm not sure that enough people will continue to invest in them to make them worthwhile; but it seems like something worth keeping all the same.
208. There was an original concept to help churches that is still valid.
209. The Church is not, and should not function, as a bank. The CEF was a blessing in the past but has come to the end of its usefulness.
210. If such funds are not going to be building Schools and Churches -- those who are placing funds in these accounts should be consulted on the use of THEIR MONEY.
211. I do not understand Extension Funds

212. Should be only one
213. There is a need - however in light of ABC difficulties stronger guidelines are necessary.
214. Stricter guidelines and supervision should be set over the remaining CEFs. As long as they are able to function safely and securely, being realistic about falling investment rates from an aging church population, then there is still a helpful role that they may serve in the church. Congregations should be encouraged to be responsible for their debt, and not depend on CEF to let them be irresponsible towards their debt. Congregations unable to service their debt should be encouraged to sell their buildings and be the body of Christ worshiping out and about in the community in which they reside.
215. The over site and management of these funds is critical. Only people with a strong background in banking, investing or accounting should be managing the funds.
216. They have a good purpose but need to be more carefully and professionally managed.
217. This has been a useful service. It lost its vision in some jurisdictions.
218. LCC should not be a lending institution.
219. The funds are of value, but they need to operated by people who understand economics.
220. CEF can be done for the good of the whole church (see the East District CEF and the surpluses which have benefited the entire district in buying LSB hymnals one year, and surpluses that were given back to local congregations). Checks and balances and God-given common sense needs to be exercised and actually followed! Sometimes we need to say 'No' to projects that are just too big!
221. If they continue they should have the insurance against bankruptcy that banks and credit unions have or CEF become a Credit union
222. With the volatile nature of the economy today, and with restrictive provincial policies and regulations to which the fund must answer (at least in the Central District), there is no need for the church to continue in this arena.
223. Church extension has provided a great service to congregations to build, expand etc. however after the ABC crisis stronger guidelines are needed - Plus the fund should have a cap on investments depending on projected needs according to it's original purpose
224. churches need to spend funds more carefully. They also need to fund raise for there wants like anyone else and not expect it all given.
225. If discontinued right now, people would lose financially. Perhaps new investors should be curtailed however - and the church move away from Extension funds.
226. Times and situations have changed; CEF's should be professionally managed and reviewed on a regular basis by qualified people with regular written reports to those who have invested.
227. Unsure - it was certainly of value to churches when established.
228. Church Extension needs to be tightened up to keep to it's mandate - help build church's not senior complexes or other risky ventures. Don't throw the baby out with the bath water!
229. Governance needs to be strengthened
230. They should be continued, but only according to their purpose: to fund mission.
231. There should be rigid restrictions in place regarding the amount of funds which can be loaned to churches etc., so that a healthy balance is maintained at all times. A good beginning might be that not more than 30/35% of money on deposit in CEF be out on loan to congregations etc. I'm sure that banks and other lending institutions have such regulations in place.
232. 'Lost a lot of money due to stupidity. This is an area that we don't need any more.

233. I believe these can offer a valuable service to the church, provided they are constituted as separate entities from District and Synod.
234. Definitely for now. It's a weird business model. We charge churches interest so that "investors" can make money on the backs of the churches who borrow funds. I understand the need to borrow because it's costly to go ahead with building projects but it's a conflict of interest in some ways... why don't people just donate money interest free if people are interested in building churches?
235. This is no longer a necessary service.
236. Church Extension Funds have served the church (LCC) very well. Proper accountability is always necessary.
237. Church Extension Funds still have an effective role if they stay true to the original purpose of making money available to churches/schools for building projects.
238. If operated like the ABC, then discontinue. CEF must be run by someone with financial expertise.
239. Based on the fiasco that occurred with the CEF in Alberta-BC District, it's apparent that transparency and accountability are sorely missing from the process. Pastors and others running it should not be allowed to make decisions on any financial matters, since the purpose of the CEF was for church development of various kinds, not using money for conferences, etc., since they are unable to make sound financial decisions.
240. BUT... there should be a new corporation for each district which accepts investments or donations from congregations which can be used over time as capital for lending to emerging parishes. This would be a corporation or foundation with a separate board of directors - not answerable to LCC. I know that this seems like the Extension Fund, but that is a ludicrous name in the first place, and its partial reliance on individuals investing is causing appalling grief and anger.
241. The entire subject of congregations' ownership of real estate needs to be re-examined carefully. Like every other worldly item, the value of real estate is not a 'sure thing'. Clearly, some congregations must have their own building(s). However, others can do quite well renting the space they need for the times they need it.
242. As a service for investors, CEF could be discontinued. As a service to churches that need to borrow, it always seemed like a good idea.
243. Just look at the problems in ABC District
244. This would largely depend on how it is administrated, governed, utilized, and set up.
245. Too many government regulations. Was great when it started but has lost its purpose.
246. The Church does not have people who are trained in finance to properly run CEF.
247. Any activity performed by pastors is extremely expensive. Our pastor receives compensation in the top 10% of Canadian tax filers, not including the pension plan benefits.
248. Church extension finds should become part of strategic plan for the Synod and the Districts.
249. Present is terrible.
250. The days of major church building in Canada are OVER for many more generations to come.
251. They could continue as a fund but not as an interest earning investment that tops the lowest interest given at a financial institute. The basis of the CEF should be about lending because of the cause not the interest earned.
252. There is a need for congregations to be able to finance programs and building renewal, expansion or new buildings

253. The church should proclaim Law and Gospel and administer the sacraments, not run a bank. The CEF crisis in ABC district has resulted in the loss of distinction between the Kingdom of the right hand and the Kingdom of the left hand and appears to have distracted the leadership from major societal issues such as euthanasia
254. Financial institutions are better at delivering these services.
255. if the are continued funds must be utilized for the stated purpose
256. Experience over the long term has been good.
257. The church should not be in the business of Savings and Loans. CEF fiasco in A-BC district harmed trust in the Synod!
258. The church should not be in the business of Saving and Loan. CEF fiasco in A-BC district has hurt the Synod!
259. No longer fulfills its original purpose
260. My reason for disagreeing is not the fund, which has been used successfully, but rather in the administration of the fund as in the case of the ABC District
261. The fund is an asset; its management is what is in need of change
262. The CEF has served a vital purpose in days gone by when, as I understand it, banks were reluctant to loan to churches. The Church should not be in the business of banking. Even with the changes in the Central District it is still a liability to the church.
263. The church should not be in a business situation of making money. Members of a congregation should not be motivated to invest in building churches with the hopes of investing for their own gain. On the other hand, financial matters require individuals who have credentials in finance. Best left to the banking industry.
264. In many ways from what I understand the funds compensate for our low contributions to missions both at home and abroad
265. Some churches needing loans would have difficulties getting them in the banking sector. However, there MUST be good and proper management thereof with parameters guiding the loans in order to protect the investors.
266. ...but they need to be properly managed
267. The A-BC district CEF mess is a prime example of why they should be discontinued. The Church should not try to act as a financial institution.
268. would have been good if the ABC district financial people hadn't ruined it.
269. After ABC, very little faith left in CEF.
270. I do have a CEF account, but I don't know enough about the topic.
271. My suggestion would be to limit which activities could receive funds. I would limit it to building churches when those needs arise...but require a larger "down payment" to those bodies which are applying for funding.
272. as they currently have been operating
273. Initially it's goals were laudable but in the wrong hands (incompetent) they were poorly managed and became the source of disaster.
274. If it is viable and not a diversion of essential funds, then it should be kept.
275. I disagree because I think it was (and still is in the central and east district) a great program to support new and current missions when it can be difficult to find financial support through traditional lending agencies. The biggest issue though I believe at this time is the lack of trust that will be out there in the ABC District and potentially other districts at this time. A few possible ways to garner trust back: - Synod controlled fund - Clear lending guidelines and applications - new structure: financial people approve decision of church workers to put

money into certain missions. I.e. congregation pitches a proposal to board of church workers who, if they approve of the pitch, take it to the financial board (all members must have financial backgrounds) and they decide whether or not the risk can be taken and the parameters of the deal if approved.

276. Given the recent ABC District tragedy, the fund of that name needs to be eliminated. If replaced, a new fund needs supervision by experts with appropriate financial expertise.
277. Funds only to be used for LCC new church buildings or repairs or additions on churches.
278. The CEF represents substantial debt to the "intermediary" (District CEF). The districts simply do not have the assets behind them to back loan losses should they occur. Financial troubles within a CEF, which could include a substantial loan default, or stock market loss on excess capital, have the potential to bankrupt and essentially shut down the primary work of our Synod.
279. its original purpose does not exist anymore
280. CEF still needed to help congregations. But the guidelines should be solely for that.
281. Need to know the rational for this
282. I think that in our district the trust of the majority of the people toward the district with their finances will never recover. The CEF or any financial ministry should not be resurrected in ABC.
283. Too many small churches have little cash reserves and often need to borrow money for unexpected building repairs that must be done. Many churches are in need of renovations but aren't able to raise it all in one go from their members; therefore, they need to be able to borrow without having to go to the cost and trouble of taking out a mortgage.
284. If CEF has a professional money manager with a board that is capable & knowledgeable with investing funds - I think it might be still needed.
285. no longer serve their original purpose
286. discontinued after present matters are all cleaned up to the best possible way to benefit all concerned.
287. Due to present circumstances, yes!! But if in the future it could be re-evaluated, it should be administered by professional financial advisors & accountants and not clergy!!!!
288. The Districts should go to the Mennonite method, when a request is made the church is canvassed for support and various individuals invest as they desire for the length of the project perhaps up to 15 years.
289. Nationally?
290. We have shown we are not good managers of other people's money. We are using these funds to invest and get return in many cases - hoping to fund operations! Totally inappropriate. In some other cases we have overpaid investors paying 4,5,6 % when the bank can only afford to give 2%! We are not capable of doing a credible job in this area.
291. After what happened in the ABC districts, I think these kinds of financial matters should be left to secular lending institutions.
292. in light of what has happened in ABC district, perhaps money management should be left to the secular world
293. ABC has to now that it has been destroyed The other districts maybe ok
294. should be discontinued UNLESS fund is professionally managed by external and independent firm

295. ABC District goofed big time by not happening good investment governance and having incompetent investment advisors (I hope a lawsuit follows). Now they want to get of the whole program?
296. needs to be supervised and managed by professionals
297. They serve a purpose to provide loans to congregations. BUT, annual audited financial statements, no exceptions. Clear mandates to include that "loans" are only made for church/school repairs, renovations and building funds. Forgiveness of Loans can only be approved at convention. No one entity can borrow more than perhaps 10% of the total value of the fund. REAL world conflict of interest guidelines. Prince of Peace board members who were on CEF Board and voted for loans to Prince of Peace is a testimony to the amateur operation it was. The ABC District Lawyer's claims no conflict existed should be evidence that District should get a new Lawyer. My Lawyer disagrees and if any of that ever goes to court I am afraid the individuals involved will find out how bad his advice was.
298. Continued if it is helping to spread the Gospel, while being a safe and secure investment.
299. The Alberta BC fiasco is in my opinion a classic case of individuals operating outside their expertise. A church extension fund is appropriate but must be managed professionally
300. CEF should continue however there needs to be bylaws and procedures in place to ensure that it stays healthy and protected from collapse.
301. And replaced with some form of guarantee so that church bodies may get commercial bank loans.
302. -the historic purpose of the CEF (building projects of legitimate needs and reasonable size) is admirable and should be continued; however, the CEF needs to be properly monitored by educated financial professionals
303. There is a place for the church extension fund, but there needs to be an appropriate governance and expertise as required by regulated institutions. There should be no conflict of interest.
304. It needs to be controlled and outside of the Synod/District budget and operating processes. The fund is critical to the building of church properties but it should not be seen as a risk to the integrity of the Synod or District. The BC/AB District is a perfect example of what not to do but it was still a valuable program to the development of Church properties, as financial institutions will not take the risk for funding such developments (in most cases).
305. The existence of such funds is a matter of distinguishing them from financial instruments that are available from mainstream financial institutions. I believe there is a distinct need that tends to not be easily served from the big FI's.
306. The church is not a banking system.
307. keep money in a fund to act as security for a loan from a financial institution like a parental loan/security.
308. It may be a mistake to eliminate the ABC District CEF. CEF serves a very worthwhile function if it is managed properly.
309. I'm not sure we would be able to continue - the distrust is aimed (correctly) at the personal in the ABC district. But that doesn't necessarily mean that there is enough trust to continue. I think it was a wonderful program while it lasted; and I think it would be valuable to have it continue in the future.
310. With CEF in the state it is currently in it would be difficult for it to continue at this time. Perhaps in the future there will be a place for it again. I do believe this to be an important part of LCC.

311. We should not be a bank
312. This program needs to be overhauled and supervised by people who understand the financial world!
313. Secular financial institutions are best-suited when it comes to financial matters. All we have to do is look at the disaster that has befallen the Church Extension Fund in 2015.
314. It would have been a benefit if those in control would have stuck to building the kingdom of God rather than making bad choices in investments. I do believe that we should lay up our treasures in heaven and not in earthly gains, perhaps this is a lesson for all of us. God is in control and he has the last say.
315. ...agree on the district level
316. should have been 50 years ago
317. should have been done 50 years ago
318. We must never put ourselves at the mercy of the commercial world and at the same time we must have qualified leadership and management which excludes most if not all clergy.
319. CEF needs to be independent of any operating budget from which salaries and such are taken.
320. We must never place ourselves at the mercy of the commercial world, but we do need better management of the CEF's that we have
321. I would like to understand the impact of discontinuing it.
322. These funds need to be handled by professionals.
323. Church Extension Funds should be managed separately from an operating budget. I for one thought that they were operating in this manner. I contributed to my CEF accounts and I contributed to my congregation with sent off a portion of our offerings to District Missions, to me meaning, operating costs. I had no idea the it two titles were the same 'bucket,' so to speak.
324. I know CEF has helped many mission congregations in the past, but I don't have enough current knowledge to know how effective it really is, or whether it being discontinued would be detrimental to start up ministry within LCC.
325. As they are currently structured. They should be arm's length from the Districts' administration. Revisit their purpose and establish strict guidelines.
326. As a member of the ABC District, it has become apparent that Pastors have no business in banking.
327. this has been a huge disappointment and fiasco. Our family has lost a significant amount of money with CEF. If the church cannot afford to have the 'right' people dealing with financial matters of people's investments, they should not be in that business.
328. The church has no business being in the banking business. This is not a new opinion, I believed this prior to the ABC CEF collapse.
329. I wonder if the money that is being borrowed is only to make the physical church nicer and more comfortable for its members... I don't see a lot of growth and expansion of God's community of believers because of it. It would be good to see some statistics as to the results of these investments.... (because we paved the parking lot we now have 200 people in church instead of 100 or since our expansion to add 5 classrooms we have increased our Sunday School attendance by 10%)
330. These funds are important in that they can help a congregation that probably could not get a loan from a commercial bank.

331. The future of the church & it's well-being depends on these funds as I understand it. If the monies are held and invested properly and conservatively, and decisions on how and when the monies are spent are voted and agreed upon, then that's good by me.
332. Having funds available for ministry growth goes back to the time of the Apostle Paul and the early church. Sharing each other's burdens in growing/supporting the church is integral to the work of spreading the gospel. Whether this happens in the form of Church Extension Funds or a different mechanism is arbitrary in my view.
333. Could be a valuable service. The question is - Can they be properly managed?
334. CEF could provide a valuable service to LCC if properly managed.
335. We still need to encourage church growth. Expert opinion (redundant safeguards, cross checks needs to be in place) is necessary.
336. The "church" is not called to be money lenders/exchangers.... that’s who Jesus through out of the temple. Just because it is the "church" lending the $$ does not make the process holy. In fact, the "church" applies the same practices that one might expect from any lender.
337. I don't know if congregations have trouble getting loans like CEF works have told us in the past...but financial institutions would make more objective decisions regarding money management. Buildings are not the primary focus for mission.
338. Better administration of funds should be monitored by auditors or outside firm to avoid what recently happened this past year or two.
339. Gifts are gifts. Money earned is money earned. Where it's deposited, should hopefully make $$ for the Church.
340. Managed properly and possibly registered in a province that enforces the rules and regulations regarding investments like this the CEF is a wonderful resource for our Church body and the congregations who make use of it for proper reasons.
341. Particularly if the lack of due diligence and criminality continues.
342. 2/18/2016 6:17 PM
343. Except for funds required for major repairs or upgrades to buildings, there is little or no need for a Church Extension Fund within our church body. There is no benefit for a new mission in an urban area taking on the debt to build a new church facility. In cases where a congregation has taken on such a burden the focus quickly shifts from mission and ministry to the building and debt. In the current climate and in the foreseeable future, shared finances and efforts on a regional or national level should be focused on building up the mission and ministry of a congregation, not on debt and buildings.
344. We have had some extreme problems with Church Extension Funds in ABC District - not sure how I feel about it at this point. The idea was good and a lot of good has come out of it, but unfortunately at the present time, things are not so good. However, I don't think it should be discontinued, but changes should be made on how it is run.
345. Have completely lost trust and confidence in this group.
346. At least for the time being. The CEF crisis has spoken to this issue better than anything else. Parties on both sides took advantage of the CEF and its temporary benefits in a way which does not reflect the Christian life.
347. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
348. This is not even an option to continue with CEF or any investment funding for ABC District and would be wise for the other districts to wind up this practice.
349. I disagree that the church should be offering return on investment to funds that should properly be seen as

350. The ABC debacle of recent times has left a "bad taste in the mouth".
351. I think that properly administered, the CEF can still be a valuable tool for our churches. We need to learn from the ABC district crisis, not simply assume that all kinds of CEF tools are doomed to failure.
352. leave it to the professionals
353. I see no reason to discontinue the practice if safeguards are put in place to avoid the ABC disaster.
354. I think that a CEF is useful for the church. It may not be as useful in the future as it has in the past. I do think that there should be one CEF in LCC, not three. And it must be administered by people who are capable of good money management and stewardship of investors funds.
355. This is our best means of financially assisting ministries starting out, but needs a caring administrator who can oversee its method of dispersements and investments.
356. Yes, and no. If professional management can be secured to properly manage it, then yes. If not, then no.
357. I don't know enough information.
358. The Bible does not support the business of lending money.
359. only continued if controlled and administered by an outside agency that is fully qualified in financial operations
360. There will again come a time when this miniseries will be a grate blessing to the work of the LORD, as has served us VERY well in the past
361. I do not believe that Extension Funds are as important as they were years ago when other financing options for churches were non-existent, but, at least in our area, credit unions actively finance church construction and renovation, so the role for extension funds is reduced.
362. A totally dysfunctional group of pastors/lay destroyed the CEF. How can it continue?????
363. Should use formal banking institutions
364. Certainly as they were abused, there could be reason to discontinue them, but if they are properly supervised, they can provide a service.
365. CEF funds should be monitored by persons with relevant expertise. Projects should not be undertaken without 75% approval from those who are invested, and should be vetted by an arms length capable third party.
366. Should be handled by outside resources
367. The Church is not a financial institution so should not handle large amount of funds.
368. The CEF performed a valuable service for church plantings when commercial lending institutions hesitated to give mortgages to churches. The situation has changed, so it may be no longer required.
369. Churches should raise their own funds.
370. I am not familiar enough with this.
371. I have never thought that the church should be a bank as well.
372. We do not have the expertise to be in the loan business.
373. This has been very, very discouraging and disappointing to all involved!!!
374. Beyond providing affordable loans for capital projects that have demonstrated an ability to repay the loans, CEF has no place in the financial business. Certainly it should not be in RRSP or investments.

375. We should not be in the banking business nor the property accumulation business. WE do not have the expertise required and seem to be unable to hire outside our church circles. The most important qualification for those overseeing it is that they belong to an LCC church.
376. They should be better managed and monitored in view of what has occurred in the ABC District.
377. CEF is important but the rules around the congregational loans need to follow industry standard more closely and returns to depositor should also be in line with industry standards.
378. We should get out of the banking business altogether. We are not a financial institution and should not pretend to be one.
379. I can't speak for East and Central District. ABC District's has been discontinued.
380. With the correct oversight, they can still provide a valuable function
381. Mixes the kingdom of the left with the right.
382. Trust has been Lost end of storey
383. Poorly managed and directed. Cannot trust it would be better managed.
384. This fund served a needful service to smaller congregations to meet immediate financial needs with an opportunity to pay back. What was dome with the fund was not what was anticipated for the fund.
385. Disagree however the CEF needs to be more clear in letting (all) congregations know (individually) where the funds sit, where they are going, exactly what the investment process is (Admit to being a CEF member but it is a constant struggle with other non-CEF church members how to calm their fears when they hear about ABC CEF demise (The through process being by non-members "I thought it was investment in congregations who then pay it back -not stock market driven investments". (see also Q.6,7)
386. I am not sure that Churches should be in "business" of lending and borrowing money
387. Church Extension Funds need to be supervised so that the debacle that occurred in the ABC district cannot happen in those funds. What I don't know is if they can be continued - seeing as the church has lost the trust of many investors in the ABC District and probably across the country.
388. The church (congregation) needs to have a source of getting fund to do their outreach at a small cost.
389. This financial service has been abused by the authorities who were entrusted to this. It would appear that LCC-ABC District staff were not the right people to be entrusted to financial services. I do not know at what point this happened, it was probably a very good and noble idea many years ago, but somewhere along the line people who worked at ABC District manipulated the intentions and misled innocent investors. It HAS to be discontinued because of that breach of trust and breach of fiduciary duty. That there is no one to be accountable and take the responsibility proves that there was no one capable of administering financial accounts responsibly. The District was underqualified and in over its head in financial matters.
390. Poorly managed and directed. At this time, we cannot trust that it would be any better managed
391. If managed well, they still serve a purpose. However, their functions should be strictly limited to congregationally-based ministry (housing is not included in my definition of ministry here). Other entities, such as LSOs, may be able to apply only after congregational projects are fully considered.

392. At this time with the mismanagement of the past and existing CEF I cannot trust that it will be managed in the fashion that it was intended
393. I agree, for fear of future disbursements of funds being given without proper security of funds, or being given in violation to original regulations to church and Revenue Canada.
394. CEF needs to be well managed. Here pastors will need to release control as their expertise is elsewhere. Should be done by professionals. There can be an influence by pastors so that decisions by "faith" can be included. Where risks are taken, they must be calculated
395. Get out of the finance business. Let the professionals do their job.
396. Wow!!! That ought to be obvious!! What a mess our people with "authority" have made of this. Pastors and Lutheran staff should be just that--they have little or no financial and investment knowledge. Besides, they don't even appear to care about the many people that have lost their life savings in this situation.
397. The Districts should go to the Mennonite method, when a request is made the church is canvassed for support and various individuals invest as they desire for the length of the project perhaps up to 15 years.
398. It should be discontinued in the ABC District. If it is working in the other Districts, let them keep their Church Extension Funds. The problem is integrity and full disclosure by the elected individuals entrusted with managing those funds. Can we TRUST the people in charge?
399. Seek professional advice in such matters.
400. I wouldn't say discontinued but they need to be administered by someone or an entity that knows what they are doing. Not by a group or individuals that want to make themselves look important.
401. Within LCC there are example of stable and supportive Church Extension Funds. Learn from "best practices". Document success and problems. Don't repeat mistakes.
402. Plant new churches, that is what these funds were designed for.
403. It is my understanding that the Church Extension Funds are used for building new churches. If that is what the CEF is used for then it should not be discontinued. It should be monitored to make sure that is where the funds are going.
404. Too often funds have been used by existing congregations to build bigger and grander churches rather than helping to provide basic facilities for new congregations. The ABC District experience clearly shows that the average pastor or layman lacks the skills to appropriately administer these funds.
405. If you are not trained in money matters, and the investments are not secured, why then is the Church even thinking about continuing in money matters? I think enough people have been hurt. dumb question
406. This funding is essential for churches to grow. However, I believe it needs to be restructured and managed differently.
407. The funds for supporting church buildings should come from the heart of giving (ministry) not a business model such as loans with interest being charged.
408. Obviously, with the crisis in the ABC district over CEF, this is a bit of a hot button topic. I think that CEF could be continued, as long as it was being handled in a fiscally responsible way.
409. Only if managed in a fiscally responsible way.
410. If there is no call for loans for the building of churches, it should be discontinued - administered by knowledgeable personnel.

411. But it seems to need more oversight possibly by a "third party" to ensure that decisions are financially sound. May be necessary to remove some of the emotion from decision making.
412. They must be managed/monitored by an outside non LCC body. Investments should also be approved by an outside body.
413. is it of benefit to members? is enrolment decreasing or increasing?
414. Unless we can find a financial institution to run it outside of the Church. The Synod could provide support in other ways and congregations may be willing to support each other with collateral so conventional methods could be used.
415. CEF is an excellent way for people to invest in the work of the church. These plans obviously need to be supervised by those who have financial experience and who listen to the numbers rather than their hearts.
416. On the fence having with this one. Not sure.
417. In the present form these funds are nothing more than an ecclesiastical Ponzi scheme. This fund should have been administered by those with professional business and accounting expertise and not just those who believed they had some experience with it. Why so reluctant to consult and listen to professionals skilled in business matters?
418. Its initial objective was good. It can return to that objective.
419. I'm not sure that the church has the necessary governance and oversight given what has happened in the ABC District.
420. In theory these funds could be discontinued, but if retained a max amount should be established at the district level.
421. people with the adequate training and equipped to understand and do this type of work are imperative. I'm aware that normal banks aren't as likely to handle church business
422. This fund has done so much good for so many churches. But some one let the Bars down, if my memory is right, the church body building etc. had to have or own 40 or 50% of it's value. I think there was loans made to Church bodies and they had may be only 10% equality in it
423. If administered according to sound business practice Church Extension Funds can serve a useful purpose. The recent fiasco in the Alberta British Columbia District grew from an absence of sound business practice run by persons totally lacking in business acumen who were further hampered by the linkage of nepotism run by an "old boys club."
424. They should be administered by business people not theologians!
425. Discontinuation would be an extreme reaction to the ABC crisis. Rather, better, more careful management needs to be practiced.
426. It served an important service in the past, and its time has passed. The ABC crisis (leading from higher stakes investments and lack of professional leadership) and the fact that the younger generation has not supported the CEF (leading in part to the collapse) indicates that our church should no longer be in the banking business.
427. Needs more professional guidance not just clergy.
428. I haven't seen a strong benefit to the program. The one time my church asked for assistance from the CEF we were told we were not eligible because we did not provide a "financial return" and the investors in the fund both deserved and expected a return. In our case and many other cases, the fund was of no value. I would welcome information that showed otherwise because the initial purpose of the fund is quite honorable, but I haven't seen any evidence of it providing the desired engine for growing the church it was heralded as being.

429. The idea seemed solid and served the church for a long time. However, with our current fiasco with the ABC District, and with the dwindling support of CEF from younger members of our church, it seems that the time for CEF has passed. It would be unwise in this current climate to continue down the road of being a financial lender.
430. I think it should be available for student pastors etc. to borrow funds when needed. As a building fund, it should be used cautiously.
431. Should be one fund for LCC
432. More Professional Accountancy oversight should have been in place to control spending and costs.
433. Congregations should have a fund available when special needs are required at a reasonable interest rate. Members can invest fund at a lower interest rate than market to save funds not required now. This can be a form of mission. This fund must be closely administered.
434. Until a replacement source of funding for church expansion can be found, CEF provides a useful service to churches.
435. If the CEF serves the church by helping congregations with building projects as well as generally sharing profits e.g. East District CEF's financing the purchase of LCL and LSB hymnals for congregations If the CEF is a money-making for profit affair, if should be discontinued
436. CEF has its purpose. However, it light of the ABC's CEF failure it clearly needs to be managed in a better way. In what reasonable financial investment fund would you tie up that high of a percentage of your funds into a single (Prince of Peace) thing that you can't liquidate for even a reasonable percentage of a return?
437. I don’t get any information on this subject through my congregation.
438. The trust issue is gone, and can't see anyone giving money to the church extension anymore. Maybe when all our investment is returned to us, it might change, but definitely not until then
439. I think this could be a valuable service properly handled.
440. When we had the chance to use them, we didn't because the secular institution was more flexible. That says I lot.
441. We still need a church extension fund of some type, because lending institution are reluctant to borrow monies to churches. The fund SHOULD NOT BE RUN BY A BOARD OF PASTORS AND LAY PEOPLE WHO KNOW NOTHING ABOUT FINANCIAL PLANNING AND INVESTMENTS. You have to remember this type of a fund is using other people’s money.
442. With the problem that developed in ABC District it suggests more comprehensive guidelines for investing should be drawn up, to follow by financial experts not lay people. I feel that the church extension fund still has a viable way of supporting our church body.
443. We are not a financial institution. However, we should consider why Church Extension Funds were established -- to help missions and congregations with loans. While we are experiencing historic lending loans, let us not be short-sighted and assume that this will always be the case. Simply because of exceedingly poor stewardship and judgement with respect to the oversight of the ABC District CEF, should not cause us to through the baby out with the bath water.
444. How can one respond to such a question without full information? This is a knee-jerk question which will elicit knee-jerk responses.
445. The church is not a financial institution.

446. There is no evidence of a problem where we are with this. It is fulfilling its purpose and a blessing beyond other options as far as I can tell.
447. When administered properly it was beneficial.
448. When it was working properly it need help congregations,
449. Church extension funds should operate like a bank: there is no risk to be taken. A church should not be able to simply add to their church. If it is a business (like daycare or coffee place) that they are adding, they need to prove its success with a business plan and collateral such as a decent down payment for the fund.
450. They are a good idea, but are they being managed by professionals? (e.g. accountants)
451. CEFs are helpful but they need to be administered correctly.
452. Do not know enough about this to offer an opinion. I think the original intent of this fund was very good and sound.
453. I think there are better and safer financial avenues to accomplish the same purpose
454. YES, in ABC!
455. The Districts are acting as intermediary for loans and the liabilities they are undertaking far exceed their assets. The Districts have in the past and are using the CEF's borrowed capital as leverage to fund missions.
456. Church extension funds had their place and were used effectively to build churches and renovate facilities. They lost their way when trying to get involved in Senior's housing and in land development.
457. While the original purpose of the CEF (loans to congregations for land and buildings) has become almost redundant in our present day, the CEF is some cases is serving to provide financial support for Word and Sacrament ministry in districts and to congregations. This support will be increasingly necessary due to the decline of people and dollars in many of our congregations.
458. With the current mess and the apparent lack of willingness on the part of the leadership to recognise their faults, we cannot let thus continue. Imagine the witness our body would give if our leaders who were involved in the debacle would show true love to those who they hurt by selling all they had and admitted their fault. How much more does the money in the pockets of the pastors/leaders involved belong to God, than that of those people who invested in the funds?
459. The East District CEF is solid and well managed. It is a model for the other two Districts or one national CEF.
460. I am deeply affected by the bankruptcy of the ABC Church Extension Fund
461. This should NOT be and should NEVER have been part of the synod. Churches need to get financing from existing banks or better yet, pay for church building after the CASH has been collected. Mortgages should NOT be the major budget item for charitable donations!
462. After the situation in AB/BC it is clear to me that this service should be discontinued. I believe that that is not what the church is here for. I would think Jesus would look at it the way he did the people that were selling in the temple. It sounds like a good idea, but I really don/t think it is at all. Furthermore, the pastors that were looking after this program are NOT trained to do this kind of work.
463. How are churches going to be built now that LCC ABC district is bankrupt? We still need help in this area somehow, but the trust has been taken away from the members of LCC ABC district. I feel that LCC in Winnipeg should hold the purse strings for this Fund. With a board of directors that are in the financial world not clerical people.

464. I feel that the church extension fund should be turned into a private Credit Union or operated from a bank.
465. Despite the tragedy in the ABC District these vehicles of church growth are still needed.
466. Ensure they are incorporated separately from the church
467. A lesson should be learned from the tragic events in ABC district and mismanagement of funds. We are not a financial institution.
468. The fiasco operating at the moment speaks for itself.
469. The church should not be trusted with people's savings, unless a limited amount was taken, with people aware of the "risks" for the sole purpose of helping congregations build, but only the amount that is possible for them to repay.
470. under the current leadership the mismanagement, and negligence has been disgraceful Nepotism and ego led to its downfall.
471. Decades ago CEF played a large part in using contributions from people and churches but with the explosion of the on-line choices of investments and the complexity of managing funds in a knowledgeable manner, I feel the CEF is no longer appropriate to be used
472. Could continue with outside direction
473. They started out being a very good and were supported until now.
474. There is still a need for funds to help struggling churches, but there needs to be more care when it comes to lending monies and making sure there is proper repayment and that this repayment is occurring.
475. The jobs the fund is trying to do is still very much needed. However, the management of these funds has not been very effective. The situation in the Alberta-B>C. district probably could have been avoided if there had been stronger oversight. We now need to find a way to reorganize the way the church raises capital funds. My suggestion is that we form a Lutheran Trust Society for all of Canada. This would do two things; #1. Because this would be a fund regulated by the Federal Government It would need a strong board and a strong management team. Government regulation would see to that #2. This would also allow people who have significant financial resources to have a relatively safe place to invest into Church related investments. The one thing that must be very clear though, is that this organization must be at Arm's Length from the LCC.
476. There should be a fund available to help new churches start or help with churches in financial difficulty.
477. The Districts should go to the Mennonite method, when a request is made the church is canvassed for support and various individuals invest as they desire for the length of the project perhaps up to 15 years. Side note, ABC CEF and DIL are discontinued.
478. Under it's present operating situation yes it should be discontinued. Pastors should stick to teaching and preaching
479. Focus on Jesus not money
480. Only in the Districts....
481. Not discontinued, because they can do good work, and allow churches to get lower interest loans. But they need to be separate from the districts (as ABC District has shown) and managed by professionals with financial experience, not District BoDs.
482. I like to support my district's CEF and help congregations who need assistance with major renovations.
483. If administered cautiously and responsibly they provided in the past a reasonable return on investment and an opportunity to help other churches with church planting and growth.

484. Prudent monitoring
485. My understanding is the ABC district's handling of funds was bad, but other districts' has been good, and beneficial.
486. This is a very very, very sad part of our LCC. Properly supervised these Funds would be excellent. Problem = Integrity has been lost.
487. What, really, is the difference between "neither agree or disagree" and "no opinion"?? I only know about the problems in ABC district, not whether other CEF's are successful, worthwhile, and trustworthy, so I can't really say.
488. No, I think this it should be better managed by educated people that know finances.
489. CEF is an important way to support LCC congregations but there must be careful governance of CEF funds with specific arms length business management of the funds in addition to risk management analysis of all the potential loans that CEF may be asked to consider
490. If they can not be properly managed, why would anyone continue them?
491. Theological knowledge does not supply capability with financial management. The two conflict in purpose.
492. Better management is needed. The extension fund provides a valuable service to many congregations.
493. Even though ABC District is under review of their CEF, does not mean that other districts should give up the CEF unless their is something else to take its place. Church building and repairs are essential in mission work. Accountability is also necessary to make sure funds are dispersed after a risk evaluation is first conducted.
494. Church extension fund should be topped up and refund losses to those that have contributed in the past. Current managers of the funds should be fired. Possibly criminally charged
495. I have always invested in CEF. Not only do I get a reasonable return; but it helps finance our church's operation through subsides.
496. CEFs are in a better position to demonstrate their value.
497. CEF is not bad however the ABC district CEF was poorly run. (I recently moved from ABC district to East)
498. I believe that this whole mess has not yet been properly handled, even though I am not personally affected by it.
499. Not at all. Rather there needs to be a reorganization of purpose for CEF in a world where property and buildings are far to expensive to build to sit empty 95% of the week. Buildings will burn when Jesus returns souls will not! Why don't we use funds to extend the Church not buildings via a plan to make fund available to congregations (not for starting programs) who are out actively making and growing disciples of our Saviour.
500. I believe the Church should be concentrated on the Gospel and not concern themselves with these types of Funds.
501. But they do need to be run properly and used for purposes they are meant to be used for.
502. Should be administered professionally
503. Why would we continue with them?
504. Can criminal charges be brought against those in the ABC D who lost $50 million dollars plus of members' deposits?
505. If they are managed as in the recent past, why would anyone want to continue

506. One of the purposes of CEF was to provide funds in building schools and churches within each District. The current market has seemed to change and are issuing loans to Christian institutions and if they remain then CEF is not as important.
507. One of the purposes of CEF was to provide funds for congregations that would not normally be provided in secular markets. There have been market changes which financial institutions have been providing loans to schools and churches. If this trend continues the need for CEF would be reduced.
508. Again, a little explanation of what function they serve would have helped.
509. A review of the purpose of CEF's should be a regular occurrence in order to ensure that they function properly. The current ABC problem is corrupt leadership that misused its CEF funds for their own glory. Something like "building your house" on sand.
510. The church needs to return in simply being the church.
511. continue if supporting congregations who are in need to continue
512. The church is not in the business of finance and shouldn't mix its priorities. Therefore, any funds being administered have to be run in a Christian manner (not following the banking whims and worldly traditions such as usury, etc.) and need full, transparent disclosure to investors. Investing money dedicated to the Church into unsecured, risk-based investments (like stocks) isn't Biblical in my opinion and can be likened to gambling.
513. The current ABC District CEF fund fiasco has determined that district's demise and also the end of the CEF as we have known it for decades. The current church in Canada is shrinking and there is probably little practical need at this time for CEF. That said, with proper restructuring under proper spiritual leadership and corporate management, based solely on scripture (God's words and not so much man's interpretation of His words), the LCC may be able to halt the decline of the church, draw in new members, grow and once again plant churches and justify a renewed need in the future for a new version of CEF, with focus on God's vision, not man's.
514. B/c our interest rates are so low it is not as important a service. If this changes to high rates again it would be needed.
515. It is time to realize that CEF has outlived its initial purpose. The church needs to get back to its task of being a church.
516. It is necessary to have a central fund, either in Districts or Synod, to enable congregations to purchase new facilities or upgrade and repair their present facilities.
517. I believe that the DIL crisis has less to do with the ethos of the CEF and more to do with congregations routinely building too big too soon. A return to modest developments that progress in phases as congregations note the need for other spaces would be most welcome. I believe that CEF could still provide an important service to congregations that need to take on MODEST debts to build for their ministry needs. Let's stop trying to build cathedrals and ministry campuses and get back to building chapels and church halls. Perhaps the CEF could be governed by a grid that forbids loans beyond a certain percentage of a congregations' annual operating budget?
518. The current situation does not require church extension but current church support as many are struggling.
519. If managed correctly, CEF's are a great way to support the church and its mission.
520. I feel the CEF was a good way for our members to support the Lord's work and receive a benefit at the same time. However, if it is not done properly and in conjunction with the other LCC Districts, within the legal framework of good money management practices, then

we should consider not continuing this service. The entire ABC District has a major problem on their hands that could have been avoided by exercising due diligence and consulting with our sister Districts on issues of that magnitude. The negative publicity certainly has not helped the Church's image in the eyes of the secular world either.

521. In my view this an area that caution needs to be taken. The role of CEF's need to be clearly defined. It is difficult for churches to acquire capital for building projects. This is both good and bad in my view. It being more difficult may help prevent churches from over extending themselves. I do believe that if CEF's do continue there should only be one that is national. This should be managed and directed by an independent board and staff, completely separate from Ecclesiastical staff ad board of LCC.
522. Needed but at national level with trained, expert oversight.
523. CEF is a good concept. The CEF districts should have stuck to building churches though instead of ridiculous projects like the Prince of Peace debacle or operating like investment banks/credit unions.
524. Why? It helps MISSIONS.
525. The Church should stay out of the financial realm altogether (banking, investing, etc.) and focus on providing Word and Sacrament ministry.
526. these CEF provide financing for new missions within districts.
527. ABC district has abused this financial gift in the past. Undoubtedly there have been other wrong doings in the other districts, which has not come to light.
528. Leave lending to financial institutions
529. I think people have a feeling of entitlement regarding financial security - if we are properly educated to appreciate that in everything there is risk of loss.... welcome to the world of sin (a position our "religious" insurance companies don't clarify). Aside, it seems to me Warren Buffet's billions are primarily resultant from government (guaranteed) insurance - GEICO. I hate insurance.... it’s a lie and a money grab.
530. If a congregation or individual wishes to assist with the growth of the church through the Extension Fund, then they must be made fully aware of the risks involved. The fund should not be promoted as a vehicle for growth of individual retirement income but rather as a vehicle to assist with the growth of the church.
531. As currently constituted like ABC was they are an accident waiting to implode. I am thankful that Central District made a move away from being connected to the district when they did.
532. I believe this program provides significant benefits to new and growing congregations, however, based on the recent issues with the ABC CEF & DIL, I believe it has to be managed better with due diligence and accountability by a body with more business experience to ensure a default does not happen again.
533. This is likely one of the sad lessons to be learned from the CEF crisis in the ABC District.
534. However, it is obvious that the funds should be used for the specific purposes for which they were received, primarily for the construction and repair of church facilities. They should not be used to take risks in purchasing property with the intention of making a profit, or building senior's facilities when it is questionable whether they can be operated without a loss.
535. If well-managed, they can be a useful resource for the church. But the Synod/District Board should not be overseeing these unless ecclesiastical work is removed from their work as well.

536. I believe banks will now loan money to churches. With this option church congregations should be able to borrow the money from banks. With this option now available there should be no need for church extension any more.
537. One has merely to look at the recent events in the ABC District, and previously in the Central District. (Give us some money and we think we're bankers!)
538. Not discontinued but proper management is essential.
539. Depends. If deposits are used to provide funding for facilities - GREAT! If we're building up excess piles of cash - NO!
540. Could continue outside of ABC if managed by financial people not clergy or lay people without Banking experience.
541. The church has no business being in the field of finance.
542. From me experiences with replacing my congregations CEF mortgage, it appears Faith Life Financial is capable of meeting the needs of most congregations, at interest rates superior to the rates offered by the various CEF groups. Perhaps CEF should be gradually phased out, with all congregations encouraged to find funding elsewhere.
543. However, as recent ABC District and past Central District events demonstrate, Board members must be made to understand that they have a vital role to play as INFORMED and QUALIFIED active trustees of the Synodical members' invested resources. The members must have intentional training as governance board participants and understand the personal responsibility and liability they carry as fully functioning board members.
544. This was shamefully mismanaged and so I think that we should let professionals in the lending business loan money. It seems that the Church Extension funds were not under the same laws that other lending institutions were and so they didn't take seriously enough the handling of peoples' retirement savings.
545. Banks won't loan to churches. A CEF is the way to get access to capital at reasonable costs.
546. These funds have not been used principally for construction or renovation of churches for years, possibly decades. They are now used as investment vehicles, often without proper oversight or registration with appropriate authorities. The result in the ABC district was disastrous. There is nothing wrong with using such vehicles to support the work of the church, but those investing should be fully aware of the purposes and risks, and the funds should be registered and approved by the proper authorities.
547. I think that it is a useful tool to further God's kingdom
548. The circumstances in ABC District have destroyed the credibility of CEF.
549. I could not agree more strongly. The was this fund was administered is an absolute disgrace. I don't think those responsible realize how terrible of a job they did. I lost a lot of respect for a handful of people who I know personally. A disgrace. I hope it is a full generation before anyone in our synod contemplates this kind of venture again.
550. The ABC District became a bank and not a mission centre. It became a means for retired Lutherans to get a good return rather than an encouragement for mission. There are better ways for us to help get missions started and congregations supported.
551. Extension Funds are crucial to be maintained.
552. I have heard it is hard to obtain bank loans in the public sector, if this is true then I would definitely disagree

6. Church Extension Funds are still needed and should be continued.

1. I do not know enough about this business to agree or disagree.
2. Relevance?
3. Like anyone's budget, there should be more money coming in than going out - more, better managed.
4. Believe a need still exists but bad management in Alberta indicates more oversight needed.
5. I don't understand.
6. I don't understand.
7. If money not used for buildings or programs, then there is no need for church extension funds.
8. Wonderful and painless (usually) way of helping to build "the church". Should be secure. This ABC thing is the pits. For depositors it was disappointing but for district ruinous. Credit unions don't seem to have a problem.
9. It should go to financial institutions. it is not helping anyone. least of all me. It was supposed to be there when I need extra help. like a walker, wheelchair, personal help. But now it is gone.
10. I believe the need is there, but note the above qualification in #5.
11. and repayment plans must be clearly written and honoured.
12. Should only have on registered fund.
13. and repayment plans must be clearly written and honoured.
14. repayment plans clearly written and honoured
15. Carefully
16. We don't need to be funding churches so lazy minister has a job.
17. Under very stringent guidance and supervision.
18. They are need for church plant and building, scholarships, training pastors and not to get rich or build treasures on earth.
19. Not part of restructuring.
20. This is providing it is properly structured and supervised by professional personnel.
21. Are CEF's needed? No. As many congregations (including my own) discovered, sometimes it's better to go with a bank, etc. Besides, with CEF it was easy for congregations to be irresponsible in paying off their debt; but with a bank, etc., it forces congregations to be responsible stewards in paying off their debt. This, I believe, is a good thing.
22. This may be true ... though there may be other alternatives.
23. only for church mortgages as it was intended from 80 yr. ago.
24. They should be used only as originally intended -- to assist congregations in supplying their basic house of worship.
25. As above: When properly organized and managed, they provide valuable service to the church.
26. Something could be done to cap investments but still maintain the capacity for future capital projects by congregations.
27. CEF's mandate should be limited to worship and education facilities and specifically exclude retirement homes and other real estate developments. The focus should be providing loans for younger congregations that would have a more difficult time getting a bank loan for a new church building.
28. Look what happened in ABC.

29. Lots of good use for those funds..."IF"... we would only have more energetic ...and... creative workers. Too many pastors are satisfied with the "status quo"... and a 9-5 mentality.
30. Amounts should be limited. Congregations need help with major repairs. Accessibility costs etc. Risk must be really a minimal.
31. Each church should live within their means and not over extend themselves.
32. There should be tighter controls on lending and better reporting (e.g. annual financial statements). An annual review of how it is doing.
33. They have been grossly misused here in ABC.
34. must be run by an elected board of financial controllers.
35. But with much more expertise. One can't spend what one doesn't have. Reserve should always be there as back up. So many were let down!!!
36. If I agree with #5 about discontinuing is #6 a trick question?
37. I like the original intent - however congregations do need to be responsible - pay back money borrowed - many years ago - kids bought stamps... it was as good way for children to learn to invest in the Lords work.
38. Prior to the difficulties in ABC District people felt these funds invested served a two-fold purpose 1) to receive a fair rate of interest on investment of their money for the future 2) while at the same time these funds could be loaned out to churches at a more reasonable rate than banks and could therefore in the present allow for continued growth in the church.
39. Interest rates are low, go to the bank.
40. As long as churches are still being built there is a role for CEF.
41. But not in their current un-risk managed format; need to guarantee bond type funds.
42. It doesn't matter how "useful" the CEF appears. It is and has proven to be a trap for everyone who has touched it, and some have become consumed by it.
43. I think it could be incentive and encouragement within our church for supporting new developmental mission starts which might otherwise simply never happen.
44. Not blindly, but with the right kind of direction, yes.
45. Not without proper business people running it
46. It would be nice to be able to help congregations in financial stress but there is a risk that goes with it.
47. I agree but it has to be managed better. Fund management should be done by a separate fund management company.
48. Especially for Church maintenance as well as Church growth.
49. Probably keep - aim of program is good - however must let commercial banking or investment house run. I have $30,000 invested in CEF, so have an open mind in saying "let's keep". Church, per se, should not be handling investments - loss has caused much hurt and mistrust. Jesus threw the money-changers out of the temple.
50. This applies to District CEF.
51. You're playing with my mind with these questions! I don't understand what statistically meaningful conclusions you will be able to make based on the agree/disagree form. If you agree to #5, doesn't that mean you disagree to #6? With the ABC CEF debacle, one thing that became very clear was that people had very different understandings of a church's "ministry". What does this word mean? What is the mission and ministry of the church? I anticipate we will encounter more problems as a synod in the future if we do not nail down our terminology. I believe that real-estate development is not part of the mission and ministry of the church. It may be something that creates opportunities for ministry (a sort of

pre-evangelism if you will), but it itself is not ministry. It was wrong for the ABC CEF to be providing funding for that real-estate development, especially when contributors to CEF were being told that they were helping "extend the Kingdom." Permit me to make comments on the ABC CEF debacle: it is shameful how ABC District has been recalcitrant in this crisis. Its slowness and (seeming) reluctance to give members information caused worry, and its current unapologetic attitude is causing sin upon sin. Real healing cannot happen while district officials continue to say "we tried", or "we errored on the side of ministry." No. God defend us all from such shameful pride!

52. How do we expect our churches to grow?
53. any valid project can be funded individually
54. With the lack of church growth globally are new churches a necessity? many smaller church buildings are no longer being used.
55. No communication was provided from district as to the problem with CEF. After much anxiety, uncertainty and financial loss we have experienced; not one nickel will ever to CEF. All trust is gone. We have been robbed of our life savings.
56. In our current economic climate with super low mortgage rates let the banks do their job. If, however, the funds continued they should NOT be administered by clergy at any level.
57. I am in favor of Church Extension Funds as they provide much-needed monies for congregations involved in building projects. However, it is essential that they be well-managed by professionals, and not tied to other funds. Investors must understand and accept risks of losses depending on the types of investments.
58. CEF needs to be a separate entity - arms length.
59. -again, in greater need of competency in those serving in decision making positions with "handling" financial matters. Often so lacking in NFP boards.
60. Probably keep - purpose was good - let commercial banking or investment house handle. I have at risk $30,000 in CEF, so have open mind in saying "let's keep", however, the church, per se, should not be handling investments - losses sustained have caused much hurt and mistrust. Jesus did throw the "money changers" out of the temple.
61. with proper supervision.
62. Maybe - with new Directors (accountable). I took your first C.E.F. letter to my bank manager; he said he would not put 5¢ in such a scam. Guess he was right. My husband was very trusting. But we did not invest too much more after. Took too long to advise us of the mess. Others knew sooner and were already withdrawing funds. True or?
63. Extra funds should be used to expand churches and mission work, not invested in risky and unknowledgeable investments.
64. Clearer definition of what Church Extension entails.
65. They serve a good purpose in assisting churches' financial projects, IF they are responsibly directed.
66. Despite what happened in ABC District, they still provide the opportunity for churches to receive funding for renovations and expansion which would likely not be possible if they had to rely on secular forms of financing. They give individuals the opportunity to participate in the Great Commission.
67. Yes, church extension fund does serve a purpose in the church but it needs to be managed by knowledgeable people. After loosing everything, we will never invest in church extension again.
68. So long as they are operating within their founded mandate.

69. Specific rules need to be in place and regular audits of these rules done by an independent entity.
70. Access to these funds have allowed many congregations to build and/or keep their church buildings in good repair. However, I am concerned that we have the financial expertise to manage the funds correctly.
71. Unless managed by a Trust Company. I would not allow my funds to be handled by the church again.
72. They cannot continue under present circumstances.
73. This is a reiteration of the previous question (#5) and not a necessary question on the survey.
74. Church Extension Funds have been valuable to some congregations building, expanding or renovating their building so I think some kind of funding would be beneficial but I do not think it should be administered by the church where training is in ministry. It should be run by a financial institution where training is in financial matters. I also think that it should be a synodical fund not a district fund.
75. Many congregations still need this Fund to assist them in the building or enlargement of their churches.
76. Building Churches is important
77. Must be supervised by a financial institution.
78. I believe Church Extension Funds have an important place in our church body, however, I would be concerned with how CEFs are governed, used, and the size of projects they cover. If we are going to use left-hand kingdom means to provide for the church, then they need to be governed and administered with left-hand kingdom wisdom and knowledge.
79. only to honour our existing commitments
80. need better management, supervision, accountability.
81. But should not invest in risky projects e.g. senior's residences where water had to be trucked in.
82. Support for building Churches
83. How else do we build/renovate churches? Or, is LCC considering the proposal by our new district president to sell churches and set up" church" in a nearby school or community hall? We proposed that concept to our congregation and they said, "Been there, done that. No way am I setting up and putting away every Sunday. Either we have a church home or we go find another church to join." I would like to point out that our new district president has been involved with two congregations that "borrowed" a church location and both are now defunct. Need I say more?
84. Church members are usually not good bankers
85. They are needed but need be brought back in line
86. Investment tends to go where interest $$ pays more!! Promotes either greed or good stewardship?? It's meant to serve God!!! A.B.C. District mess proves it.
87. We need mission churches reaching out to the lost.
88. Funds should only be used to repair/build churches.
89. Good practice if not directly hooked into the church - operates as a separate entity.
90. The controlling board members should have to follow guidelines or be liable if they do not.
91. See the comments under #5. The only way this could be continued is if we hire a chartered accountant and CEO at the Synod level under a new structure---people with the education and experience needed to handle the finances properly with risk to the depositors.

92. They need to continue with clear goals in mind and only for the growth of the church as supported by individual congregations.
93. Yes, they provide a source of funding for congregations that would not be available through their local banks. Likewise, excess profits, minus a reserve fund, can be used to offset budget shortages in district giving.
94. BUT--under one umbrella
95. insufficient data
96. Church's need money loaned to them from time to time so they may still be needed in some capacity.
97. The investment fund has to be managed professionally with complete transparency. This is the very minimum
98. that anyone investing their hard earned savings would expect.
99. See my answer to the previous question. I am not aware of the level of need but presume that it may exist.
100. CEF is still required to support and maintain existing church buildings, and re-build when necessary.
101. I am a member of ABC District and an investor both at a personal level and a congregational level. The problem was not the fund but rather how the fund was structured and administered. The biggest problem was that it was that it was not clearly separated from the work of the Church in the view that it was an investment fund first with a mandate to build the Church. The funds were not given to the church they were 'loaned' to the church and I think that difference was not clearly evident in decision making compared to monies given for mission. This type of fund is really beneficial and important to congregations and their growth.
102. Again, a ridiculous statement. Good steward ship of such funds in the past throughout the US and Canada have been a blessing to those congregations needing loans for expansion. In Canada at least, the trust that a CEF fund will be well managed is gone. Obviously, the accountability safeguards necessary were non existent and it will take a very long time to build the trust that people need to feel to invest once again with a church entity trying to pretend that they are professionals in financial investing matters.
103. Guidelines should be firmly established and obeyed. Efforts by the borrowers should be made to repay the borrowed amount as soon as possible.
104. where are congregations going to get support money?
105. But not under the management of clergy
106. This issue needs serious consideration and proper administration should it be pursued in the future.
107. helps to "build" the church body and share the Word-Lamp
108. I again don't know enough about the ins and outs of this to really comment and I assume these questions are being asked to avoid future financial crisis such as being experienced in ABC district but for myself, I have been glad the CEF existed in the past as a place other than the bank where I could invest savings where it was safe but could be doing some good to the church until I needed it.
109. but it should be run by qualified individuals
110. Glad to hear they will be supervised by members of B.O.D. and not left to District President alone.
111. Not sure

112. Investments must be guaranteed products.
113. Money is very cheap at present. It should be left up to each congregation to secure funds for building.
114. Many of our church buildings, ministries, and servants in the church would not be present if CEF had not and will not be there helping to support these efforts through finances.
115. (Same question as #5 but opposite sense. Are you testing us?)
116. The concept of CEF is good, but in the future it needs to be run by a third party separate from District or Synod. It must be run as a business under professional management.
117. NOT in ABC district as mentioned above.
118. These funds serve a valuable purpose--but their administration needs to be carefully evaluated and restructured.
119. in some form.
120. Providing those who invest realize they have a responsibility to stay on top of their investments: just like everywhere else.
121. They should be operated by qualified persons and insured.
122. No opinion. I do not know enough about this to comment on it at this time.
123. Aside from the mismanagement of funds and the current debt crisis it is very important that CEFs remain in existence. Without the ability to finance new churches through the CEF it will be very difficult to capture funds for any project. The CEF loan structure provides a source of funding on terms that a church can handle and that the public sector cannot provide. I fear that without a CEF we will see a more rapid decline in church attendance and significantly fewer building projects. However, CEFs need to be operated at arms length to the district/synod so that a bankruptcy does not cause a district collapse like in the ABC district. The decisions in the fund's operation should also be made in a financially-wise manner and not solely on the basis of compassion.
124. Years ago there may have been a time that churches were unable to secure funding from mainstream banks. This does not seem to be the case anymore so perhaps it is not necessary. And when we operate as a bank, we fail to focus on our mission as a church.
125. Not enough information on this.
126. May be difficult to continue given last year's circumstances
127. At least until alternate forms of funding for church expansion are developed.
128. These funds should be supervised as carefully as a financial institution. The current situation should not have been allowed to happen.
129. NO question! Look at the East District what CEF has done for support of those churches whose members are involved
130. They provide stability, flexibility, and the means to take advantage of opportunities provided by the Lord. However, some significant reforms are likely required, including, but not limited to: - improved reporting - independent and qualified oversight and governance - strong policies on lending; terms; security etc. - consideration of segregating church and church affiliate funds from congregational and individual funds. (For example, I'm not sure it is a good idea for Concordia Seminary Funds to be co-mingled with congregational funds and individual funds) Their activities should also be constrained to simple deposit/GIC type investments in unregistered accounts. Should there be a desire to operate a more fully functional financial institution within the church, it should be done as a credit union, under full government regulation.
131. If continued more due diligence.

132. Rename the fund and redefine the purpose of the fund. Example: 75% of fund utilized to grow, supporting programs focusing on God mission, 25% of fund used for loans to sister churches. Discontinue to invest in retirement facilities, schools, camp grounds etc. (leave the building and managing of these facilities to the experts) Invest in people and programs to visit the retirement and school facilities to spread Gods word. Examples: LAMP, Youth for Christ.
133. Only with the utmost caution
134. Only could be continued if they were run by qualified people.
135. With mechanism for cost / benefit / priority controls.
136. The Concept of CEF is still needed but due to lack of trust and the likelihood of a long legal battle, it will probably not be possible to restore the program. The only way to build trust in such a practice is if it was contracted to a private organization subject to all the stringent rules governing financial institutions.
137. If continued more due diligence.
138. Is this a trick question as its the complete opposite of 5.?
139. If continued, how will the investor have security? Why is the Church Workers Benefit Plan secure? It is a blessing that it is. It appears the Lord was left out of the equation in the CEF. It is sad. Our prayer is on a daily basis that God be present and guide this to pleasing end to Him.
140. Shortage of funds and declining membership has led to almost no building or renovation of church facilities. The day may come when this Fund will be needed. It has been very useful in the past. Perhaps it should be treated as a rainy day Fund. But we need to get more lay people involved. Too many pastors are poor financial money managers.
141. I think so as have been required and effective from my limited perspective
142. They will always be needed. As to it being effectively sourced through membership, I don't know.
143. CEFs provide an invaluable service to congregations & allow members a good investment vehicle that benefits the church. They do of course need to be properly managed, which ours is.
144. They were beneficial to many.
145. They need to be administered by organizations that know what they are doing and not turned over to them after they get into trouble Giving away money when these plans are doing well is not a good way of administering
146. Maybe it is still needed and could be useful but members in ABC District have no faith in this program so it should be discontinued.
147. I have personally seen benefit of CEFs at my congregation, and see the value of them. That said, I think perhaps sometimes it is a "crutch" that puts a band-aid on the problems of a congregation that could stand to be better solved by means of effective budgeting/fundraising and fervent prayer for God's provision.
148. Should be administered 'only' by professional financial advisors; and must be mandatory.
149. Church extension funds can be beneficial in helping churches when handled properly. Districts should be accountable to the Synod for the proper handling of these funds.
150. The plans are a wonderful thing but need to be properly administered from the beginning not just when they get into trouble. And giving the money AWAY when a plan is doing well is not the proper way to handle these

151. The reputation of the funds has unfortunately been so tarnished through the scandal that I feel strongly we should dispense with them. I am aware of a BC congregation that paid off its Church Extension loan to take a mortgage through a local credit union at a better rate. If Church Extension is not providing the best rates to churches, it is not helpful.
152. Needs to be restructured so that problems like the current one that the ABC faces are not repeated. Stronger accountability in decision practice needs to be implemented and enforced.
153. I would anticipate the average congregation could probably receive a bank loan these days.
154. There are still, perhaps, occasions where congregations need a loan to build/purchase a building. Could these be found in normal banks?
155. Disagree on the assumption that banks can provide needed financing for congregations. If banks won't provide mortgages to congregations, or without great difficulty, then perhaps a small version of Church Extension Fund could exist, but must have vigorous governance/control/accountability.
156. If the ABC CEF proposed restructuring is approved by creditors, ABC will be obligated to NOT have a CEF or any other similar financial vehicle so the question will be moot for this District. Furthermore, my comments on question 5 also pertain to this issue.
157. I would need to how they are currently used and weigh the pros and cons.
158. If the Church Extension Funds are managed as they have been in the past, I feel they are a great asset to LLC in so many ways.
159. I believe Church Extension Funds have an important place in our church body, however, I would be concerned with how CEFs are governed, used, and the size of projects they cover. If we are going to use left-hand kingdom means to provide for the church, then they need to be governed and administered with left-hand kingdom wisdom and knowledge.
160. I believe that there will be a need for some form of cooperative assistance for congregation's in the future.
161. How else would funding be possible for these types of projects?
162. Their focus needs to be church growth
163. They should be held nationally, managed by professionals and audited annually.
164. Redundant question - discontinued/continued seems to send a mixed message
165. If handled correctly the Church extension fund can greatly help the ministry goals of LCC
166. Am not sure... at present economical loans can be gotten at banks.
167. Helps new congregation - Maybe should have a cap on total of fund and a cap on the total investment of an individual member -
168. I do not have enough information on this subject.
169. Having recently experienced fallout from the CEF crisis and having a new church building financial commitment withdrawn, finding financial coverage from the mainstream banking system is an extremely difficult option. Unless a congregation experiences a catastrophic loss of a building that can be replaced by insurance, it is unlikely a congregation wishing to build a new facility can gather 50% to 60% of their required building cost as a minimum requirement for financing. This is only one requirement in a list of several significant challenges for churches directors.
170. Are needed but someone needs to know how to manage the money. I will not be contributing to any Church Extension Funds.
171. As long as they are managed by financial professionals
172. True. CEF's are needed. However, unless they are managed by qualified personal who have the required credentials they should be discontinued.

173. Again, church extension is a wonderful thing, is still needed and I pray that God will enable our church to expand. This particular fund should be discontinued as it leaves a sour taste in our members' mouths.
174. discontinue due to lack of expertise in managing a CEF and significant liability.
175. They are still the best source of mortgages because CEF plans can be much more flexible on repayment schedules that reflect the seasonal offering patterns of a congregation.
176. Checks and balance are necessary even in a church run activity. There must be adequate and qualified supervision on an on-going basis. Another aspect would be a "narrowing" of the scope of its activity.
177. I strongly agree that they should be continued. I do not agree that they are 'needed.'
178. The Church is not, and should not function, as a bank. The CEF was a blessing in the past but has come to the end of its usefulness.
179. Perhaps with more accountability
180. See above -- ABC has shown us some of the dangers of using these funds in unorthodox ways.
181. Under legal laws like a credit union also insured
182. Very important for young congregations - however there should probably be a cap on the total fund and the maximum investment per member.
183. The monies in these funds can and in most cases are an excellent way for both church and members to manage they're savings and borrowing.
184. From first hand experience, it is still very difficult for congregations to obtain financing for capital projects.
185. With the volatile nature of the economy today, and with restrictive provincial policies and regulations to which the fund must answer (at least in the Central District), there is no need for the church to continue in this arena.
186. Many young congregations would not have a church home without help from Church Ext. - However there could be a cap placed on individual investments -
187. too much is given. if they had to do some fundraising they would spend more wisely.
188. Agree they should be continued for current investors. Disagree about continuing with this fund, as it isn't viable.
189. How else will this work continue? Those who can and are willing to invest should have the opportunity to do so.
190. Aside from the mismanagement of funds and the current debt crisis it is very important that CEFs remain in existence. Without the ability to finance new churches through the CEF it will be very difficult to capture funds for any project. The CEF loan structure provides a source of funding on terms that a church can handle and that the public sector cannot provide. I fear that without a CEF we will see a more rapid decline in church attendance and significantly fewer building projects. However, CEFs need to be operated at arms length to the district/synod so that a bankruptcy does not cause a district collapse like in the ABC district. The decisions in the fund's operation should also be made in a financially-wise manner and not solely on the basis of compassion.
191. It would have helped us to build.
192. There should be a good review committee in place to determine the need and viability of all requests.
193. However, restructured and with proper educated leaders/board in finances & faith in place

194. For now, we need to stop and reassess what we are doing in the area of this kind of financial ministry.
195. Church Extension Funds have served the church (LCC) very well. Proper accountability is always necessary.
196. Our church has benefitted from being able to acquire loans from CEF on more than one occasion to allow for improvements to our church. We also have some money invested in CEF. The East District CEF has provided this financial assistance for loans and investments for churches for many years without any issues. I would like to see this continue.
197. Keep the purpose to build or renovate churches ONLY.
198. Based on the disaster that occurred with the Alberta-BC district CEF funds, these should be returned to investors who invested in good faith and were shafted by the managers of these funds. The people who manage these funds obviously were unable to do so in a reasonable, transparent and accountable manner so get rid of the program.
199. I believe this fund can play an important role in LCC. However, I strongly disagree with each District having and operating a Church Extension Fund. It is my opinion that LCC should have one, nationally operated Church Extension Fund. Contributors should also be made aware of the real purpose of such a fund. In our District, it was promoted as a great way to get maximum financial benefit from your investment, rather than the real purpose.
200. More oversight (professional) is needed.
201. Alternative services have to be sought out to avoid mishaps.
202. CEFs are not run by people who are who are properly trained in finances and as a result poor decisions have been made as well as poor planning.
203. How many sustaining congregations has the Church Extension Fund set up in the last 20 years? Likely none.
204. If Handled properly church extension funds can be very important to the work of LCC.
205. Change to Synod central over gifts none of which are to be subsidized by interest.
206. Would they be able to be managed to get better returns?
207. With proper administration.
208. Funds have a purpose but must be controlled. Should be only one fund across LCC
209. not as a means to generate income for the church but as a way to help missions of the church
210. I agree that they are still needed but I'm not sure if they should be continued.
211. as above...Some churches needing loans would have difficulties getting them in the banking sector. However, there MUST be good and proper management thereof with parameters guiding the loans in order to protect the investors.
212. Some churches would not get outside sources of funding without the CEF. It is VERY important that they are properly managed with strict parameters.
213. We are not in the money management business as required by the CEF.
214. CEF needs much close management and care which involves many people. We are not in the money business and should not be so involved.
215. But only if they are administered by professionals in the field and are separate from districts and head offices.
216. Given current conditions of shrinkage &c., we shall likely not need to erect many more buildings, but we could certainly use a "Church Support Fund," using worldly mammon for the sake of the Kingdom.
217. Sadly, I don't know enough about the issue to make a qualified judgement. However, I believe that they have been a helpful resource in the past.

218. We have an excellent banking system in Canada. There is no need for a Church body to operate a bank. If we're not able to meet their stringent criteria for obtaining a loan/mortgage, then perhaps we should consider whether it's not a safe thing to do it. We might have to wait longer, and perhaps that's a much better thing.
219. the initial intention of the CEF was laudable, but the manner in which it was administered, (especially in ABC) so that high risks were taken (and misrepresented) losses were hidden and the truth suppressed was abominable. The earliest rationale of could be revisited and a new system put in place with rigid controls, visibility and accountability
220. perhaps if something can be put in their place to follow the initial goals with more accountability
221. Banks and credit unions are now willing to lend to congregations and schools for building projects. Their loan rates are competitive and in recent years been less than the CEF lending rate.
222. Is this not the same as question 5? If I answered one way on 5...my answer or comments, there should not require a second question as to whether needed or not.
223. Need to know the rational for this also
224. There may be a place for them, but congregations need to be responsible for their own ministries and needs. We need to think in a different way than simply building churches as we have in the past. There needs to be a new direction in mission and ministry to our society today.
225. CEF adjusted to a smaller scale.
226. What happened in ABC District should not ever be repeated. I have confidence in my support of Central District's handling of CEF. I am sorry this ever happened in LCC.
227. The church no longer needs this method of getting funds to support their mission -banks and other financial institutions do this now.
228. See #5 comments Don't know the needs; how would the average layman know this!
229. Is this the same as Q5? Yup I am awake. Same answer except a small clarification; ABC CEF cannot continue thanks to unfaithful, dishonest, arrogant leadership that is in said district.
230. Their main use should be for cases where traditional financing is not available, or to purchase land which is projected to be a good location for a future church. Right now the Central and East Districts CEFs appear to be functioning according to their charters and generating extra funds to support the church.
231. To throw the baby out with the bath water in not the way to go. The fund is important to help grow the Church and its values. The problem happened when inexperienced people are looking after the fund. No one likes to say no but each project has to be looked at basically the same way a bank would look at a project. Can we get our money back and will we make money? As an example a Congregation comes to you looking for 4 million to expand their Church because they feel it will help them grow. A lot of questions have to be asked before you even consider giving this money. Like is the congregation growing now, how much money has already been put up by the congregation. Etc. Unfortunately, you will probably have to say no and the Church will have to go back and come up with a better plan that meets their needs but does not bankrupt the Church.
232. Churches can increasingly go to commercial banks, or credit unions and get funds for church renos and new missions. We are also not building a lot of churches anymore.

233. should only be continued ONLY IF fund is professionally managed by external and independent firm
234. There is a need for funds in church planting I believe. If there is a safer alternative, that should be explored.
235. managed by professionals and audited regularly by professionals
236. The Bible does not support use of debt, or enslaving the church to its members. All money for any "extension" should be accumulated and saved in advance. God will provide if it is his will to extend anything.
237. Governments and banks alike will increasingly attack Freedom of Religion. WE will need to make funds available among ourselves.
238. I feel that this fund should be in place for future mission churches.
239. Yes, they are a way to assist congregations.
240. -see comments for question 5
241. As commented in point 5, there is a need for this fund as a charitable organization, but that does not mean the church should ignore the rules of governance to manage these funds. There needs to be appropriate oversight and expertise put in place, not a pastor or a member of the church....it needs to be managed by an independent management governance that understands the regulated requirements to manage these funds.
242. See my comments above. CEF programs are necessary but the risk and processes must be more regulated as followed by banking institutions.
243. Strengthen CEF's mission focus as a centre for evangelism.
244. Refer to previous comment on question 5. I believe that there is a class of investments that a CEF should be making that would not be well viewed by mainstream institutions. We are a community of faith and as such I think there are times where our definition of 'risk' may be different. Having said that, there is an ABSOLUTE need for proper diligence in running a CEF. The egregious errors made in the ABC district were not made maliciously but would NEVER have occurred in a fund that has proper oversight, compliance, regulatory, governance structure in place that line up with its vision. Those structure must be done in a professional manner by people trained for such things. And they MUST be held to standards similar, if not identical, to standards the mainstream funds are held to. ..... you would never see a fund run by one of the major FI's with 80% of its assets in a single investment. I could go on, but I won't!
245. The Church is not a bank.
246. At a future time after all has been settled and all members have been paid monies owed. Start this program again. I feel it is a very important program. The problem is if the interest and monetary input is not there CEF will continue to be in the position it is in. Members need to put into it.
247. Torn on this question. I only agree to the CEF being continued IF and ONLY IF it is reformatted and is operated under strict guidelines. No deviations from the original focus of helping churches and schools build. No real estate speculation at all. Also should be audited yearly and no excuses for lack of said audit. Accountable to the investors and the government as well.
248. Secular financial institutions are best-suited when it comes to financial matters. All we have to do is look at the disaster that has befallen the Church Extension Fund in 2015.
249. Only it is for the good of all, hopefully we will be able to recover at least some our loss!

250. This is how we fund the growth and renovations of our churches. WE need to continue to support our congregations. WE also need to ensure that the funds our people put into CEF are placed in appropriate funds so that no one is at risk. These should be audited regularly and professionals need to be involved in the selection of funds/projects.
251. Projects that would be funded by the CEF need to be restricted to church planting and maintenance, and not extended to other church related projects.
252. Nationally
253. Should be continued but as one national entity.
254. It must be separate, the biggest surprise to me was that the monies to operate District, salaries and such were the same as the monies invested in CEF.
255. They can continue but they can not be part of an operating budget.
256. I cannot comment on other Church Extension Funds
257. Good grief, who designed this survey? This is the same question twice, and both have premade judgements within them. Was there any professional oversight by a polling company for this?
258. When properly managed and used for building churches only.
259. I would like to see whether it is serving the "purpose and mission".
260. 2/19/2016 3:30 PM
261. But they need to be managed far differently and policy for use needs to be made clearer. Using them to build schools makes NO SENSE. These funds should be used to upkeep older buildings and used to build new buildings. If we keep allowing congregations to be building "kingdoms on earth" then I'm certain the Lutheran Church in Canada will cease to exist in the very near future.
262. the amount lent should have a ceiling though not any amount
263. Proper oversight is necessary.
264. See above.... when studying gifts given to the church by the Holy Spirit, money management by pastors is not on the list. Leave that to experts.... deal with spiritual issues!
265. East District's fund is well managed and healthy and should continue
266. as long they are professionally managed and transparency is ensured
267. A wonderful resource when managed properly.
268. First, fix it, and don't expect much. Once burned...
269. Members are becoming fewer
270. It may still be difficult for individual congregations to obtain loans from Banks or sources other than our own CEF, under acceptable terms. CEF fulfills this need.
271. Church Extension Funds are still needed only for major repairs or upgrades to buildings in which sustainable mission and ministry is taking place.
272. This ship has sailed unfortunately
273. The original reason for CEF was providing funds to build churches and should continue to be the reason.
274. If they continue, they need to be revamped to account for the tragedy of the ABC district never to be repeated.
275. CEF functions should be carried on, but with proper safeguards to prevent another ABC fiasco.
276. The idea and purpose of the funds are important, yet they can certainly be attained by other means.
277. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.

278. They were needed but have been ruined by mismanagement and poor stewardship. Even if they could be established again, there would not be the trust needed to make them successful. There is a consequence to sin.
279. The functions of CEF should be carried on, but re-organization must be done to the way CEF functions so as to prevent another ABC fiasco.
280. Cooperation between congregations to fund outreach and social initiatives is needed.
281. Those who work with CEF should KNOW how to HANDLE money, be CAREFUL with it, be HONEST.
282. It will probably become harder in the future for churches to receive mortgages from secular lending institutions in the future. A Church Extension Fund is a wonderful way to help our fellow brethren in Christ build churches, as long as THAT is what it is used for. CEFs should NOT be used to prop up struggling congregations (this should be done through Mission funds, not writing off CEF losses as District operating expenses as ABC District has apparently done), and should IN NO CASE be used to build condos in a swamp as part of a District's misguided sense of "Mission" or "Ministry."
283. This is what is known as a check-question. It is meant to balance against the above question. however, because of the added phrase "are still needed" it skews that purpose. one may think CEF should indeed be continued, and also hold that they were never "needed", but were and are simply a good and salutary service we were able to offer.
284. I only disagree with this because I feel that there should be only 1 CEF for LCC as stated above.
285. I don't know enough information.
286. CEF is an important asset, but should be consolidated nationally and be managed by appropriately qualified fund managers. However, should LCC continue to decline in membership and doesn't outreach into more communities then CEF would not be needed.
287. More professional supervision and checks may be required.
288. Perhaps in the short term, but a plan to discontinue them should be made.
289. See above. Hopefully we're learning something about the need to properly vet loan applications to insure lenders' ability to repay and protect the funds of investors.
290. As long as they are operated properly and safely
291. If the focus is on missions, not the accumulation and securing of dollars. Perhaps the word "extension" needs greater emphasis in CEF.
292. I can't speak for East and Central District. Much depends on whether or not banks and other lending institutions will loan to churches.
293. But since few congregations are building churches, perhaps the focus should be adjusted to support struggling ministries and new work in missions.
294. Same question as #5. Why the repetition?
295. Only if it is managed by people who are qualified in these type of funds. Must also strengthen and re-establish the needed trust in directing the funds
296. If the church can benefit from it when needed and it is looked after properly
297. Agree subject to 'Christian business plans and information being relayed to each ind. Congregation using CEF or not. (context see Q.5,7)
298. Care, of course, needs to be taken to not tie the work of CEF to the operations of the District or Synod in a financial dependent way. CEF provides a valuable resource that congregations can access. It provides an avenue for members to contribute to the work of the church at large. However, it needs to be carefully managed so that congregations can count on it to

continue and contributors are assured that their funds are as secure as possible. CEF should exist and needs to be run in a way that engenders trust. If it cannot exist on its own merits and success, and run by those competent in the financial fields in which it operates, then it will not be trusted and it will fall on its own.

299. Just take care of the growth of the Word, and only that.
300. There is a need for making disciples, not buildings.
301. It may very well be that the funds could be "needed", but the management this far has proven that there is no one capable of managing such financial matters.
302. It looks as thought there was a lack of professional, financial oversight. Assets were very badly allocated. There was no proper plan for withdrawals. Such an unprofessional investment should never have been pushed as a safe place for people to put their savings. It would have been OK as some sort of a charitable donation for church buildings, never as a safe investment. More should have been done to explain that there was no CDIC membership or cover.
303. Only if it is managed by people who are qualified to direct and manage these type of funds. We need to strengthen and re-establish the needed trust in directing these funds.
304. I think this is supposed to be a "mirror" of #5, but it's not the exact opposite...I provided my comments in #5.
305. Only if it is managed by people who are qualified to direct and manage these types of funds but believe that at the same time, as you can well understand, the trust will need to be re-established
306. There would have to be better oversight, financial management and disclosure. The use of funds collected cannot be changed based on some small group's preferences.
307. Please see comments above. CEF should also be set apart from the operating budgets of whatever organization the church takes. They should only be utilized for the purpose intended i.e. to help build new/renovate/add to existing structures. They can be an excellent alternative to other financial institutions.
308. Under the present conditions and track record, no. Needs 100% restructuring and a binding re-payment structure and intent scale.
309. Is this the same as Q5? Yup I am awake. Same answer except a small clarification; ABC CEF cannot continue thanks to unfaithful leadership.
310. People have lost faith in the ability of the church to administer this type of service so probably won't support it.
311. See previous comments. They should be totally autonomous.
312. But needs qualified administration personnel not just pastors
313. These funds were meant to help start new churches. Have we in LCC stopped planting new churches? If we have, then let us get back on track to use the money for what it was intended for.
314. Yes, the CEF should be continued to build new churches and only new churches.
315. Think!!!!!.....who is qualified to look after it .... Dumb question
316. We believe the church should not be involved in lending money with interest. Psalm 15:5
317. Only if managed in a fiscally responsible way.
318. See answer above - If there is a genuine need and benefit it could carry on --for building of churches!!
319. Banks are less expensive and based on issues we are dealing with now in ABC the trust is gone. Synod and District Boards are not put together for their expertise on business matters

320. CEF is an excellent way for people to invest in the work of the church. These plans obviously need to be supervised by those who have financial experience and who listen to the numbers rather than their hearts.
321. These could be continued only if handled as a business dealing, administered by those with best business and accounting practice. The elected Church officials may not necessarily have these skills.
322. Those who wish to support the original objectives should still be able.
323. CEF has a role in the life of the LLC congregations. Must be managed and supervised by individuals or organizations that are not influenced by Clergy or individuals who have limited or no financial management training.
324. Isn't this already covered by the previous question?
325. a whole lot of changes would have to be made
326. Church Extension did lots of good and helped get many church's things they needed
327. At some point CEF will likely become unsustainable across LCC. At that point continuing won't be an option. Until then it can be a valuable service to the congregations of the synod as long as it is well managed.
328. As per above, I would need to see evidence that the fund was helpful in actually extending or benefiting the church.
329. Combine into one fund, one management and tighten rules for use.
330. Don't repeat yourself. See question 5. This is an example of the church wasting time and funds on things not needed.
331. It is a great benefit to those newer congregations to receive support from the CEF....but maybe it should be limited to Church buildings in the future.
332. Church extension funds ought not to be run by the church, but an independent charity to benefit the church.
333. This has been a useful tool to enhance church buildings and schools.
334. They must be administered as a business.
335. At least until alternate forms of funding for church expansion are developed.
336. The CEF should not be a risk-taking money-making venture
337. Yes, I agree. However, rates need to be reasonably looked at to market rates. Our church mortgage was able to get 4 or 5% lower from a private bank than from CEF - tough to compete with that, so no wonder the churches in good standing have been pulling their mortgages out leaving CEF with a heavy portion of delinquent outstanding mortgages.
338. The funds were not used in the manner that they were intended for in the first place so why would we think different now
339. Consider that CEF is not only a source of loans for congregations and missions. It is also way that congregations and LSOs can deposit money, earn money and help out their brothers and sisters in LCC at the same time. In a time when it is getting increasingly difficult to get congregational treasurers, it is a blessing when they only have to deal with two accounts -- a chequing account and a savings account with CEF -- and not have to investigate different possible investment vehicles.
340. Again - from where we are, there seem to only be great things happening.
341. this has helped many congregations
342. Only if properly administered, not by pastors who are not qualified.
343. This is a duplicate question from question 5 but is the antithesis.

344. My understanding was that CEFs were to be used for assisting congregations with the building of churches or renovating churches. I don't think these funds should be used for building Lutheran complexes (e.g. senior homes, community buildings, schools)
345. See above. I do believe if it was structured and used for the purpose it was originally intended for it could be a good thing.
346. Following STRICT Policy & Procedures, the East District CEF has produced a profit from investment that assists the Mission work of the East District and provided a share of the profit to each congregation in the district in 2015
347. In good and God fearing districts - they are a blessing to churches
348. Credit unions and most banks are now willing to lend money to church congregations for building and renovation projects. The Districts no longer to provide that service.
349. A Church should not be involved in the banking business with volunteers in charge. Even Jesus threw money handlers from the temple.
350. If it works it is fine.
351. If the investments are not needed for building churches, then the yearly surplus should be used to pay for Canadian missionaries to our large cities and various immigrant communities. This then would be a "spiritual church extension fund."
352. This was and is a VERY BAD IDEA!
353. I strongly believe that when a church building is erected, the moneys for it need to be collected in advance as much as possible. That would free up the money collected through offerings and tithes to be used more wisely (to pay for the workers' salaries and to give where it is needed. To fulfill "Blessed to be a blessing". What has happened in AB/BC is not only embarrassing (the world is watching us) but it is also highly divisive and it creates hard feelings within the church's body. What kind of example are we giving to others??
354. We need to have professional people involved in church investments, pastors should be pastors, let people trained in investing do that for us LCC and each district for a fee.
355. Larger pool of funds, but must have fund managers that will be in compliance of gov't regulations in financial securities and also to learn from what happened in Alberta.
356. There seems to be a lot of churches, and creative ways could be used to share facilities. Also, churches could borrow internally from their memberships if needs arise.
357. The work of our church could be greatly enhanced by the continuation, however parishioner, and investor confidence is at such a low, I doubt it would be supported.
358. With exceptional management
359. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
360. Is this the same as Q5? Yup I am awake. Same answer except ABC cannot continue.
361. but operated by professional money managers and not pastors
362. Not in the Districts....
363. If we do have them then they should be overseen by people who know what they are doing
364. The church extension funds should be continued, but monitored and checked into regularly by competent, trustworthy people.
365. It is unfortunate that an LCC regulatory body appointed by the President or the BOD does not exist. This body may have alert and protected "investors" in the ABC extension. This body could be made up of knowledgeable laypeople and non-Lutherans (at arm's length) with an education in finances and government revenue experience. It could be chaired by one pastor.
366. But they must be handled properly, not gambled.

367. I agree, but never again would I contribute or invite others to contribute. I invited others to contribute and now they are shafted. I bear their anger and disgust as does the church. Integrity has been lost.
368. Why do you need question 5 AND question 6? They are getting at the exact same answer.
369. Needs good management
370. Same as the above, the people involved should be more aware of what is happening with the finances etc.
371. CEF should ensure risk management and arms length decision processes so as not to invite the types of circumstances where one organization dominates the loan portfolio of the whole CEF
372. Clearly, they were being abused.
373. once abused / twice and many more times forever avoided
374. I have been a member of many congregations over the last 50 years and each congregation has benefited from Church Extension Funds for their church buildings plus their Lutheran schools so YES CEF has helped my congregations in the past and should be continued. I personally know of a number of congregations & schools who continue to need assistance.
375. Unfortunately, not likely to restore enough trust unless previous misspending, misuse of monies has been redirected back to members
376. CEFs are in a better position to demonstrate their value.
377. It is my understanding that Church Extension Funds were created as an avenue for church bodies to borrow funds to build or repair church buildings. Churches don't usually qualify for regular ways of borrowing, such as a bank, so church extension filled that void. I think a back to basics approach could be in order though, and by that I mean, focus on the original intent. RRSP, term deposits, TFSA's and the like can be purchased by individuals in a number of ways, so perhaps, church extension funds are not necessary for that. It is always important to remember, a bank does not act like a church, and a church cannot act like a bank.
378. They should be used as a source of funding for churches that need loans for repairs and building.
379. The abuse of the CEF investors in the ABC district is unprecedented. Not to mention the fact the CEF aided the ABC district leadership and board to adhere to a bastardized definition of "missions" which still exists to this day.
380. Why does the East District offer deposit rates that are double what regular financial institutions offer (100% higher than banks)? & therefore has to charge borrowing congregations correspondingly more on their loans?
381. So LCC wants CEF to continue. IMAGINE! Well, why not? A great idea. Let me suggest a qualifier; that all administrators from ABC, be the first ones to submit all their life savings to equal the missing $100m. That provides a solid foundation to move forward and I will b e the administrator. What could be better? And we’re all happy.
382. A review of the purpose of CEF's should be a regular occurrence in order to ensure that they function properly. The current ABC problem is corrupt leadership that misused its CEF funds for their own glory. Something like "building your house" on sand.
383. They offer only distraction from what the church is truly all about.
384. At this time, the church infrastructure is bigger than required. Space for new members is available. Aging infrastructure will require funding of course, however, with the decline of the church membership due to attrition by aging and the lack of evangelism interest by LCC

corporate, there is little likelihood of growth enough to sustain funding of the current infrastructure. The outcome of not growing LCC membership will be failure of local churches and consolidation.

385. B/c our interest rates are so low it is not as important a service. If this changes to high rates again it would be needed.
386. Isn't this question similar to 5? I don't understand how it is different.
387. Funds are still needed but the mandate needs to be broadened.
388. Maybe this source of income could be used to provide seed money strictly for mission projects (staff, resources, etc.) instead of church buildings/properties. When a mortgage is required for buildings or properties for any need (mission congregation, renovations, etc.) then a mortgage from a bank would be the appropriate financial resource.
389. We need missions.
390. Perhaps there should just be better management of these funds.
391. Demographics reveal the LCC church number have fallen. Building new churches is simply not happening. The survival of LCC needs to be radically altered beginning with the resignation of Robert Bugbee for his ineffectual leadership and failure to grasp important issues.
392. For established churches they should be able to borrow from the banks but for the start up churches (new) there is maybe a need for financial help.
393. The fund should only be operated for the purpose of assisting congregations to be established and / or grow in service to the mission of the church.
394. But as separate, accountable to their members' plans.
395. See comment above. Where else can a congregation secure a loan for expansion, repairs, etc.? Our congregation recently applied to our financial institution for a small loan to deal with an unexpected maintenance issue. The financial institution rejected our request for a loan because they were worried that they would receive bad press if they were forced to foreclose on a church in the event that we were not able to pay back our loan.
396. I see the need a venue for congregations to have access to low interest loans for building repairs etc. However, I would expect a repeat of ABC district fiasco if you trust the clergy who have very little experience with large amounts of money to maintain the fund.
397. Consolidate in Winnipeg into 1 fund.
398. I just answered this in #5. If well-managed, they can be a useful resource for the church. But the Synod/District Board should not be overseeing these unless ecclesiastical work is removed from their work as well.
399. But the people who are handling it need to be capable, accountable, honest, ethical, transparent, not arrogant, and not have a sense of entitlement.
400. New churches should be "daughtered" by existing congregations where there is strong accountability and responsibility.
401. But need to be handled by people who are honest, transparent, knowledgeable, ethical, not arrogant, and do not have a sense of entitlement.
402. The one problem would be congregations who don't qualify for bank/Faith Life Financial loans, but such congregations probably shouldn't have loans in the first place. Financial aid to congregations like this should probably be provided through the LCC mission budgets and not through CEF.
403. The money is still needed but not under the same system as before

404. Churches rely on extension funds to secure much needed loans for growth and repairs. However, the extension funds do need tighter oversight and regulations.
405. Yes, with careful supervision and caps on the size of individual loans church extension funds are an excellent solution to church capital funding needs.
406. As noted above they are useful for soliciting funds for general church purposes.
407. Congregations need to show some financial viability in making their loan payments. I was part of two different congregations, both owing lots to the CEF and both who never paid principal for many years. That shouldn't be allowed.
408. It is no longer possible to have confidence in this type of investment.
409. We deserve the temporal punishment that comes in the form of not having Church Extension Funds.
410. Get out of the area or have it totally separate from the Ecclesiastical leaders as they have done in Australia which acts more like a credit union, at arms length from the National and district leadership.

7. District Church Extension Funds should be merged into one synodical Church Extension Fund.

1. I do not know enough about this business to agree or disagree.
2. probably the best plan.
3. reasoning based on the ABC District problem.
4. Get legal advice how to create credit union style fund.
5. This might be the answer.
6. Just as the "church" itself is one body we must all work together.
7. Synod is working together.
8. Just as the "church" itself is one body we must all work together.
9. It requires more at hand knowledge of investors and recipients.

a. the events over the ABC district CEF are a reason to keep them separate

10. I don't know! Especially what happened in ABC district.
11. Explain how this has to do with restructuring.
12. Each district knows best how to spend their funds.
13. The thought of this option troubles me. If a synodical CEF were to go through similar problems that AB-C District's CEF went through, then LC-C itself could potentially go bankrupt. I don't like that idea. I think it may be best if CEF were its own entity. That way, if it makes poor investment decisions and goes bankrupt, then only the CEF and its investors will suffer; the districts and the synod would not be effected. For that same reason, perhaps some might argue that it is best to merge it into the synod. That way, if the CEF goes under, the synod can do what AB-C District did and CEF's investors would be left with something instead of nothing.
14. we are done, lost all privilege, LCC is friends with District people, no trust and no declaration of conflict with no arms length action.
15. As an investor into LCCFM, the Synod management practices and outcomes of the existing funds is not communicated well.
16. To secure the proper resources and skills to manage investments, there should be one fund with strong management and reporting functions.

17. Perhaps? Without more information about what this would entail, it's impossible to know if the benefits would outweigh the disadvantages.
18. I don't know what this would look like or how it would operate, but there would be consistency across the districts (if they remain).
19. It depends how it is organized. It should be a separately incorporated entity, so that the troubles of the ABC district are not repeated.
20. Likely a good idea, as long as good controls are in place.
21. It would perhaps be easier to know all outcomes and needs - more experience in finance is perhaps needed
22. Give it back to the individual churches who donated it to be used for local mission work.
23. Possibly if more knowledgeable people would agree.
24. If we've already had major issues with mismanagement of funds, why would we want to continue this on a larger scale? The people serving in district have great skills with acting as a pastor and serving the spiritual needs of the people in the districts and synods, but there is no reason to involve the church with the financial aspects of the synod. Please leave the financial aspect to those who are knowledgeable in that area and stopping trying to insert church leadership in an area they know little about!
25. Church extension funds should cease to exist. The church is not a bank.
26. Give people back their money before it is too late!!
27. I believe that direct District involvement to oversee the needs of each District is better served by the diversity of each District.
28. This might allow better and more effective administration.
29. Learn from your mistakes we do not want to see a repeat of what happened in the ABC District
30. A professional 3rd party financial management service incorporated along with depositor insurance.
31. There are many legal questions to answer to accomplish this.
32. Close all Extension Funds - unless you can get deposit insurance
33. Do we need such a fund?
34. The entire CEF program must be eliminated at all levels. It is a catastrophe.
35. This is an even worse idea than individual district CEFs! Money should be managed at the congregational level, with congregations helping each other, their members, and missionaries directly.
36. Presuming it is prudent to do so, this would seem to be a solution for the aspirations of church mission.
37. If CEF do continue, then yes, should fall under the banner of Synod
38. If this was the case the entire fund would have been in jeopardy as did happen with the ABC district.
39. Depends on how the fund is managed.
40. I would agree if the unified fund was managed by a third party fund management company.
41. Yes, but must be handled by financial firm knowledgeable with such funds - absolutely no church involvement other than to promote fund's existence and of course, some involvement in disbursement recommendations.
42. This question presupposes that CEF will continue to exist.
43. Simplification would be easier.

44. This could be something better or could end up worse. If there is no proper study of what has gone wrong, we would just move the problem to a higher place with a larger impact when it fails. If the purpose of the fund is to fund projects at the district level, then this will not make things better. Over all it is not the fund but the way it is used causes the problems. If it is a money fund set primarily to make money, then it should have no place in the church. If it has guidelines to insure the fund does not suffer unduly but supports church work from each district, then it should remain in practice.
45. feelings, etc. in ABC district preclude any future
46. close them
47. Having regional funding sources is important.
48. If the goal is to operate as one unit (which I believe we should do) then yes It would seem that administration costs would be reduced but more importantly. that accountability would be in one area.
49. The problems in Alberta - British Columbia were big enough to sink a single, merged Church Extension Fund ... so continuing to avoid having "all our eggs in one basket" seems a good idea.
50. They should be eliminated. If they continue we need only ONE level of administers and definitely not clergy. It would make me feel a whole lot more comfortable if LCC could see the value of helping correct the financial mess at ABC-CE and give at least some relief to investors. This whole situation should never have been allowed to get to this point before LCC stepped in. It is SHAMEFULL if not CRIMINAL.
51. I see no evidence to support the idea that synodical control of the Church Extension Fund would be any better than District control.
52. Must be able and responsible to unique geographical variances.
53. Yes, but completely managed by outside firm. Church involvement should only be in advising/promoting existence of the fund.
54. Wouldn't that be like putting all your eggs in one basket? What happens if losses, not gains, are realized?
55. Better banking practices needed to build confidence in CEF. Don't let the troubles from ABC happen again!
56. Carefully administered this might make sense although with a disaster like ABC district this could put Synod at risk.
57. Clearly, the ABC district model CANNOT be followed. Perhaps the models of other districts can be.
58. Due for recent events in ABC many are severely traumatized and yet if it is managed well it can be a common source of extending the Church
59. Both separate or merged CEFs could work well.
60. Banking/finance is very complicated. A church organization does not have the expertise for this activity. Also it is difficult to remove the spiritual aspect from the process of lending and/or collecting money when congregations are in trouble or get into financial trouble.
61. Could be a good idea, but I don't know if this is legally possible given that regulations can vary from province to province.
62. managed by a qualified person
63. I agree but only if we hire a professional management and adhere to their mandate.
64. Something to be considered once the current problems have been resolved.
65. Should be dismantled.

66. It just makes sense in a church body of our size.
67. No. If they would have been in one fund as in the ABC we would have all been in trouble. There should be more stringent and more accountable.
68. I am not personally active in the fund so will allow those who are to respond intelligibly
69. One governing body. Equity loans with assets collateral guarantee.
70. I believe Church Extension Funds have an important place in our church body, however, I would be concerned with how CEFs are governed, used, and the size of projects they cover. If we are going to use left-hand kingdom means to provide for the church, then they need to be governed and administered with left-hand kingdom wisdom and knowledge.
71. there are pros & cons both ways
72. My major concern would be associated with administration cost which should go down.
73. i.e. if we would have been grouped together with the group in charge of the ABC fund we would all be in trouble now. There need to be more regulation about do and don't with the use of the funds so a repeat of the ABC fiasco never happens again.
74. Probably but administered by a financial institution.
75. What is the risk by having it in one fund? The advantage is hopefully better management of the fund and more streamlined, but possibly making for greater risk as well. I know from the management side, it is probably better to have this centrally managed and would recommend merging to one fund.
76. As long as professional people are running it and it is being properly audited.
77. I am not sure about this
78. If it continues, yes, we don't need duplication of services.
79. Not with the ABC District situation. now on the books.
80. If it is competent and wise stewardship and stiff regulations that are adhered to.
81. Funds can be managed more carefully on a district level. Districts have more knowledge of congregations that make up a District.
82. Agree if this is manageable.
83. If it cuts down on administration costs
84. This is a poorly chosen survey question. More information is needed. Would such an action put the synod or a new CEF at risk of a potential lawsuit? It is unlikely that they could simply be merged, though the question gives that impression. Would they need to be shut down and "restarted"?
85. Each district has different needs
86. Maybe. Not sure what the pros and cons of this would be.
87. See comments under #6. This could only be done with the right structure in place and at the cost of hiring expert managers. It is too risky to have Pastors and Board members look after financial matters for which they do not have appropriate education, experience and skills
88. however, I do not have a reason as to why.
89. IF something is again mismanaged, because we all live in a sinful world, it is far easier to contain a single district collapse than a synodical one that would collapse the entire support system. Don’t be putting all of your eggs into one basket.
90. At present we have three distinct Districts with their own peculiarities. To try and merge them all into one would be a disaster. The East may not understand the needs of the western churches the same as the West does not understand how the eastern churches operate. We may be a national church but our Districts are distinct in how they operate.
91. Synod should not have all financial power.

92. it seems unlikely that separate plans are necessary
93. Is it possible?
94. The districts are separate and as such so should the funds be.
95. Only if overseen by a Synodical Board of Directors designated committee
96. This would be a consideration as there would be more efficiency in larger numbers and one administration.
97. See my answers to the previous two questions. Regional oversight may be appropriate. Pooling of resources may be beneficial.
98. Geography would be a challenge. CEF involves managing property, which is subject to regional and local market conditions, and municipal bylaws and development plans.
99. I think a District level fund would be closer touch with the needs of the congregations they serve.
100. The Churches are not equipped to handle this. When you have Pastors control and manage outside their Spiritual core business< you have entered the Road of Glory vs. the Cross.
101. Depends on the safeguards in place. Could be at the District level. The problem in the ABC district would appear to have been related to taking an unacceptable risk by extending too much credit to one project.
102. Hopefully bigger would be more effective.
103. If CEF still exists, there should be only one fund run by professional financial people.
104. I'm still not sure how many people will choose the church as it's investment strategy because of the last 14 months. I won't.
105. see above. If this would be better financially, then maybe they should
106. Only after they pay back the investors 100% of their invested money that (District totally mishandled.)
107. If accountability was missing before, what safeguards will be put into place, and more importantly, monitored and enforced?
108. There would have to be a way to ensure that the whole of Synod is not brought down by things such as ABC is experiencing. There would also need to be a way to appropriately distribute the funds based on the depositors' area and wishes.
109. Agree as long as they are properly managed and not allowed to put "all their eggs in one basket". Should be a stand alone entity so they don't affect the "church." Suggest that they it be modeled on the East District CEF as it seems to be well managed. Excess income should be distributed to the congregations after retaining a surplus.
110. if they do, they need to be staffed by certified professions, not church workers
111. Every district is a different size, with differing number of congregations, with differing needs and differing amounts of moneys being deposited into the Church Extension Fund. Therefore, I feel it would be better if each district managed their own Church Extension Fund. That way individuals who contribute to the fund would know that the money is helping Churches/Individuals within the district they reside and participate in a Congregation also within that district.
112. The Synod does not need to own and operate what amounts to a Lutheran bank at all. Assuming the flaw with the CEF was simply in its geographical isolation from the rest of synod does not get at the heart of the issue for me. Yes, the other two CEF's are solvent, but even so I don't feel they are appropriate business for synod to engage in.
113. Then the people on the board are at arm's length from any projects the fund supports. They should not sit on multiple boards and have conflict of interest

114. I think CEF has been of great help in the past but not sure it is anymore. If this fund is necessary, then I think it should be Synod based rather than District based.
115. This would definitely allow the administrative costs to be applied to fewer; qualified' people who would be in a better position to male qualified decisions in the administration of the funds should people still consider putting their trust in such a fund.
116. Lay managers in each district should manage their own CEF's -With full consulting between all districts
117. I just don't have enough financial knowledge to answer but in light of the ABC financial issues, I am glad things weren't merged earlier and maybe it is a good idea to so to speak keep eggs in separate baskets...I guess it depends if this whole survey/restructuring is leading towards a total dissolution of districts....
118. As long as the funds are evenly distributed to all Districts without bias or weighting in any one area
119. where well managed
120. If they are continued, yes, indeed!
121. Get rid of Church Extension Funds.
122. I'm not sure I see a benefit to a national CEF
123. Maybe could be looked at.
124. The pool of money would be larger and better directed to where needed.
125. It's too late for ABC district, but the other ones should remain as is for better local control.
126. If the goals are the same and everyone is not fighting over too little money, then they should be merged. People forget it is a mission.
127. If at all, it should cover the whole synod.
128. I think this could work. Like many facets of business in our Synod, there seems to be much duplication.
129. Although outside my area of knowledge, this seems to be a reasonable suggestion.
130. I am uncertain of the proper form. On one hand the consolidation of funds will provide a centralised and theoretically more stable fund. On the other hand, multiple funds provide more options for congregations (possibly for inter-district funding) and will somewhat disassociate the fund from synod as a whole in case of a collapse.
131. Am not sure what that would look like. May be Ok as long as the other districts and synod do not have to bail out the ABC CEF.
132. Not enough information on this.
133. Not enough information to make a decision.
134. If CEF is to be continued, should have only one CEF instead of three. Should operate independently and not report to a District
135. I see no detriment or benefit except for the congregations of the ABC District who are now without a fund.
136. Managing of funds should be left to financial professionals, in financial institutions. The church should NOT be in the business of managing or making money.
137. In my belief, would lose control of regional matters which are important and would risk the impact of ill made decisions which could effect the greater good as a whole.
138. If this could be achieved, Synodical oversight could prevent what happened in the ABC District.
139. Seems like it would be a more economical way to operate.
140. if they are continued

141. Perhaps. I'm sure we all think that CEFs should be better managed in future, and if a centrally-controlled CEF would lead to better management practices, this should be done.
142. I would have to know how the fund was to be managed before offering support or not offering support for the concept. The Prince of Peace compound east of Calgary should have been a "cash cow" for the church.
143. That would depend on the initial setup. Definitely be open and in-depth discussion?
144. I think that merging them would dilute any efforts to improve oversight and governance. Plus, it would open the potential for even larger single loans.
145. making allowances for individual circumstances
146. As long as the directorship represents the needs of the entire synod.
147. The funds to be used for the mission God has directed us to spread His word.
148. This would admit tighter control via a national Board of Directors. Moreover, this may have adverted the recent difficulties experienced by BC-AB District.
149. HISTORY HAS SHOWN THAT THIS MAY NOT BE A GOOD PLAN
150. If continued, this would be the best option but must ensure the fund is competently managed.
151. Once again only if it is run by qualified people.
152. How to equitably prioritize?
153. In concept merging all District CEF's would improve efficiency and economy. However, the legal battles which will soon begin will make District CEF mergers impossible.
154. See # 6. How is this possible with what is happening in the ABC district?
155. Maybe if we had one fund, we might have avoided the problems we now have. Even Districts are in competition. Who is the greatest? How many years have we been trying to merge?
156. believe that savings would result
157. Yes, if a church extension fund is necessary
158. I think because of importance and liability should have professional management and oversight
159. Believe 1 fund, 1 manager would reduce costs and make more funds available
160. The Synod has no business owning and operating a bank.
161. The current structure allows for more local input, means those in charge have more local knowledge in terms of extending loans, & allows for policies that can adapt to regional circumstances and needs.
162. recent occurrence of A-BC District would make one CEF unequal across Canada
163. should be managed within each district, and information, resources, etc. be shared nationally.
164. Hard to say on this one, given the recent issues that came from the former ABC district.
165. The Synod needs to ensure that the Extension funds be managed and dispersed in an appropriate manner.
166. I believe this is the way to go but again it needs proper administration of the plan
167. The separation by district saved LCC-East District from the ABC disaster.
168. As church members and pastors, why do we think that qualifies us to run a financial institution? Running any kind of financial service has become far more complicated than the initiators of the fund ever envisioned and should be left to those whose expertise is in finances.
169. If they must continue, one national fund is better. However, it must be overseen by competent financial managers and board members who have financial acumen and are not afraid to ask hard questions.

170. In the event that the CEFs continue, I would prefer they be merged into one structure with greater oversight.
171. If they continue, they should be merged.
172. If they're merged, it means that wealthier districts can help out the poorer ones. Resources should be centralized.
173. There should be no CEP, but if there is, it should be 1 for Synod.
174. Too difficult to monitor and treat each need individually, when funds are being used.
175. If feasible legally and if amalgamation makes the best sense.
176. So you want my ignorant opinion about something I know nothing about. It seems to me that this question requires a great deal of research about legal requirements, federal laws, accountability which I, and might I add probably none of your respondents, have the ability or inclination to do. Another poor question in my view.
177. We could refer to the western district getting into quite a mess with this. If this were an option, experts must be in charge and held accountable.
178. I believe Church Extension Funds have an important place in our church body, however, I would be concerned with how CEFs are governed, used, and the size of projects they cover. If we are going to use left-hand kingdom means to provide for the church, then they need to be governed and administered with left-hand kingdom wisdom and knowledge.
179. I think that this might be good, but again, I think that the decision should be assessed fully first.
180. Districts would suspect that funding-decisions could play favourites.
181. Maybe Alberta wouldn't be in trouble if more overseeing was done.
182. The church should not be in the financial business.
183. Let the ones that deal with this deal with it. The ordinary church member doesn't know or care.
184. This is a better idea - 1 body for 1 church (LCC)
185. If they want the District and Synod to be together in agreement as one, then I would agree.
186. Discontinue all CEFs.
187. Since the ABC District is being restructured, this may be a good idea.
188. May eliminate some overlap - however if merged the Districts should approve any requests before going to Synod board
189. I'm not well-informed
190. That would put the whole LCC church in danger not just one District (Alberta B.C.)
191. Looking at what occurred in the ABC District is a prime example to keep them separate
192. I believe that one synodical CEF could be established. I see no need to duplicate administrations across the country especially when we have now experienced the result of not having qualified fund and loan managers in place to handle the transactions. CEF can no longer be a line item on the books of the District or handled as a convenient slush fund to be disbursed as a fallback bank account.
193. I think that existing CEF investors should be approached and asked to consider changing the status of their investment to a donation, or their funds returned and the fund dissolved.
194. I am not sure that 'bigger' is always better.
195. its time to start a wind down of CEF, now would be a good time for ABC CEF to shut down entirely. and likely central district too if there is anything left of it.
196. On the one hand, there would be greater resources to work with than local plans; on the other, it may be much more difficult to access a mortgage.

197. Problems have shown the need for separate Funds -- Checks and balance are necessary even in a church run activity. There must be adequate and qualified supervision on an on-going basis. Another aspect would be a "narrowing" of the scope of its activity
198. With proper organization and supervision, this could function in a very positive way.
199. We're all in this together; the separate districts never made that much sense to me anyway. They seem like a sort of unnecessary appendage left over from when we were LCMS, as if were trying to not be ignored.
200. Perhaps, but not to the detriment of requests from outlaying communities in favor of large centers, and not to the detriment of any particular district(s). One major change needs to happen and fast. Ministers must not be in a power position in any way in managing this fund. People well educated and licenced in financial affairs such as accountants and auditors must manage this fund with input from Synod & District presidents, and Board of Directors to ensure proper management / stewardship of these funds.
201. The Church is not, and should not function, as a bank. The CEF was a blessing in the past but has come to the end of its usefulness.
202. Have a good accountable system
203. There may be some serious legal issues with this. However, economy of scale works in favour of this option.
204. People will participate first according to local/geographical interest because they want to see the results of the CEF. Second they MIGHT give to a Synodical-managed CEF.
205. With fewer new congregations and the reduced need for church extension, one fund may provide better control. If this happened the District should approve requests before going to Synod board.
206. Whatever makes the most sense based upon the structure that comes out of this process should rule a potential merger of CEFs.
207. This would certainly need very careful management. There would be significant monies invested.
208. IF that is legally possible and if it is professionally managed.
209. Strength in numbers and more accountability.
210. There should be no CEF's
211. If it makes sense then yes, it MAY be better served by experienced people if it were centralized. You have detailed the benefits or downside of centralizing and that analyses should be done before making a decision like that.
212. Perhaps, but once again, the checks and balances need to be FIRMLY established and followed. CEF should be a service to the synod, not a burden or a problem!
213. The ABC District is a prime example of why the 3 should not be merged.
214. There is no need for this--let them die, but recognize with thanks to God the benefits they have provided to many congregations in the past.
215. With what has happened in the ABC District compared to how the East District is handling its Church Extension Fund it shows how having separate Funds can be managed. The East District growth benefited both East District congregations and LCC.
216. This maybe an area of overlap - however IF one Synod fund - the Districts should be required to consider the request and approve before going to Synod fund board. Would such a move create greater control and overall savings???
217. People want to see where their investment is going. That means limited distance. Anything else would be seen as a donation and that would be limited!

218. I am uncertain of the proper form. On one hand the consolidation of funds will provide a centralised and theoretically more stable fund. On the other hand, multiple funds provide more options for congregations (possibly for inter-district funding) and will somewhat disassociate the fund from synod as a whole in case of a collapse.
219. I think that if this were done, it might tend to become an avenue for territorial favouritism.
220. I'm not aware of all the various district funds and how they work together or don't work together.
221. Church Extension Funds have served the church (LCC) very well. Proper accountability is always necessary. At present they can assist one another with surplus funds.
222. East District CEF has successfully operated for many years with excellent supervision by its directors. There has been issues in ABC District and I am not aware of any issues with the Central District.
223. With the proper oversight.
224. This would save on costs and allow the hiring of someone with fund management experience. Run it as a business not as the Christian thing to do even if the investment is not viable.
225. So you can hide more money? No thanks.
226. This would be monolithic and very likely unresponsive to local conditions.
227. Real estate is a business where local knowledge is absolutely vital. Making financial decisions in Winnipeg for a congregation in Petawawa is begging for trouble.
228. I think they should be discontinued altogether.
229. CEF's should be DONE AWAY WITH not reconstituted into one synodical CEF
230. If anything has to be done this would be best. Have a strong (smart) administration.
231. They should not exist on the district or synodical level. We do not have people trained in finance to run these things.
232. Forget about church bureaucracies.
233. The Synod needs to ensure that CEF investments and disbursements are handled to protect investors and lending promotes church growth.
234. Give money back, close present and form a gift only mission building fund.
235. Who would manage them to make sure the districts would maintain the proportions they had originally invested?
236. If there is one synodical extension fund and it experiences financial problems, it has the potential to endanger the financial stability of the entire church; whereas, if it is localized to a District, the financial problems are more contained.
237. This CEF MUST however be modelled along the lines of the Central District CEF and have more checks and balances than the ABC District CEF did!
238. If this is to get the West off the hook for their problems, then I strongly disagree with merging.
239. All Church Extension funds should be discontinued.
240. I can see benefits to having individual and joint funds. The challenge with one fund is ensuring equitable distribution across the country - we would need administrators who were able to see both the broad picture and the specific needs of congregations and geographic areas.
241. idea that there is strength in numbers - larger contribution base and therefore possibly more accessible assistance for church missions
242. Existing funds should be returned to depositors

243. Disagree, but there should be synodical oversight. Have a "standard " practice of operation for all districts
244. If the CEF is to continue it should be synodical and incorporated separately from synod and operated primarily by people who have financial training.
245. I feel each one has its benefits. I also feel if the funds are merged, it could become too large which can cause less accountability to members
246. If so, there MUST be good and proper management thereof with parameters guiding the loans in order to protect the investors.
247. depending on who is in charge of fund must have the ability to manage fund
248. I think everyone would be wary of this - the East District contributors who want to make sure their money is secure and those from the West whose trust has been shattered
249. There is no way in the current economical climate that churches can pay the interest rate a CEF fund would have to charge. Since many churches are able to find alternate cheaper funding, it is time to change our dealings here. Also, our church is no longer a growing church. One could argue that many of our congregations are dying. Not a good "investment" for the investors. Also, in hindsight we see that the ABC District should not have gotten involved in investing. I don't see how having the Synod be involved in investing would be an improvement on things.
250. The potential of having one ship sink is preferable to having your only ship sink.
251. The church should not be acting as a financial institution. That is not its mandate.
252. Bear in mind the massive loss of confidence as a result of the Western fiasco; I have confidence in the East District's CEF and would be very wary of change.
253. My goodness...! I thought I was well informed on church matters and am quite involved in the church, but am honestly starting to feel frustrated by these questions. I wish I could be more help.
254. Yes, and have the people who are on the committee submit their decisions of funding to the entire centralized LCC elected officials.
255. I could see arguments for and against this. I mentioned some of my thoughts above in question 5 regarding bringing CEF under LCC. It may be seen as a move to bring in impartiality to loans but may also impact the amount of money received as people may feel like they are sending their money "away" when they would like it to be used in their local area. Hard to say but I guess they could perhaps have a check-box on designating their funds towards a specific district if they so chose.
256. Must be supervised very carefully under God's guidance.
257. If the CEF is to continue a merger into one corporate structure is the only way to go, for maximizing economy of scale efficiency. The central district CEF is already separately incorporated, and is licenced as a financial entity. It also has charitable status. Amalgamating the other district CEF activities into this established corporate structure would not be to cumbersome
258. An outside financial board should govern this...arms length from the church, but for specific use of the church and limited.
259. provided that no more than 5% may be loaned to any project which only supports the proclamation of the Gospel.
260. no need for any such organization anymore
261. This may be a good idea, but I really don't know!
262. More money to administer.....more trouble!!!!!!!

263. maybe...it depends on the format of who is handling the fund. I think it should be an outside body for the principal funds and the interest from those funds can be distributed to needy congregations and schools. The who should be decided by the elected church body.
264. In no circumstances should anyone, anything touch ABC CEF. The mismanagement, nepotism, and sheer arrogance drove into the fund into bankruptcy. Please note this includes letting anyone from ABC leadership be involved in administering monies.
265. This requires knowledge of the business implications of such a move. If it makes business sense, then it should be done. If it doesn't, then don't. I'd also note that the ABC CEF problem festered as long as it did due to insufficient supervision on the part of the Synod to monitor the Districts and let the Synod Convention know there was a problem.
266. How do you police it? Just think what would have happened if this had already been done. First the problem would still be hidden because what the heck we have lots of money. By the time it was discovered the whole Church would have been in danger of being wiped out.
267. I do not think we should have Church Extension funds
268. ABC district will forever be tainted; churches here will have to go to the bank like we did. The other districts maybe to make it work, the same rules should apply for the applicant no matter who the lender is, if ABC had required the same accountability from POP that a bank would have, CEF would never gone broke
269. And managed by professionals, with LCC guidelines and low risk.
270. makes sense. larger pool of funds, lower % management fees
271. Need consistency rather than fragmented investment policies. Use East District as the model, and who have a good investment policy and corporate oversight in place.
272. Absolutely not.
273. No one big fund will be an even bigger risk. We should have smaller funds for each area. Keep the funds smaller and we will limit the tendency for amateur real estate speculation like Prince of Peace.
274. See the get aspect I allude to.
275. -would need to be properly monitored
276. Agree only if the fund is managed by the appropriate management group and governance. Appropriate reporting and management including disclosures needs to be provided.
277. I like the idea of one centralized fund as long as fair access and use of the funds is available to all regions of the country. Further, that the processes are not set in too bureaucratic processes as to make it difficult or cumbersome to understand or follow.
278. The pooling of funds throughout the synod would help avoid a concentration of loans to one body.
279. Within limits, bigger is better. It would allow better diversification of investments. It would also reduce the governance and oversight burden that must be in place.
280. The Extension funds should be discontinued. The Church is not a bank.
281. Perhaps a good idea from the standpoint of Administration
282. I see how this could be beneficial but it could also hinder others. I am undecided t the best course of action would be.
283. Should be strictly monitored at all times and held accountable to investors. Government regulation would be a good idea.
284. There should be no district nor synodical church extension fund.

285. Only if it is managed by experienced and knowledgeable who are trained in the field of investments. I do believe it is great to be able to help other smaller churches to do up grades etc. and borrow from CEF at a lower rate of interest.
286. CEF should be continued nationally as the funds could then be used to aid congregations throughout Canada rather than forcing them to go to the banks. There would have to be more accountability in repaying these loans.
287. no extension funds
288. Chances are that one CEF would have better qualified management and be less likely to be tempted by pipe dreams
289. As long as they are separate items. If one goes under, the other should be able to survive on its own.
290. Not only should District CEF's be merged into one national funds, but the Districts themselves should be merged into one national church; eliminating Districts and having the synod and circuits to manage the church.
291. I would like to understand the impact of doing this
292. Agree only if handled by professionals
293. If the CEF fund stands on its own and is governed separately from the LCC operating budget. I don't want ANY salaries paid out by a CEF, the board should consist of laypeople and clergy who are without conflict of interest. If they desire to be on this board they can not be an elected or appointed member of the LCC executive.
294. question: would recent problems have been prevented this way? If yes, then I would agree.
295. Only if the administration is done by professionals, i.e. accountants who know how to assess the risk factors.
296. THE CHURCH HAS NO BUSINESS BEING IN THE BANKING BUSINESS. Churches need to learn to save their money for their building programs and not rely on borrowed money.
297. Agree, presuming the districts are collapsed, though obviously there would need to be care taken in how such a process was undertaken to avoid (wind down weaker ones, use strongest one as the new vehicle).
298. absolutely.... but a secure one.
299. The CEF of the ABC District was very poorly managed. No loan should be worth more than 4% of the entire assets of the fund. BEFORE one sets up a fund like CEF, one needs to have all the rules, checks, and balances written down. You must incorporate and protect all investments. All investments and loans need to be insured. You need to operate like a business or credit union, NOT like an old boys' club.
300. As long as they are held and invested conservatively, equally shared as appropriate, it doesn't really matter.
301. Centralized management and pooling of funds allows for employing managers trained in finance and creates a more balanced overall distribution of risk and availability of income generating opportunities.
302. Only with a general meeting where everyone's' opinions could be voiced and heard.
303. Only if they are managed by financial professionals at arms length from LCC
304. there would have to be some very good procedures, policies, and practises in place
305. Possibly a good idea however diversity is often a better course.
306. And registered in Ontario or a province that actually enforces the investing regulations instead of looking the other way. No more laissez faire Alberta registrations.

307. Once again, only with checks and balanced.
308. This presumes there is still a need for a Church Extension Fund. If this is true, and there are no longer any regional "management" entities within the church body, then the "money" should follow the "managers". If there remains a regional management entity, then the work involved in helping a congregation assess its abilities to have a building program in balance with sustainable mission and ministry should happen on a regional basis with the money managed at a central location.
309. Only if there are some changes implemented in how it is run!
310. Forget about it!
311. There are politics within the east district that I believe keep an unfair distribution based on favouritism when it comes to finances.
312. As long as congregations could access funds in case of an emergency.
313. As I understand it, that is how the LCMS does it and it seems to work for them.
314. Dangerous....
315. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
316. Again this is a bad question because if I disagree, it implies that I agree that they should exist without being merged. Pastors should not be business men and fund management should not be their focus. They should be discontinued.
317. Cooperation between congregations to fund outreach and social initiatives is needed, using donated instead of deposited money. This could be on regional or national level.
318. I recognize that moving to a national fund would perhaps be difficult for the East and Central districts who already have things working well, but having a well-organized and run national standard could help us pool our resources and make the best use of the funds that we have. It could also allow congregations in ABC to responsibly access fund to further the building of churches when many of that district's members are currently unwilling to invest in such a fund.
319. While this may be an "all the eggs in one basket" approach, I still find it preferable to 3 separate funds. However, that is with the caveat that checks and balances are put in place to greatly reduce the risk of repeating the ABC disaster.
320. The districts seem to be closer to the action, so to speak, but there are good reasons for a national or synodical fund instead.
321. Yes, this might be interesting to pursue.
322. If funds are needed, then they should be obtained by gifts and fund raising activities.
323. A better way to use the funds for all of L.C.C. Run by independent board and MANAGE by people with financial knowledge
324. As we recognize that extension need professional financial advisors, and as their role is somewhat reduced from years ago, one national extension fund, incorporated independently from LCC, can probably do the best job for both the churches and the investors.
325. Funds should stay in the district
326. ALL District functions should be merged into a single synodical entity.
327. I don't think those areas exercising good stewardship or business practice should "bail out" those that do not.
328. It is a matter of economy, not geography.
329. Put all the funds where it's most needed.
330. Perhaps in the short term, but a plan to discontinue them should be made.

331. Unless we can determine how the ABC District could have gotten into the situation they are facing and establish procedures that would not allow such a fiasco to happen and continue to be undetected and appropriately addressed it having separate CEF's may not be a bad idea.
332. As long as they are operated properly and safely
333. I think they should all be dissolved.
334. Not sure. What would be the advantages and disadvantages of a merged synodical CEF?
335. yes, there is strength in numbers
336. We should just do away with them, let everyone collect their investment deposits and move on from this idea.
337. A question for the remaining CEF's - East and Central
338. The district CEFs are familiar with the situations in their own region. They are better able to determine how best funds should be used to meet individual situations.
339. Better to have one larger fund with appropriate oversight - do away with issues that caused the ABC CEF debacle.
340. They should be abandoned entirely.
341. Each District if to continue should uphold itself. There are to many disparities across the country to apply
342. Again, what is the plan the objective where exactly are the funds going and to whom -what is this we hear about pastors in ABC losing their pensions as a result. Why are there differing terms -minimally all rules, goals and objectives... should be identical. (context see Q5,6)
343. I do not have enough financial knowledge to give a response one way or the other. To my untrained thinking in this area, a national CEF would seem to have greater potential for security, growth, and utilization by all members and congregations. However, I do not know if a synodical CEF in any way would hamper or impede more locally district-based needs. If it wouldn't, then the larger CEF would seem to be wiser.
344. I agree in principle but I have no head for numbers so I don't know if this is practical or manageable. I believe the only way we might be able to continue to have a Church Extension Fund is if it happens at a national level. There is no element of mistrust between investors and the synod and I believe that everyone knows that what happened in ABC was a district problem; not a national one.
345. CEF needs to be close where the work is done and responded to quickly.
346. There should be no CEF.
347. The ship has sailed. Trust has been irreparably breached.
348. This presumes they should still exist. It's also highly dependent upon whether Districts would continue to exist in their current form.
349. This would provide some economies of scale and would have to have a high degree of independent oversight. It cannot be managed by clergy only!
350. Only if regulations & conditions of disbursement agree with LCC and Revenue Canada.
351. This may have to as districts under a new LCC organization may not have districts. As well, the ABC District and Central Districts would have to reincorporate if the current organization remains.
352. This may be a good idea but I really don't know the pros and cons of such a move.
353. The CEF should be managed by professional money managers, and exist on a smaller scale than it does now.

354. In no circumstances should anyone, anything touch ABC CEF, the mismanagement, nepotism, and sheer arrogance drove into the fund into bankruptcy. Go back to Q5 answer.
355. If a Church Extension Fund is to continue it would be wise to consider merging the Funds. I believe LC-MS has one synodical fund. Remember, in the LCMS the synod created the Districts, unlike our Canadian experience where the Canadian Districts created the LC-C. (We did it backwards.)
356. No way CEF funds should be merged. This should not be done.
357. Hard to determine which group most qualifies to receive those funds when they are scattered across the country. Becomes too businesslike and less personal.
358. Hopefully, the powers that be have learned that they need to be handled separately and by professionals.
359. With qualified money managers
360. If it is one fund, I believe that the West and Atlantic regions would be served in a balanced way.
361. The best financial advice is "Don't put all your eggs in one basket". Our faith is a belief in "One God". Our finances should be diversified.
362. It could be worthwhile.
363. If there were ever a problem like the one faced by ABC district's CEF then the entire synod would be in jeopardy, not just a single district.
364. In the lending world, merging would mean having a bigger pool of funds to draw from. This would be a good move for the CEF, as long as the funds were managed for the original intention of building new churches.
365. We believe the church should not be involved in lending money with interest. Psalm 15:5
366. As long as the whole thing is handled in a fiscally responsible manner, it shouldn't matter if CEF is handled by district or synod. That being said, it seems that each district would have a better understanding of the needs within their own congregations than synod.
367. It CEF is to continue, then yes it should only be merged into one.
368. As long as there is regional input or even that the funds need to be spend in the region of source.
369. One must be mindful if synodical then administration costs could be reduced.
370. Let's get out of business. Clergy and Academics are not necessarily qualified to run this.
371. Sounds like a possible solution if it is deemed to be a program that is needed.
372. This would be efficient, however, East-West divisions within Canada may effect how well this would work.
373. Funds should be separately wound up over a 3 to 5-year period.
374. Only if it will improve the governance.
375. Need to be kept within each district.
376. These funds need to be closer to congregations than a national fund.
377. If it were kept, that just might be one solution.... again only with trained people involved
378. I agree only if it is decided to keep the Extension Fund, I still believe it should be discontinued
379. The political and social divide between East and West in Canada will hamper the trust necessary to allow this to function as it should. For example: investors in the east may be unwilling to have "their money" lent to congregations in the west. The reverse may also be true.

380. While I am not an expert on these matters, this would seem to be a logical way to continue CEF in a sustainable way.
381. More sharing this way rather than isolation in a district.
382. I'm mixed because, while this would save on bureaucracy, it would create difficulties in determining which regions should be invested in. This could cause conflicts within LCC.
383. I don't want the fund to get too big. The money should be used close to home.
384. Should the church at large pay for the excesses of one district?
385. The cost savings would be beneficial if merged into once synodical Church Extension Fund, however, there could be biases as to which part of the Western, Central or Eastern District would receive the funds. There is politics even in church bodies.
386. I agree because church members move from one district to another in their lifetime.
387. I see no detriment or benefit
388. I do not know the structure well enough to comment on re-structuring
389. This is a misleading point... No one would want ABCCEF to bring down the other CEF's?
390. Regional funds are best
391. ONLY IF IT IS RUN BY A PROPER FINANCIAL INSTITUTION. BOARD MEMBERS ONLY WITH FINANCIAL BACK GROUND AND A PASTOR ONLY FOR ECCLESIASTICAL GUIDANCE.
392. Here is another avenue where those parts of the church which have, can better support those parts of the church that do not have. However, we should seriously consider then having a Board of Governors/Directors of such a CEF elected by synod in convention, distinct from the synod's Board of Directors to preserve an arm's length relationship that has not always been effectively maintained at a District level. At least some of the lay people on the board should be qualified in financial matters, much as we strive to have a lawyer on the Board for Adjudication when possible.
393. Stay away from banking.
394. That caused my eyes to get big - don't fix what isn't broken - or should I say I have a fear of messing with something that is a good thing and making it not so good any more.
395. Should be managed by a professional agency outside LCC
396. A larger fund can provide more fiscal stability, as well as the liquidity of the fund. Funds distributed to a church must be based on a rigorous formula that takes into account multiple factors such as average weekly congregants, current sq. ft. of church, time since last significant change has been made, etc.
397. As long as it is managed by professionals, it could be more of a cost savings measure to merge. However, bigger isn't always better. Transparency is critical.
398. I have no knowledge or expertise in this area.
399. However, how this is done and the Policy and Procedures implemented, will determine whether investors will continue to invest in the new structure.
400. I mean a fund that is administered at arms length from the church
401. YES!
402. If the CEFs continue they should be merged and incorporated into one entity.
403. IF THIS WENT BROKE LIKE THE ONE IN ABC YOU would have a real mess on your hands. It appears that since the ABC has NO FUNDS LEFT they now want to take over the East District plan. (SINCE THEY HAVE THE LARGEST MEMBERSHIP OF ANY DISTRICT). May I assure you that if this were to happen MOST of the funds from the East

would be immediately withdrawn so that Ontario investors were not in the same position as those in ABC.

404. There are probably pros and cons to this.
405. There SOULD BE NO CHURCH EXTENSION FUNDS. Get out of the financial-investment business and stick to Gods work!!!
406. But only if CEFs are continued
407. No way!!!!!!
408. This could be a Private LCC credit union - operated under Federal Banking regulations
409. Larger pool of funds, but must have fund managers that will be compliance of gov't regulations in financial securities and also to learn from what occurred in Alberta.
410. Why would we want to merge us with a fund that is now bankrupt?
411. For other areas, not A-BC district which is in total disarray.
412. This would not be manageable, in my opinion, unless it turns out there will only be a synod and no districts.
413. If merged it requires oversight and transparency from professional independent third party legal and accounting firms with the authority and accountability for the actions.
414. Canada is too vast a country. The social & geographical factors that influence the types of ministries & mission churches, land purchases, priorities, etc. is too varied from province to province. It would be extremely difficult for one governing body to understand the various needs & situations across the entire country.
415. There are different needs in different districts, and the districts are in a better position to know what these needs are vs. a committee that may be located far away.
416. Merely merging the extension funds would make problems much bigger than they need to be. What is needed is a complete reorganization of the way these kind of funding issues are dealt with.
417. if something happened again like in ABC that could take the whole church down
418. In no circumstances should anyone, anything touch ABC CEF, the mismanagement, nepotism, and sheer arrogance drove into the fund into bankruptcy.
419. districts have been set up for a reason. Canada is too vast and varied for a central control
420. there should be clear guidelines in place, very excellently qualified oversight in place, so that $ is used ONLY for church building NOT for risky investment.
421. This would put some the extension funds in a bad position given what is happening with the AB-C Extension Fund
422. This way would eliminate a lot of paper work, time and expense, as well as having less people on the payroll.
423. Maybe, but definitely not before the ABC mess is finished.
424. What happened in ABC needs to repaired and never happen again. I suggested LCC invest in a regulatory body that annually audits these funds. This could be by appointment and consist of knowledgeable laypeople and non-Lutheran accounting professionals with one pastor to chair.
425. If managed by a professional and competent financial professional
426. I disagree as long as we maintain districts in our governance. Investing in my district is important to me.
427. More direct oversight by Synod might help avoid some of the problems that we have had in the past.
428. Possibly, if this results in better oversight and reduced administration costs.

429. If, after what happened in ABC district, they are merged into one, the thought will be that we are putting money in to right a wrong, where there was no accountability made.
430. But I still would never again invest with them or encourage others to do so. Once burned, forever cautious. Integrity has been lost.
431. I don't know enough about CEFs to "agree or disagree". Or does that mean I have no opinion?
432. This could have great benefit provided that access to deposit-making and loan application processes are conducive to a national program. The way that each CEF is currently established under provincial regulations would have to change and that may compel specific governance changes that would be a departure from the current steps.
433. conflict of church business
434. Guidance from separate boards representing the district is required so all are treated fairly and with the same personnel guidance.
435. I would normally strongly agree; but given what happened in ABC I have concerns.
436. The Church Extension Fund should be eliminated.
437. Fascinating idea. Let's explore that notion.
438. Each District should have their own CEF, because the needs of each district are probably different.
439. I think this needs a "vacation" until it settles down; perhaps look at it again in 10 years or so.
440. That is not necessarily getting to the root of the problem. The problem exists in CEF's current purpose not where the monies are housed.
441. LCC is small enough that we can do this.
442. This may be difficult to answer from a relatively uninformed perspective, but I would tend to think that a decentralized structure would allow the fund to be more responsive to local needs.
443. Shut them down.
444. Pros and cons both ways. Depends on effective management. If a region can't be trusted, how will the national church?? Besides, what ministers have financial training? All only as good as the people running it.
445. This option should be reviewed.
446. The church does not have the expertise to be in the financial business. Financial Ministries should be discontinued.
447. This could be one option to be investigated.
448. NO. If they have a value, each district should have control of its own funds
449. No if one fails others were ready to help
450. Yes, if CEF does continue, it is better to be merged into one.
451. I believe the CEFs and the like should be eliminated altogether, so that the Church may focus solely on her Call to provide Word and Sacrament ministry to the Body of Christ.
452. I don't know enough about the potential advantages/disadvantages of this move to comment.
453. Keeping them separate is the only thing that saved the Central and East from the same fate as the ABC. Also, provincial regulations differ so I am not even sure if they could be merged easily.
454. For current account holders they should remain separate until all current accounts are closed but for any new investments they could then be combined under one synodical fund.

455. Yes, it should be merged into one synodical CEF in terms of a national way of doing business but it can still be divided into the three districts in order to have some regional diversity but to have strength in numbers.
456. Too much centralization means fewer services and attention to small areas.
457. They should be eliminated altogether.
458. Church Extension funds need to be abolished. LCC is not building new churches or founding new congregations although a National Lutheran Archives has been called for and needs to be built.
459. I agree that if there is a need for CEFs, they should be merged and dealt with on a national level. Perhaps contracted professional management should be considered.
460. Because of population there should be only one fund for the church body
461. With what has been experienced in the ABC District I feel the church/synod do not have the qualified people to be in the banking business and therefore should not be.
462. If we were to keep some form of a Church Extension Fund, it would be prudent to keep safety barriers in place between Districts (to protect LCC as a whole). Also, each District should have a better understanding of the risk/safety of investing in certain areas ("zoomed in" picture as opposed to "zoomed out"; a Synodical CEF would be operating more on hearsay than a District's first-hand inspection). But I'm still not a fan of CEF as a loan with interest program.
463. 1.Clearly this should only be done if the merged synodical CEF were to use the practices and policies of a well run CEF such as those that are in place in the East District CEF 2. Realistically, this may no longer be possible, considering the situation in the ABC District
464. Any Church Extension Fund should not, in any way, have its final decisions made by pastors, or a board half filled with pastors. Unless we want pastors to have financial training, and go through business courses to sit on these boards, there's no way a pastor should be making these kinds of decisions. We never allow a pastor to make such a decision in a congregation (decisions regarding church budget, etc.) why would we allow a pastor to make such a decision on a District/Synod level? This confuses our wonderful doctrine of the two kingdoms.
465. Even better, an international fund ideally. I wonder if most people are primarily interested in lining their own nest....in which case, funding outside of one's district is unlikely to meet with support.
466. Liability for failure of portions of such a fund must be mitigated and spread over as large number of contributors as possible with the church remaining at arms length and without legal obligation to the funds contributors. Under no circumstances should the synodical church be held legally responsible for fund loses. This might require that the fund be administered by a third party whose mandate and principles of operation are acceptable to the synod and subject to periodic revue.
467. Only if disconnected from the synod.
468. What is the benefit of having multiple funds? A single fund would require less people to manage.
469. If church extension funds are retained, this would undoubtedly be a better way of structuring things, ensuring clearer monitoring across the church.
470. What is important to me is whether the funds are properly managed whether operated by Districts or Synod.

471. You're a bunch of pastor's not hedge fund managers. If you are even going to consider this. You need people outside the Church to manage and maintain this.
472. Church has no place in the investment business
473. A national scale may be helpful, but I'm not sure how the local needs would be well represented.
474. .....and the name of the "Fund" changed.
475. Would probably be easier to manage. Lead to a common goal.
476. They should be totally eliminated. We are a church, not a bank.
477. see above
478. The current fiasco in the ABC District is a good reason for each District to keep CEF separate. Unless a centralized CEF were exclusively limited to raise and carefully oversee sufficient funds to meet actual needs for capital projects. Otherwise the temptation is too great to start using funds for purposes other than the church's needs and venture into areas like RRSPs etc. - which requires skill sets better left with banks and investment houses.
479. No such fund should continue!
480. Similar to the way a large bank is more financially stable than three smaller independent banks.
481. It would only work if it was a separate corporation, with insurance and whatever else is needed to prevent a repeat of what is happening in A-BC.
482. Strongly agree as long as the ABC church extension fund losses are not transferred to depositors in the Central and East District CEFs.
483. The presence of four funds (one synodical, three district) in a body of less than 70,000 members is absurd.
484. The church should not be in the financial business. They do not have the judgment or expertise necessary as evidenced by ABC District.
485. If the CEF must continue, then it should be one single entity. Not driven by 2 or 3 boards, or financial committees who are made up of volunteers or by members who have no "skin in the game".... no financial investment of their own... How many of the decision makers of the ABC's CEF actually lost significant amounts of money themselves?
486. Yes, but only as a step towards winding down this function altogether.
487. East District and ABC district should remain non-merged entity.
488. only if going forward they are for churches and schools only, not other uses ~ possibly there should be a cap limit as well for an amount I would defer to wiser minds, maybe $3-500,000

8. LCC's efforts in inter-church relationships meet the needs of our congregations.

1. It would have been better to specify what you mean by inter-church relationships. Do you mean e.g. Lutherans and Catholics or congregations with each other? If you mean interdenominational relationships, please do not overdo it. Especially with the Roman Catholic Church. They have not changed much in 400 or 500 years.
2. If you mean among LCC congregations then yes, I agree. If you mean among other denominations, then that is not a part of restructuring. It is one of doctrine and as such is not open to debate.
3. Again it is very hard to get the problems of a small church listen to when the authorities come from a large church.

4. proven by the Dual Congregation approach
5. If you mean how we relate to other denominations. We need more co-operation i.e. food bank idea - altar fellowship-no.
6. I'm not sure how they have helped our congregation, at least.
7. We do invite other LCC members to special events/services but few come. Why? do they not feel welcome? Why not?!
8. We do invite other LCC members to special events/services but few come. Why? do they not feel welcome? Why not?!
9. I believe that the God given Holy Sacrament should be available to any who believe that Jesus Christ is their saviour.
10. Needs careful monitoring.
11. There needs to be more attention paid by President on how good a job the minister of a congregation is doing.
12. More local involvement would enhance a closer, brotherly relationship.
13. Not sure exactly how except that theological conversation is being done and relationships between leadership seems cordial.
14. Maybe its there, however don't see it.
15. What do you mean by inter-church?
16. Time for more effort on inter-church relationships.
17. poor results due to ignoring the cries and experts within our churches telling us to be quiet we know nothing, just do what we say.
18. I have very little idea of what goes on in that area. Does not seem relevant to what goes on in our little congregation.
19. Generally, this may be true ... but the world's complexities prevent all needs being met in a single way.
20. we would not have the outcome in our District if they did. Not in my backyard mentality and walking by the Good Samaritan parable ignored here.
21. I see little interaction between congregations. Perhaps behind the scenes pastors work together to joint fund raise, combine volunteer resources and encourage joint projects, but I don't see it as a church member.
22. They need to remain in the smaller groupings of congregations, whatever form that may be after restructuring.
23. The Synod was not even present when the removal of out Pastor happened and they should have been there in the congregation long before this. It is obvious that there have been doctrine and other problems long before. I was on the Parish Planning Council at the time of the wrongful dismissal of Pastor Nathan and I wasn't part of voting when this meeting would even occur.
24. I think we are overly isolated, not even sitting at the table to discuss with others. We should join the Canadian Council of Churches, which does not require a common confession from participating churches.
25. Hardly, at this trail there were Pastors from Pincher Creek and Magrath, AB. and they kept quiet during this spectacle on October 25, 2015 removal of Pastor Fuhrer. Heaven help any new Pastor out of seminary that lands a job at Immanuel Lutheran in Lethbridge, AB. In recent years other Pastors were thrown out.
26. Inter-church relationships - what does this really mean??
27. Who knows?

28. Don't know as a layman.
29. We pray so.
30. This only applies to churches 100 km radius of Kitchener. Who from Pembroke is driving 6 1/2 hours to Fisherville for kids to attend a Youth Sleigh Ride and 6 1/2 hours home again. Get real!
31. Inter-church relationships could be improved if church was views as being broader than the congregational level including circuit, district, synod, missions, etc.
32. We leave the impression that other bodies of believers do not have faith and practices correct.
33. Unknown
34. Not sure if this means within LCC Districts, Synod, or outside LCC.
35. What are inter-church relationships??
36. relations between other denominations is ok - or churches within LCC, needs more communications
37. Not really aware of any promotion of inter-church relationships and/or services being promoted.
38. I don't know what this means.
39. We must continue to engage in dialogue with other confessional church bodies with the goal of uniting around a common Biblical and orthodox confession (Book of Concord).
40. I support productive discussion with other confessional Christian church bodies. However, we must be careful not to compromise on our core beliefs for the sake of fellowship. If true doctrinal unity can be achieved, it would certainly be God-pleasing.
41. Inter-church relationships are sorely lacking, at least in St. Catharines, Ontario.
42. Being from a small community I think we need to adapt to other denominations.
43. I'm uncertain of what's meant by "inter-church relationships" in this question. I am assuming that this is in regards to LCC's dialogue with other church bodies. I think LCC does a reasonably good job at maintaining these relationships. Hopefully, opportunities for greater partnership will come in the future. I am encouraged to see our dialogue with break-away confessional Lutheran and Anglican groups.
44. I hope it does, I do not know.
45. I agree, however there is a lot of room for improvement. Things such as congregations having service at neighboring congregations would help improve relationships. There are many times neighboring congregations have no idea the struggles their sister churches are having and even just the support of others knowing and being there would help find the faith to conquer issues they have. Even more ideas of supporting and being a part of more distant congregations would help bring our congregations closer together.
46. each church within our district is a silo - neither sharing or intermingling. our church does not function within any other churches within our community - there are NO relationships! we should have community confirmation, community youth groups and community seniors groups - that way a church with few members can share the comradery of others who share the same faith. we should be looking at amalgamating churches so there is strength in numbers
47. the district meetings facilitate this.
48. Not sure what "needs" refers to. Clarify
49. Our Synod doesn't seem to value and participate in many inter-church activities and projects.

50. "Inter-church" meaning relationships with OTHER denominations? Or within LCC, church-to-church? If the latter, you mean "intra-church." And I don't know what LCC's efforts are in either of those categories.
51. There should be a group of counselors to decide where and when these funds are given or loaned out.
52. No idea what this question means.
53. Still feel isolated
54. The Christian church needs to have a strong presence in this day and age.
55. We need more interaction with other denominations. Forget all the manmade rules and regulations. Let's be Christian first!
56. congregations still operate in isolation at times. not familiar with Synod, District and even area churches.
57. I'm sorry, I don't know for sure.
58. Congregations in our circuit seem to operate as islands unto themselves.
59. I don't know since I don't have that information.
60. I am not sure.
61. I do not see much effort on inter-church relationships.
62. I have no knowledge about this.
63. I am not sure what is meant by "inter-church relationships". Are you referring to relationships between LCC congregations? Are you referring to relationships with other Lutheran church bodies/synods? Are you referring to relationships with other Christian denominations? This question requires clarity...it is quite vague.
64. Ongoing Spiritual guidance provided to ABC district is one example.
65. Feel that churches are competing with one another, instead of cooperating and sharing resources. Depends on the leadership.
66. I find that too many members worry only about their own little world, their own church, and do not try and see the big picture. As members of the church and LCC-East District, we should be working and striving harder to grow the ministry, not just in our own church, but helping support and grow all of the neighboring churches as well. Does the LCC try and do this? Yes, it tries, but it can do a better job. It should try and make it a goal for neighboring churches to try and help support each other better.
67. What do you mean by "inter-church relationships"? I think our LCC president is a rare gem who has many gifts to bring care and reconciliation where needed, but I am unsure what this question is really asking?
68. they don't meet any needs, lots of ideals, lots of propaganda but no actual work
69. Have been told L.C.C. is legalistic, teaching and caring never mentioned. Still under Catholic structure in worship influence.
70. inter-church?
71. Again, this is a poorly worded survey question. The inter-church relationships such as that with LCA seems to be eroding. However, is the ultimate goal of inter-church relationships primarily for the needs of our congregations or to be faithful in encouraging other Christians and seeking to find those with whom there is true unity?
72. I think the Districts have been too independent in the current structure. LCC could do a better job of this under a new structure with no Districts.
73. Efforts could always be even greater, but we do not appear to have BAD relationships with other church bodies.

74. I don't understand if you are referring to relationships between like congregations or LCC working with other Synods. I think we can do better in trying to find more common ground with other church bodies. Sometimes we are just too hardline and we are losing our youth to other churches bodies.
75. I don't see what those relationships are from my viewpoint, however, if there is no negative news I assume it meets the needs of our congregations.
76. More efforts should be made to worship and associate with other congregations in nurturing the faith.
77. I don't see this happening--especially if one lives in a small community
78. Not quite sure what you mean here...relations between LCC parishes or between other fellowship bodies around the world.
79. Is this possible. Are the needs the same at the national church body level and the local congregation/community level?
80. Not clear on the question.
81. I'm not sure what is meant by this question.
82. I assume this question is referring to (or includes) efforts in official communication between our national church body and other church bodies internationally or across denominational boundaries.
83. Not sure if inter-church relationships relate to LCC-LCC congregations or with other Christian churches of other denominations. Either way it comes from and is the responsibility of the individual congregations.
84. They state they can't act, even when pointed to the Constitution and bylaws allowing them to, on some matters, i.e.: CEF etc. and its district matter, yet get involved beyond their scope as they choose, i.e.: Concordia. Not consistent practice and action.
85. I wonder sometimes if congregations use or try to access inter-church relationships in all the ways they could.
86. What do you mean, inter-church?
87. I'm not aware of what the LCC's "efforts" are. Perhaps this survey is more suited to Pastors, Deacon's and such because as a lay person, I don't know how I would have the information to answer them.
88. What would those efforts be?
89. vague
90. inter church relationship with who? our church bodies or with other churches or both.
91. My congregation has asked for help to build up declining number of members within our church, and Pastor Astley and Pastor Glen have come to visit regarding this matter, but once they left no further visits or communication to the congregation has happened to help with this matter.
92. Synod Yes, Local not always.
93. Not sure what this question is asking; whether this has to do with dialogues with the Anglicans, other Lutheran synods, etc., or with fostering fraternity among the congregations within the synod. If it's the latter, I have seen no such thing happen. If it is the former, then I don't know. Reports of what is accomplished at such dialogues are so vague that they communicate nothing of substance. Phrases like "we found that we have many points in which we agree", and "there are still some areas to work out", are about all I recall hearing.
94. more work needs to be done here

95. LC-C is very isolated among Canadian churches, and there is no compelling reason to stay out of the dialogue that happens at the Canadian Council of Churches.
96. What are the congregation needs of inter church relations?
97. I am not sure what is meant here...do you mean between sister congregations in LCC or between LCC and other fellowship Lutheran church bodies the world over? if it is the first case then yes, I think LCC is meeting needs of congregations for the most part...
98. don't have enough information to offer an opinion
99. what relationships?
100. Could improve
101. Lay people do not know or see what relationships are happening
102. I appreciate the work being done within LCC to dialogue with other denominations.
103. need to do much more
104. But it still could be stronger with more unity as the goal
105. What's "inter-church"? Could be relationships with non-Lutherans entities. Could be relationships with other Lutheran entities. Could be relationships among LCC congregations. Results will be all over the map depending on how people interpret the question.
106. No effect on our congregation.
107. What inter-church relationship??? I have no knowledge of matters in this area.
108. Not sure what is meant by "inter-church." Within our own congregations? other denominations?
109. We need to very specific in not only supporting our theology but living it.
110. I am not sure what this question is asking. Is this referring to LCC parishes working with each other, or is it referring to dialogue with other Church bodies, e.g. RC and ACNA dialogue? I will assume it is referring to RC and ACNA dialogue. I have found these dialogues to be encouraging, and think they are important and necessary work.
111. Between our churches or other church bodies/denominations?
112. I see progress in communicating with other world organisations. We have not made concessions to conform to other churches which is also important. But as usual there is always more that can be done to present a unified front to society with other churches with similar doctrine.
113. Not enough information on this.
114. LCC continues to be actively engaged in the International Lutheran Council and other efforts in North American to provide a clear, confessional Lutheran witness in inter-church relationships.
115. I believe most congregation members are unaware there are inter-church relations and indeed to our detriment, some of our pastor regard their local ministerial circle with barely veiled suspicion and even contempt. Despite our theological differences, and indeed because of them, we need to reach out to our brothers and sisters in Christ, learn from them and gently correct them to further the whole Christian church.
116. Sadly, I don't know. I'm not sure exactly what LCC does in terms of inter-church relationships. Perhaps that means more should be done.
117. Aside from an article or two on talks with Confessional Anglicans, and some support for Nicaragua I see no real efforts at inter-church relationships. Indeed, my perception is that Lutherans are a very, very closed group that isolates itself from the world around it, actually intentionally withdrawing from the world. Relationships with other churches are viewed at

least with suspicion, at worst as sinful, because really, everyone else is wrong about Christianity.

118. It is unlikely that our congregation will be sustainable beyond the next year but we see no evidence of LCC providing any support or guidance to us.
119. What LCC effort has ever been made to address inter-church relationships?
120. Needs to be more, to clarify what it is that we believe, why, and therefore why we sometimes practice differently than other denominations.
121. Different churches may have differing opinions on this, depending on location
122. Not sure what this question is asking, whether this has to do with dialogues with the Anglicans, other Lutheran synods, etc., or with fostering fraternity among the congregations within the synod. If it's the latter, I have seen no such thing happen. If it is the former, then I don't know. Reports of what is accomplished at such dialogues are so vague that they communicate nothing of substance. Phrases like "we found that we have many points in which we agree", and "there are still some areas to work out" are about all we hear.
123. This question's meaning is unclear - does it refer to interdenominational relationships or relations between our churches. If it is the former, it would not so much be meeting the needs of the congregations as of our church body as a whole. Bad wording.
124. perhaps we spend too much time for what can truly be achieved.
125. Not sure what is meant by "inter-church"? - Roman Catholic? Judaism? Islam? Wisconsin?
126. Again, I can't comment on how consistent this might be. As far as "inter-church relationships" as pertaining to other LCC congregations, I suspect many of these relationships are often good, with sporadic challenges. Where I have often felt we fail (and I have occasionally been vocal about this) is our inter-church relationships with other God-fearing, bible-believing, John 3:16 kinds of churches (i.e. not Lutherans.) Inter-church relationships stretch far beyond that of those under the banner of "Lutheran Church-Canada." Sure, we read about the talks between LCC and some of the Anglican and Catholic synodical brass/committee members (and I sometimes question the purpose, or the fruitfulness of such talks.) But what of the dialogue at the congregation level? Do we, as LCC congregations, work together on community projects to further God's kingdom? (Sometimes, the answer is yes.) But often, I observe the attitude to be "We are right, and they are wrong!", or "Lutheranism = the one true religion!" We as churches can thus become rather insular and cut off from the rest of the kingdom, often out of fear, or even arrogance. We disagree on 5% of doctrine, and fail to celebrate the 95% of doctrine in common...of the God who saved them, and us alike from an eternity of separation from Him in Hell. In a world that becomes increasingly more hostile to the message of hope contained in biblical scriptures, and rally together against the believers of Christ, we need to seek unity around a cause. His cause. His great commission.
127. I am not sure what you are referring to here. Meetings with other Lutheran churches around the world? Meetings in Canada with non LCC Lutheran bodies?
128. I see little evidence of this happening, other than CLWR.
129. LCC's inter-church work is a blessing to the church at all levels, and should encourage congregations to have closer relations with our ecumenical partners.
130. The inter-church work our synod is doing is important for us all.
131. I support LCC's inter-church work, but I don't understand what this question is asking.

132. Assuming 'inter-church' means relationships between LCC congregations, more is needed. There appears to be very little coordination between congregations in a city/geographic area for coordinated efforts and outreach.
133. Not sure of the full extent of LCC's efforts in inter-church relationships. How is this information really shared to individuals, other than the Pastor or Deacon of the churches?
134. What does this even mean? By "our congregations" does it mean the synod as a whole? Or does it mean how "inter-church relations" affect the individual congregations? Is it in reference to possibilities of shared communion fellowships with other denominations or individual congregations? If the first, then those close to the issues would be able to provide input. As far as my limited knowledge goes, it seems okay. If the second and/or third, inter-church relations are limited to what our theology and subsequent practice dictates.
135. The elderly need to treat the younger new comers with more respect
136. I feel communications could be improved.
137. I am not sure what is meant by "inter-church relationships". Are you referring to relationships between LCC congregations? Are you referring to relationships with other Lutheran church bodies/synods? Are you referring to relationships with other Christian denominations? This question requires clarity...it is quite vague.
138. If "inter-church" means inter-denominational, the Bible clearly warns us to avoid heretics.
139. Don't know anything about this.
140. They can be useful for seeking areas of cooperation--relief funds, response to political questions (euthanasia, abortion, etc.). As far as meeting to achieve doctrinal unity, the effect on individual congregations is questionable. It might be a good exercise in apologetics, but does not meet particular needs of congregations.
141. What does inter-church mean - between/among Lutheran CC or Lutherans across the board or ecumenical.
142. What have they done?
143. It depends how each church's relationships with separate congregations are functioning and focusing on.
144. LCC's inter-church relationships confuse and confound our congregations.
145. the need for continued open dialogue with other church bodies is always beneficial as we share the truth of God's sure and certain Word.
146. (Is this interdenominational? Then no as it is a point of doctrine.) We don't know others.
147. I appreciate the contacts made/email communication with other administrators/teachers in the ABC district.
148. Doctrinal issues usually lead to compromise. To discuss areas of member & youth retention would be beneficial as well as joining other faiths in opposing laws which are contrary to Bible teachings.
149. From what I have seen, most LCC congregations are cordial toward each other but do very little to combine their resources for a stronger and united program.
150. I'm not overly aware of the national church's efforts to connect individual parishes.
151. What congregation knows anything about what is going on -- and furthermore how many really care for things beyond the walls of their own congregation? We don't hear about it in the congregation I attend -- I only find out because of a personal interest.
152. Communication often falls down along the way. Our people need to know the importance of this subject.

153. marriages between Christians of two different traditions = had to look this up on the internet to understand your question.... you assume that the regular layperson knows what you are asking???
154. WHAT DOES THAT MEAN
155. Those relationships seem fostered more on the congregational or circuit level, which is where that should be happening anyway; so yes, the amount is fine.
156. We must correct the divisions in Our Lord's Church with more understanding and a mindset to work together with other Christian Churches.
157. What does this mean? Does it mean between LCC congregations? Between Lutheran denominations? Between all Christian denominations? This is a useless question.
158. This does not seem to affect our congregation in any way.
159. No - never heard of that
160. Issues of Doctrine usually only lead to compromise. Discussions on member & youth retention ideas or to speak as one voice on laws which conflict with Christian beliefs could be beneficial
161. I believe most congregations operate largely as islands unto themselves, with the clergy and a few highly involved lay members taking part in inter-church relationships. The average congregation member has little knowledge of Synod, and sees little benefit of our inter-relationship beyond the purely pragmatic and financial concerns. (obviously this is largely the fault of pastors who don't make efforts to educate and inform their people).
162. No idea what your efforts are or what they "could" be
163. Doctrinal issues would likely just lead to compromise. To discuss retention of members & youth could be beneficial or to join other churches to speak as one voice on government laws which oppose our Christian views
164. LCC is very specific on its policies on this - and doesn't guide our congregation to make decisions to welcome into full participation, those who come from other denominations, are fervently Christian and yet would not be able to ascribe to our current policies in the LCC. Also I would hope that retired Pastors from ELCIC and other Christian denominations, would be welcomed and their gifts used in Pastoral and educational work, if they were to join our congregation. Our pastors should be highly encouraged to participate in ministerial and ecumenical worship and social justice/ ministry in the community.
165. If "inter-church" means "inter-denominational" there is nothing there that we need! The Bible warns against heresies and heretics tells us to stay away!
166. Unsure. I certainly believe that we should have closer relationships with other Christian denominations.
167. I see progress in communicating with other world organisations. We have not made concessions to conform to other churches which is also important. But as usual there is always more that can be done to present a unified front to society with other churches with similar doctrine.
168. what inter-church relationship efforts - if they exist, the examples have not trickled down to this local church - they are so isolated - and due to their own efforts. they exist in an island onto themselves - very frustrating - God never said that anyone of the Christian churches were of His direction - we are all His children.
169. No experience to know

170. I appreciate the path our synod has taken in keeping open dialogue with other churches. I am also pleased by their cautiously optimistic approach that is centred on agreement on God's Holy Word first and foremost.
171. LCC's efforts are inadequate in inter-church relationships.
172. It is a duty of an evangelical Lutheran congregation seek out and support those who share their confession for the sake of love for our brothers and the unity of the Church. However, does an individual congregation
173. LCC's efforts in inter-church relationships are unknown to our congregation as they are always published in a
174. In my role as a lay leader, I find that our congregation is left on its own, especially when dealing with legal matters. I believe there should be expertise available in LCC or District that we can go to get assistance with legal matters. LCC could provide sample documents, or even final documents in areas that are common to all congregations, such as policies. For example, Benevolence, facility rental, Restricted funds, etc. I know we are referred to CCCC on these matters, but if this was provided by Synod/District, we could spend more effort on the Spiritual matters with our members.
175. I am unsure as to whether this question is referring to inter-church relationships within our synod, or with other denominations. However, I will answer this assuming it means within our synod and in that area I have found there to be extremely little inter-church relationship except what is sought out individually by congregations themselves.
176. We are not in full alter and pulpit fellowship with ELCC.
177. Our congregation does not need inter-church relationships by an expensive bureaucracy.
178. Do the congregations know about the importance of dialoguing with other church bodies?
179. I do not see much activity on inter-church relations just a few statements.
180. There has been very little communication with the lay people in our congregations. We have not been educated or continuously informed of the "goings on" in our church affairs and many of us are surprised to see how many branches of so incorporated arms length bodies there are and what they do and how much money they all handle. Only the TOP appear to have some handle on this.
181. We don't get together often enough to get to know each other.
182. I feel there should be more opportunities to get together with other congregations.
183. Opportunities for pastors and lay people to participate mission work in Nicaragua, Thailand, and the Ukraine is extremely important. Relationships with other denominations does not impact our congregations.
184. If the inter-church relationship is involving congregations in mission work (e.g. sending mission teams to Nicaragua or Ukraine) then there is a positive benefit to a local congregation. If the inter-church relationships are focused on ecumenical relations, then we are wasting a lot of energy, time and resource on something that in no way meets the needs of our congregations.
185. It is not clear if this refers to relationships between congregations of between synods.
186. Overall, I am unimpressed with communication in the whole LCC organization. I don't see much sharing between congregations, districts etc.
187. we need to stop functioning as a hundred different bodies and come together as one body that shares resources, ideas, people, and fellowship. I am amazed at how many LCC congregations fail to pool resources with their fellow LCC congregations and instead 'burn-out' their core members doing the same thing as their neighbor LCC church down the street,

when we could function as a larger team to accomplish the same efforts more effectively. LCC should nurture and encourage more collaboration between congregations

188. communications not always effective
189. I think it is a shame that we can't openly inter-act with other denominations.
190. If inter-church means relations between denominations, then a good effort is being put forward toward unity in doctrine. If inter-church means relations between LCC congregations, then on a synodical level there is zero being done.
191. I have not seen that it has made to much of a difference.
192. Our congregations don't really need talks with Catholics or Anglicans or other 'Lutherans' or...unfortunately in this fallen world, there will be different denominations.
193. There is one Lord but different denominations and that's the way it is. I don't want to be catholic or move towards it.
194. Assuming this question is addressing the issue of dialogue with other denominations. Quite useless. A waste of time and manpower. I mean, dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church? Why?
195. I don't know what is meant by this.
196. we can't be isolated from other congregations or other church faiths
197. Our modest initiatives are appropriate for our church body, bearing in mind its confession, history, and resources.
198. this is a vague question and needs to be clarified
199. This question is vague and needs to be re-examined
200. There ought to be more encouragement and emphasis on using a common liturgy across all congregations such as the LSB. This is a valuable tool in binding our congregations together and the easiest starting point.

201. I would disagree only for the reason that when I tried to think of the inter-congregational opportunities provided by LCC all I could think of was the Canadian Lutheran. Other than that, nothing jumps out at me.
202. I don't know what these efforts involve.
203. more information to make the congregation more knowledgeable
204. There is a large gap between LCC and other Christian denominations.
205. I see no correlation at this time.
206. I feel some of our service organizations need to have a second look.
207. Very poor!!!!
208. I agree if you mean outside of the Lutheran denomination. Otherwise, I am not understanding the question.
209. Despite the best efforts of providing information much is lost in translation; a blurb or two in the bulletin, article in CDN Lutheran really doesn't cut it.
210. What efforts?
211. President Robert Bugbee is a man I have a great deal of faith in. He believes in inter-church relations and works hard to make them happen. If we are all believers in Jesus Christ and his saving grace, then we should work together because there are greater forces working hard to destroy us one by one.
212. Haven't seen anything trickle down to the congregational level.

213. We are increasingly becoming more and more isolated and consequently irrelevant in the world to a majority of people. The next generation of Lutheran kids are increasingly finding church irrelevant.
214. I don't know what these are.
215. LCC does not really facilitate any practical inter-church relationships either with other LCC churches in our district nor with any other non-LCC churches in our community.
216. No clue, sorry.
217. I understand that each district has its own entity, because of the vast geographic area of our country. However
218. I see nothing at all occurring in this area.
219. Could be more open to being partners with other churches.
220. -irrelevant to restructuring within the Synod
221. Too strict...especially re women. Ok to be involve in service projects but not the ministry. This sets this church apart from participating in inter church relationships.
222. Not sure what you mean by this.... does this mean between the LCC churches or between other Christian churches???
223. Too far away from our church. Even the District (which is much closer to our home) has difficulty in handling all of the challenges of inter-church relations. LCC has an impossible task in this regard if it is to meet and maintain healthy, timely inter-church relationships.
224. I'm not sure if this question means relationships between LCC and other church bodies or relationships between congregations. I find it quite interesting to see the work that LCC does with other church bodies. I think it is appropriate and encouraging. On the other hand, if the question refers to relationships between LCC congregations then I think not much is happening and more could be done.
225. However, more inter-church relationships are required.
226. not if you're referring to ELCIC or other denominations
227. I'm not sure I understand what this means.
228. Our churches minimally, if ever, interact with each other.
229. We have to rely on services provided by another Lutheran Church body to provide hospital visits to our members.
230. Don't understand the question
231. Churches need to work together. They are working as individuals only.
232. I don't really know what is being asked in this question. What would qualify as "inter-church relationships"? And how is LCC fostering that? I believe inter-church relationships are important but I don't know whether what LCC is currently doing meets those needs.
233. I am not sure whether you mean inter-church body relationships, or inter-congregation relationships.
234. I think you need to be more specific on this question. What type of inter-church relationships are you talking about?
235. Inter church relationships appear to be synod and district presidents travelling around the world to other church conventions to bring greetings. What a waste of resources. Also, we're so worried about what other people believe or don't believe that we can't seem to see them as fellow children of God.
236. ILC is largely irrelevant to our congregations, and it isn't really clear what we are doing within Canada to work with others where appropriate (irrational fear of "unionism" is wearing a little thin).

237. There are not inter-church relationships unless the pastors are good friends.
238. There is a historic east-west divide. It is part of the Canadian psyche and prairie farmers complaining that rail rates favour the east. A consistent, strong, loving effort on a daily basis is required to improve inter church relationships.
239. If this means we share & assist our sister or other churches, I believe we do so.
240. I would say that our local circuit pastors have a good relationship through their winkles but actual inter-congregational activities are few and far between. One local congregation hosts a yearly youth gathering that invites other congregations to attend but this is about the only example I can think of. The same can be said for the district/synod conventions/youth gatherings but I cannot think of any district/synod events or other efforts that result in inter-congregational/denominational work.
241. Some churches in area still do not support each other in promotion of each others' events, even in support of the seminaries.
242. The local congregation is not the focus of their work
243. don't fully understand LCC's role in that
244. Don't understand question.
245. They meet the needs of continual dialogue with other Church bodies and have little direct impact on our
246. The national church body of LCC is set up to take care of the national and international inter-church relationships. However, the Districts and Circuits have been the most responsive in helping congregations deal with local inter-church relationships. The national church body would need to absorb the regional duties in order to meet the full needs of congregations. The national church body currently has little or no experience in managing on this local level.
247. More evidence of competition than co-operation.
248. No evidence of inter-church relations in 25 years
249. We could do better. Much better.
250. It doesn't really impact my congregation, which pretty much meets their needs.
251. Are there inter church relationships?
252. It is neat to read about the LCC's efforts at this are, but most inter-church relationships happen at the grass-roots level, person to person and congregation to congregation.
253. as an emeritus pastor, I can't speak for the congregation
254. I don't think that it is a need of our congregation. As far as LCC goes, it is good as a church body, but it does not affect the individual congregation.
255. I like the current efforts but I think it needs to be stepped up, especially in relation to WELS and ELS.
256. as an emeritus pastor, I cannot speak for the congregation.
257. There are very few inter-church relationships.
258. If this is referring to relationships with other church bodies, then I feel that our congregation is largely un-impacted by such things. Nevertheless, I think it is still an important task for our national church to participate in as there is a need to have international relationships with churches who are like-minded, and to understand the reasons why we are NOT connected to other Lutheran church bodies in our own neighbourhoods.
259. I do not see much efforts from LCC in regards to inter-church relationships.
260. Our congregation needs to know but 2 things regarding inter-church relationships 1. That the door is always open to study scripture in an attempt to lead the erring to the doctrine in all its

faucets. and 2. That unless that doctrinal agreement exists, we maintain the unpopular position that while not denying anyone's salvation who trusts in Christ crucified for the forgiveness of their sins, false doctrine and unionism is to be avoided and closed communion faithfully practiced. Thus we should not be in league with mission societies that are heterodox, (even if they take the name Lutheran) nor should some of our parishes commune whoever they please while the rest appear unfaithful for their uncompromising stance.

261. I am glad to see the men who are involved in inter-church relations and are best equipped to enter into such discussions and relations.
262. Again, I have seen no evidence of this.
263. I feel that as a congregation we are isolated.
264. unsure of what is meant by Inter-church relationships
265. None, that I have seen.
266. I don't think we work with other churches as much as we could. We work well with fellow LCC congregations.
267. How would the average layman know?
268. Inter-church relationship efforts are abysmal.
269. They are trying but can't please everyone.
270. My community does lots interfaith activities - bible study, special occasion (Ash Wednesday, Candlelight service, Shrove Tuesday, etc. otherwise we would not be able to participate.
271. I do not know what you mean by "inter-church". More explanation would be needed to make a judgement.
272. Inter-church relations are viewed and practiced very differently in small and declining rural communities than in cities and areas of large population.
273. the congregations all work as little islands and need to work better as a synod with the synodical office at the head of the church body right below our saviour
274. Don't really understand what this is asking.
275. I don't know what the efforts have been for "inter-church" relationships.
276. haven't seen any of LCC's efforts in this area
277. When has this ever happened never.
278. One see's very famous personages representing LCC in various efforts to bring the various main stream Christian churches but totally stay away from conversations with local "Westminster" based churches. These being the most common churches that we share within our small communities. Get it together.

a. Dialogue is good. 2) Can lead to wrong results if "we give in/stray"

279. not informed enough to comment
280. I do not know
281. We have to be careful that we don't give in on our doctrine and faithfulness to the Word of God.
282. Assuming 'inter-church' means relationships between LCC congregations, more is needed. There appears to be very little coordination between congregations in a city/geographic area for coordinated efforts and outreach.
283. We have no business joining any organization that has a connection with the Vatican.
284. I haven't been aware of any efforts in this direction.

285. I think few people in our congregations are aware of what the efforts are; still less aware of how and/or why they meet the needs of the congregations.
286. No inter-church relations outside LCC should take place without consent of the church body. Too many churches have found themselves in pulpit exchange without agreement
287. However, I am unaware as to what relationships are being promoted and provided by LCC now.
288. Not always as idealistic trends from some pastors and district officials were not always in the individual churches and their members best interests. That has caused friction with officials and lay members throughout.
289. This needs a great amount of work! New thinking is needed.
290. Despite the best efforts of providing information [from LCC] much is lost in translation; a blurb or two in the bulletin, article in CDN Lutheran really doesn't cut it.
291. In a shrinking community of believers, more needs to be done to support these relationships.
292. Are you talking about between denominations or between LCC congregations?
293. What are their needs?
294. All congregations feel most comfortable using their own building and practices. All Pastors want all their members 'in their seats' every service. We could all learn so much from exposure to other practices and programs, but we don't take the time and effort to get this exposure. LCC should support reporting of the best, and worst, of worship in other congregations and other Christian denominations.
295. Not at all.
296. Do not know what this means. I have not heard of this before.
297. My experience is that at the local community level pastors and congregations tend to withdraw from contact and dialog with other Christians.
298. We really don't have any inter- church relations. I know it's a tough call and really depends where other Churches are with their beliefs.
299. We do not have enough knowledge to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
300. More association with other denominations gives a wider view of Christianity.
301. What are the efforts being made?
302. how is it fostered actively?
303. Not sure what is considered as Inter Church relationships?
304. Explanation?
305. A little leaven.....
306. Once again, as a lay member I have no way of monitoring or measuring this.
307. Are you meaning relationships with other denominations in our communities? If so we tend hide ourselves and don't play well with others. If it is amongst our own we could have more inter parish functions like family days, pulpit exchanges.
308. If there is inter-church dialogue going on, we would never notice it at congregation level, except in articles in Canadian Lutheran. what are results? Why are we not part of Canadian Council of Churches or EFC, when there appears to be no doctrinal compromise?
309. I'm not quite sure what is meant by inter-church relationships. Each congregation I've been at has different ideas concerning inter-church relationships.
310. These largely make no impact on the local congregation. They seem to be activities that are "busywork" for the national leadership to keep them busy.

311. These efforts with NALC and other denominations seem to be more intriguing and academic exercises rather than making traction in furthering the work of God's kingdom. I don't see how it has impacted our congregations in any tangible way.
312. Let's not work in isolation and no new ideas.
313. I'm not aware of any such efforts.
314. I am uncertain what these efforts are. If it refers to the conversations between the Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and NALC, I've yet to see any fruit from the talks (besides academic/theological exercises). These efforts have not led to greater cooperation in the Kingdom, at least from what I've seen.
315. What do you mean by inter-church? Other denominations (5) or our synod (2). See the paper copy for the meaning of the numbers.
316. Not sure how much discussions between church officials really serve the needs and realities our parishes face.
317. I am not certain that our inter-church relations have any real direct impact at the grass-roots level as these tend to be more 'international' in scope. This is not a criticism so much as an observation as I am not sure who, locally within Canada, we would seek out to engage in fellowship.
318. I believe most congregation members are unaware there are inter-church relations and indeed to our detriment, some of our pastor regard their local ministerial circle with barely veiled suspicion and even contempt. Despite our theological differences, and indeed because of them, we need to reach out to our brothers and sisters in Christ in love and with, if necessary, gentle correction and they should dialogue with us in the same way. But maybe simply more communication about our discussions with NALC and other church bodies would start to diminish fear and build bridges.
319. dialogue with other church bodies of all kinds is essential and edifying and a crucial role for confessing the Faith
320. People in the volunteer positions of church council need more training in their required positions. Quite often, personal opinions take the place of church doctrine.
321. Generally, the LCC has appeared to separate itself from the Body of Christ on doctrinal grounds. We need to seek unity on Jesus prayers in John 17. Unity is based on love and relationship with Jesus.
322. It would be helpful to have more up-to-date information on the various denominations in Canada and their practices here as they might diverge from elsewhere (the Roman Catholic church practising things differently here than in Africa or Asia, similarly the Anglican). As well, with the United Church of Canada having ordained a publicly professing atheist, we seriously have to make a decision as to whether the United Church of Canada is still part of the visible Christian Church and whether or not we should treat them as heretical and no longer recognize their baptisms as Christian baptisms (as we treat the Unitarians). Having said all this, I cannot see any practical way of handling this that would not cost more money and already over-stretch overly stretched staff. Put this in the realm of dreaming.
323. Local pastors condemn interaction of members with different denominations as being a bad influence.
324. not seeing anything coming from LCC in this. Anything I see seems to be grass roots from auxiliary groups
325. The dialogue with Roman Catholic Church is encouraging
326. We have never had anyone come out to talk to us.

327. LCC congregations must be urged and educated to look at the common good for LCC rather than their individuality - Especially important with our "greying" and declining congregation numbers.
328. We have never had a visit from any of our church leaders.
329. not a priority, we should focus on being Lutheran, preaching doctrine from the stand point of who we are, instead of trying to please everyone: can't
330. Different congregations do not collaborate at a level of satisfaction. Better utilizing technology and digital means can accelerate and meet some of these needs.
331. Not sure what inter-church means.
332. Not knowledgeable on this subject.
333. The Canadian Lutheran is an excellent paper. Also the work of the synod in discussions with LCMS and other church bodies is important
334. Not sure how much of our synod's inter-church relationships and contacts actually affects our congregations. One area that does, however, need addressing is our relationship with the LCMS; especially as it relates to the large number of English District congregations in Ontario and the great confusing such has caused in the minds of people.
335. Do we actually have any? Oh! I see! You mean between OUR congregations! Our congregations act as if they are all alone, in the circuit, district, synod, and body of Christ. We are so careful to show that we are not like those other sinners. Just like the parable.
336. The intent of these talks are not for the immediate benefit of a local congregation but the long-term benefit of the church-at-large.
337. LCC needs to be more ecumenical and supportive of THE CHURCH (all Gods people), not just LCC Christians. We need to show a united front to non-Christians. Stop the confusion that helps the devil do his work of division!
338. I am not sure exactly what that means.
339. Don't know what LCC inter-church relations are, they may have different meanings for different folks
340. This is important to be part of, however, I don't see where it makes a difference among congregations.
341. These efforts, if any, are essentially invisible to the congregations.
342. Now that Pastor Astley has been involved, I hope so
343. Not clear on this statement. What are "inter-church relationships”? Fellowship (altar and pulpit) with Lutherans other than LCC or churches of different beliefs? If the latter, then I disagree
344. Does this include other Christian congregations? We should nurture relationships with others.
345. Our Pastor wants no relations with other Denominations!
346. What are the 'inter-church' relationships? Just specifically to LCC?
347. I am not fully aware of what LCC's efforts are with my congregation.
348. churches still for the most part stand as silos within LCC more should be done to encourage a community
349. I know nothing about inter-church relationships in LCC
350. Despite the best efforts of providing information much is lost in translation; a blurb or two in the bulletin, article in CDN Lutheran really doesn't cut it.
351. What efforts, the normal congregation does not know this answer

352. I think our congregation would benefit greatly by inter-acting with other Christian denominations more than they do.... especially the Pentecostal, Congregational and Anglican churches. They do inter-act with the Baptists somewhat. They could put notices up on the bulletin board, and in the church bulletins more often, of events in these churches. They could have bake sales and yard sales together to raise money for the Christian School.
353. I stumble on inter-church relationships. My interpretation is the amount of time the synods and districts spend in dialogue with other Christian churches. I feel these discussions are not very fruitful and do not need to be ongoing.
354. referring to Alberta/BC District
355. I interpret inter-church relationships as our dialogues with other Christian church bodies. I believe our church spends too much time defining (defending) its role with other churches. There is no advantage in these discussions. We are different and we should not waste our time trying to decide what we agree or do not agree on. If inter-church means amongst ourselves, I believe this is best managed at the district level. LCC synod should focus on the bigger stuff.
356. Not so much seeking unity and fellowship, but understanding and cooperation, particularly in social issues and legal issues. We need not be in full fellowship to present a unified front on issues which we share a common teaching.
357. What are examples of "inter-church relationship" efforts?
358. Not sure of any efforts made.
359. Not really anymore.
360. What are LCC's efforts in inter-church relationships? Could you have listed them?
361. I've observed thoughtful LCC leadership and positions taken relative to other denominations and the theology and doctrines (or lack thereof) that we've seen elsewhere.
362. Interchurch? Between other LCC churches or with other denominations? Between LCC churches it is fine. Cavorting with other churches is a bad idea.
363. This is a very unclear / confusing statement with little meaning. 1. Much to much "lets all not say anything" and hope things will be forgiven and forgotten (see ABC - CEF and DIL)
364. I haven't seen any efforts at inter church relations within our congregation. Maybe an invite to an outside choir or introduction to a new pastor
365. We need to reach our more to other emerging confessional Churches such as NALC and CALC
366. We need to get our act together and become ONE united Lutheran Church
367. I understand "inter-church" as the relationship among LCC congregations. If so, yes. Congregations need to be aware that they are not alone; they are not Lone Rangers. Our sorrows are divided; our joy is multiplied.
368. If you belong to Wisconsin Synod or ELCIC, you are inferior according to LCC standards.
369. Though most don't even know it is going on at a Synodical level it is an assistance to us all.
370. LCC and the separate districts seem to focus on things that have little to do with the actual congregations.
371. Do not understand the question
372. We should have more information available to us about why we have good or not so good relationships with other church bodies.
373. ???

374. What does inter-church mean? Is this only Lutheran churches we speak about? How about working with other denominations in a community? Aren't we all destined for the same journey?
375. It is my opinion that this need has been fulfilled mainly at the District level.
376. My opinion is that this effort has been provided more at the District level.
377. What efforts are made. Sorry!
378. I find that much of the work of LCC is poorly disseminated and many in the churches [including myself] do not understand what is Synod is doing and why.
379. While different churches do things differently, an indeed believe differently, there is merit in maintaining a relationship with other Christian churches. LCC does not seem to support local ministerial groups, as for more than 20 years our pastors have dis-associated themselves from the local ministerial. It seems to be an attitude within our congregation's leadership that the Lutheran way supersedes the Christian way.
380. Romans 16:17
381. I appreciate the LCC dialogue with the Roman Catholic church and finding agreement on issues like abortion, women's ordination, etc. I also like the idea of us talking with other Christian groups, like our conservative Anglican friends.
382. This question is a little confusing. I believe that LCC does a very good job of staying true to our confessions while being compassionate to other church bodies. If you are asking about inter-church relationships within LCC then I believe we do an adequate job of encouraging relationships amongst our churches.
383. From my vantage point as a lay member, it appears we are doing a decent job of this.
384. There is definitely not enough here. It is important for inter-church relationships to exist on a regular basis throughout the year. This is how we learn from each other, grow together, support each other.
385. Congregations must fit into community in meaningful ways; prayer for Church Unity, Food Bank, Community outreach; arrogance or separation doesn't win people for Christ.
386. I don't see a need for inter-church relationships.
387. Our needs are not significant, but we want to see Gods people working together.
388. All Christian denominations need to work together these days.
389. Other than The Canadian Lutheran, there is little done in the area of inter-church relationships.
390. LCC Churches are too arrogant and rude to get long with other congregations; how can they react to other denominations in a positive way.
391. LC-C's efforts in inter-church relationships appear non-existent at the congregational level
392. Being isolated we have little or no inter-church relationships.
393. Our congregations NEED to be outwardly focused.
394. More resources are need to support smaller congregations. i.e.: sermons, liturgical calendars, liturgies for the layman, hymns on DVD's or flash drives. With the ever increasing numbers of vacancies and lack of vacancy pastors, churches that wish to remain open and provide services to their congregations need resources for lay members to conduct lay services.
395. This is the generation for being Christian first, denominational far behind that.
396. As a lay person, I am unaware of such inter-church relationships other than what I see in the Canadian Lutheran, and to be truthful, most of the time I don't really read these articles. I read the headings, but that is about it as they don't seem of interest to me.
397. This question is too ambiguous

398. Next to no one even knows they exist
399. I do not believe discussions are prompted by the needs of present congregations.
400. In terms of local cooperation (say, congregations in a given city working together), this is probably more the responsibility of the local pastors. Perhaps the circuit counsellors should be doing more to encourage inter-church relationships within each circuit.
401. Attendance is low at circuit forums. It's difficult to impose this from above.
402. LCC has taken some leadership in international church relationships, but it seems to me that more effort could be put into improving inter-Lutheran relationships in Canada, perhaps as part of the 2017 celebrations.
403. Other than the pastors getting together for monthly meetings are there any inter-church relationships? Only if the 2 or 3 pastors of the different churches are buddies.
404. We have been, within Canada, an inward looking church, and haven't really grasped what it means to be a Lutheran Church in Canada
405. ~ the only concern here is that we stay strong in our doctrine. ~ I think of St. Paul speaking to the Galatians 3:1ff and warning them about what they are walking away and leaving for something else.

9. Our congregation values the parish services, e.g. stewardship, youth, education, that our District provides.

1. Have not noticed much of that since I became a member.
2. Central district lacks the funding to provide any significant assistance in these fields.
3. We have lost all our youth to other churches. The youth conferences are great, but then they come home to little churches with the same old songs and liturgy. It depresses them and they leave or don't go at all.
4. We value these services but see little offered to our parish. How can these services be provided and by whom?
5. Seems to have little impact at congregation level.
6. We are small, so most programs do not apply.
7. as a small congregation I don't feel we utilize those services.
8. not sure what is offered
9. No opinion as we have not used these services - much seemed unrealistic and more trouble than home grown ideas. Some really good Bible studies, and video would be useful.
10. As a very small congregation, most have not met our needs.
11. Sufficient opportunities and programs in these areas. However funding participants if individuals cannot pay must come from districts not through own congregations. Re youth and educational opportunities.
12. Sufficient opportunities and programs in these areas. However, funding participants if individuals cannot pay must
13. FUNDING ISSUES. District to pay costs of registration for e.g. Evangelfest.
14. They value only what they are involved in
15. They value only what they are involved in.
16. It works well when it is not misleading by High Church Ministers.
17. Our congregations need to increase usage of services offered.
18. Our congregation is aging so what does LCC do for aging congregations.
19. I don't know what our district provides.

20. Our congregation is failing in this respect big time! (all aspects)
21. My congregation values these things, but I'm unsure of what parish services the District provides.
22. some but so much is muddied with the CEF impacts, drained our funds and abused our savings.
23. There is no existing youth, stewardship, or education parish service in ABC.
24. Too much energy, $ and people went to other matters like CEF role, and not what we really needed. So now we have very little provided.
25. Other than joint youth events, I haven't experienced many programs provided or facilitated by the District.
26. I don't think our congregation uses any of these services. Nor am I even certain what is offered anymore.
27. Some of these services are appreciated, others not. Our youth ministry, for instance, in my opinion treats youth basically as Sunday School children and does not instill appreciation for our liturgy and confession.
28. There could/should be more interest by the members of my congregation. As pastor, I try to promote events and opportunities that are offered via the district.
29. PPC recently cancelled the Steven Ministers program because most of the volunteers involved with the program disagreed with the removal of Pastor Nathan. Care Receivers have had their care workers that have been together for months terminated. My Wife is a Steven Minister and at no time were church politics discussed unless the Care receiver asked questions.
30. It seems that our church does not make use of the services
31. The congregation does... but the pastor does not share very much interest OR concern.
32. I don't think this can be answered objectively. In today's atmosphere, there likely isn't much positive thought.
33. We need to start a youth program like the "Walther League" to keep our young people in church.
34. Only pastors and helpers are qualified to know though - Some areas are perhaps better than others.
35. What services of youth stewardship and education? Nobody wants to travel this far to us, as it seems to be a longer road for them than it is for us.
36. Our church is a mission a fair distance from District resources, so often unable to utilize them.
37. I am not aware that such services are provided.
38. I find resources from the district to be lacking. As a professional church worker who specializes in education (including youth education) I wouldn't even know where to go in the district to find resources.
39. Many are unaware of what's available or happening within the church.
40. While these are some good resources available, I am not sure that congregations are regularly updated or reminded of the resources that are available.
41. We have not used much of this in recent years especially in Central.
42. District Stewardship program was very ineffective - Offerings actually got worse Never used any services for youth or education - based on the above not likely to try
43. We really do need these.
44. Tried the stewardship program offered by district it was very ineffective

45. Didn't know this was available
46. Not all of the parish services are utilized nor considered important.
47. I am sure it would value these things but in my opinion I don't think they are provided at all from a district level.
48. We have an outstanding seminary in St. Catharines that seems to be training and delivering solid men for the ministry lately. This seminary is the only properly-operating function in the LCC. The rest of the District services like stewardship programs and youth events can be terminated. I have four children (ages 5-11) myself and value fellowship opportunities for them, but I will not send them to any event that is not distinctly Lutheran. As things currently stand, individual congregations can organize these events more effectively. The DPS is just another money- and time-waster and should be eliminated.
49. Our congregation has hosted the District Confirmand Retreat twice in recent years, and members were so turned off by the flakiness of the whole thing that nobody would even consider sending their children to such a retreat again. We now seek out Higher Things and other confessional retreats, usually outside our District and even outside LCC. We had a District representative make a presentation on a stewardship program which was so misguided that it would have seriously compromised our congregation's focus on Word and Sacraments. We had another District representative make a presentation about outreach, which also missed the mark entirely. We've become very skeptical of the District's parish services, and try to stay away from them.
50. Perhaps this is more my own feeling than that of our congregational leadership, or the relevance to our congregation's current needs and ministry setting. I nevertheless agree to say yes, these services are of value and I'd like to see them continue.
51. My congregation feels that certain prerogatives of the LCC and LLC-East District do not necessarily always reflect the spiritual needs and values that we hold, especially in terms of youth engagement and education.
52. Since we are a mission church there hasn't been much provision in the areas of stewardship, youth, education but the District has been supportive in providing pastoral care.
53. I see very little benefit from our District. It seems to me that the biggest service District provides is financial aid to congregations that cannot support themselves. The other operations of District seem minor in comparison, and their efforts are not widely felt.
54. Our PPC has just removed a valuable service for people in need of Christian caregiving with no reason given and in my opinion, no justification. Definitely not based on investigation as none was done to the best of my knowledge.
55. None of these services are provided to our congregation.
56. I feel it does.
57. I believe this is true, however I do not think most parishioners know what is there and being done from above.
58. have see no leadership from the district
59. district has not provided much in these areas
60. have seen little evidence of the above at our church
61. I've been in leadership roles within our Congregation ... and have seen very little evidence of any "services" being provided by the District.
62. very little help given from district
63. I think more should be done to encourage boys at Sunday school. Most programs include crafts and reading, memorizing which is great for girls

64. At present we have a lot of young people not in church there also must be encouragement from parents.
65. I'm not sure what "stewardship" and "youth" services the District provides. Individual churches take care of their own stewardship perfectly well. Youth events are planned by district pastors, but how does the District Office itself enter in? "Education," meaning providing courses for laity? Isn't that a function of the synod, or the seminaries themselves? I don't see the District providing meaningful help in any of these categories.
66. Don't think our members are aware of this services.
67. We value it but is too often lacking in Fundamental ways? Not usually timely assistance and too much administration.
68. But not with everything that comes along from our Dist.
69. Just aren't always aware of what that is, see General comments.
70. It only has limited use for various reasons not the fault of the District.
71. Most of our congregational members are probably unaware of these services.
72. At this time, I am not involved in my congregation's review and choices in programs implemented, so I am not sure if District programs are valued or not.
73. In my experience as a board member on the district level, I noticed that some congregations choose to plug into ideas and material offered by various of the district committees--if the congregation or its pastor saw a need and found the offered material relevant to that need. On the other side of the coin-- it was rare that a congregation shared with a board or committee material, that the congregation or pastor found beneficial.
74. My congregation has not experienced these services from our District.
75. Never seen evidence of parish services.
76. not aware of how often or how valued these parish services are accessed.
77. Congregations, however, need to realize that the work resides with the congregation and not District staff. It is at the congregational level that God's work is done. District cannot be an excuse for being unfaithful in our duties. Especially mission!
78. The Free and Joyous Response program didn't accomplish anything in my church.
79. I think these services could possible be provided by Synod in a restructured form or by the circuits.
80. I am not aware of any parish services that our congregation receives. There are no District Youth events that I am aware of.
81. We do not hear or see District other than the LCC news Letter
82. Many/most of the District events do not get filtered down to the congregational level where members are informed about them, let alone encouraged to attend such events.
83. I do not know the extent to which our congregation has used these services
84. If you are referring to resources provided by the parish services "departments" of our Districts/Synod, then yes, I have appreciated the use of stewardship resources provided by our district as well as resources accessed online from the East District several years back. I have also used and appreciated the family Confirmation material written by the Wetaskiwin circuit and provided through the ABC-District office in my parish. I believe providing sound biblical, doctrinal and well-prepared resources for stewardship, youth, and education is valuable to our congregation, though I haven't used these resources extensively.
85. What parish services provided by district??? We receive no district support.
86. I believe that the congregation believes they are doing this themselves.

87. Depends on the leadership. Some are more enthusiastic than others. Lack of understanding and utilizing of spiritual gifts given to us by the Holy Spirit to build up.
88. We don't see allot from the District level. Other than our News letter.
89. Let's be clear - I think the A-BC district took care of itself first, in salaries and extras, and then saw to do what it could for the congregations. Years ago when I suggested to Ted Ulmer, then the financial guru for the district, that all district staff should be paid on the scale given for pastors, the poor man almost fainted. I took that meant his salary would be significantly reduced! Never could I get a straight answer out of him for anyone's salaries either. When I pointed out that these wages are paid from our gifts, not our taxes and we deserve to be made accountable for where our monies have been spent, he said that it was "just too complicated" to explain how much was paid in each individual salary. When I asked him what was the amount on the cheques he wrote for salaries he walked away. To declare these is the only fair and open way to do business. And I would urge LCC to become as open as they can regarding all expenses, including salaries, to be divulged individually, unless you too want to hide how you have spent our gifts???
90. I don't think most people know what it is...they come to church for an hour on Sunday and participation beyond that is limited
91. NO Sunday School, 3 youth counted (are bored and no friends), old members, younger (so sad) go to Pentecostal Baptist for social gain
92. Our Pastor feels the above services are not important. “takes effort”
93. With limited resources come limited parish services.
94. In the past few years, we have not seen much benefit in our District as far as the District providing these services. We have done most of this on our own or within our Circuit.
95. Somewhat
96. What we have received in the past has been valuable. We have not had good communication in the past year with District in regards to CEF. Many people are upset and haven't seen Matthew 18 come into play.
97. I assume my congregation values the seminary, for example.
98. The ABC District does a great job with what they are given for services and outreach.
99. Congregation may somewhat but the Pastor and immediate select circle have circled the wagons to protect on matters related to CEF. This has taken the value of the core business away. Missioning using these service terms have lost their value and meaning.
100. Occasional involvement.
101. I think part of the congregation values the parish services while other parts of the congregation do not really consider/think of them to utilize them or wonder if they are valuable.
102. I only see what our congregation does in term of stewardship, youth and education. I don't see what our District does or how it contributes.
103. Again, as a lay person, I have no idea what is provided or if it is of use to our congregation.
104. But like so many things, only when they need something from them.
105. I don't know
106. The youth of today are the adult members of tomorrow. We must find a way to educate these people for the continuation of their faith and our church memberships.
107. Servolution is the only material I remember. And upon (cursory) review, it looked to be a gimmick with no Lutheran content. If such clear Lutheran content was there, it was hidden in generic pop church language that would fall below the radar of those who need to hear it.

And that seems to be the point of the wiki fivetwo approach, which is an abomination to confessional Lutheranism. The fact that our district promotes pastors to attend the wiki fivetwo conference in Katy, Texas, frankly makes me think that the District is not qualified to teach the church and perhaps should refrain from such programs and materials.

108. Although I really don't know how much these services have been used in the past.
109. The problem is that youth ministry in my district has been basically promoting non-liturgical forms of music and service, and in my opinion it only prepares our youth to abandon LCC once they are independent.
110. more work needs to be done to bring youth into the church. e.g. declining attendance at youth gatherings
111. Not aware of most programs
112. We do not need "Directors of Parish Services" -We need "Parish Service Workers"
113. To our knowledge, there are few Parish services offered to our congregation
114. what does it provide?
115. District services are worthless.
116. I would say that the majority of our congregation have no idea what support they get from District.
117. need more info from district - can't evaluate it
118. I can't say we have been impacted one way or the other
119. Agree somewhat. The mentioned services are useful but not crucial.
120. But we didn't make full use of the material available.
121. What services are provided? We would value such services if they were available. The services that do exist are hindered dramatically by very poor communication to congregations.
122. Our congregation seems rather isolated. You are saying District provides services.....what are these services? In what way could they benefit my congregation? There is a gap between what may be offered and how to access these things.
123. They don't know much, if anything, about it.
124. Are there any?
125. No opinion. I do not know which services we use that are provided by the District. I will educate myself.
126. I have very good memories of attending youth conferences and events. These memories will stay with me all my life. In addition, the seminaries provide excellent opportunities for not only clergy but also lay people within the church such as the Quest series. If anything, more youth outreach could be done.
127. It is valued but not essential.
128. In the past I think some of the programs have been more evangelical than Lutheran. I see an alarming trend to get caught up in the number of members and pressure on Pastors to show growth or have a certain number of members - especially in congregations that are subsidized. This happens to such an extent that I hear many clergy feel that preaching the Word and administering the Sacrament is not enough. One must have exponential growth to be "successful." I know of one retired clergy who feels his entire ministry was a failure as he did not have this exponential growth in his congregations that he served. I find this very disturbing and heartbreaking.
129. Not enough information on this.

130. In the Central District I do not see much activity in this area. I feel far removed from District planning and from seeing District staff once in a while. My church used to belong to Minnesota North - LCMS District in the 60's and 70's and there was an attitude of working together and good leadership style. Especially appreciated working with A. Mennecke and J. Uhrinak. and witnessed rapid growth within our congregations. This aspect has ended.
131. Our (formerly) large ABC District staff did not seem to be providing essential services to congregations, and was distracting from its constitutional purpose by the kinds of projects it was supporting through the CEF.
132. Our congregation does not appear to access these resources.
133. Very, very little provided
134. Communication on services they provide could be stronger.
135. I don't think our congregation values these above services as I don't really hear about them much at our church.
136. Not aware of any
137. agree that there are support services for stewardship and youth etc. that are there and valuable but it is up to the individual churches if they make use of these services. I think more could be done to encourage the utilization of these district services.
138. We get District help with Stewardship and with evangelism. I see no District involvement in youth or education
139. In terms of deacons, we currently have nowhere to send individuals who wish to become DPS's, and there are very few individuals that even know what a DPS is.
140. Don't know what services District provides.
141. Our congregation does not use the above services??
142. Am not aware of our congregation receiving such services.
143. No visibility.
144. What LCC effort has ever been made regarding stewardship, youth, education?
145. Don't know what services District provides.
146. I Am not sure what they provide to my church
147. Needs to be more effective and the importance stressed. The future is our youth.
148. Not aware of these services
149. I helped start a Christian preschool at our church. I received lip service that the parish services were there to help but in actuality, because of distance from Edmonton, the needs of the south were so different from the north that I ask for help from other Christian preschools in the south. Canada is so spread out that it was difficult to get
150. Feel more could be done
151. We have in the past.
152. Servolution is the only material I remember. And upon (admittedly cursory) review, it looked to be a gimmick with no Lutheran content. If such clear Lutheran content was there, it was hidden in generic pop church language that would fall below the radar of those who need to hear it. And that seems to be the point of the wiki fivetwo approach.
153. we ought to focus more on youth and children than we do.
154. Our congregation asked for help in setting up a preschool. We were giving a book to follow but very little hands on help.
155. Though we haven't had a DPS at our congregation for several years now, we have not forgotten the benefits we reaped from that.
156. Little evidence of these services.

157. The materials are written only in English; my congregation speaks and reads only French.
158. Some have been of great value to us - youth.
159. These services have been of negligible help and in some cases have caused our congregation to get off the path it should have been on.
160. Our children and youth need to receive greater emphasis in LCC. If not, we risk becoming a denomination of grey-haired members.
161. we are a small rural parish so I would say we do not benefit as much as a larger more vibrant congregation that has multiple age groups. but we are working on it one soul at a time, thanks be to God.
162. As far as I know, our district doesn't have these services. If it does, they're not located at our church.
163. Not sure my congregation makes much use of any parish service materials or personnel that the district provides. Not even sure what the district provides.
164. Again, what does this mean? As a pastor, I would say that our congregation has, from time to time, received value from our District, which I have appreciated. I think our congregation's leadership would say they have valued some of the help and guidance provided by District. This is particularly the case now as we are in a vacancy situation. As for the congregation as a whole, I think that they generally are indifferent to the District.
165. If you are referring to resources provided by the parish services "departments" of our Districts/Synod, then yes, I have appreciated the use of stewardship resources provided by our district as well as resources accessed online from the East District several years back. I have also used and appreciated the family Confirmation material written by the Wetaskiwin circuit and provided through the ABC-District office in my parish. I believe providing sound biblical, doctrinal and well-prepared resources for stewardship, youth, and education is valuable to our congregation, though I haven't used these resources extensively.
166. Especially in the ABC District, our schools and some congregations are missing the kind of support they once had.
167. Don't know what the district provides.
168. I am not aware that any of these services are provide by our district.
169. I guess I don't pay attention who is providing these services. I thought Pastors just contact each other and organize events according to who has time & expertise.
170. I don't know what they provide
171. I value the past support of parish services, especially the LTA conferences and district grants.
172. The District has an impressive amount of program research and experience available for the asking.
173. I assume this means my particular parish. My congregation demonstrates through attendance at district youth gatherings and through their call for a full time DPS that they value parish services and the service of youth and education.
174. We value these services the most when we need them most directly, but don't give much thought to the ones that we don't particularly need at the time.
175. How can you value something when it is not used or heard about?
176. The biggest problem for our congregation is to get the action going -- get these things beyond the pastor's desk.
177. does the district even provide those items...? thought it was the responsibility of the Pastor & Elders

178. DON'T SEE ANY OF THAT.
179. I don't believe our district supports our youth enough. More work is needed in this area!
180. I was only recently accepted as a member at my new congregation, and while I think I would agree, I haven't been involved enough to know.
181. Central does not provide this services to any tangible extent.
182. Over the last few years District has been providing very little help in these areas. This is especially true with regards to youth and education.
183. Need to make annual parish service materials available. Rather than each District developing programs, ONE "program" in each service area should be coordinated to be used in all Districts.
184. Never used - unrealistic to our small group.
185. Unknown
186. This is largely from lack of education, not an awareness of the resources available and a dislike or rejection of those materials.
187. The problem is there are times when it's difficult to find workers for the many positions these services require.
188. Our congregation has generally been independent-minded.
189. Many are not aware of them.
190. I believe the close congregations can benefit from the services of the district, but farther flung congregations see no benefit to all the work being done in that area since they are too far away. Some services need to be made available to those congregations that are spread out rather than everything only benefiting those of close proximity to the office.
191. While many congregations say that they value these things, they do not provide the funding through their Mission offerings to make these areas a reality.
192. Unknown how much leadership is provided.
193. NA for our small congregation.
194. I have very good memories of attending youth conferences and events. These memories will stay with me all my life. In addition, the seminaries provide excellent opportunities for not only clergy but also lay people within the church such as the Quest series. If anything, more youth outreach could be done.
195. in the 4 years I have worshiped at this church I have not seen any stewardship or education service, and we have no youth. won't either - I am one of the youngest in the parish. it is dying a slow death.
196. It is left up to the initiative of individuals to seek out resources.
197. Services provided are very limited
198. I don't believe our congregation uses these services.
199. The Central District no longer provides these services. The District is neglecting its people.
200. But we do not regularly use it.
201. Not sure the district has provided much leadership. In the case of ABC, the President should have been removed after the death of his son, as all of his energy on the cause of death. Synod did NO serve to either the president or the district by leaving him in office.
202. I have no idea what our District does. They are invisible - no presence, no communication, no sense that they actually exist. Never seen anybody from the District in my church (at least who has bothered to identify themselves). I have asked, and others in our congregation seem equally bewildered.

203. Our congregation can make virtually no use of the services that our district provides as those services are provided in a foreign language, English.
204. Often when I called on District for advise or guidance, I was referred to CCCC or given information on what needed to be done, but not much help on how to do it. A Synod or District coordinated effort to have knowledgeable expertise available would be very much appreciated.
205. what we get, we value
206. I honestly was not aware that the District provides any of these things, to our congregation or any other.
207. I do not believe that the East District is strong in these areas particularly around "Youth"
208. There is very little, that I am aware of, that our district provides in these areas.
209. Not sure we get much in a small rural community.
210. I don't see how our congregation has access to these.
211. No services are provided. The basic contact we have with District is normally relates to the congregation sending money to District.
212. -I don't even know what this question is asking exactly.
213. It's hard to put these in place due to the language, but it seems there could be more participation in District provided parish service programmes.
214. In ABC District there has been NO services provided to help strengthen our congregations. There seems to have been more effort in keeping congregations separate and almost in competition with one another. Certainly not ONE church body wanting to unite to glorify God and do His work.
215. The Stewardship Programs recommended by the District were excellent.
216. Absolutely, the ABC District has historically done an excellent job of servicing our congregations. Once the dust from the financial crisis settles, we pray that the District regains its ability to continue in this important work.
217. The ABC District has provided very practical resources that have helped our congregation grow in our missional awareness and our responsibility as stewards of God's resources. We pray that our District will rebound from its current financial problems so that we can have the District staff in place to assist us in doing our local outreach and congregational ministry.
218. Central does not currently provide much in the way of parish services in general.
219. More could be done. For instance, since none of our churches have many youth in one church why not have a circuit youth group lead by a trained Youth Pastor who would be paid by the District.
220. WE did before the latest restructuring - we did try to share resources and did work with an neighbouring congregation for youth activities. In the past, our congregation used the family confirmation program and the resources it offered.
221. I cannot say if these services are valued or not, since there doesn't seem to be much communication about these services being even available or promoted within our congregation
222. Consider having a circuit within each District becoming responsible for each one of the parish services portfolios. A pastor or lay person from each of the circuit’s congregations could comprise a committee that, for instance, takes charge of stewardship ministry in the District. They would research resources and programs of stewardship and they would be the “experts” for the other congregations in the District, consulting and teaching as requested. Other circuits would become “experts” in those other portfolios of parish services.

223. don't use all services, but value ones we do use
224. If what you mean is project printed material - then perhaps, however if you mean training available for congregations or circuits, not so much....
225. There are individuals who do but not enough to say the congregation as a whole. This is a shame
226. Central District has not had any stewardship, youth, education or other parish services for years. In some ways they have been missed. But it would be better I think if such things were developed on an synodical level.
227. District has done good work with stewardship but lacks the zeal required for our youth, being future members taking on responsibilities in the church which is our future.
228. We did but this seems to have decreased in recent years.
229. although they could be more active.
230. However, the District needs to be open and honest with respect to Higher Things events and resources. These resources are currently being used positively by various pastors and congregations to instruct and retain youth in our synod. This is a fact. The District should support and promote Higher Things. Or, if not, clearly
231. Central District is currently not providing much help in this regard.
232. I don't know what services they provide.
233. district services have done little in my parish and for the most part district has served to be a hindrance.
234. The school I was a part of did until the position was terminated as mentioned in a prior question.
235. The service from the district which has been visible to me was their guidance in calling new pastors.
236. Our congregation is not receiving any of these services from our District. The District does not have any staff to carry out these essential support functions.
237. our congregation does not make use of all the services offered as all are not applicable to it.
238. Less programs please.
239. Our congregation has rarely have utilized the parish services in our District. Although I recognize that others do, the cost of the services provided in the ABC district in the past was too high in terms of dollars for the results offered. I think that most of the services we need could be provided by the synod instead.
240. The Central District no longer provides these services.
241. we use some services but limited
242. Agree if we would get it.
243. Some of the services are not applicable to this congregation
244. when our district provided the service. At present we have a skeleton crew....
245. Petty much the same answer as Q8.
246. District provides something?
247. Very little that is a quality experience goes on.
248. We received little help from district
249. Do not see the involvement
250. District provides very few parish services today.
251. Not necessarily needed from the district, could be from one centralized Canadian body.
252. don't use
253. I see little evidence of this.

254. We might value it more, if we heard more about their efforts.
255. We are home to a mission and we make use of a youth worker.
256. -irrelevant to restructuring within the Synod
257. We are a large congregation with the people and financial resources to provide in these areas. Having said this, we still value greatly having and sharing the expertise of District resources in each of these areas.
258. The District is very under resourced to provide these services
259. Our congregation does not know that these services exist.
260. All of our children have participated in National Youth Gatherings. We think they are a wonderful thing. I think that LCC's seminaries do excellent work. I wish that the work done a couple of years ago to make them work more closely together could go further since I think we do not need two distinct operations.
261. Some the services provided by the District, especially through CPH are trite and Baptist/evangelical like.
262. Personally the church I go to looks down at the young adults in the Community the youth leaders had a bunch of things planned they didn't even want the youth to fund raise money for the youth or open the church to other no of the community I feel this is killing our church community as the older people get older they push the youth and young adults out of the church with there ideals of what is right
263. there are very few services offered - the one that I think that has been mostly used was the T4M program. I think a fair number of congregations participated in this program. I'm not sure that we have enough data to say whether it was successful or not - that would be a congregational opinion as well.
264. LCC should provide more outreach efforts.
265. As a member of our church council, I am unaware of any such services that our District provides; if they do, they need to do a better job of communicating them to church councils.
266. There had been more services provided in all the areas years ago.
267. don't know what you provide
268. we don't know what the district provides
269. We seem to need to come up with our own stuff. District parish services seem to be geared to larger congregations while the small congregations that need the most help are left to whither.
270. I see no reason for the District to run a youth retreat and the Synod to run a youth retreat. Stewardship is already covered by congregations and, if by education, you mean Lutheran schools, the schools fail because congregational members do not feel they need to send their own children to the school run by their congregation.... I honestly heard this at a seminar on starting a school - I asked, 'Would you send your children to the school started by your congregation?' The reply, 'No, it isn't for my children, it is for mission outreach.' Ding, ding, ding.... doomed to failure and it did fail.....
271. The services that were provided seemed to be tailor made for larger congregation while our smaller and struggling congregations were left on their own
272. These items listed become redundant. Our congregation runs stewardship, youth and education programs. Our congregation has a stewardship program, our youth are invited to participate in city wide youth events, a District youth event is offered, a LCC event is offered.... that’s one or two events too many. It is very possible that there need be only an LCC event or an event that is designed and offered in various zones. An example: Catechism

101(I just made up a title), offered in, -and these locations would vary over the years- Nanaimo, Prince George, Vancouver and Kamloops, BC; Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, AB; Saskatoon, Regina, Prince Albert, SK; Winnipeg, Brandon, MB, Thunder Bay, Toronto, Ottawa, ON. Run the same program in three to four locations in one calendar year.

273. There needs to be more ongoing evaluation and commitment to those values.
274. our congregation is very dysfunctional and does not have the programs that it should offer.
275. I see none of this evident within our church from the district
276. Haven't got anything from district other than a pile of money lost in years. Any programming provided was largely ineffectual, superficial and downright misleading.
277. I have very little understanding of what these district services actually produce (other than mileage bills for committee meetings). While I know they do some good, there seem to be a lot of things that could be managed less formally, and on a per project basis. Sometimes the "district" geography makes sense for a committee, but other times the synod or a circuit could do the same job.
278. I don't see any of these services being provided by the District... Not youth, education or stewardship.
279. The problem is that every congregation is struggling with attendance, youth especially.
280. I wish there was more. I understand the constraints of shrinking congregations and therefore the funding to provide such services.
281. None seems to be provided
282. do not know of any parish services the district provides.
283. very little tangible support
284. The congregation does not use or really know or care about the parish services and most attempts by Pastor to encourage it are met with silence.
285. What are those services? They have markedly diminished over the years....
286. Our congregation has made extensive use of parish services available through the District. Congregations that have used the District services value the services provided. The inverse also seems true in many cases. Congregations that have not made use of the District services seem to undervalue or hold of no value those services Districts have provided for the benefit of congregations.
287. Our services are provided "in house".
288. The east district parish services have been eliminating youth services. This will not help our church grow.
289. My congregation doesn't use those services.
290. as an emeritus pastor, I can't speak for the congregation
291. Either is not good or not communicated well/valued.
292. Our youth have enjoyed the opportunity to participate in national youth gatherings. When it comes to District gatherings, they've elected not to go but to plan something on their own which they have liked better and have been cheaper so these haven't been well utilized. The promotion of CEF as a form of stewardship is what got us to deposit our savings in a fund which did not practice wise stewardship and harmed us greatly. I'm sure there are other services that we have been taken for granted but there are also other ways of providing these parish services, other than through District.
293. as an emeritus pastor, I cannot speak for the congregation
294. Our congregation has not done a good job using District services - we would benefit from using them.

295. I am quite new to my particular congregation and at this point I am not certain (due to its particular circumstances) that it takes advantage of the things our district offers (or did offer). I do, however, think it is important that the greater church (be is through a district or nationally) offer support and resources to the congregations that would like to make use of them. These services can be very valuable.
296. All of these benefits and blessings show their fruit in the ability of our congregations to find mentors, resources
297. Sometimes the language is a problem
298. As with most of the LCC activities I am largely unaware of what they are doing other than making a general mess of their finances.
299. As our congregation shrinks we have not utilized any of the services
300. This has generally been a waste of time, energy and money for years.
301. We tend not to use district resources.
302. Parish services from District have been mostly absent from our congregation.
303. We set up different programs.
304. we are not a large enough congregation - we have few youth, no Sunday School
305. My congregation has taken these services for granted. I did not realize this until attending ABC District Convention workshops to discover how blessed we have been!
306. As far as I know we do our own thing except for the national youth gatherings.
307. Programs do nothing but make district employees have a job.
308. Sometimes it seems those services are few and far between.... not much promoted.
309. We have needed some of the services that district has provided in the past and it would be a shame that we would no longer have access to them. However, the amount of services that were needed was very small for our congregation.
310. We couldn't get anyone out here to run a Sunday School session for our teachers even though we pleaded for 6 years.
311. weak assistance
312. we would value if it existed. to date our parish has not been provided with any of the above mentioned services.
313. Very little that comes from the parent churches affects our daily or annual church programs
314. we really don’t seem to get much of that
315. I do not know what is provided
316. I think congregations are using whatever resources that meet their needs. Because so many resources on the internet are free congregations are using all kinds of resources. The synodical & district youth gatherings are too expensive - they are not being attended by the vast majority of our youth groups. Other than the youth gathering the synod is not doing anything in the area of youth ministry. The district does have a staff person in charge of parish services but there is very little happening there. The ABC district did have a partial staff person for youth ministry but that person resigned because there was no buy-in amongst congregations and there was very little one person can do. There have been many discussions about what a synod& district can actually do that would be effective youth ministry - and no group has ever agreed on anything enough to get any kind of plan off the table. Same goes for most areas of parish services. T4M has had some level of success in the ABC district.
317. Our Districts have full time Presidents - but they seem to be occupied with administration rather than pastor to pastor and spiritual leadership to congregations.

318. Not aware of these either.
319. We would value it if it existed. To date our parish has not been provided with above mentioned services
320. Much of what we were told from parish services execs where "share with us and we'll share with the churches" but little of that actually happened. With technology the way it is today, it's much easier to share directly than it was before. One exception to the disagreement would be in youth ministry. Too bad the question didn't allow us to answer more specifically - some areas are valuable, some aren't.
321. We would value it if it existed. To date, our parish has not been provided with above mentioned services
322. What services are provided from Synod?
323. To my knowledge I am unaware that the District has provided any of these services to our congregation.
324. Needs a major overhaul.
325. District has been of little help in any of these areas in our congregation.
326. Petty much the same answer as Q8.
327. Not aware of what services have been provided at our parish.
328. With communication and technology being what it is these days so much information and opportunities are available without "reinventing the wheel" so could be much more efficient with providing information using the new technology available.
329. What do they provide to most congregations? Most congregations are not aware of the services the district provides. They do a poor job of communicating these services.
330. They provide this?
331. Our church at present has no youth group, our stewardship emphasis is very weak - they hand out a time and talent sheet once a year. Programs are lacking in our church. It is sad!
332. Don’t think it’s used nor encourages nor promoted.
333. I don't see any services our district provides that we require except providing a list for the Call Process
334. Are any provided?
335. Some programs initiated from the higher ups have little idea how they function in meeting local needs. the most effective programs come from caring and creative people in the congregation.
336. My congregation values it, but I don't agree with the present youth programs.
337. I see no evidence of these services provided to our congregation.
338. I'm not really seeing the District providing a lot of what is stated.
339. I see very little or no parish assistance service. At two District Conventions I asked our internet specialist about internet assistance in developing web pages and skype projection of church services to those unable to attend. Got good lip service to the idea and that something was being worked on. This could benefit older parishes like ours who do not even know where to seek assistance. service in stewardship, youth, education haven't seen much in the last 40 years.
340. last year the district offered a camping weekend for families, which was a nice tangible result of these boards. otherwise, often it is hard to see tangible results of boards, besides evangelism or stewardship programs, resources, etc. that have little meaningful use in my eyes.

341. I don't believe the churches utilize these enough...perhaps more so in larger city congregations...education materials are probably the most used
342. These efforts could be much more effective if the were not mostly "top down" initiatives that assume to know what local congregations need most.
343. Again District has not been active in our congregation.
344. I have not been in my congregation long, but there very little understanding of the work that district does and the parish services offered.
345. I don't see any real supports, but we need them!
346. The district geography is important here.
347. These "services" don't seem to exist. As chairman off our evangelism committee I once asked our district office for any ideas or materials we could use to help us organize an outreach program. I was told they had nothing and if I wished to look further, I should contact St. Louis. (LSMS). to say I was disappointed would be a huge understatement. What was the purpose of LCC again?
348. I do not see many effective supports being provided. However, this is an area that is greatly needed and should be done.
349. Requires improvement in communication and dissemination to local parishes
350. My congregations aren't even sure what they provide.
351. I think the stewardship or evangelism outreach of our districts need to be reviewed to be current to this day and age.
352. The services seem expensive. Could be perhaps more beneficial to have independent networks of workers in the field for various areas of ministry.
353. We have not been made as a congregation that parish services our district provides. Our pastor has not shared this with us, as far as I know.
354. Central District has limited resources in these areas and as such, there is little on offer (in any active sense) for the local parish to tap into.
355. We certainly have used the extension fund.
356. Our congregation participates very little in anything outside of our own events... geographical perhaps but we have 4 other LCC within an hour drive from us. Sad really...
357. never have used them. we make our own services for our congregation and for our area
358. Quite frankly, the bulk of our congregation is ignorant, despite repeated opportunities to learn, of much that District provides. However, I am sure I would hear a hue and cry if no more youth retreats were offered.
359. Reminds me of big government/bureaucracy
360. HOWEVER, there have been programs that we have used, like Free and Joyous response, and we found we were rewriting (correcting) and making it fit so that we could send out the invites out to members
361. I really don't have a handle on the question
362. More outreach is needed.
363. We rarely see the effect of what the district supplies in person, however I am sure there are things going on unseen to the eye (i.e. funding).
364. Our small congregation is often left to fend for itself - NO PASTOR for years - but some excellent vicars - & other help.
365. While our congregation did use the services of the executive for School services in the start-up of a preschool, we have found the other services to be pretty much irrelevant and out of touch with the needs of the parish.

366. We are a senior congregation. Do not benefit from much of this.
367. But with younger generation, etc. decline, this seems difficult.
368. These services are not a high priority. Congregations do, after all, have a CPH catalogue. Perhaps the district and/or synod could function more as a clearing house of providing information to pastors and congregations about confessional Lutheran material that is available.
369. Do they do anything in these areas? Never seen any. They were too busy with trying to keep/hide a senior's housing complex afloat with money that was intended for other purposes. If they did anything, it was not effective.
370. I've never used them in 25 years.
371. It seems to polarize people, and cause pastors to have calm muddied waters.
372. I am unaware of such services.
373. I chose the middle line chiefly because of the high costs of these people, including transportation etc. and because our digital world facilitates interaction on any topic one needs to talk about. Perhaps blogs or other media are just as effective. Because of the economy, and because of shrinking numbers in our churches it's difficult to make financial contributions
374. We exist due to subsidy. However, there is no plan or support to assist us in how to determine the needs of our community and how to meet them. We seem to be operating under the view "build a church and they will come".
375. I do not know of any time that our church received a service from our district.
376. Not sure what is provided?
377. do we receive those services?
378. The District does not provide anything that we cannot receive on line from LCMS
379. There is very little of this available in the Central District.
380. these are not well promoted. I used to benefit greatly from the Sunday School teachers convention. The outreach conventions are good to attend.
381. I am not that involved in the district level activities. I believe there are much less offered by the East district now than in the past and I'm not sure why. There used to be a Sunday School Teacher's convention that helped me a lot when I was a teacher. Perhaps these are not well-promoted at the congregational level. I have found Rev Ron Mohr very helpful.
382. Not really anymore.
383. With our church consisting mostly of seniors and a small parish as well, we overlap and join in all the positions. The same people pretty well do the same year after year. and do get burned out however that is the only way to keep our church running.
384. It is very difficult to observe specific instances whereby my congregation avails itself of District-provided material. We've enjoyed Stewardship resources that come from ABC District which was beneficial. Our District did not have enough staff resources to develop that material. We should be able to have districts collaborate in developing materials OR there should be one national body to provide all those types of services to the church at large
385. Not aware of any that are supplied 2. We have very few youth, 3. We need better care and attention to elders / seniors in need
386. It has been my observation that each congregation has taken their own initiatives. We need to explore what other churches (denominations) do to encourage youth, Sunday school age, and young families to attend church and feel comfortable to get involved. Once the things that seem to be working are identified they should be implemented and tried.

387. I don't see any obvious actions from the district. Other than visions for mission. Assuming that came down from the district
388. Our congregation couldn't articulate what the district does.
389. Apart from parish services, we see very little value from the other categories.
390. I'm not sure about this. I think our Leadership team tends to work on these programs using resources within our congregation. We have people well trained in these fields (degrees from a Christian University nearby)
391. I don't think our District has ever done anything for us, even when we have specifically asked.
392. Most of the resources available are rooted in Evangelical theology or a theology of glory. I can honestly say our district resources are useless.
393. I am part of a talented multi-staff team that have developed connections outside of what the District can provide. However smaller congregations certainly benefit from having the expertise and resources from the District staff.
394. In our congregation we have a talented multi-staff team that finds their own resources but for smaller congregations with limited resources the District has been very important in assisting in ministry opportunities.
395. I think our congregation values everything that is provided for it.
396. supports are minimal due to staffing limitations
397. We didn't as congregation support it but for us it's very important.
398. Once again, the answer to this question depends heavily upon the location/region/District of the congregation.
399. I agree only be a small margin. I question whether the investment that ABC District has put into district staffing has been too high.
400. Our congregation really doesn't take advantage of any of the services that the District provides. We have no youth and the people in the congregation don't get involved in any of the other events that are provided except for the pastor and his family.
401. with limited financial and staff resources this is nearly invisible or non-existent to the point where local congregations wonder what value does Synod let alone District provide. With my current and past exposure and involvement on District boards and committees, I believe the structure has been set up for failure, poor communications and for the most part results in volunteers who are on so many committees that the only thing that happens is some members get together to discuss hopes and plans then prepare minutes until the next meeting but very little happens as these volunteers don't have any time left or the leaders want to control every decision.
402. From my vantage point as a lay member, we do most of our stewardship, youth and educational endeavors within our own congregation. I do believe we receive our VBS program materials and other publications from our District.
403. Haven't seen a current stewardship program since Minnesota North series on Small Catechism (1986); nor from ABC District since Covenant Agreement (1987). Little training for Sunday School Teachers; nothing in Evangelism since Dialog Evangelism and Gospel According to you for the last 20 years.
404. Our district doesn't provide any of these things.
405. Our church has no such provisions in place.
406. District is almost irrelevant to our congregation.

407. We cannot value what we do not have. Our congregation has not received any of these services from the District, nor has any neighboring congregation that I'm aware of. We have a neighboring congregation that has been vacant for over two years, and they haven't received so much as a visit from the District President.
408. We don't get any support.
409. These were very much valued until the services were no longer offered.
410. Agree somewhat but the entire church structure needs younger members and change. LCC and congregations has to quit recycling these old, narrow minded people and placing them in new positions. It is like all Lutheran entities are challenged by the lack of Lutheran talent and has to recycle these old stagnant men.
411. youth yes, other services ignored.
412. Our congregation has not made much use of these recently as we have not found them to be affective. With the recent changes in our district these are no longer offered.
413. Our congregation does not run a school, not have we used a District stewardship program ... but we LOVE the District youth gatherings!
414. I've often found the resources coming from my District (note: I recently moved to the East after 3.5 years in ABC, I'm commenting on my experience from ABC) to not be very Lutheran, often guilt ridden, law focused, and Christ-less. Very often the focus is on changed lives, missions, and giving your money to the church and not on receiving the forgiveness of Christ given in Word & sacrament. So often the doctrine of vocation is ignored to give the guilt trip of, "If you're not doing work in, or giving to, the church, you're a bad Christian."
415. Again, a question for pastors / leaders to assess. It seems to me our congregation is "self" supporting (and district supporting), perhaps less so vice-versa.
416. We get nothing from district except request for mission funds and convention assessments. The last time a district representative visited us it was to suggest that we close and find another church to attend. We are still going and offering weekly services 20 years later at no expense to district or synod.
417. There is not currently to my knowledge any one other than the district president tasked with making any of this happen.
418. I have not witnessed these services and therefore have not seen any benefits thereof.
419. I'm not aware that help is given to congregations to promote good stewardship practices among our members and in our congregation -- sorely needed in my opinion.
420. None are apparent for our congregation
421. We find little value in them. We could be better served by a different system - resources that are at the same time both farther away (expertise can be shared far more easily over distance today) and closer (better equipping of local leaders).
422. Those responsible for constructing this survey have failed to do their homework ~ these service have all but been eliminated within the Central District.
423. Not aware of services other than youth gatherings that our congregation utilizes.
424. When a congregation asks for assistance in a parish services area, the concern can be turned over, not to a staff person in the office, but to a congregation that excels in this particular area.
425. DPS expectations and responsibilities need to be raised to a higher level and monitored more closely.
426. We have often made use of district resources and programs in the past.

427. Since these services are essentially invisible in our congregation, it is difficult to have an opinion. Perhaps they are more useful in the 'core' Lutheran within 200 km of Kitchener.
428. Our district provides little of this now.
429. I don't believe our District provides any of these services. If they do, it is not known to us.
430. As far as I know, our District is not currently providing anything. I don't know that my congregation misses it.
431. The mission is not meeting Canadian needs and we have tended to rely on experts from the US far too much. We need to be creative in our own country. Youth Gatherings have overshadowed real training of our youth in ministry.

10. LCC should explore more creative forms of outreach in Canada.

1. I sort of agree, but there is a limit on how much creativity is acceptable without changing the basic principles of the LCC. I became a member of the LCC congregation, because it is pretty firm on homosexuality, same sex marriage etc. etc. etc. and women's ordination.
2. I was not aware that Christ's mandate went beyond word and sacrament ministry. I know that my ordination vows do not.
3. Break forth was/is a wonderful out reach for all ages. I attended several times and thoroughly enjoyed it. but it was frowned upon by LCC and I never found out why.
4. If Gospel centered, yes. Outreach just for sake of more numbers is not good.
5. As soon as you look to programs etc. are you watering down or preaching the Word as it needs to be given out. More Bible Study is key!
6. But what more creative ways are still out there?
7. Let the Holy Spirit do this work.
8. Make sure they are practical and affordable. Co-ordinate activity coast to coast - i.e. radio, TV. Make a big noise so "Lutheran" is noticed. i.e. Reformation. So people will say "what is that all about?" Most people around here have never heard the word Lutheran. I know we want to "make" Christians but Lutheran is helpful.
9. T4m didn't result in much, partly because we lost our pastoral supervisor midstream, and never gained another.
10. Get with the modern times to reach younger set and future generations. We must keep up to technology.
11. Creative usually means watering down theology i.e. go to the world's standards not upholding God's word.
12. Get with the modern times to reach younger set and future generations. We must keep up to technology.
13. The T4M process has been effective in our congregation.
14. More use of today's technology to reach younger generations.
15. We need more interest at home in Canada.
16. We show little interest in keeping up with what we have. Somewhat out of trying to meet our own budget
17. We show little interest in keeping up with what we have, partly because of local expense. Usually pastor and one or two at most give to missions (I think)
18. Step One is to get rid of the St. Catherine Seminary that don't teach out reach to its students because the High Church instructors don't believe in outreach.
19. We have to do something that will stop the decline of numbers (members) in LCC.

20. Perhaps addressing the social change head on whether we are talking about euthanasia, abortion, marriage, immigration, refugee, etc.
21. I think it's a waste of time if we expect to do a task and that task brings people. LCC questions the reason for outreach; question one could ask, do this with the help of synod for my personal gain or the desire to have everyone in reach.
22. How is this about restructuring? Word and sacrament is all that's needed.
23. Time for significant outreach in Canada. Islam and atheism and apathy are taking over.
24. It depends on what is meant by "creative forms of outreach." I would expect that anything contrary to Scripture and our Lutheran Confessions would be avoided.
25. we were given creative options disguised as false witness marketing with CEF, no thanks
26. Depends on what you mean by "creative". If you mean as in 'creative worship' then I strongly disagree. If you mean constantly looking for hitherto unexplored opportunities to reach out with the Gospel while not compromising our Lutheran doctrine and practice, then I agree.
27. We need to get off this soapbox of having to witness with words. We witness with action as we develop relationships with the unchurched. when are we going to realize that preaching a louder, longer, and more slowly isn't reaching the world?
28. Yes, but creative within the understanding of what makes LCC distinct and Lutheran ... we NEED to be missional and creative with the outreach of the gospel, but not using crass Church Growth practices.
29. We are in severe multi family level pain, that will not heal over many years. Spiritual help is not available that we trust.
30. Our church holds many great programs for our own members, however, we are reluctant to share in other Christian programs or services if not organized by the Lutheran Church.
31. Maybe? I'm not sure how much of the "problem," if there is one, has been lack of creativity. I think lack of motivation and insufficient implementation might be bigger issues.
32. We should do more outreach, not seek "creative forms" which is code word for "let's imitate some worn out heterodox practice which made this or that church grow in the last decade". We should relearn to do what we are called to do, not divert time and energy away from word and sacrament to pursue new fads.
33. I am not interesting in being involved in "creative forms" that compromise our theology and practice, but that does mean that we are unable to pursue "creative forms" at all. We need to explore how we might better connect with our communities in which we live and communicate the Gospel, even while the people we desire to reach seem to be less aware of even basic Biblical truth.
34. The current PPC at Immanuel is more interested in the building and money and so is the Synod. The problems started over issues involving Communion Doctrine. The have been serious problems for years in Immanuel Lutheran and we were not aware of how serious they were for years.
35. "Creative" how?
36. We should be looking at a lot more church planting and training pastors in that specific topic. Other Christian churches have been doing much better than us. We should also make sure church plants do not get burdened with a building program too early in their lives. A lot of evangelical church plants don't even consider a permanent facility until they reach a regular attendance of 500 or more. Furthermore, we should consider church plants in partnership with existing but dying congregations in larger Canadian cities. To be successful

in these environments, the church would need a very different focus and style (but not theology) than the remnant congregation, but they could use the same building and grow a new congregation before the old one dies off.

37. It's not Synod's problem... too many pastors don't believe in the concept of outreach. For them, the Holy Spirit is supposed to bring the lost to church. we do not go after them. Is this what the Bible teaches??? NO
38. Do creative forms compromise our beliefs?
39. Have more contemporary services and relax the rules on communion participation (i.e. more open)
40. Some way to reach a younger congregation! As Canada's congregations are now elderly, and there is great need to interest younger persons. We lack big time!!!! Christianity seems to be losing ground.
41. What is creative? Card parties, dances, summer Sunday School only entertains. Those don't come to church on Sunday afterwards.
42. Continue strongly with God's word - taught in truth and purity - not be "creative for the sake of being creative.
43. Yes. One way forward may be to form regional parishes who band together in metropolitan as well as regional areas.
44. Our outreach efforts and resources are largely staid, and do not reflect the reality of the country we live in.
45. More opportunity for individual members to build confidence in sharing their faith. Also helping congregations to recognize their strengths and ways to learn more about people in their neighbourhoods/community.
46. Monday to Friday After Schools Programs actually 2 x 55 min. of Bible Stories (religion) Christian education 4p to 4:55 pm and 5 to 5:55 pm
47. Always a good idea.
48. If outreach means finding more members, then YES - More uplifting services with a mix of modern and traditional music If outreach means giving to more organizations then NO - it looks like we already support enough
49. Music at times to attract the community outreach who might visit our church from other congregations and feel comfortable with familiar music.
50. What is meant by "more creative" forms?
51. Don't know what you mean in this statement
52. each member in servanthood should do outreach therefore each brings their own form of doing so.
53. Evangelism is seldom emphasized or utilized on a congregational level.
54. It is more important than ever to strengthen our message. The Western governments are trying to lock us away from society akin to a mentally ill relative locked in an attic. I feel that Christianity is being publicly shunned in favor of "politically correct" fads.
55. An area that I believe is lacking in use is technology. We do not utilize this tool enough to provide outreach.
56. Agreed, but outreach should be done by local congregations with spiritual guidance provided by pastors and bishops.
57. LCC should focus on ecclesiastical supervision of doctrine and practice so that individual pastors can fulfill their office, and congregations and members can hear the Gospel and

receive the Sacrament every Sunday, and armed with strong Catechesis go into the world to spread the Good News to those people that God places in their lives in their various vocations.

58. I'm reluctant to answer this because I'm not sure what may lie behind this. It depends what source or direction of outreach efforts are in mind.
59. This might not always need to take a new form per se. It could involve revitalizing old forms.
60. I realize that I do not attend church to be 'entertained' but fresher approaches to sharing the gospel may be a help to bring more people into the church and keep them there.
61. The word "creative" scares me. We should preach the Word not just to ourselves but to everybody.
62. Define what is meant by "creative". Outreach should focus on preaching the Gospel.
63. Not if contrary with scriptural teaching.
64. In matters of youth & young adult ministry in particular, the church's emphasis on tradition ("this is how things have always been done") is not taking into account the needs of a person growing up in post-Christian society.
65. I would be interested in hearing others viewpoints about outreach and what we as Lutheran's can and/or should do.
66. It never hurts to branch out and try to improve and find new innovate ways.
67. Looking at more ideas, new and old to help reach more people is something we should always be doing. If something being done is not reaching people, then find ways to improve or move to ways that can reach people.
68. BC mission boat is but one example - we should have swat teams of energetic enthusiastic people going from church to church infusing the vibrancy into stagnant congregations
69. if current forms do not work, unsure that problem is in form or delivery
70. Would this not require a change in the mandate of the current LCC? I believe this is the current job of the districts through the congregations. On the assumption that the districts merge.... then yes
71. Absolutely! Organisations are either growing, or stable, or declining. We're in serious decline. More of the same leads to our demise.
72. mission begins at home!
73. Stronger presence in media
74. We our selves have to also be responsible not think someone else is to do everything for us.
75. "Creative"? Again, a vague word that means different things to different people. As opposed to "traditional" -- or "hidebound" -- or "proven ineffective"? Of course LCC should always seek BETTER ways of reaching people. And if the old ones aren't working, I suppose someone needs to "create" new ones. Again, this seems to be a question simply designed to elicit an "agree." After all, how many people would say they are AGAINST creativity?
76. I would even suggest such outreach is in great need these days. Christians have become the outsiders these days and we need to bring the former outsiders back into the fold.
77. Not if contrary with biblical teaching. There is absolutely nothing wrong with being Lutheran and promoting ourselves as such. When in doubt, Lutherans let scripture weigh the decisions.
78. What does this mean? It seems to me that the more creative stuff has been a disaster.
79. Better training and stronger ethos for parish and personal missions and evangelism - a strong, confessional stance!

80. Much more interaction with other Lutheran and non-Lutheran churches. When you don't share pulpits with other Lutherans and other denominations it sets a very unfriendly attitude to others, not what the Bible teaches.
81. We do a lot but I'm sure there is more especially with social media that could be done. We have talented Pastors whose strengths are how they relate to different age groups. Ex. a site for teenagers where they could go each week that address topics of interest to them and how the Bible relates to those topics.
82. This is especially needed for outreach to new Canadians from various ethnic backgrounds.
83. There should always be outreach, but forms can confuse the faith.
84. The only way to growth is to reach out to the unchurched in a meaningful and relevant way.
85. Scripture tells us that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. By our Lord's leading, it is always possible to consider different ways of presenting the good news to those around us. However, God's Word needs to remain central in ANY means of outreach. Gimmicks might attract and intrigue people for a while, but have no lasting value as far as their souls are concerned.
86. creative forms (bothers me)
87. Changing times for mankind causes a need for different ways of reaching out to the individual. Change in that respect can be a good thing.
88. Especially by exploring creative ways to use modern technology (i-pods, i-pad, phone programs, apps, etc.). Those who are very tuned in to these forms of communication are the younger generation. Some church web sites are exceedingly well done. Lutheran Our Ministries does a fine job of reaching out in creative ways of on-line learning.
89. Most important that we actively engage the mission field of Canada.
90. We need to stay in the Word.
91. Are we talking about missionary or gospel outreach? Needs to be clarified.
92. I think we need to be careful about "creative" forms of outreach. We need to stand firm and grounded in God's word as it is written in the Bible. If we proclaim God's word as written, God will work in the hearts of those who hear it.
93. I think that we need to be careful with "creative" forms. We need to remain firmly grounded being sure to stick to God's word as it is written in the Bible.
94. What do you mean by "creative" means?
95. More within our congregational areas and northern areas
96. Need to understand where people are at today, and meet them there.
97. Lots of mission work to be done in Canada
98. We need to be involved in the 'Great Commission' as individual people and not just give money for someone else to do the work in the mission-field. We have a mission field right in our own communities
99. Training at our seminaries (pastors) and through our parish services education (deacons) should provide for extensive missional/outreach knowledge, experience and focus, especially in the cultural climate of our Canadian communities today. Pastors and deacons should be equipped to do outreach well and have quality outreach resources available to educate and train laypersons in carrying the Gospel into the communities around them. I fear we are far behind the curve in the necessary knowledge and skills to do mission and outreach in the growing secular culture around us. Maybe training professional domestic missionaries should be seriously considered.

100. LCC should support our parishes and outreach should be left to the parishes in the communities. They are best to apply the support in their community. Not district office or administrators in some other city
101. This is needed to grow our church, in times of shrinking membership.
102. Discovering and developing our spiritual gifts within our churches will lead to more creative forms of outreach in our communities.
103. Within existing congregations' areas and remote areas.
104. I think that we need to be careful of "creative" forms of outreach. We need to stand firm on God's word exactly as written in the Bible.
105. Unsure what is meant by "creative forms".
106. I pray that I had a good answer for this, but I don't at this time.
107. Many congregations in Canada are dying or going under financially now!!! Is this really feasible
108. We are so busy going to third world countries that we have totally forgotten our country Canada is not longer a Christian country and we need to concentrate back in our own country
109. If churches close their doors- this survey is pointless. Need ideas, just ask me.
110. Bring youth, your adults back. They become redundant in our parish.
111. There needs to be more follow-up of Sunday visitors.
112. If it is not at the expense of dropping. Perhaps there are some programs that are not so successful and could be dropped.
113. This is an unclear question. Does it mean should we avail ourselves of digital media such as YouTube and Facebook to strive to communicate, or is perceiving worship as the place of evangelism and seeking to bring creative forms into worship to supplant the Divine Service? Regardless, the tools Christ provides are baptizing and teaching.
114. MORE BANG FOR THE "BUCK"
115. Make ourselves better known
116. What a short-sighted statement! God forbid that I and my congregation embrace Joel Osteen and the likes outreach! Does this mean that God's Word and Sacrament are not core? St Paul reminds us full well: "I seek to know (and to proclaim) nothing but Christ crucified"! (1 Cor 2:2)
117. Growing in a way that is not sacrificing proper theology is always a good thing for the church and is needed.
118. YES!!! We need to develop and train "urban" missionaries for right here in Canada. There are huge numbers of unchurched people in the cities and towns of Canada. Many of our members do not have the training to properly speak to their neighbours etc., but a trained missionary I would hope would do better. Likewise, with so many apartment buildings and condo buildings in larger communities we have to develop a strategy to be able to reach the people in these buildings.
119. LCC has had such a focus on the outside world that it has neglected its own country in its missions. If we want more Canadian pastors, we need to work on gathering our people together.
120. More events like VBS where many neighbourhood families attend and feel comfortable. They may not be comfortable with formal worship but their initial introduction is welcoming with no expectations.
121. of course we should always be doing this

122. As part of the great commission - yes absolutely! Our church going population is ageing and shrinking. We can strike a balance between being modern and doctrinally sound.
123. With modern technology there are many ways for outreach.
124. In an appropriate fashion.
125. LCC has a very low profile. We need to raise awareness. An evangelism website that responds to basic
126. questions and links to local congregations would be a good start.
127. Can always get better. What worked 10 years ago doesn't necessarily work now. If you want to reach society, you have to be in tune with where society is. We introduced T4M a few years back and it has made a big difference because it takes away the barrier between church and community -us. The most important change is not our communities view of us (which has improved a lot) but rather our view of the community.
128. And stick to the bylaws and constitution and enforce it, when it gets off track immediately.
129. That is vague. What is meant by "more creative"? Outreach in LCC needs to reflect/show who the synod is and not just be creative to get people in a building. Our outreach is to be sharing Christ our Saviour to the world.
130. We need to have more social outreach within the communities with the Gospel working hand in hand with the outreach. Ideas for outreach for small communities seem to be lacking. There is a lot of ideas for the big city and inner city settings, but not much for the smaller congregations/communities
131. As the congregations age and the next generation is not appropriately encouraged to stay connected to the church, many congregations are dwindling and will soon not be able to support themselves. Offering more family centered activities within the church and encouraging young people to be involved and share their opinions and participate in worship services and service tasks that THEY THEMSELVES CHOOSE AND ARE INTERESTED IN are key points to consider if the church is to grow.
132. It depends on what is meant to be implied by 'creative forms'. Our Lord has given us His Word and Sacraments. We dare not think we need to 'create' anything that would work better.
133. It would depend how "creative" these forms of outreach were.
134. If we don't do some outreach our shrinking churches are going to cease to exist. Elder's in our congregation realize something must be done to retain our youth. Our own youth are leaving to join other non "mainstream" congregations - 3 considering at the moment. Even a nephew of our previous Pastor, that was a member of our congregation, became a Pastor and is now a Pastor of a no denomination church in Hamilton, that is rapidly growing, but ours is shrinking. On Hamilton Mountain the Pentecostal and Baptist seem to be rapidly growing. The Baptist church, that already seats 800 and has 2 morning services is putting on an addition to double their size at a cost of $8 million!
135. I agree with outreach but we don't want individuals or groups who do not believe in our Theology and that Scripture is our first resource in all our beliefs.
136. Maybe creative is the wrong word. We need to do outreach.
137. We simply need to teach the bible according to the Lutheran confessions without obsessing over the need for attractive window dressing. Jesus already created the gospel, no need to supplement it with more creativity than Christ's own, whatever that would entail.

138. Stop bad mouthing the creative efforts of LCC congregations and instead letting all congregations know about their successes (and failures) and looking and evaluating what other church bodies are doing and exploring how it may be used by LCC congregations
139. especially with using technology. What about congregations without pastors renting smartboards and have a service with a pastor who lives further away
140. Do your job well done, not reinvent the job.
141. tv, online, bill boards
142. In one way, these changing times in many ways and in some ways I think the church needs to and will necessarily change and adapt, it wont be able to help it...but the term creative makes me a little apprehensive in that I don't think that LCC needs to loosen up theologically or turn to contemporary worship or something like that, I love the fact that we are still using the small catechism from 500 years ago so if creativity involves making that same catechism more accessible online then fine but if it means updating or shelving the catechism then NO! This question is really vague in that I would need more info or examples of what is meant to answer properly.
143. This is 1950s "thinking."
144. Missions begin at home
145. A point of doctrine
146. should be an on-going process
147. A lot more money to Canada and less to international. A stronger Canada will eventually be stronger for international outreach.
148. LCC should create short videos to be used during worship. This is already being done by other churches, many of our congregations are probably using material with questionable theology.
149. Always open to new methods of sharing the Good News
150. Doubtful that LCC as such will be able to do anything more than they're already doing. Maybe we need a mechanism to encourage small innovative groups to do more.
151. Our beliefs cannot change, but the way we convey those beliefs has to. E.g. our standard worship services are incomprehensible to non believers. Worship should use plain modern English (replace archaic words like beseech and the fear of God), sentence structure should be shorter (there is a 92-word sentence on page 212), sermons should be clear and concise. Some Christian churches have different services for new members and visitors. Options like home churches should be explored.
152. Yes, we need to address the challenges placed upon outreach efforts by our challenging postmodern culture. Our outreach within Canada is poor and could be greatly improved.
153. This was attempted by initiating the Finnish Evang Luth Mission (FELM) program to provide worship and spiritual care ministry to Finnish speaking members whose numbers were dwindling but there were no Finnish speaking Pastors to provide such a ministry. The FELM mission was established however with minimal support and encouragement by Central District. Nevertheless, this ministry was established in 1997 and has continued to the present. The current Pastor is a retired LCC pastor living in Thunder Bay.
154. What does "creative" mean? Sheep beget sheep not shepherds. "Programs" don't work.
155. Albeit satisfying to some to catch a flight to a foreign country and do ongoing Mission support, if I have read the statistics correctly, the decline in the number of those who are practicing Christians are in our own Country. Is it that we might be judged confessing Christ in our communities?

156. I am checking agree with the expectation that such creative forms would be approved by ecclesiastical authority. Admittedly, as I have come to the Lutheranism from Evangelicalism, this question makes me a little suspicious as to what "creative forms" means. I think outreach in Canada, i.e. making the presence LCC teaching and belief known, is very important.
157. But what does "more creative" mean?
158. If the church is not willing to modify its methods of outreach and service delivery, to within doctrinal guidelines of course, it will not adapt and it will not survive. I believe re-imagining outreach and coming up with new ideas should be done constantly. Always strive to improve, do not get stuck in the old, traditional ways. The printing press was new once too.
159. On some level it is difficult to do ministry in your own backyard. Therefore, I see a lot of efforts going international but Canada is our closest mission field. Should we not be more concerned for our next door neighbor as a synod than those thousands of miles away.
160. Am not sure as we do not have a large membership and I think we do fairly good at this already.
161. What forms are there currently being used?
162. I have been involved in the Finnish Evang Lutheran Mission since 1997. This mission has provided spiritual care and worship services for the remaining Finnish people who used to worship in various LCC congregations but, due to unavailability of Finnish pastors in Canada, were left without access to Lutheran ministry in the Finnish language. This situation was remedied by the planning and creating of the FELM mission which is still active and is led by a retired LC-C pastor in Thunder Bay. Much support and encouragement was given by the former Dr. Roy Holm. The Mission continues to operate but there is no involvement by the Central District. The FELM mission over the past 20 years has been truly a blessing to the decreasing numbers of Finnish worshippers in Thunder Bay - a successful Canadian outreach amongst the Finnish people.
163. The question cannot be answered. What does "more creative" mean? LCC as such is not charged with outreach--that is the role of local congregations and other affiliates (including its former university CUCA, which until recently was engaged in outreach amongst our diverse student body through a full time chaplain. The ABC District should call and pay for a full-time chaplain (who could also be a Director or even Vice President of Church Relations) to serve at Concordia University of Edmonton. Even with the CUE Board's recent decision to present itself as a secular institution, LCC and its Districts could and should engage with the university and support a Christian ministry there, and also seek to restore (and pay for) a church work program (Pre-Seminary and DPS) at this school that was founded as an education mission of LCC (formerly LCMS in Canada).
164. LCC should expand training of its church workers and parishioners for outreach in Canada. Pastors need to give confidence to their parishioners. LCC should provide training and resources for churches and church workers to lead the way in outreach.
165. Perhaps more could be done to reach our aboriginal friends in our community and further north in Manitoba.
166. I am puzzled by your terminology here - why "creative" and not other descriptors? Why do you assume creativity is something that is a gospel imperative? You could have also said "faithful" too, which would have been more scripturally accurate. I have no problem using our creativity in outreach, but I am concerned about over-emphasizing creativity above other characteristics.

167. Creative approach is wrong. Define what you mean with creative.
168. I can not begin to tell you how IMPORTANT this is! We have excellent theology but we have been totally inept at outreach in far too many congregations. We unlock our doors and expect the unchurched to find us; they will not! We have to reach out to people where they are at, in our hockey rinks, at our community facilities, at our libraries, at our schools (and I don't mean Lutheran schools). We are so afraid of change that our church is dying. God's word does not change but our packing of it better or our church is doomed. Our own congregation has grown and is filled with young families simply because we have reached out beyond the church building to the community in which we live and we have been open to creating a "seeker friendly service" while still maintaining our heritage in things like confession and absolution, the creeds and the Lord's prayer. How many congregations can say the same?
169. I really don't see LCC based outreach in Canada currently happening. Most anything would be more creative than what we have now. Outreach does not consist in abortion protests and gay bashing.
170. Get our house in order first.
171. Not now, we are supporting many now. Let's get past all current issues first.
172. It is almost non-existent. What are the people heading this doing? Pastors, deacons, and laypersons need to beat the bushes. Not saying, "Lord work some miracles!" Scripture tells us "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." Pastors, especially young graduates are not doing this. There are exceptions. Praise God for them.
173. The arts need to be returned to a prominent place within outreach. Door to door evangelism ends up annoying people. Artwork, music, etc... however, is something than cannot but come from the heart, and tends to soften hearts because it is so very personal in nature. As a pastor, I've just begun to explore this avenue. Creativity cannot stand on its own, but needs a strong doctrinal foundation, from which faith is able to express itself.
174. We all agree that we need more creative outreach. But getting it done is a real problem. For many people the church is really nonexistent. What do some people say? We are in the post-Christian era.
175. The training of young pastors at seminary has become a stumbling block in sharing the Gospel. They are ultra conservative, rigid and focus on preaching the purity of the Lutheran Confessions, walk around during the week with clerical black shirts and demonstrate little of God's grace with poor pastoral skills for the congregation and the community at large. This is a generalization but that's been my experience with four young pastors I've been involved with in the last number of years. I feel like LCC is trying to go back to the 19th century. It's a recipe for the death of LCC. One of the main reason I'm filling out this survey is my great concern about what's happening at the seminaries. What is being taught that causing so my graduates to be so hyper-conservative. The first seminarian we called from Edmonton immediately wanted to change the congregation--our communion approach and the involvement of women. I had been in LCC for almost 40 years. There was always a good balance between law and grace. Now the pastors are very legalistic, worshipping the Lutheran Confessions. The young man was released in 3 months. The second young seminarian came from Fort Wayne. It seemed he was going to be excellent--preaching the Word. Then all changed. He wrote, "The Lutheran Confessions is God's confession on this earth and all other confessions are flawed in such a way that people under their care are at

risk of loosing their salvation." That's horrible. Is this what LCC believes and is this the direction LCC agrees with? His call was rescinded. Both situations have torn our congregation apart. I'm asking who can we call in the future that comes with a pastor's heart? These men belong in the 19th century. I can't believe their narrow outlook. They demonstrate little or no grace toward others. There's now 2 more young seminarians in the area that behave the same way. I'm very concerned about our congregation and LCC as a whole. I realize we have a liberal attitude in the greater Christian church that needs to be addressed but when our pastors loose the heart of Christ's ministry on this earth, we need to rethink what we are teaching. People need to hear God's grace in our broken world.

176. We simply need to teach the bible according to the Lutheran confessions without window dressing. Jesus already created the gospel, no need to supplement it with more creativity than Christ's own, whatever that would entail.
177. Ambiguous. More creative than what? There are currently many different form of outreach being used. In general, the church always needs to be open to new ways of reaching out and I think the church is now.
178. LCC should focus on Canadian Mission since no other Lutheran ILC entity will do this. We are it. And we become less Christian day by day.
179. Don't sacrifice sound doctrine!
180. Unfortunately, new ways always seem to be combined with electronic communications which I do embrace but are not always the answer
181. My husband and I have had the chance to travel to and worship at several LCC churches and we notice we have so many seniors in our churches so we are effectively meeting their needs I think but we need to reach out to other age groups for sure.
182. Most people spell love "T-I-M-E." You want to show love to people? Have influence in their lives? Make time for them. And, let's be done with the fallacy that this is "the pastor's job." It's not. It's OUR job. WE need to be shaking hands, asking people questions, and stopping to LISTEN to them. I mean REALLY listen. Make the time to hear their heartbreak, comfort through their tears, help them in their need (often by just being a good ear to listen.) Get our butts out of the pews, and love people where they are at. We don't have to be theologians or biblical scholars to do this. We just have to demonstrate love (agape) to them.
183. It seems the only new ways of outreach is through electronic communication which I really embrace but ultimately this is going to backfire
184. This is crucial for the relevance of LCC.
185. Outreach materials in French are needed yesterday!
186. More outreach is needed but I'm not sure the LCC body as opposed to individual churches is the right level. What will be effective in rural farming communities will not work in cities. What will reach people in Ontario will not reach the unchurched in BC.
187. Canada is becoming increasingly more multicultural and increasingly more highly technological. If we want LCC to exist as a vibrant, living church by the mid point of this century, then we need to explore ways to reach our fast changing communities and use technology as a facilitator. The apostle Paul said that he was willing to use any means possible to spread the Gospel. All of LCC needs to do likewise or we risk becoming a dead church and there are plenty of those around already.
188. Constantly explore and try new ideas, rework old ideas, God's word is timeless how we communicate it, the possibilities are endless.

189. LCC should seriously reconsider its stance on closed communion. That is the single biggest factor that discourages me from bringing friends/family to church.
190. No sure LCC has the resources to achieve this.
191. The ABC District experimented with a form of "creative" outreach with the Prince of Peace development. We know that has not worked out very well. Creativity is well and good as long as it flows out of our understanding of Word & Sacrament and the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ Jesus. We must be wary of saying what we are doing now is not working so let's try something (or, God forbid, anything) else without remembering that it is the Holy Spirit who calls, gathers, enlightens and sanctifies.
192. Training at our seminaries (pastors) and through our parish services education (deacons) should provide for extensive missional/outreach knowledge, experience and focus, especially in the cultural climate of our Canadian communities today. Pastors and deacons should be equipped to do outreach well and have quality outreach resources available to educate and train laypersons in carrying the Gospel into the communities around them. I fear we are far behind the curve in the necessary knowledge and skills to do mission and outreach in the growing secular culture around us. Maybe training professional domestic missionaries should be seriously considered.
193. This question is not clear enough for me to answer. What is meant by creative? Also, outreach is primarily the work of congregations. It can be helpful to resource people who share outreach ideas with congregations though.
194. Times change, people change, therefore communications must be reviewed regularly.
195. There is a lot of work that can be done in Canada itself rather than overseas. Look after the people at home first before other countries. How can you look outside of Canada when there is so much that SHOULD be done here?
196. Outreach is THE MAIN function of the church. It follows that Synod should to all it can to assist districts and congregations to carry out this function.
197. I don't know
198. If people are getting tired of the same ideas within the church, creative forms of outreach could be a good suggestion to help.
199. "Creative" is the last word that should ever be used when talking about anything the church does. For example, Five-2 is creative but it is Satanic.
200. There is plenty of opportunity for outreach... just a shortage of leaders. Services/programs for children i.e. Mother's Morning Out, Preschool, VBS, Schoolage weeknight program (Art, Music, Gym) - would likely attract new families.
201. Not only outreach but member retention
202. ?
203. As long as these efforts strengthen local congregations
204. Yes. This is absolutely true. Our culture is becoming increasingly secularized and we have a great opportunity with sound theology and the sweetness of grace to do amazing things in Canada beyond our currently established (and at times rote) practices.
205. We would need the funding.
206. We need to worry about Canada and in return we will outreach the rest.
207. Change in approach may be beneficial -- but don't sacrifice doctrine or practice e because of a "hot trend for this year". Perhaps if more training of congregational members on HOW to live out their faith would be a great help -- many just don't know or are not encouraged in that path.

208. This is especially true in cross-cultural ministries.
209. too rigid with "close(d) communion"
210. I suppose it doesn't hurt, provided we're very careful with what we allow on the basis of 'creativity.' I should note that I am content with the status quo.
211. Considering my answer in #8, how can we truly serve Christ's mission without working more closely with other Christian Church bodies?
212. We should ensure any outreach is centered around Christ and Him crucified, leading people to baptism and faith.
213. LHM materials should be promoted and used at all levels of our church body. In East District the trend seems to be anti-evangelism. One of our conferences featured a "mission/evangelism" speaker who primarily cut down LCMS efforts at evangelism but didn't have anything evangelistic to offer us.
214. One of the very important services
215. Absolutely
216. Very important to reach non-Christians in our somewhat secular society.
217. Not only outreach but Member & youth retention
218. There should be a "Super Most-Definitely Strongly Agree" option for this question. Most LCC congregations need an intense shake-up to rediscover the redemptive mission of God and their vital place within that mission. To the extent that Districts and Synods have influence in congregations, they should be actively engaging and encouraging congregations to initiate new mission opportunities around every corner.
219. Possibly - no idea what you do now
220. Perhaps, but we CANNOT do things that would be detrimental to the Holy Word of God. We are not enthusiasts; we are sacramental Christians. Christ works in his established means: Word, Baptism, Communion, Absolution.
221. This statement assumes that LCC is doing outreach in Canada. Most often this is currently done by the districts. If the districts are eliminated, then LCC should explore outreach in Canada. When it comes to "more creative forms of outreach," I would agree only if our doctrine is not neglected. In the past, we as a church tend to get "creative" in the sense of attempting to mimic the mega church down the street and ignore any doctrinal considerations, or attempt to make our doctrine fit the practice after the fact.
222. Not only outreach but member retention - why are young people leaving our churches?
223. If the church is not willing to modify its methods of outreach and service delivery, to within doctrinal guidelines of course, it will not adapt and it will not survive. I believe re-imagining outreach and coming up with new ideas should be done constantly. Always strive to improve, do not get stuck in the old, traditional ways. The printing press was new once too.
224. Some creativity yes. However, members are God's disciples - who are to go forth and share and live Basic simplicity.
225. The role of the church is changing in our society. We need to do more outreach to lead more to Christ.
226. Provided all outreach forms are firmly centred in Word and Sacrament ministry to the lost, supported with programs for physical and mental health.
227. I think each congregation needs to do this... not synod.
228. Some of the restrictive policies re. communion and inter-church relationships discourages outreach and effective ministry by congregations.
229. we do need to get our teens and young adults more actively involved in our churches.

230. We should always be investigating new and creative forms of outreach.
231. Scripture doesn't say be creative. It says, "Preach the word; in season and out of season." I don't think the question is one of creativity but rather, "Are we preaching the Word?" And, "Is this in an in season time or not?"
232. Not sure how you would do that, but spreading God's word is always good. New ways must be explored.
233. LCC must come to grips with fact that Canada has 2 official languages and that there are outstanding mission opportunities among those who speak French. Our Lord Jesus Christ died for Francophones too.
234. Please define "creative" or give examples.
235. More use of and a stronger social media presence
236. The term "creative" is very vague. Depending on what is meant by "creative" would drastically change my answer.
237. yes, we are struggling to compete.
238. This question is unclear. "Creative forms" needs to be more clearly defined. We must maintain our strong theological foundation and not cave just to get more people in the door by giving them or telling them what is popular.
239. Give this responsibility to the congregations. LCC is stuck in the 1950s when pastors were paid low salaries and people went to church.
240. Rather a poorly worded question??????
241. I think it's more important to communicate the joy and peace of knowing Christ followed by the desire to pass on the riches of His relationship with us to others. When we are happy about what Christ does in our lives then we'll want to share that heart and life knowledge with others. It won't take money to do.
242. I'd be happy with just a form of outreach plan for Canada. Its all left up to the parish to figure out with outdated ideas and programmes that do not work. But then again, LCC is afraid of the unknown unchurched person.
243. The outreach initiatives that have been implemented in the ABC District have been very valuable. Grassroots efforts from the Districts best address mission opportunities relative to the regional needs of Canadian churches. These ideas should be shared to spur outreach efforts that will be appropriate in various contexts across LCC. The ABC District's focus on Transforming for Missions, Urban Parishes, Bi-Vocational Workers, and Missional Communities has strengthened our District's outreach to the unchurched.
244. The ABC District has implemented a very helpful process called Transforming for Missions. There is also discussion related to missional communities, urban parishes, multi-point parishes, bi-vocational workers. It would be prudent to have a church-wide discussion on how we respond to the challenge of being Christians in post-church era as we may need to change who we identify to be church workers, the type of workers needed (e.g. missionaries, lay catechists, pastors, etc.) and how/where we train them.
245. LCC needs major improvement in the outreach ministry
246. Provided that emphasis is on doctrine not on cultural background.
247. this is a motherhood statement - we should always be looking for new and different and hopefully better forms of outreach - careful lest we have another Prince of Peach fiasco.
248. This outreach of LCC should be encouraged through and organized within the congregations, rather than in isolation within the LCC synod or districts. The body of Christ, a.k.a. the people of the church should be directly involved in outreach - not as 'programs' or

'projects' but through genuine and meaningful involvement in the communities they serve. - building relationships, being the hands and feet of Christ and creating opportunities to share the Gospel.

249. Youth, is lost ministry
250. Let’s get our 'house' in order before we start with creative forms of outreach in Canada
251. Word and Sacrament ministry is for the believer!! And is foreign to the unchurched/our culture. We don't want to change our worship to fit our culture so must explore ways of reaching into the lives of people with the Gospel.
252. Word and Sacrament ministry is important...but you cannot worship unless you are Christian because you do not know the God whom you are worshipping!
253. Provided that such "creative forms of outreach" do not contradict our teaching and practice. "Bait and switch" is not an honest way for the church to approach the world. People can see through such methods. They don't work.
254. Since Districts currently are closer to Ground Zero they should have the primary responsibility for outreach in Canada. Having Synod do this will only lead to delay as the necessary contacts might take too long to identify and utilize.
255. Present forms of outreach are taxing our resources to the limit and further forms of outreach would only put a further burden on manpower and resources.
256. We should take care to not overextend ourselves and our resources. Present forms of outreach put us at our limit.
257. Where is this question leading? The word "creative" is not clearly defined here. As Lutherans we should be mining our Lutheran heritage for insights into outreach, and/or we should be going to Scripture and the confessions as our guide and norm. Is that "creative" or are we talking Church Growth practices, or Charismatic practices, or other Enthusiast approaches? What does creative mean here?
258. It is very difficult to be part of the community and witness. To bring in more new members is difficult.
259. The blessing of mission and outreach are entirely in the hands of the Holy Spirit (see what is happening in Berlin-Steglitz right now!) and simply cannot be programmed.
260. Leave the outreach work to local congregations who can meet the needs of their particular communities.
261. I feel that our "understanding" or "stance on Grace" comes across confusingly when our hymnal makes it sound that we are "sinners" and must confess our sins before receiving forgiveness. Christ died many years ago (factual act) for all the sins of the whole world. Christ has paid the price...we are holy in the sight of the Father...saints. We can't "do" anything to redeem ourselves, as it is the Holy Spirit who leads our thinking as to what Christ has done for and to us. We realize that we still sin, but these sins have been paid in full thousands of years ago, by Jesus. We confess our sins because we are forgiven (not the other way around). This is an important "form" of worship to our God, we recognize and are thankful the Spirit convicted us of our sins and transgressions, that the Father sent his Son to earth to satisfy the requirement of the Law, that Jesus completed God's plan of Grace. Grace is a gift of His Righteousness to us. Romans 6: 7-14 informs us that we are free from the condemnation of sin (the Law) and suggests we should not let sin "reign" in our mortal body, again! Let Christ reign in our mortal lives as He has so many blessings to share with his daughters and sons while we are still kicking the dust of this earth. We need to trust, "Father knows Best."

262. LCC needs to expand its concept of mission to include the daily work which occurs in a parish. District mission execs traditionally dismiss any mission work that does not fall within the narrow parameters of their own understanding. Sometimes effective mission is neither exciting nor creative but that does not mean that t is not valuable. P.O.P was considered "creative mission" too
263. LCC and especially ABC needs to recognize that mission is a far broader term than many "mission-execs" like to define it. Daily pastoral work is also mission but receives no recognition that it seeks to further the Gospel into the lives of the people. The message seems to be: "if it's NOT creative and exciting...then it's NOT mission."
264. We do not need creative; we need passionately faithful to the confessions. Most of the time, our own creativity distracts us with our need for validation. "Was my idea the best?" rather than "Was this faithful and clear? Will this fully equip the next generation to persevere through challenges to their Christian faith?"
265. This may be becoming one of the fastest growing issues in our country in my opinion. While once considered a Christian nation, and still a political leader in our world, our mission field locally has become more and more crucial. Outside missions are important but the toughest one with potentially the most future impact is within our border.
266. Make Pastors more missionary minded and trained.
267. attitudes not structures need adjusting
268. We absolutely have to do this, it is critical. But I do not know what creative forms will entail. I am just concerned that a lot of our Pastors display apathetic behavior in regard to outreach and our congregations often mirror their pastor's behavior. I wish I had an answer as this is the most significant challenge we face.
269. ...we can never say we have done everything we can to bring the Word to all our people
270. "creative”? An understanding and teaching of vocation should be emphasized.
271. Reach out to other Christians with respect.
272. We have the Good News and we need to get it out there. Waiting for people to come to us is not effective nor is it the model which God gave us when he sent his Son to save us. Congregations need to come up with different means to reach out beyond the walls of our church buildings.
273. Sometime we overlook Canadian citizen needs.
274. always a need to strive harder at getting the Word out to all our people. encourage more effort by individuals
275. How can we reach out to our members who still consider themselves a "member" of a LCC church but do not feel a need to worship regularly (except Easter and Christmas) or partake of the Sacraments? Also reach out to some of our youth who also don't attend church anymore.
276. Look after our own people. I know we are trying to follow the great commission (go ye therefore etc.)
277. The present ways we have tried to reach the unreached with the gospel has not been successful. How do we get the Word of Jesus love to all ages?
278. Many services exist, more would be overkill!!
279. I believe our outreach ministries are good, as far as I am communicated to: LAMP, LLL and LWML and the Rock provide worthwhile ministries. The other 9 ministries are very important to us as well.

280. From the letters in the Canadian Lutheran and the updates from LAMP LLL and LWML and other church bodies I believe we are spreading the funds as best as we can.
281. LCC should always explore different methods of extending Law and Gospel to the CDN people. Looking, naturally, to the confessions to give us guidance and direction.
282. Outreach is a local church endeavor.
283. "Creative" outreach is a bit of a red flag for me. It depends on the definition of creative, I suppose...
284. We need to revisit how we do evangelism and work with others to increasingly provide a visible witness to how we live our Christian faith vs emphasizing saving souls by preaching and teaching. Unfortunately, we need to let people get to know us by our acts of kindness and then let them ask us the question of why we do what we do.
285. You need to minister to the young women (14 to 30) who will decide whether or not their family will attend church. We are told the man should be the spiritual leader of the home, but very few young families will come to church without the mother leading the way, this may not be what our church wants but it is reality in Canada now. I want to see women in leadership roles, 60 and 70-year-old men don't know what young women in Canada are looking for in a church.
286. Each church's primary outreach should be in their local community - churches should partner with other churches in their community in joint outreach opportunities. Evangelism and ministry should focus on your immediate community. If partnerships are required, consider LCC churches in your circuit, and other non-LCC churches in your community. LCC should empower local congregations for outreach and ministry to their local communities.
287. Everything has been tried.
288. There are many outreach projects close to home.
289. Agree if by 'creative' using worldly methods is not implied.
290. We have a well earned reputation for being dull and boring
291. There are many that could be reached with just a little more effort.
292. -Synod should provide guidance and resources to circuits and congregations
293. I personally agree. While we need to be sensitive to world needs our first responsibility is keeping our Canadian population aware and committed to being good Christians. We need to work with other Christian denominations and our fellow Lutheran churches to expose Canadians to Christianity and participating in Christian life.
294. Investigate & learn from other denominations. Share in the use of other denominations training programs & facilities.
295. I think LCC directly or indirectly supports excellent outreach in Canada. It would be wonderful if things such as BC Mission Boat Society could be done in other areas also.
296. However, Church growth movements like Five-Two etc., should not be allowed. Word and Sacrament ministry should still be primary.
297. Only in the sense of looking for more ways for pastors to preach law and gospel to others and maintaining the historic liturgy and strong adherence to the doctrine as taught by Scripture, creeds, and confessions.
298. We need to open our doors to everyone no matter who what or where they are from or their appearance
299. Absolutely. We are not a church body that is known for its outreach. I met a gentleman in a Christian bookstore; we were having a wonderful conversation - after chatting for a while

the gentleman asked me what denomination I was from. I said Lutheran. He responded - I didn't think you were Christians.

300. I agree, but in our increasingly secular society, this can be very difficult. Social media is the medium that will help accomplish outreach in today's world.
301. We are not seeing the next generation of current families attending church. Therefore, our very existence depends on growth. We need to show the Lutheran church as open to all, not just those who are born into it.
302. Not necessarily 'creative', but just outreach to the peoples of Canada whether in large cities, towns or the North.
303. There are forms of outreach that have been created by non Lutherans that merit attention and study and maybe modification so that we can use them. District should be watching for these and doing the legwork on that so that each congregation does not have to do it on their own. Also, the 3rd leg of the great commission " teaching them to obey everything I have commanded " is mostly neglected and can be used to reach out to the world out there. Too many times, if we do something in this line, it ends up being for ourselves and not presented to attract the world. After all Jesus used food and healing to attract people and teach them about God's love.
304. Teach the people this simple formula, worked for me for years, clean up your language at the office, no expletives at all, soon your co-workers will apologize for using such words in conversations, when asked what you did on the weekend, reply 'On Saturday I _____ and on Sunday I went to church.' Your co-workers will soon ask, 'Do you go to church every Sunday?'; 'Yes, I do.' I would then have individuals come and talk to me, inquiring about my faith in Christ. I have held several jobs and following this witness plan, the Holy Spirit, brought the inquiring ones to me.
305. It's always good to assess how things can be done better.
306. There are so many ways that the 3rd leg of the great commission (and teaching them to obey all that I have commanded you) can be used to connect to today's society. For the most part, this is either ignored or applied to those already in the church where it is useful but does very little to reach out to the world. Instead we tend to criticize the world and point out what is wrong with the world rather than offer godly help to bring them around
307. Lutheran Churches need to be more visual in all of Canada and more outspoken about issues. More media exposure is required.
308. No, this starts one down a slippery slope. I have shared so many times with whom ever will listen-in the work place keep your language clean...people will notice...your co-workers will begin to apologize to you for their choice of words.....when asked 'what did you do this weekend?'....reply 'I did _____ on Saturday and on Sunday I went to church'...soon they will ask 'do you go to church every Sunday?', even if you said on Saturday I tried out the new pub in our area!....and then, individuals will come as ask you more about your faith.....it worked for me for years....
309. Although outreach can be difficult in such a large country, outreach is necessary, so using creative forms of outreach is a must.
310. Churches as we know them are dying. People want to know that God loves them by the actions and love of other people. They want to be listened to, not preached at.
311. Our churches are failing at attracting the youth and young families - we have become congregations of "gray & white heads"!!!!

312. Or how about just going out and talking about Jesus? Good grief. This shouldn't be another task force. Train people up in sharing their faith. The Holy Spirit will do the rest.
313. I believe we need to take the focus off of schools and refocus our vision on growth, especially when it comes to young families. Offering public child care, before and after school care, summer camps for the public creates SO MANY opportunities for outreach to our local communities. The only way for churches to create revenue and growth is to look for opportunities within their communities.
314. With Waterloo the 'hub' of technology, perhaps there is an opportunity for one of these start-up companies to provide ideas on what can be done to improve membership, outreach, etc. to bring more to Jesus and the church. In fact, these young people are who the church are missing more and more everyday and who do not believe.
315. One of the pieces missing in most LCC congregations is the use of small groups (home groups, community groups) as a way of inviting and introducing people to the gospel in non-threatening small environment. We know that people don't come knocking at the door of our churches looking for answers, we need to reach out to them and creating small groups and inviting non-believers to join for coffee and friendship is a great way to do this.
316. Never hurts to look at new ways
317. We have made inroads into outreach among our native peoples and this should be strengthened and encouraged. Also, now that we have so many more refugees in our communities, it is essential that we have outreach to these individuals.
318. Including support of congregations in circuits that don't seem to support each other. How can we be unified when pastors don't support each other and their congregations? "Creative forms" just means spreading the Good News of Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour, most importantly. Doctrinally the Lutheran Church is "best" however that does not imply that it is more important than the Good News!
319. I don't know what this means.
320. I suspect they already have jumped in on twitter, Facebook, etc. but Waterloo On is the HUB of technology and might have an opportunity to gain back the teenagers, University students, and everyone who had never been in a church or brought up with any religious belief. They are coming up with ideas, tech, movements, for everything in this world it seems, but religion never seems to be in the conversation. They do not know Jesus. They do not know the Bible. They are out there and need to be brought in and use their talents today.
321. We need to proudly stand out as different in a crowd of Christianity that all tries to be more creative than the next group. We should not apologize for our doctrine and practice but be proud that we are biblical in all senses of that word and faithful to the Word of God.
322. In the vernacular: "Duh... of course!" Even Scripture would agree with that. However, the national body of LCC has had very little experience with creative forms of outreach within Canada. That experience resides mostly on the district, circuit and congregational level. In fact, as long as a "Synodical Restructuring" process deals only with the rules and regulations and the structure/governance/finances/required support of the "system" but ignores any need to examine the health and well-being of the members of the synod (congregations and church workers) and the types of roles each might take in the structure of the synod, efforts at restructuring will be like "shuffling deck chairs on the Titanic." Congregations and Church workers currently make up the "synod". And unless the mission and ministry of "congregations" and "church workers" is healthy and sustainable, any resulting "synod" of such will be unhealthy. Placing all the emphasis on restructuring the top of a synod structure

without strengthening and/or restructuring the "base" (congregations and church workers) is unwise. When congregations are healthy they are involved in significant and creative forms of outreach in their local and regional areas and supportive also of larger shared efforts. Even the most creative of synodical national outreach, when done outside of a healthy relationship/partnership with local congregations, is prone to paternalism.

323. Outreach programs are very weak.
324. Something new would be wonderful. Something that appeals to young people and flexibility with liturgy
325. More use of internet.
326. "Creative" is a vague way to describe any kind of outreach. Specifics are required before any discussion can be had on the synod's need for outreach.
327. Although it depends what is meant by "creative." Buying a CFL Team, and then having a worship service while the game is on would be creative, but not wise.
328. Because each congregation is an individual within the larger body, each should minister to their context, based upon a Word and Sacrament ministry. LCC should provide potential ideas, and resources, but yet nothing prescriptive
329. Outreach is vital for our Christian faith, but LCC cannot adopt Church Growth methodology or quick fix ideology.
330. This is a poorly worded question and what will the results tell you or give you permission to do? What are you meaning by "creative forms of outreach"? It is this independent "risk taking", competing with evangelicals and following the fad mentality on an administration level that brought District to stray. On the other hand, we don't exist as congregations just to serve ourselves. We have to be advocates of the Gospel in our lives personally, which means sharing the faith we have with others in our community. We trust God's word is powerful and will produce the results that God desires.
331. Although, depends on what is meant by "creative." Buying a CFL team and holding a church service before each game would be creative, but not wise.
332. I strongly agree, though this is not necessarily a negative comment on our current strategies. I simply think that we always need to be creative in the ways in which we spread the gospel. There will never be only one way of doing this, nor will the strategies that work today continue to work the same way in the future. The world is always changing and though the gospel itself never changes, there are always new and innovative ways to deliver that same truthful message.
333. At face value, there is nothing wrong with this, but unfortunately such language tends to be favoured by those who prize creativity above faithfulness. If we are faithful in outreach, God's Word will do its work. We don't need more (well, any) marketing gimmicks, we need to reach people with the Word. We should be open to new ways of doing this, as long as we keep in mind that it is God's Word, not flashy shows/gimmicks/programs/apologetics/marketing/etc. that converts people.
334. One should always "explore" creative forms of outreach, if only to be educated as to what passes for evangelism. However, Christ said to baptize and teach - as in word and sacrament, means of grace talk. Plus, we have the best intro to Christianity program ever written, some 500 years old and never improved on: The Small Catechism. with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
335. Through efforts of LHM this must be pursued.
336. Let's look after ourselves first.

337. The needs from other people outside the Lutheran are great.
338. Outreach means helping people to meet Jesus and build a relationship with him, and not about filling the pews
339. but only in ways that are confessionally Lutheran.
340. There are so many unchurched people.
341. Let women do more - our church will fail if they don’t
342. My disagreement with this statement is more a result of the wording rather than the intent. I am not a fan of 'creative forms of outreach'. I strongly believe that LCC needs to engage in more active outreach within Canada, but do not think we need to be creative, rather we need to be consistent and true to doctrine.
343. More outreach with diverse backgrounds
344. I agree that more outreach needs to be done in Canada but I am not sure what you mean by "creative". Have we even explored any forms of outreach other than LAMP? If so, it has not been well communicated that that is what our mission dollars do. We hear about foreign missions but nothing of national.
345. It is concerning that in the last years LCC has opened few missions in its 3 Districts and has come to be viewed as a declining, if not a dying, church.
346. if we are the hands and feet of God we need to use them
347. What we are currently doing is not really working out, but we really need to get our people to understand that they are to be also going out into the world to let their light (the light of Christ) shine before it not just some or others.
348. Agree - but this need to be done at a district level, not LCC. Each district is very different and even within the district there are various needs that have to be identified and dealt with differently.
349. The World is changing rapidly. We need to be creative in how we confront it with the Gospel
350. Any outreach would be more than we have now.
351. starting at the church level if possible
352. the possibility of this occurring is very unlikely
353. Cannot believe that as a Christian church will stay away from actually communicating with our local church communities.
354. It is always wise to seek avenues in which to reach others with the gospel. Of course, it is the power and work of God through His word that changes lives and brings people to saving faith in Jesus Christ, but seeking creative ways in which to bring God's word and His love through His people to others is important.
355. LCC should stick to the inherent word of the Bible in all they undertake and never be distracted from that.
356. Our pastors don't know how to do effective outreach in Canada. Most of our pastors and many of our seniors don't want to make the kind of changes that might be required to reach out to our neighbours - in many cases we would need to update our music considerably. We get no encouragement from the synod or the district to look at those kind of tough heart issues that need to be resolved before we can seriously discuss outreach.
357. Use computers - the cults and sects as Mormons, J.W.'s, use radio, TV, etc., and publicize their religion. Why not us, besides Lutheran Hour radio. Let's start using these means very rapidly.

358. By now we should have been the leaders in warning to congregations of the machinations of the new world order, agenda 21. Instead, we run away from it because it appears too "political" What do you think Christ the Lord would say to those monsters?
359. There isn't much outreach that I can see, except through our school. Even there much more could be done to go out to the community and recruit pupils.
360. But the possibility of this happening is very unlikely
361. We need to get way more creative. But we also need to solve significant disagreement over church and ministry issues which have serious implications for outreach.
362. But the possibility of this happening is very unlikely
363. As Christians in Canada are on the outside looking in, we need to change our philosophy and methods bringing Christ. The one best one still remains-talking about Jesus with relatives, friends and neighbors.
364. New programs for all age groups are needed, particularly for young people and young families. Our congregations are made up of approximately 70% of people over the age of 60. What are you doing to bring in and/or keep the younger people in worship and church activities? We need better communication!
365. LCC should always explore different methods of extending Law and Gospel to the CDN people. Looking to the confessions to give us guidance and direction.
366. There is a huge age group of unbelievers that are not considered: baby boomers who have no spiritual background and yet are seeking spiritualism in some form.
367. If we don't reach out, we die as congregations because we are not fulfilling the great commission given us by our Lord.
368. What do they provide to most congregations? Congregations don't tap into them
369. See my other comments on the need to exchange information on 'Best Practices'.
370. When will we wake up to the fact that more churches are being closed than started. I think most Lutheran Pastors need help and encouragement to take the Gospel to those that are lost.
371. Not sure what is meant by creative
372. We need to always be open to the direction of Holy Spirit in new opportunities in reaching people founded on biblical principles.
373. This is an absolute must as our church moves forward!
374. Immigrants are growing rapidly. Are we reaching out to them?
375. Not sure what the thought is here. If it involves going into business or changing the definition which includes "speculative investment" I disagree. An explanation of what this would /could look like would be helpful
376. I think we need to take care that in trying to create new and better programs that we do not decimate the existing good programs and the members of existing congregations.
377. This is what is getting us into trouble.
378. Depends on what you mean by "outreach". We need to reach out to bring poor attending members, ex members and new members to actively practice faith in our congregations. Guidance and support on how to accomplish this and share ideas and lessons learned is needed.
379. If we're serious about outreach, then we will have to become more creative because society has become much more diverse.
380. There does not appear to be any plan. if there is, it is poorly communicated

381. I would like an example of "creative". I believe that we should do all to outreach, but to bring people to confessional church and liturgical worship experience. when divine service turns into an opportunity to do outreach, I have great concerns.
382. you would have to define "Creative". I've rarely seen "programs" work with any success...really comes down to one on one …what is that old saying.... Shepherds don't give birth to sheep.... sheep give birth to other sheep....
383. The day of "if you build it, they will come" church outreach is long gone. The effort in Northeast Edmonton which attempted to present a "complete congregation" to a new community by "borrowing sheep" from existing congregations fooled no one. Outreach forms that seek to reach people who do not yet believe are needed much more than moving existing member from place to place.
384. define "more creative"...
385. This is why we are here, and we should always be looking for creative ways to meaningfully and effectively share God's truth and grace with those in our communities, locally and nationally. The question is whether the larger church should do this by supporting congregations or on its own. To me, congregations - boots on the ground - are our front line venue for national outreach initiatives.
386. Work with other Christian philosophies is important.
387. Young people have given up on Our Church. My own three children - now on their 20s - have stopped going to church. They don't see it as relevant to today's realities. They are not alone, obviously, as youth and young families are the greatest loss to ours and most congregations. We need to be more open to more contemporary forms of service or our synod will soon be just a memory. How many churches do we have now with an average age approaching 80? This is not sustainable.
388. Mission is why we are here, and we should always be creative, relevant, and context-aware as we seek out ways to share the truth and grace of Christ with those in our communities.
389. You can't tell somebody to be more creative.
390. Currently and in past seems like we have put the cart before the horse. perhaps with little or no proper plan and often at a high cost. Very disappointed that LCC has not taken a lead role in Canada Refugee sponsorship.
391. Yes, I believe that there are some creative forms of outreach being done by members of LCC but are not being supported by LCC Districts because of differing opinions on outreach. Should we not do as Paul did "and to the Jews I became as a Jew... 1 Corinthians 9:19-23.
392. I think outreach needs to be explored by local congregations or circuits. Synod should encourage these entities to do the exploring and may provide some support to get these efforts going. Seminaries can also provide some expertise.
393. Not just in Canada, but each individual church must do more outreach in their communities. Lutherans are too "exclusive" to other believers in their community. They also believe that Jesus died for their sins.
394. This can often be provided by lay members as volunteers.
395. I would have marked "strongly agree" except that the question poses "creative forms" of outreach. I agree that we need to foster a stronger evangelistic culture within our church. They need to be faithful to our confession, however. If "creative" is meant to be iconoclastic in relationship to our confession and historical heritage, I would prefer to focus my attention elsewhere. PAT style outreach should be encouraged - as should re-starting the identity of 'mission congregations' etc. to help structure our outreach.

396. We have been blessed with excellent speakers on the Lutheran Hour. I pray this will always continue.
397. LCC should expand training of its church workers and parishioners for outreach in Canada. Pastors need to give confidence to their parishioners. LCC should provide training and resources for churches and church workers to lead the way in outreach.
398. this is a no-brainer
399. This is our purpose and mission, to reach the people around us who no nothing of Jesus and could care less about Lutheranism.
400. any idea that has the needs of the unsaved at heart is probably a good idea. Good ideas that work should be shared. Therefore, statics need to be part of the evaluation if it is to be shared. whatever happened to the evangelgram?
401. Lutheran Laymen's League and Lutheran Hour Ministries have great resources which could be used more efficiently by both LCC and the Districts. The LLL and LHM are specialist in OUTREACH.
402. Let's continue to focus on teaching the Holy Scripture and equipping our people through Word and Sacrament to tell others about Jesus.
403. Focus on creative forms of re-engaging families and securing that spiritual foundation, then the outreach will happen by osmosis
404. Not exactly sure what that would look like, but for certain we need to hold fast to doctrine and the promises that this is the Lord's church, He wants all to come to Him and the Holy Spirit is the one who instills faith. (of course)
405. You have to get up with new views and technology.
406. Old school does not work.
407. By using Word and Sacrament ministry.
408. LCC needs to take charge and break the stereotype (as do other denominations) of what Christianity means and how we can better reach those in need.
409. What does "creative forms of outreach" mean?
410. The Holy Spirit moves as it pleases and caution must be exercised so as not to compromise our doctrine.
411. this is like agreeing with motherhood... this is not permission to pursue every wild idea that passes through an executive's head
412. I like our Lutheran service very much - sure not looking for charisma - but I am not 16.
413. It seems to me that LCC is totally out of touch with today's un-churched Canadians. We claim to have the true Biblical doctrine, yet we have been ineffective in communicating it in a meaningful way. Therefore, our church is a dying church.
414. The Lutheran Church comes across as too old fashioned.
415. All outreach is important
416. Not sure what "creative forms of outreach" means. If it means employing non-Lutheran methods and materials, then NO. If it means going back to an emphasis on providing Word and Sacrament ministry and people living out their daily life in the vocation or station in life in which God has placed them, then YES.
417. If by "creative forms" you mean church growth strategies and silly marketing techniques, I disagree.
418. I have not seen our church body being ABLE to truly be outreach focused. We are not willing to be creative nor do what is needed to be attractive to our communities. Our

congregations almost without exception are comfortable being just as they are. And those that ARE being creative are excluded and accused of being unLutheran.

419. See answer # 6 above. Also we could give extra funding to our seminaries to have a special chair for immigrant studies/outreach or urban outreach.
420. Most definitely. I think we are the only churches that have very poor outreach programs. I think we need to learn from other churches that are growing amongst us. (Alliance church, Center Street church, among others). We should talk to them, ask questions, get ideas. They are obviously doing something right.
421. How about a professional LCC television broadcast?
422. We are a dying church. We view the great commission as the protection of our doctrine not reaching out with the gospel.
423. but I don't know how.
424. What do the other denomination do? As long as we don't violate our doctrine, can we not learn from others? That would be true 'inter-church relationship'.
425. We should be very active in evangelism and mission and find ways to reach out to our communities and so that we make a difference in the places we are located. A question we should ask if what difference does this congregation/church make in this community. If we were to disappear tomorrow would anyone notice, would it effect the community in any way?
426. I'm not sure our congregation for example could do much more, but there has to be a way to get people more aware of the church.
427. we are rapidly falling behind in communicating with the people especially young people
428. LCC should always be looking for more creative forms of outreach.
429. LCC should always explore different methods of extending Law and Gospel to the CDN people. Looking to the confessions to give us guidance and direction.
430. We can learn from other Christian denominations about what forms of outreach have worked for them. They in turn can learn from us. We can also learn more about outreach to the lost, by having Bible Studies on Evangelism and reaching out to our neighbors and people of non-Christian religions.
431. As long as we recognize it is only the Word that calls. Creative is ok, gimmicky is not.
432. If the current structure stays, LCC priority is much larger than Canada. The people best able to welcome and nurture new individuals gained by outreach need to be the ones supporting those programs. So outreach in Canada is best delivered by districts or LSOs.
433. Under the current structure, this is the work of the districts or LSOs. I would be less interested in supporting an outreach in AB than I would be an outreach in Toronto or my own community. The ones that can most effectively receive new people from an outreach effort should be the ones to support it.
434. There are many who are seeking something that their churches have been unable to provide; we need to be innovative enough to extend an appealing welcome to those people; even if it means that we might have to step outside of our own comfort zones.
435. We should not be afraid to partner with other churches and groups in our communities to provide musical concerts for youth, divorce care and family life seminars, after school child care centers, new Canadian/refugee care. Impressed with the make-a-difference care provided by the Regina and Thunder Bay street ministries and The Rock in Edmonton!
436. People are leaving the Lutheran church, because services are rote and boring. Our ministers, with the help of members, need to motivate, and invigorate people. We need more joy, yet

still law, but more joy! He IS risen! We are saved! Hallelujah! Lutherans are sometimes too much law, to the point of driving people away, excluding some, offending some. There is a better way. LOVE! People can be guided better in a loving way!

437. From a Scriptural point of view, yes, absolutely. From an integrity point of view, very challenging. Once you have slapped people in the face and spit on them, it's hard to reach out to others.
438. "More creative forms"?? What is LCC doing for outreach in Canada now? Could you have listed the forms of outreach? This seems like a leading question. Of course people would be in favour of outreach.
439. I endorse the forms of "street ministry" that Central District has in Thunder Bay and in Regina and what had been ongoing in Vancouver with Pastor Roggow before the ABC funding issues. I believe an opportunity exists in University Campus ministry across Canada that we are missing.
440. 1.Let’s take care of what we have, before reaching for something we know very little about
441. #8 and #9 are related to this. Perhaps a missionary type position could be created in cities that shares with the LCC churches. They would encourage programs, teaching, involvement with the aim of attracting especially children to attend and enjoy church and Sunday school. Many of our pastors do those things but are busy and need the help and coordination to make it work over numerous congregations. They would not replace individual programs and SS teachers but help and encourage them.
442. I feel LCC would help itself immensely if Pastors simply invited everyone "WHO BELIEVES IN THE LORD" to come forward for communion. Communion cards in my opinion should b thrown out the window. It is another form of LCC congregations playing God and interfering with the Lord's deliverance of communion. While effective, memorable messages from the pulpit are a more critical part of a church service, issues dealing with communion have hurt us a lot over the past several years and helped to diminish our numbers.
443. I would recommend Transforming for Missions (T4M) to all districts if all districts are not using it. I know the ABC District has used the Transforming for Missions to review and refocus a large number of congregations. Transforming for Missions is a great outreach tool for congregations to take the Good News outside their walls and into their communities. I have experienced this as a member of a congregation who is part of T4M for many years now.
444. Very little creativity seen as of yet
445. We do not need to explore more creative forms of outreach; we just need to "DO IT"! Reaching out with the Gospel, the Good News of our salvation through faith in Jesus Christ is something that needs to be lived daily in the lives of God's people, not just on Sunday mornings during Worship.
446. What does it mean by "creative forms"?
447. In so far as those creative ideas are faithful to our confession and have purpose, sure. I leave the creative ideas to the creative ideas people, and use pastoral discretion in how (or if) the congregation can apply them.
448. We can no longer afford to think that the community non-churched will come to us, we have to go out to the people, who are hungering for the Gospel. It's a new concept, and I don't think we have that figured out yet.

449. If that is the stated mission of the Synod, then get on it if not then pass. Please don't centralize every thing in one Canadian location! Outreach is the work of every single person in the pew fed by Word and Sacrament to go out into the week to by a witness/missionary to those they are in relationship with. If we centralize more and more then Joe Pew will be more and more tempted to say let the Bishop do it!
450. I am not sure of the specifics of how the LCC is practicing outreach in Canada. That being said, I very strongly believe that there are many people who are stuck in churches feel that the only church options that are available to them are more of the same (Generic Evangelicalism / Baptist Theology). Most people simply are not aware that Lutheranism exists, and if they are aware of it they have no idea what we believe apart from the fact that they think we are either "Anglican Lite" and/or doctrinally liberal. Engaging in creative outreach without compromising doctrine (engaging in church growth strategies) may be an effective way to make people aware that the LCC is a very viable alternative to run of the mill evangelicalism.
451. As long as our doctrine is not compromised
452. I think the only form of outreach LCC should be involved in now is the restoration of faith to those who have been scandalized by the ABC District.
453. What do you mean by "more creative"?
454. Fix the 'outreach' at home first; the rest will come.
455. Absolutely.
456. Absolutely.
457. If you think it would have value. We certainly need to try to increase or stabilize our shrinking membership.
458. carry on as present
459. It's us with God's help to talk of what Jesus has done for us.
460. LCC needs to find a balance between the "Right Wing Radicals" and the Left Wing Loonies"
461. This question is not helpful. What does 'creative forms of outreach' mean? Districts have been attempting to be 'creative' for decades, and to what end? The church simply needs to be church. There was nothing 'creative' about the sower sowing seeds (Luke 8). He even sowed on less than fertile soil - not very 'creative.'
462. Why can't we simply tell others about Jesus 1 Peter 2:9? Why does it need to be creative? The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Christians are to read, mark, learn and take to heart the Word of God and the telling will take care of itself.
463. This question is not very helpful. The question needs to define what "creative forms of outreach" means? How can one agree/disagree when the question is not very clear? Often when people get "creative" in the church, it rarely turns out well in the long run. The church simply needs to be the church.
464. I cannot give an opinion to this question until I first understand what is meant by "creative forms of outreach".
465. What do you mean by "more creative forms of outreach"? Getting the Gospel out to people in our communities so that they can hear and understand the Good News needs to be the goal; not creativity. Any other means of enticing people to come to church is not worthy of our attention in my mind. If this question is asking whether we should explore more creative forms of sending our people into their communities, workplaces, neighbours homes, etc. with beautiful, Gospel-carrying feet, I am 100% in favour of continuing this discussion. How

can we be creative in giving our members a deeper appreciation for the Gospel in their own lives? How can we be creative in equipping our members to engage their neighbours in conversation about Jesus? I believe that these are the questions we need to be asking...

466. Maybe some more youth and young adult functions
467. At this point, I feel that LCC needs to focus on the members that are already in the congregations and those who are delinquent rather than spending more money and energy on outreach. Times are not good in the congregations.
468. It is interesting how local volunteers explore the ability to obtain assistance from District and Synod to start and expand a local ESL program but there is only verbal encouragement or worse yet the Pastors of all people don't listen or even see the potential and quickly discount such alternative mission program. Much of this seems to come down to overwhelmed Pastors. Without the ongoing visual support and promotion of such programs, there isn't much use in the laity wasting the little time they have outside of work hours and family obligations. More paid and trained professionals are necessary for any mission program to succeed in this society as the cost pay a mortgage, feed a family, save for college and retirement requires two incomes and discipline to make sacrifices but if laity who are professionals in certain areas like ESL, early childhood education, schooling, even strictly a local evangelist can be paid a modest but realistic salary doors open. One must question if individuals are managing their financial gifts given by the Lord and responding proportionately to the sacrifice Christ made for us. With greater financial gifts, the Church can explore other forms of outreach but without more financial resources any program will struggle to get off the ground let alone grow. The church will grow by running mission programs that provide opportunities to establish and maintain relationships leading to sharing our faith one-on-one. Many of these types of programs are grass roots level (locally established) and not a brain child of someone at Synod or District but require the support and removal of the established "red tape" or lack of interest from Synod or District as the leaders don't get it or have the time to provide the support and resources necessary. The Pastor leaders have to think outside the conventional box and learn to trust laity not judging for themselves whether they think this can work--this is a great way to destroy the church and mission programs by shutting ideas and enthusiasm of laity who are willing and ready but can't do it by themselves.
469. I am not familiar with all the resources we are currently using to give an informed decision on this one way or the other.
470. for example????
471. Bring back the "search for possible church workers" emphasis in congregations, having members mark or suggest who might be a potential worker & then that person receives info & encouragement to continue the search.
472. Pastor/church workers seed to be required to do evangelism as part of training; also pastoral care, including visiting.
473. This is the role of the local congregation.
474. What is meant by "creative"?
475. If we are not doing mission, we are dead.
476. What is meant by "creative forms" of outreach?
477. We need to look at alternate liturgies that attract young people.
478. Such as?

479. LCC should provide resources and encouragement for congregational members to do outreach in Canada.
480. LCC is on the verge of bankruptcy, survival is far more important.
481. Canada-wide advertising of a special outreach event.
482. Local outreach is imperative for the growth of the church. We spend large sums of money around the world but sometime don't knock on our neighbour's door with a simple invitation. I understand this is a calling for individual churches more than LCC or District.
483. We need something to counteract the decline of attendance in most congregations, which seems to be the result of complacency.
484. LCC needs to present itself (in publications, news releases, etc.) as a caring, Christ-centered, Bible based, and intelligent entity ... so that church members are proud to identify themselves as LCC. Church members who are proud of their Church and see it as the mission of Christ--naturally invite others to "come and see." Outreach programs are largely a waste of time and money.
485. What do you mean by creative? I don't understand, and so can't answer the question.
486. I'm not sure that's LCC's mandate – more so the congregations and individuals, I would think.
487. Culture changes, the good news doesn't. Having said this, how the message is distributed has to change. Church buildings are moving towards irrelevance. We need to find a way to connect with families, youth and young adults.
488. Based on my personal lack of involvement in this specific area, I could not say one way or another.
489. God gave us means (word and sacrament), we don't need to invent new means
490. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations baptizing them and teaching them to obey all that I have commanded. The church was given command and means how to go about outreach
491. It's not so much the creativity, but the actual desire to reach out would be a good start, instead of struggling to simply keep the doors open.
492. We fail to give proper recognition and attention to the needs and opportunities right before us, to reach out in our mission efforts.
493. Not Job of Synod nor District ~ hence why we have asked for restructuring.
494. We think churches-- new Christians think study groups and relationships with believers.
495. I think the current ABC District President has a suitable background (education and work experience) to lead us in this "new direction" (e.g., ethnic ministries)
496. Church attendance is down and especially it looks like we have very few young adults coming to Church. I've heard young adults speak dimly of "organized religion" and so I think we need more outreach on Social Media. I think that they would be attracted to "faith in action". For example, doing useful things to help the needy.
497. I don't know what this question means. The question needs to be more specific.
498. if the actual voting member of LCC is our pastor, and evangelism and outreach is not their strength then the pastor should encourage organized outreach. Programming for young adults, public sneakers etc.
499. Definitely need to find ways to integrate immigration populations into worship and membership in our congregations.
500. I'm not convinced that "Outreach" is an appropriate task for the synod. I think this belongs to congregations.

501. ~ only as noted in #8 if we stay faithful to our confession!

11. I receive the right amount of information from the Synod.

1. However only by reading “The Canadian Lutheran” and by the end of February 2016, we still do not have the first issue of this year. The last one was Nov./Dec. 2016.
2. That is a great question that the newly restructured synod should look into in order to better serve its membership.
3. Very little passed on to our congregation that I am aware of.
4. Could always be better. Many in our congregation have little or no access to electronic media.
5. What information
6. People won't come or read. You have to GO. Could have overhead presentation. Now I don't want to be deluged with expensive mailings etc. You can't assume everyone reads everything. A well informed, personable person could visit during a service discuss and inform both synod and district matters.
7. It's hard for Synod to meet the needs of diverse congregations and individuals. Most of our members are not interested in a lot of what comes out.
8. Partial agreement. Overseers of any and all auxiliaries and LSOs need to be equipped/skilled to spot problems - report to Synod immediately and Synod share info across Canada in a timely and efficient manner. e.g. What happened with CEF in ABC District should have been reported and addressed immediately not waiting to share at a later date.
9. Much is available but it takes time to find what you want.
10. Partial agreement. Overseers of any and all auxiliaries and LSOs need to be equipped/skilled to spot problems / report to Synod immediately and Synod share info across Canada in a timely and efficient manner. e.g. What happened with CEF in ABC District should have been reported and addressed immediately not waiting to share info a later date.
11. Partial agreement - e.g. what was going on with ABC District and their CEF? If there were "overseers" from across the board the root problem may have been nipped in the bud and the whole of Synod would have acted.
12. I receive very little or nothing as an LCC president of a congregation.
13. Always room to be monitored
14. High Church Ministers don't forward information from Synod or District.
15. The media "Lutheran Church-Canada and internet are valuable sources of info.

a. so much is available that all of it can't be read even

16. I receive no information from Synod, and what does this have to do with restructuring?
17. The information is there. We members need to read it.
18. Not too much information is received
19. It depends if I sign up for it, or look online for it, or read the Canadian Lutheran, etc. If I don't do these things, then I would receive / be aware of almost no information from the synod.
20. don’t nurture or feed us the truth.
21. We need practical helps to live as Christians in this world
22. Sometimes. But there are always things that even Synod doesn't know ... there are flaws in the system of getting info to Synod to dispense.
23. Not in my backyard discipline is the result. Bury head in sand problem.

24. We receive great updates from our pastor, but that is not directly from the Synod. The Lutheran Witness contains a lot of information about events but little in the form of important decisions and how they affect each church congregation.
25. Communication from Synod has become considerably worse in the last 5-6 years. Despite being signed up for all the pertinent lists, I still find myself stumbling upon information I was unaware of, which was actually "published" on some website somewhere.
26. not Synod's fault - neglect in our church to pass information on
27. We probably receive the info... but too many pastors only pass on the info that they decide upon.
28. The contents of "The Canadian Lutheran" is mainly what I think of.
29. Lack of information.
30. Either I wasn't paying attention or we weren't informed. I wasn't aware of all the auxiliaries our LCC is involved in.
31. Very little information is received in Western Canada.
32. The average lay person is not informed unless pastors report more.
33. Too much. Save the money on brochures. Send one to the church library. I only look at the names for genealogy purposes. No synods are mentioned in the Bible. To me they are in the category of trade unions - a hierarchy of well paid people attempting to reinvent the wheel.
34. Synod seems so far removed from my local congregation.
35. I very much appreciate our synodical president's mailings... they are written in such a way a lay person can understand what's been said.
36. Canadian Lutheran is a good communication piece but more info to congregations regarding concerns at synodical level to be addressed at and after conventions would help congregations be better informed and learn how they can help including with outreach, nominations, missions.
37. through the Canadian Lutheran magazine.
38. We receive no information from Synod - haven't tried asking for financial information yet but I am guessing we will get the same response as we do from District
39. A seasonal news letter on "new items" may be helpful. The Canadian Lutheran.
40. Canadian Lutheran delivers lots, convention Pastors and reps should report to their congregations upon return home.
41. The work that Synod does is so important and I believe that most congregations lack a good understanding of this work.
42. The amount of information is fine, but to be honest I would rather see regular reports on ecclesiastical supervision, such as visitation reports and cases highlighting efforts to harmonize doctrine and practice. The monthly issue of the official publication of Professional Engineers of Ontario includes details of disciplinary actions that have been concluded against its members. The report documents the allegations, the counter-arguments, and the rulings of the disciplinary committee. LCC should do the same. Our bishops need to get down to serious matters and show that they are doing their jobs, otherwise we just don't need them.
43. I, a lay person, don't need much information from the Synod. I need Word and Sacrament in the Divine Service, Catechesis and teaching from my pastor, Confession and Absolution, etc.
44. While I am agreeing, I'd say really that I'm not aware what a "right" amount should be. by what criteria? I'm okay to accept the status quo; yet, am I missing out on something more I should know? (I'm not one to read a newspaper.) I'm comfortable to know our publication,

The Canadian Lutheran, presents good materials and information. I'm aware there is info available on-line, but I rely mostly on emails sent from LCC for info "I need to pay attention to." I'd prefer not to be deluged by a whole bunch of stuff.

45. Lay persons are not very well informed of what's going on with synod.
46. I feel very disconnected from the synod.
47. I don't know, do I? I receive only what Synod thinks I need!!!
48. probably not but most likely wouldn't have the time or the knowledge to understand the workings of the synod.
49. What does right amount" mean?
50. With reference to our congregation's situation, there has been very little information shared from Synod.
51. Just the Canadian Lutheran
52. I am not knowledgeable about what is the right amount. I did not know what a Synod was until I studied to complete this survey with some knowledge. It is too hard for lay people to understand.
53. I agree that the information is available but it is not as easy for some people as it could be. It would be worth while looking into this t see if there is anything more the Synod can do.
54. not sure what the synod does except have ministers in administrative positions - certainly no leadership and governance
55. The Canadian Lutheran
56. The synod does not keep the congregations informed. A good example is this survey. The background philosophical information relating to the thesis of Walther were not alluded to at all in relation to this survey. The purpose of this survey seems an evaluation of the acceptance of an ideological shift in how our church is structured. How are church members supposed to adequately answer the question of whether we should be a top-down church or a bottom-up church if the synod doesn't even clearly communicate that this is the real issue.
57. I believe the distribution mechanism is faulty. I do not receive direct communications.
58. For instance, still no information about the number of Lenders impacted by the collapse of the ABC Church Extension Fund, nor the relative dollar amounts per Lender, nor how many were Individuals as compared to how many were Congregations, etc. Another for instance, who currently serves on the LCC Board of Directors? And where do I find their e-mail addresses?
59. Especially Canadian Lutheran
60. We don't receive mush if any information from Synod. How can we comment on this?
61. The Canadian Lutheran publication provides lots of information and updates.
62. Using this survey as an example, the written forms were well-distributed and discussed at our church. But finding the ONLINE form was difficult -- as if it were hidden somewhere in the LCC website. I was only able to find the form by Googling, visiting LCC and Canadian Lutheran websites without success, then finding a private blog that provided a link and password.
63. Question lacks precision for a meaningful response - what is "the right amount"
64. Define "right amount"
65. What is the "right" amount?
66. Appreciate short electronic format with links, timely sent.
67. about what?
68. Is the Canadian Lutheran our source of Information?

69. Trying to disseminate the information can be difficult. As it seems many parishioners are not familiar with their Synod, District and even circuit. This is not the fault of the Synod.
70. I am not always vigilant about reading my print copy of Canadian Lutheran, so any lack of knowledge on my part is very likely my own fault. I sometimes find it difficult to dig through the layers of the website when searching for something in particular.
71. I receive information from the Canadian Lutheran magazine only.
72. Would there be a better way to connect LCC members besides just the Canadian Luth Magazine?
73. ? I try to stay updated through Info Digest, Canadian Lutheran; are there other sources???
74. Not sure. "Amount of information" indicates quantity but not quality. We could be overloaded with info and yet not know what's going on, as was the case with sudden breaking of the ABC financial crisis.
75. I don't really know but I think it is okay. Of course, there probably can't be too much information. Perhaps a little more would be good but I don't know if that is practical. I do look forward to the Canadian Lutheran publication and any online information that is available.
76. Generally, it is from the Canadian Lutheran which is months behind.
77. We are not always informed about urgent matters in a timely fashion.
78. Don't hear or see much from synod other than the LCC news Letter
79. Except for events notices
80. I believe, perhaps, that the "right amount of information" is available either by dissemination or upon request. I would have to confess that sometimes (perhaps too often) I do not take the time to digest the information that is provided. Other times I do not, perhaps, take enough interest in what is shared. I have heard from members of our church body/congregation that they either do not receive enough information from Synod/District or that they do not have invested interest in national or district concerns. There is information available through the Canadian Lutheran. Whether there is enough information given there, I do not know.
81. What information from Synod?
82. Appreciate receiving The Canadian Lutheran but feel it is somewhat sanitized
83. Don't see or hear much from Synod. Other than our News letter.
84. I receive most of my information from the synod through my Pastor
85. Only District news!! i.e. Presidents ball and banquets.
86. Very little information rec'd from Synod other than the Canadian Lutheran magazine.
87. What is considered the "right" amount?
88. Several sources are available to us.
89. It seems as though the Canadian Lutheran print edition has become a second thought. For example, we received the latest edition that deals with this survey only a few days before the deadline of the survey.
90. The magazine is very informative.
91. The Canadian Lutheran has been good, but we have not been receiving enough financial info from our District--in fact we have received none in the past few years until the CEF and DIL crisis hit. Now we have asked twice for financial reports from our District with formal letters from our Council and have been told this cannot be provided. This is a huge concern. The congregations are the employers of the District and yet we cannot get financial statements showing all the admin costs (salaries, etc.) as well as the money spent on Ministry and mission.

92. however, the uptake and action by the congregation is presently the weak link
93. Synod has not been very forthcoming on their true opinions of the CEF crash and their intentions to flip the bottom up structure of the church to top down. Pure speculation of course. We would hope that our church would not abandon its Waltherian theology of church structure, that if maintained, would have help avoid the collapse of CEF.
94. The main information we receive is through our Pastor or some member who is on a major committee of Synod. There could be a two to four-page commentary issued monthly by Synod to be attached to the local congregations' monthly newsletter.
95. Synod should create an email list that any member of a congregation can receive. I personally am not aware of any such list for news letters and the like.
96. I get some info via email LCC Info Digest.
97. AS a lay person, I feel we don't get any information in what is happening at Synod
98. usually
99. While the monthly magazine is nice it can be too focussed on the good news however things such as how is the Synod financially doing not always there. Granted we have not stepped up to be active in the Synod level but perhaps there is a way to share some info to the masses.
100. We receive the LCC magazine and Canadian Lutheran online. I'm fine with that.
101. Pastor is in a conflict of interest, so not all info is coming through, much is censored out and even with Orders to disseminate come down are ignored or filtered or manipulated. We are fed what the Pastor chooses. Info has to come through a different channel, designate in congregation other than Pastor.
102. I wonder sometimes if I seek out all the information that the Synod has made available to me or if I brush by it.
103. We did not receive information about the troubles in ABC District until there was deep trouble. Our congregation is struggling to get by with a small congregation and no pastor, so we feel out of the loop. Perhaps form the Synod perspective all congregations would be treated the same.
104. I cannot answer many of the questions in this questionnaire because I do not have the information from synod.
105. More information via website would be beneficial. Currently I find the website quite difficult to maneuver.
106. The communication is available, however, I don't know if many people are availing themselves of the information. Apathy is widespread and the communication is often falling on deaf ears. Perhaps, testing new and different forms of communication is in order....
107. mainly through the Canadian Lutheran and the East District EN3.
108. I am not really sure how much information is brought down to the congregational members or congregations themselves. Do pastors know more than they share with us? Does Synod know more than they share with our pastors?
109. But I am on a board so I get a lot of information.
110. The synod is good about giving updates about things that don't involve controversy: mission projects etc. However, there is division and controversy within the Synod over Doctrine and Practice right now, and the synod does not touch appear to want to touch controversy unless they can get on the popular side of it, or until their negligence allows things to utterly fall apart and they have to say something (CEF, CUCA). When Richard Docetal was accused of child pornography, the DP was quick to point out how quickly he did the right thing and

turned him over to the police; and the District newsletter was quick to announce his resignation. But when my congregation literally fired me--there was and has been no synodical publicity or discussion of it at all. In fact, the Ecclesiastical Supervisor put an informal gaging order on the whole thing, even advising some dissatisfied members of the congregation shouldn't talk with one another about it. It appears he did so under the auspices of the 8th commandment. The 8th commandment says put the best construction on everything and that is true. However, at least in my case, our synod officials have used it as an excuse to advise against St. Paul and the Word of God which says not to keep evil deeds in the dark, but to "expose them" (Ephesians 5:11). Satan can quote the psalms opportunistically (Matt. 4:6), he can also invoke the 8th commandment in order to remain hidden and allow sin and false doctrine to spread in the shadows. I believe he has used our synodical fear of open conflict to do so.

111. Seems like those things that are not " politically correct " within LCC do not get reported. So we hear about confirmations, anniversaries, baptisms etc. but not much else. The Canadian Lutheran is the most orthodox, theologically correct publication I know.
112. The lack of information on the status of the church extension fund was withheld when the first rumors were heard and were denied putting investors at risk.
113. Synod communicates with Pastors, not lay members
114. would like to know more about foreign mission projects & opportunities for participation
115. How could one possibly know this or even have the vaguest idea?
116. The Canadian Lutheran
117. I don't read all the stuff they send but the stuff they send should be continued because there are likely people out there that do read it all.
118. Usually, with the exception of the recent Church Extension Fund debacle, but this may not be under Synod's control. These kinds of investments MUST be totally regulated and audited by people with the right qualifications.
119. We receive very little information from Synod.
120. I am guilty of not seeking out information that I assume is readily available.
121. Canadian Lutheran is an excellent publication! Thank you!
122. Not so sure magazines are telling it like it is. I think you have to go out of your way to find things out. Depends on your pastor and church leadership also.
123. I will have to seek out the updated Constitution
124. But "in house" information services often don't tell of "unhelpful" things.
125. I acknowledge that there is communication from the synod about church events and initiatives. In some cases, these are done well and the information is available. However, the quality of information is not always as good as it should be. Things of substance, such as matters of church structure and definition of the roles and interactions between synod and district should be discussed from time to time. Additionally, matters of significance that are being decided behind closed doors, such as at board meetings, should be brought forward to synodical conventions and not left up to a small group of people.
126. What??
127. LCC media is excellent. Excellent online and print (Canadian Lutheran, with its District pages as well) media are made broadly available. I appreciate that the Canadian Lutheran is distributed free of charge in our congregation.

128. More information from the board and the committees would be helpful. This may not be something that fits the Canadian Lutheran but a sense of what the board, COP and committees are working on would give a sense of connection with the work.
129. The Synod feels more distance, which may only be my perception, being in a small congregation.
130. More information is always better than less.
131. I appreciate the emails from LCC; excellent way to keep informed.
132. The monthly email based communications are good.
133. Canadian Lutheran online has been providing timely information.
134. Canadian Lutheran on line is excellent!
135. Info from Synod is superficial. Synod ignores or delays all difficult issues.
136. Canadian Lutheran online has been providing timely information.
137. What is the right amount? If I am looking for information on a certain subject and that information is not coming, I might think I am not getting the right amount of information.
138. If it comes in the form of the Canadian Lutheran: yes
139. As long a person has access to a computer and e-mail.
140. I think so.
141. The synod is good about giving updates about things that don't involve controversy, mission projects etc. However, there is division and controversy within the Synod and the synod does not touch controversy unless they can get on the popular side of it. When Richard Docetal was accused of child pornography, the DP was quick to say how quickly he turned him over to the police and did the right thing. But when my congregation literally fired me like a coach after a bad season and there was and has been no synodical publicity or discussion of it at all. In fact, the Ecclesiastical Supervisor put an informal gag order on the whole thing, going so far as to say the members of the congregation shouldn't talk with one another about it, under the auspices of the 8th commandment, no doubt. The 8th commandment says put the best construction on everything. Our synod officials have used it as an excuse to advise against St. Paul and the Word of God which says not to keep evil deeds in the dark, but expose them (Ephesians 5:11). Satan can quote the psalms opportunistically; he can also invoke the 8th commandment to remain hidden.
142. However, the web site could be improved by providing information about the board of directors - who they are, and summaries of what they are doing. Also I could not find the synod's strategic plan anywhere on the web.
143. Nothing is shared beyond the Pastor's desk unless you ask a specific question
144. It is my fault if I don't read my magazines and emails to keep myself updated.
145. Communication seems to be decent via e-mails, communications via pastors, articles via the Canadian Lutheran, etc.
146. Synodical information is available only in English. There is, to my knowledge, no synodical information available in French.
147. I receive the LCC emails. The information is there when I want it.
148. LCC provides good information both in print and online.
149. There is a wide variety of information available from synod in both hardcopy and electronic means.
150. I appreciate the regular online news updates, as well as the magazine.
151. I read the Canadian Lutheran and try to ask questions if there is a particular issue.

152. I feel what is happening with District and Synod should be communicated much better to the congregations in place of much after the fact, as it is in some cases
153. I believe, perhaps, that the "right amount of information" is available either by dissemination or upon request. I would have to confess that sometimes (perhaps too often) I do not take the time to digest the information that is provided. Other times I do not, perhaps, take enough interest in what is shared. I have heard from members of our church body/congregation that they either do not receive enough information from Synod/District or that they do not have invested interest in national or district concerns. There is information available through the Canadian Lutheran. Whether there is enough information given there, I do not know.
154. Through Synod, I believe that the Canadian Lutheran magazine meets our needs for information.
155. Depends on what they want me to know.
156. For example - Not aware of this survey until notice seen at a church (not home congregation) 3 days before deadline!
157. Receive absolutely no info from Synod. I would like to know why there are so many synods in North America. Can they not get together and become ONE Lutheran church not many?
158. The on-line information is good: The Synod Website and especially the periodic Synodical Info Digest are excellent sources of information easily accessible to anyone with an Internet connection.
159. I don't know that I receive any info from the Synod.
160. I don't receive anything.
161. I don't believe I know enough about this all the time.
162. I suppose I can find some information when I look for it.
163. information received via Canadian Lutheran print is helpful
164. Canadian Lutheran & Synod newsletter
165. Information is sent but not always passed on in a timely manner
166. I appreciate e-mail and follow up written news
167. The information is there if one is motivated to look for it.
168. The Canadian Lutheran magazine is a great source and there are other communications as well.
169. We have ABC connect newsletters which I appreciate receiving via email, could the synod do something similar?
170. I have been on our church council for 17 years and I can't answer this question - what information do we receive?
171. The LCC publication is very good. Thank you to Matthew for the work that he does!
172. only because of personal interest -- because such information is almost totally neglected -- thus it is non-existent: Nothing is heard for me or others to learn UNLESS one search for it.
173. All information must always be direct and to the point. If it is too long and detailed, it won't be read.
174. I receive little information about what Synod is doing. I would, and this congregation would appreciate knowing more about what Synod is doing.
175. Have never got any
176. I appreciate the updates on-line. Much information is not shared within the congregation.
177. Limited - Canadian Lutheran & Synod newsletter -
178. Information is available and broadcast, but unless it is "in your face" many pay no attention. It is effective for those who are interested and involved in the larger church.

179. Sometimes the information tends too much to the positive and sometimes in the past has been clergy-centred. While the positive is helpful, there are times when the hard facts need to speak for themselves, such as in the case of the recent Concordia University-Edmonton situation, and the Church needs to grapple with them.
180. After more than 25 years I still do not know specifically what the LCC accomplishes annually
181. There are many things happening in LCC that the Lay do not hear about.
182. I receive the information and read it. Many (pastors and lay people) receive it and don't read it. The trick seems to be getting people to read the information.
183. Basically Canadian Lutheran - and Synod news letter on internet. - which are very basic info.
184. For instance, where are these on-going talks with other denominations headed? Nothing good can emerge from groups that each thinks is right and represents "the truth". We lived through the ecumenical movement and we were going to pray to our own God -- together!
185. I acknowledge that there is communication from the synod about church events and initiatives. In some cases, these are done well and the information is available. However, the quality of information is not always as good as it should be. Things of substance, such as matters of church structure and definition of the roles and interactions between synod and district should be discussed from time to time. Additionally, matters of significance that are being decided behind closed doors, such as at board meetings, should be brought forward to synodical conventions and not left up to a small group of people.
186. The Canadian Lutheran could be a great vehicle to get information out about a congregation’s rights and keep things transparent.
187. Through pastor probably but not experienced directly to know
188. Not sure what this question is trying to ask. What kind of info?
189. More than enough.
190. How do you determine "right amount"?
191. We get and read Canadian Lutheran and Info Digest. We depend on these to keep us informed as to what is happening in LCC.
192. I guess. I would like to receive more Scriptural commentary on the issues/debates of the day, as in the early days of the LCMS. Debating these issues so that we might have a unified confession and practice is a clear preachment of the Word, whether this be an "in season" time or an "out of season" time.
193. Canadian Lutheran great magazine.
194. Receive very little information except the positive. Feel there is no transparency in the Synod management.
195. East District is roughly 4,216,100 square kilometres in size. This is larger than the continental US east of the Mississippi River (roughly 3,476,000 square kilometres). Approximately 6,350,000 persons living in this area speak French, not English (the language of the East District), as is their legal right under section 16 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, signed into law by Her Majesty, Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada, 17 April 1982. My congregation speaks French and receives little or no information from either the Synod or the district in a form they can read or understand.
196. My question is, "What information are we as lay members suppose to be receiving from Synod, and for what purpose?"
197. Not sure more info is needed if no one is reading it.
198. I don't really know what the Synod does or its purpose and I've been a lifelong member.

199. In our family, our weekly focus seems to be staying faithful to Christ and making the effort to be present in church and Sunday School/Bible class. Because this take precedence, I as a parent don't seem to put a lot of effort on what the Synod is offering.
200. More than I need or desire.
201. I don’t find the information from Synod all that helpful.
202. I rarely hear about the Synod. Not clear whether the fault rests on the Synod or our local congregation.
203. The majority of information I receive is from my pastor and the Canadian Lutheran. I find the website cumbersome to use.
204. I don't know - how is this information is distributed? What kind of information should I be receiving or looking for?
205. More direct communication from Synod as the district info seems incomplete.
206. If the information is sent through individual congregations, it doesn't seem to filter down and is distributed effectively
207. This is a difficult question. I personally make an effort to be informed. Many of my brothers and sisters in Christ do not. How then do these members have information come to them? If the Pastor is not big on passing on information to the members, they then blindly carry on their ignorant way. Do you have council members elected to be the "info and news" reporters? Big pet peeve of mine. Ignorant members don't further the church
208. One shortfall is in the communication from Synod regarding our enrollment at our seminaries. We here about much of what is going on at the seminaries and how the professors are involved here and overseas. However, we do not hear much about enrollment, numbers of candidates/graduates/ vicars etc. This needs to improve. Much of the information that is received from Synod is done electronically until the next print issue of the Canadian Lutheran comes out and even then not everything is found in the publication. Not everyone in our congregations is connected electronically.
209. Very uninformed about what goes on.
210. The online updates are helpful. But, we could perhaps utilize Online Town Hall Meetings, Online Forums?
211. I can't say because who would have thought that ABC district could foul up so badly
212. Having had my first call in the LCMS, I have always been impressed by the contrast between the modest amount of mailings, postal and electronic, from Winnipeg and Kitchener as opposed to the endless stream of verbiage from St Louis (and also from some LCMS districts); if you read all that stuff, you'd never read a chapter of the Bible in a day.
213. What specific information are we talking about here?
214. Recent happenings in the ABC District seemed to be shrouded in secrecy and I had to ask certain people who seemed 'privy' to information to clarify why they were going bankrupt. Things of that nature should employ a larger amount of transparency. The membership needs to know things, even if they're just broad details.
215. I'm happy with the Canadian Lutheran and LCC website.
216. I had never heard of, for example, Wagner Hill farms or Rock inner city ministry, and I do read The Canadian Lutheran as my main source of synod information.
217. on-line has greatly enabled this
218. Information does not always reach me. It gets lost on the way
219. While right amount in terms of enough may be true, but there is a difference between the kinds of info shared. Perhaps since pastors and congregations are members of synod,

minutes from meetings could be given to members of synod. Congregations in many cases print off minutes from council meetings for members of the congregation.

220. The information from the Synod is okay, but at times it seems to be unrelated to the parish. I do appreciate the information about foreign missions and value those efforts.
221. I am not sure what information I should be receiving.
222. the path of communications sometimes gets lost during the way
223. I feel that we should have been alerted to the financial difficulties the Church Extension Fund was having going back to 2007, and now what is REALLY being done to recover the $90,000,000.00 from Prince of Peace. Who in their right MINDS would offer that kind LOANS?
224. There's room for improvement.
225. Some materials available, but not always read or of interest
226. Concordia High School and Concordia University are now in the wind. Frankly, I don't believe all was done to keep our membership in the loop of their demise. Education used to be a priority in the Lutheran denomination.
227. I am saddened that the membership did not know about the impending implosion of Concordia University. We could have prayed for a better outcome. The High School was a disappointment as well, which I understand no one knew until it happened. Perhaps it was the same with the U, but usually these things take time.
228. See answer to Q8.
229. I would like more. I once emailed synod office with a question about a branch of ministry and never received a reply.
230. How can I answer this question? I hear very little from the Synod and perhaps that is the way it should be. Should I be made aware of the various Churches that are being questioned by Ecclesiastical Supervision? Is this a need to know so we don't fall into the same trap or kept under wraps so we don't think we are better than they are?
231. I believe it is available if I seek it out.
232. More transparent financial info
233. I use the Synodical website and Canadian Lutheran publication for reference.
234. Synod should be responsible for ensuring accountability both financially and spiritually. The Canadian Lutheran should be used to ensure all audited financial reports are printed and distributed. Any ongoing debates on Ecclesiastical issues should be published.
235. If information is being received by our congregation from Synod, it doesn't seem to filter down to the congregation level. Information I receive comes mainly through The Canadian Lutheran
236. We see very little from the Synod.
237. -yes, but only because I seek it out both online and from The Canadian Lutheran when published -definite time lag on information from one publication of The Canadian Lutheran to the next
238. I must admit that I don't know what I receive from Synod. I assume it is nothing but I know that much of the materials of our congregation likely come from Synod. I guess I would need to find out more of what we really receive from both Synod and District.
239. Would like to see more information on what other denominations are doing re missions, key social issues, etc.
240. The Canadian Lutheran is my main source of information. I feel well informed.

241. Synod/District news only, could be put on a separate sheet in the church bulletin with heading Synod/District News
242. It would be nice to have in-church announcements when there are updates.
243. Only information received is Canadian Lutheran and e-mails when there is a crisis.
244. The Canadian Lutheran is a good way for lay people to see what is going on across LCC.
245. I don't know how much information Synod has to provide. I see what's in the Canadian Lutheran; is there more going on behind the scenes that can be shared?
246. Only what I read in the Canadian Lutheran
247. mostly from reading Lutheran church Canada magazine
248. mostly from reading The Lutheran Church Canada magazine
249. Information gets bottle necked and filtered before it gets to us. Pastors are a great bottleneck while, on the official level (Canadian Lutheran and others) we get standard info on traditional things like Confirmations, anniversaries etc., but practically nothing from outside the box such as creative things that some of our congregations are doing.
250. with the exception of the issues involved in this survey - more on this at the end
251. Although, since I am in the ABC district, I wonder if sometimes it isn't sugar coated.
252. Information usually has to go through bottlenecks (the pastor is the biggest one) and gets filtered or left out. The Internet is a great tool but I continue to be surprised how many lay persons don't know about or don't know how to sign up for newsletters. This survey is one example of how there is a disconnect between synod, district and lay people.
253. Need more information about the workings of the Synod.
254. What is right amount of information?
255. If I weren't on social media, I would never have heard about this survey. My church certainly hasn't publicized it; which is not the fault of synod.
256. LCC communications are very professional.
257. Information is available as one wishes. Most aren't particularly interested much beyond their own church. The Witness is a good resource. I believe our Pastors provide us with information that they feel we need to be aware of.
258. The only mechanism that I know of where information is sent to me from Synod is the Canadian Lutheran. We receive this in our church mailbox and it is a good source of information. I know information is available on the Synod's website but that requires individuals to actually seek it out and websites tend to be repositories of more static information than fluid up to date information.
259. Probably a lot of my own fault as I don't pursue it
260. I do not think I have received any.
261. Now there are too many filters between Synod and congregation. With the layer of District organization "removed" more information/greater communication could be facilitated between congregation and synod.
262. I receive lots from our church I belong to along with periodicals.
263. As a Pastor who is also interested in the doings of Synod I receive most information I need to be satisfied. The problem is that I know where to go to get the information I want and who to talk too if I cannot find the information. Clear and concise information is not disseminated from the top down very well. I feel that we truly fail to communicate well from synod and districts to the individual congregations and members.
264. I receive all the information I want from Lutheran Church - Canada (the National Church body). However, that information is almost entirely made up of news and rarely is of

practical help to congregation's mission and ministry. The practical and more personal help has traditionally come from a regional partnership such as a District.

265. This is especially true with the LCC and Canadian Lutheran Facebook pages and I appreciate being able to share articles on my congregations own Facebook page.
266. Mostly because I do not read enough, yet the amount is fairly good.
267. It's rare for us to see anything from district, and I think this needs to change.
268. How much is the right amount of information? My opinion is that the Synod has provided little information and leadership, especially in time of crisis when they've been looked to for guidance.
269. I have no problem getting the information that I need from LCC. If something isn't posted or emailed, I feel like I can ask for it and I generally receive a timely response and the answer I need.
270. If there is information I am not receiving - how on earth would I know??? what a silly question
271. Through its publications and email communications, I am pleased with the amount and quality of information I can access.
272. Other than information gleaned from the Canadian Lutheran I am very ignorant about structure and function. I am singularly unimpressed with hoe things have been managed. I have a feeling that there has been an old boys club mentality when selecting representatives at levels of administration. I am not impressed that the questionnaire has requested information concerning gender.
273. Generally, the Canadian Lutheran provides a good deal of information.
274. See item 1
275. We receive very little information.
276. It is always there when I need it.
277. I come from the ELCIC - before joining the LCC. I believe that I have to support this church. I know very little about the LCC except the little bit that I read in the monthly magazine.
278. Technology, social media, etc. We need to get the young people engaged and involved.
279. We receive very little communication of any worth as to what our church is doing. The Canadian Lutheran magazine comes out with out dated information and the stuff we receive via online is vague and non-substantive.
280. Sometimes it seems a bit sparse.
281. ABC connect into my inbox and Canadian Lutheran is a great service
282. For what I need from Synod, I have received exactly the information that was needed and required.
283. Besides the old newsy / picture information in the Canadian Lutheran and the occasional LCC News by email, I don't get anything from Synod.
284. other than Canadian Lutheran don't really receive anything from Synod
285. we only receive information through the Canadian Lutheran
286. Unless one receives the Synod News Letter, the amount that is communicated down the line is next to nothing.
287. from The Canadian Lutheran magazine
288. I receive it because I know where to look and I am a lifelong Lutheran. I don't believe most people in the pews beside me care much about synod or what is happening there.
289. Could sort the info more - to know what is really taking place.

290. I receive no information from Synod.
291. We only get information from the Canadian Lutheran
292. I receive whatever's written in the official publications - the magazine (and increasingly online). There's a lot of information shared, but whether it's all the right type of information, I'm not so sure.
293. What information arrives from Synod?
294. Some issues still become muted (shoved under the carpet) and are not met head on. One example is the state of the defined benefit pension. The is no info coming from LCC as to the state that pension is in and there is rampant speculation. Coming from the ABC District, a level of distrust not realized before is within our congregations and is not being addressed.
295. There's always room for improvement on communications!
296. Only what you think we should know. How about the truth?
297. See answer to Q8.
298. Canadian Lutheran is a good vehicle for advising us of the "news" from Synod along with using our e-mail opportunities.
299. As a member of Church Council I see much more of this information than most of the general congregation. Perhaps a once-a-month pre-service 'announcement' about Synod news.
300. Other than the website and paper information, our congregation receives very little information from the synod. They are left to their own resources.
301. The only information on the Synod I hear is second-hand from my Pastor.
302. Where would I get this information?
303. If I need more, it is my responsibility to request it.
304. I'm not sure how to answer this question - I receive information (through the various Lutheran publications) but what is to say that is the "right amount"? Is there something they are not telling me? :)
305. I read the LCC Digest from cover to cover. It keeps me generally informed
306. I read the LCC Digest from cover to cover. It keeps me generally informed
307. Information is provided through the Canadian Lutheran, but it is often of a superficial nature and the rationale behind certain decisions, or the future implications of them, are not properly spelled out. As an example, there was not sufficient prior notice from Synod on the actions recently happening at Concordia University of Alberta or any warning that this would lead to the disconnecting of that institution from the national church. Maybe this simply means that the national church was not looking carefully enough at the situation there, but that is not an excuse.
308. I usually get "after the fact info".
309. We as Lay Person only receive limited information. (keep the masses happy)
310. I believe the Canadian Lutheran provides what I need.
311. How would I receive info from Synod - other than in Canadian Lutheran magazine?
312. Often it seems that there is a lack of transparency from synod.
313. If I needed information or wanted it, I could get it. It's accessible. Synod seems to be the "big brother" out there somewhere watching out, I personally don't feel at all connected with "Synod". Do we need more of the "K.I.S.S." principle?
314. Canadian Lutheran online helps in this regard and keeps people up to date on what is happening in our synod.
315. The Canadian Lutheran is a good publication. I wish there was more to report!

316. I am not always sure what the synod does for me or my church.
317. We hear whispers about a problem with the ABC extension fund but no real information. Now, we are looking at restructuring, presumably because the ABC fund was mismanaged and the entire LCC is now in jeopardy.
318. The Canadian Lutheran is a good venue. I wish there was more good information to share!
319. Information should come more often from one source and in little readable bits so that they will read and remembered. When it comes from multiply sources with some new and some overlap the tendency is to discard it after briefly seeing that it was seen before.
320. Synod publications provide the right amount of information, both in print and electronically.
321. All, it seems, we have access to, is the "Canadian Lutheran". Perhaps a synod resource brochure or something like that could be established and made available to congregations.
322. Through "The Canadian Lutheran" It's up to everyone to read it cover to cover
323. More information from the board and the committees would be helpful. This may not be something that fits the Canadian Lutheran but a sense of what the board, COP and committees are working on would give a sense of connection with the work.
324. While information is ample and available, it is not always complete; if more information is requested there must be answers given - that is not always the case, but must be
325. I don't hear much on a Synodical level often. Just District.
326. we are kept in the dark about the future plans of the existing church extension plan, and what we can expect on our investment
327. The fact that this survey requires a password makes it somewhat exclusive. How many people other than the chosen ones who received the password will have access to complete this survey?
328. Very seldom do I here from the Synod
329. A lot of information is provided in the Canadian Lutheran and it is very good information. Its available on the internet, but I don't think a lot people take the time to read all the story's, they just read the headlines, so they are missing the District Presidents and LCC President messages and a lot of other information. We also have access to the Canadian Lutheran publication. All churches receive a copy, but how many members pick up the publication and read what’s in it. So a lot of congregational members don't have a clue what's happening at LCC or the Districts. Not sure how to get the information out so everybody knows.
330. Two thumbs up Mathew.
331. Synod information is irrelevant to the average Lutheran. There is no input from the bottom. The lay people have no voice in church matters, everything comes down from the top.
332. thank you for the newsletters and information that does come through but .... communication and connectivity for most members isn't happening
333. Only what you want.
334. The Synod should be a small administration to serve the church in the actual communities where the physical churches are. This is where discipleship takes place, not at Synod meetings
335. Usually it's more of a question of reading what is available
336. Where the information is sent is unseen or inaccessible. (I am a digital native and don't read magazines and find some of the content pushed by LCC to be not in laymen's terms and confusing)
337. Canadian Lutheran is very good at keeping the church informed as a whole

338. Seminary students and laypeople need to learn much more about the structure and workings of the district and synod
339. The email notices from LCC and the Canadian Lutheran magazine serve adequately.
340. I think the Lutheran Church Canada magazine is excellent in providing both district and synod coverage as well as examining current religious and secular issues.
341. Need more e-mail and internet information on a regular basis.
342. I confess I don't know much about the info from the Synod.
343. We didn't in the case of the Church Extension Fund, until it was too late. Now I appreciate that there is openness. I hope this is the case, at least
344. Other than the Canadian Lutheran we seldom hear of anything else that's forthcoming - but this could be, at least in part, because the pastor chooses not to disseminate information within the parish/congregations
345. As opposed to the right kind of information?
346. I know very little about the synod.
347. none?
348. I think the information which lay people receive from the synod could be improved upon through inserts in our bulletins from time to time.
349. The Canadian Lutheran is a good vehicle both online and printed. Recently it has been discouraging to read some of the discussion raised by the editor on controversial topics addressed, especially when letters submitted to the editor are given a hand-slap and a one-sided answer. For example, God actually is the one that grows the church and growth is not dependent on Lutheran women having more babies. These arguments are a waste of time and alienate people rather than build up.
350. The Canadian Lutheran is a good vehicle. It may be good to make it quarterly. I sometimes feel its articles are more slanted towards clergy and less towards laypeople living their faith in their communities or workplaces. The opinions of laypeople in letters to the editor are poorly handled. We should not be dividing; we should be uplifting. For example, it is actually God who grows the church, not whether women have more babies. How do you think a woman who is single feels about her role?
351. The "Canadian Lutheran" does not provide a forum for exchange of ideas/discussion (as in letters to the editor). Information is "from the top down." Communication should be an exchange of ideas and listening too.
352. Off the top of my head, all I can think of is the Canadian Lutheran. Is that from Synod? I do like President Bugbee's article on the last page of every magazine. A better way to write this question would be to have a list of all the ways that Synod communicates, and then ask the respondent to check off which ones they have seen in the last year. Then the next question could ask about satisfaction with that.
353. I enjoy the Canadian Lutheran and many articles are instructive as well as informative. I appreciate receiving the online LCC InfoDigest.
354. Clearly, we weren't in regards to CEF, so what others are we not getting the information in?
355. 1.nothing from synod on the issues and history of problems re ABC financial situation 2. Received no notification of members that needed support after all their funds were lost 3. we are receiving no support as to what to do with private shares to be given to security holders of CEF, that will really tie up their estates. The Lutheran members we have do not know how to deal with and it will be much to late after LCC promotes all accept plan to keep this quite 4. Why is ABC and LCC putting in agreement restrictions so no actions can be taken

after accepting plan 5. No Information received about Concordia becoming non religious (board member selection and purpose statement exclusions)

356. Like the emails
357. I feel I receive the right amount of information from the Synod through the Canadian Lutheran.
358. I really don't see much coming down from the synod. The little bit I have seen regarding church extension funds scandal has appeared deceptive, deceitful and biased
359. I can't remember when I have ever received any information directly from the Synod.
360. Thanks folks!
361. by doing this survey, I have discovered there are service organizations and co-operative agencies that LCC assists in some way, that I never even knew existed. This could be lack of effort on my part or lack of updates on synod or maybe both but regardless, a synod update for service organizations and agencies in the Canadian Lutheran magazine might be helpful to spread the word on what LCC synod does in more detail? Not sure how this would look practically, but folks I have talked to don't really know what the synod "does".
362. Very little is conveyed to individual congregations. Unless you are a delegate to various district conventions the average person does not know what is going on.
363. Mine comes on-line, so I'm glad paper isn't wasted on this. I can read as much (or little) as I want.
364. Our communications out to the Synod (all of us in Congregations) Synod is not the office in Winnipeg!!! is very good. The office and those in it have done a great job over the years in the area of communication. Well done! Always room to improve but that is true for all of us in all areas.
365. Hear more from the District then the Synod
366. Only if I go looking for it and pick up the magazine.
367. Too much propaganda and not enough helpful material.
368. The information is not correct and ends up being politicized to the desires and wills of those in leadership positions
369. As long as the information is passed on by the pastor or elders. Otherwise, I do not recall receiving any information.
370. I find that much of the work of LCC is poorly disseminated and many in the churches [including myself] do not understand what is Synod is doing and why.
371. However, the "right amount of information" is not the same thing as the "right information".
372. Yes, but I subscribe to the Synod and District Facebook, email and mailings list and am a delegate for both Synod and District conventions so I seek out the information if it does not come to me directly. From what I understand, most others in my congregation have no idea what is going on at the Synod and District levels.
373. At our Board of Director meetings, we receive periodical Synod information on the latest developments. Our Pastor also keeps the congregation informed on any updates he has, from the Synod, that is general knowledge for our congregation to know.
374. I think this could be improved. This isn't only the responsibility of the Synod but the Pastor and leadership of the individual congregations. I believe that Synod should develop a procedure for this and share it with individual congregations of LCC.
375. "The Canadian Lutheran" is a fine publication that provides adequate information from the Synod. I was only sad to see the number of issues decrease.

376. I find that using the computer information about synod is helpful. Not all members, including the senior member do not use computers so we still need to have print copies of this information. perhaps congregation could provide this information to the non computer members in a more cost effective way.
377. LCC is too resistive to change and lacks democratic processes
378. Canadian Lutheran is an excellent publication.
379. One example is information on seminars. ...viability of having two instead of one. Not knowing financially and student wise how things were going.
380. Honestly, I believe the information is available should I wish it - any lack of receipt is more a comment on my lack of searching.
381. Again, the information I receive comes from the Canadian Lutheran. Other than that and the LCC website, I am not sure if there are other sources of information. Again, to be honest, I don't go to the LCC website unless I want to find out about certain things related to my current volunteer position at the church, for example, Salary recommendations, Benefit Program Costs, etc.
382. We are left in the dark about what has happened, for example, to what was once Concordia College (University).
383. It's not so much an issue of the right amount of information we receive, but the content. There are much larger issues our churches face (e.g. abortion, euthanasia, LGBTQ issues, etc.) which need to be addressed. Sometimes it seems that reporting on the CEF crisis or on a meeting of the ILC is more important than addressing the challenges that all of our members face every day.
384. More frequent financial reports would be appreciated (i.e. where mission remittances are going, operations costs of the districts and synod)
385. Web presence need a little work
386. Financial info on LCC Canada should be made more readily available.
387. Synod, particularly boards and commissions could improve their response to queries and suggestions. Often there is no response at all which is offensive. They should at least acknowledge receipt of communications.
388. I question the value right now. Synod did not respond in any constructive way to solve (or help solve) District's inept handling of CEF/DIL problem. This problem was caused by Pastors in charge whom we had trust in. This trust is now broken and neither Synod nor District seems to be really interested in regaining in trust.
389. I only get the Canadian Lutheran in my mailbox at church... but maybe that's all I need.
390. We are in our present position because too much has been kept from the Rank and file of our church: i.e. Concordia University becoming a secular institution, CUCA being separated from synod, the church extension issues in Edmonton.

12. I receive the right amount of information from my District.

1. Again, only what I read in “The Canadian Lutheran”
2. Again, not seeing how this is even remotely helpful in the restructuring process.
3. We receive some information. What's the right amount?
4. Same as above # 11: Could always be better. Many in our congregation have little or no access to electronic media.
5. Bride seems to be informed on a need basis only.

6. This information should not just go to councils but directly to lay people in the pew. If you did the above now and then the information would be where it should be.
7. For me personally. Most of our members are elderly and are not interested much in what the synod sends out. Most do not use computers.
8. Same thing, we need more information at home.
9. Needs a lot of work.
10. High Church Ministers don't forward information from Synod or District.
11. The media "Lutheran Church-East District keeps us informed of local activities.
12. I receive no information from District, and what does this have to do with restructuring?
13. It depends if I sign up for it, or look online for it, or read the Canadian Lutheran, etc. If I don't do these things, then I would receive / be aware of almost no information from my district.
14. There could/should be more information shared about the status of the financial settlements ...
15. can’t get $ details when asked, and lied to us for many years.
16. I'm not sure what I should know about the workings of the District but I know very little.
17. District is far less important to me than Synod. What I hear from and about the District is sufficient.
18. EN3 is painfully repetitive. I waste time scanning just to see if something might be new buried in the bulk of it. Not a very effective format.
19. Or if I have questions, a call to the District Office helps me seek the help I need.
20. again, not District's fault
21. Again - not willingly shared by pastor.
22. Can't be answered objectively.
23. Congregational Delegates do very little reporting to their home congregations.
24. Certainly not where CEF was in trouble.
25. I don't read it. I don't care.
26. little contact or communication
27. As above: Canadian Lutheran is a good communication piece but more info to congregations regarding concerns at synodical level to be addressed at and after conventions would help congregations be better informed and learn how they can help including with outreach, nominations, missions.
28. While this has decreased compared to past years there is more online plus some of what was sent out in the past wasn't particularly useful or even Lutheran.
29. We receive minimal information from District - and when we ask for any financial information our request is ignored - how are we supposed to feel good about sending missions when we are not told how our funds were spent
30. A seasonal news letter on "new items" may be helpful. The Canadian Lutheran.
31. So long as I am not expected to participate it's fine.
32. I believe the communication from my district is severely lacking.
33. as my comments in the previous question.
34. Again, this goes back to our congregation and the lack of communication.
35. Just the EDEN Report
36. I do not know.

37. Same as in question 11. I agree that the information is available but it is not as easy for some people as it could be. It would be worth while looking into this t see if there is anything more the District can do.
38. seems some/much of abc district information has been false, misleading or at best, incomplete in the last few years
39. district as a distinct entity is old fashioned and unnecessary
40. East District News
41. I like how the districts have sections in the Lutheran periodical.
42. Especially not by the pastor
43. There does not seem to be a lot of info flowing out to the general members.
44. I don't hear much from the District itself.
45. I don't know what information I receive from the District, honestly. Do you mean through our pastor? He is very communicative in sharing District info. But I have no way of knowing if it is the "right amount" -- how can we measure that? By a "feeling" that the District is being transparent? Events have shown the District has not been transparent in the past.
46. EN3 newsletter is an effective tool
47. -same as # 11. How can we distinguish between too much or too little.
48. As above, THOUGH disappointed in lack of clear and detailed information on CEF/DIL situation as it progresses.
49. If you have the internet but for those who don't I'm not sure they would.
50. Trying to disseminate the information can be difficult. As it seems many parishioners are not familiar with their District and even circuit. This is not the fault of the District.
51. Publications distributed by Districts should be combined with synod publications to reduce costs and reduce duplicate information received by members.
52. I am not always vigilant about reading my print copy of Canadian Lutheran, so any lack of knowledge on my part is very likely my own fault. Information seems to travel faster by social media or word of mouth than via the website or other formal means (i.e., who has received a call, who has accepted a call, etc.)
53. Canadian Lutheran has much good information
54. I do not use my computer enough and should ask to be on the District's distribution list.
55. Again, "Amount of information" indicates quantity but not quality. We could be overloaded with info and yet not know what's going on, as was the case with sudden breaking of the ABC financial crisis.
56. I have no clue what is happening in the District other than what I read in the Canadian Lutheran which is months behind what is happening by the time I receive it.
57. We do not hear or see District other than the LCC news Letter
58. Except for event notices
59. Sharing of information has improved now that we get information online i.e. ABC connect.
60. I believe, perhaps, that the "right amount of information" is available either by dissemination or upon request. I would have to confess that sometimes (perhaps too often) I do not take the time to digest the information that is provided. Other times I do not, perhaps, take enough interest in what is shared. I have heard from members of our church body/congregation that they either do not receive enough information from Synod/District or that they do not have invested interest in national or district concerns. The ABC Connect is available to pastor, deacons and lay persons. Whether enough information is provided through that circular, I don't know.

61. The District offers information and support, but this is generally passed on via the pastor, who in turn pass it on to the congregation and its members. This can be a very effective way of passing on the message and the information, but this link can be quickly lost if you don't have a pastor, and/or your pastor is not providing this information to the congregation. Better ways (or multiple ways) of passing on this information needs to be encouraged.
62. Glen likes to spout off in long sermons whenever he sends something to the pastor, but to actually get information from him seldom happens.
63. Why do we or they need duplicate services? Divide and share under one president only.
64. What is considered the "right" amount?
65. Information about C.E.F. loss not shared with members.
66. Several sources are available to us.
67. Information very well presented and on line readily available.
68. Don't always know what is taking place.
69. See comments under #11 above. The ABC District is refusing to give us financial statements even after 2 letters of request from our Church Council. We should be getting quarterly financial statements and if this had been done properly starting 10 years ago, we might have been able to see and avoid this huge financial crisis in this District!!
70. More information could be given to the people. They serve us after all. We do not serve them.
71. Again, an email list should be available. If it is, congregations should be made aware of that fact.
72. We don't hear much about what is going on at District
73. usually
74. The ABC District has not been up front with information concerning CEF.
75. The District through their ABC Connect does a great job of communicating what's going on, even after the downsize.
76. ? not answered, financials not provided, don't know who does what and not answered when asked. Ignored when many pointed? are asked. Don't walk the talk.
77. In communication, is the information available and I just don't see it or could there be other blocks to the flow of information? Or, in this era of internet is there a lot of information available from many sources and lose track of what I should be listening for?
78. Currently the only information I receive is via the Canadian Lutheran publication or if our pastor shares information with the congregation.
79. Receiving the right amount and receiving trustworthy information are two separate issues and I believe both need to be addressed. When there has been information filtering/censoring what is received has questionable value.
80. mainly via the weekly EN3v received by email.
81. 2/29/2016 2:31 PM
82. See above. We don't hear much about creative worship styles or ministries happening in our own back yard.
83. very poor info about CEF
84. Apparently not, as the CEF and DIL caught me and others completely off guard and destroyed some faith in our church governance.
85. District communicates with Pastors and deacons, not lay members
86. Well I get the EN3 report and enjoy reading it so in that sense I feel up to date from district.
87. none that I know of

88. The email newsletters contain much information, though the layout and format is not pleasing.
89. ABC Connect is good.
90. Communication from District is also poor, although better than from Synod.
91. I personally do not receive any information from my District. I am aware there is a District e-news publication but I do not receive it and I wouldn't know how to go about requesting to receive it.
92. I have relied on information from our District Office often.
93. I have not made a distinction of what information came from where. For receiving information, I generally use the LCC website, The Canadian Lutheran, the ILC website, and what ever is passed along from my pastor via e-mail, which usually comes from the same places I just mentioned.
94. See question 11. District is in a similar situation as synod though I believe district is slightly better understood by the laity. District representatives are seen more often at congregations.
95. I have not made a distinction of what information came from where. For receiving information, I generally use the LCC website, The Canadian Lutheran, the ILC website, and what ever is passed along from my pastor via e-mail.
96. If that was the case the CEF crisis would not have been a surprise to everyone.
97. Not enough information on this.
98. ABC connect is the only source of information
99. Currently the only district information I receive is from the Canadian Lutheran which includes very little on what the board and committees are accomplishing or struggling with. I have no real concept of what is happening in the east district.
100. Same comment as number 11.
101. These 2 statements are interesting. I think the quantity of information is fair, but I am concerned about the quality of it. I hear almost nothing about what is happening in our district apart from the blurbs in the Canadian Lutheran and the letters written by District Presidents. These letters, with all due respect, leave a lot to be desired. I almost never look at them any more. I would like to have more content on what my district is doing
102. SO often we get emails from our district and that keeps us informed about what is going on. Keep these coming.
103. What happened to the newsletter in each monthly quarter??
104. There is not a lot of detail from District. Most everything is high level or preachy. There is not a lot of discussion around decisions to be made. For example, the money lent for the church/day care in New Brunswick was very quiet and not discussed. It could have lead to a significant loss, and certainly should have led to a discussion on how the decisions were made.
105. Often not clear or timely.
106. Closely held and over managed.
107. Lack of info from District created the CEF crisis. Unilateral action from District to invest 90% of CEF funds in Prince of Peace WITHOUT consultation of investors or the laymen demonstrates the Districts TOTAL DISREGARD for its membership and for basic scriptural principles.
108. What I do see is not timely.
109. I would like to know all they do for my church and district.
110. The previous comment serves also for the District.

111. If it comes in the form of the Canadian Lutheran: yes
112. ABC District is located in Edmonton and it's difficult to feel connected living in the South. Before the financial problems we are now dealing with, I found the people of District overloaded and they operated like a click of high school students.
113. In the past we have been able to access information.
114. Not sure if there is a difference between communication from synod vs. district
115. District information needs to be available in French.
116. We really had to seek out info on CEF and the current status of the situation.
117. I've heard little from ABC about the CEF challenge. I've had to actively seek out information on several occasions.
118. There's district news in the magazine.
119. I think the information is there somewhere, but I do not always access it. i.e. website
120. I read the Canadian Lutheran which outlines each district and I receive emails from Ilene Fortin. I am the liaison for my congregation.
121. I believe, perhaps, that the "right amount of information" is available either by dissemination or upon request. I would have to confess that sometimes (perhaps too often) I do not take the time to digest the information that is provided. Other times I do not, perhaps, take enough interest in what is shared. I have heard from members of our church body/congregation that they either do not receive enough information from Synod/District or that they do not have invested interest in national or district concerns. The ABC Connect is available to pastor, deacons and lay persons. Whether enough information is provided through that circular, I
122. In ABC District, the website and weekly email called Connect are also very helpful. In the case of the ABC/CEF crisis, there was certainly a lack of information of the financial nature shared. Better efforts in this area should be made.
123. Don't get any info from district
124. If there is periodic communication from the ABC District, I don't know about it. But then, I haven't searched for it either.
125. How/where do we receive info from District. If it is online, we should be made more aware that it is available there.
126. Plenty of information. However, the EN3 is unwieldy and poorly organized. A lot to read each week; much is repeated (sometimes within the same e-mail).
127. The other districts have regular newsletters but Central rarely sends out any information.
128. Canadian Lutheran and via Pastor
129. Again, there is information available if you want to find it.
130. We may get more than we really need at the district level.
131. We are CEF investors in Alberta so are stinging from the lack of information on something that was so important in keeping our trust.
132. I appreciate the ABC connect email newsletter.
133. I suppose it is the right amount of information because I have never been concerned about the information from the District in the past.
134. I know I would receive more of the information I want if legal reasons didn't prevent the District from responding to the misinformation shared on the blogs.
135. Disclosure of the financial crisis in the ABC District has left me believing we did NOT receive the RIGHT information for years.

136. only because of personal interest -- because such information is almost totally neglected -- thus it is non-existent: Nothing is heard for me or others to learn UNLESS one search for it. Don't hear about it or read about it in congregational bulletins etc.
137. The comments on # 11 apply here as well.
138. I was only recently accepted as a member at my new congregation, and while I think I would agree, I haven't been involved enough to know.
139. I receive little information about what Synod is doing. I would, and this congregation would appreciate knowing more about what Synod is doing.
140. only what I read in the magazine
141. Can't understand any of their stuff
142. Information is limited.
143. Canadian Lutheran or info via Pastor
144. ABC Connect
145. I should take a more active knowledge road...I trust they are doing what we need
146. District information is available as needed; people can choose not to get it or read it only to complain they never receive anything later on... its a catch 22. How much is enough?
147. As above there are also many things happening in the District that the lay does not hear about.
148. Minimal - basically what is in Canadian Lutheran unless something special via Pastor.
149. It all depends on how interested Synod is in getting my interest!
150. See question 11. District is in a similar situation as synod though I believe district is slightly better understood by the laity. District representatives are seen more often at congregations.
151. With respect to CEF, we did not receive enough information about the serious situation of the ill health of CEF in the ABC District.
152. 2/24/2016 3:01 PM
153. Case in point - CEF
154. Again, not sure what this question is trying to ask? What kind of info?
155. More than enough for me.
156. When there is nothing happening, there is nothing to report.
157. We get and read EN3 and other materials from the District. We depend on these to keep us informed as to what is happening in the East District.
158. With better financial statements, the CEF problem would have been discovered years before.
159. Totally mishandled the CEF funds disaster in the AB-BC district. Total silence to investors on the issue. Feel they don't really care about the district church people but only ask for money.
160. See above comments. Other then the anodyne reports in The Lutheran, I am unaware of the District activities.
161. 'Synod' is derived from two Greek words meaning 'walking together'. Each district's 'doing its own thin' does not contribute to either harmony or efficiency.
162. The AB-C Connect is informative and appreciated. However, when it comes to assistance with governance requirements, District assistance and expertise is lacking.
163. Before the CEF crisis, I would have said yes ("right" meaning my level of interest) but since the big letdown of the CEF, something was obviously wrong within the organization and was not communicated.
164. Maybe a quarterly financial report would be helpful.

165. Transparency has been a major issue for some districts. We can't make informed decisions without all of the facts as they relate to calling pastors, CEF and other issues in the church.
166. No information regarding the real issues, e.g. CEF, coming pension catastrophe.
167. I receive very little from my district.
168. We should have been informed about CEF before it failed.
169. I feel District should have informed us regarding the difficulties in the Church Extension Fund earlier than they did.
170. The initiatives taken by the district do not percolate down to my congregation. Moreover, my perception is that there is a great discrepancy between the size of the financial contribution sent to the district (by the congregation) and the service that we perceive as being done.
171. The majority of information I receive is from my pastor and the Canadian Lutheran. I find the website cumbersome to use. l feel we did not enough nor timely information during the CEF fiasco
172. Over the years, there has been insufficient information regarding the financial circumstances of district.
173. DIL would have never happened if the right amount of info was given to the investors
174. I don't know - how is this information is distributed? What kind of information should I be receiving or looking for?
175. If by that question we understand that the Canadian Lutheran is the source of our information, then perhaps more information needs to be distributed in the individual Districts (excluding information about the CEF situation in the ABC District)
176. There has not been much communication in terms of mission goals/offerings etc. from our congregations, and financial updates and how our district is "doing" in outreach efforts.
177. often over looked
178. Just have to read it if interested.
179. A modest volume of largely pertinent matter.
180. Statement is somewhat ambiguous.
181. when the CEF crisis hit - all communication effectively ceased and doors were locked in ABC. Perhaps if there was more effective communication - even to relate to the people that there was nothing new to communicate that day - there would not have been such an overblown rumour mill and paranoia toward district.
182. When the CEF crisis hit the district failed miserably in communication. Rumors and anger began to spread because there were no facts communicated from District in anything even resembling a timely fashion.
183. I enjoy the weekly Monday Connect.
184. All information does not get passed on.
185. Better than from Synod.
186. Information asked for in the past was not provided. Openness did not seem to be a characteristic of the workings of the District. The failure of the District CEF was a shock to almost everyone and it should have been dealt with in a more open and honest fashion earlier on.
187. I am not sure what information I should be receiving.
188. it sometimes gets lost during its pathway
189. I sometimes do not know what our district is doing. Some information gets lost in the line of communication

190. Not any more. I get the emails and that's great.
191. I have deep sadness about our District. Prior to the convention I do believe I knew what I should as a congregational member.
192. Sometimes the Connect is good, and sometimes it could use more info.
193. can't say
194. Perhaps the information should be pointed out to us. More education on what is available
195. In 2015 they couldn't release a financial statement for 2012, so NO we didn't receive anything of value from them. I have to say the new guy is better, and trying harder but the damage to confidence has been done
196. I receive the monthly e-newsletter publication from our district
197. CEF best example of District only sending us good news, when its bad they just stop. WE need to hears news about issues and activities, District doesn't get to decide what to tell and what not. I sat in a Church in Camrose and heard a gentlemen state that in 1995 he asked why he wasn't getting financial statements from CEF. THAT WAS 20 years ago. Congregations should have revolted and demanded the information or stop sending all funds to district.
198. Information received by our congregation from District office seem to get lost before it gets to the congregation. The Canadian Lutheran is a good source of information regarding the District.
199. We see the odd note, but otherwise we are barely aware of their existence.
200. -yes, but only because I seek it out (via the EN3)
201. I have a little more knowledge of what it is I receive from District but since our District is heavily into restructuring it remains to be seen what information will be provided by the District in the future.
202. Primarily through The Canadian Lutheran
203. Once again, The Canadian Lutheran is my main source of information. I sometimes wonder if there should be more in this area though.
204. Synod/District news only, could be put on a separate sheet in the church bulletin with heading Synod/District News
205. It would be nice to have in-church announcements when there are updates.
206. I receive nothing from the District, other than the submissions in the Canadian Lutheran as to what congregations are doing.
207. Only from 'Connect' or the Canadian Lutheran
208. we didn't know that this disaster was happening
209. we didn't know about the financial disaster that was about to happen
210. I know that the District and the synod have electronic newsletters but in my experience a significant majority of lay people don't know about them or how to access them.
211. I leaned more about district affairs in the lunch and dinner line at a Lutheran Laymen's League convention where two gentlemen were discussing the wisdom of CEF giving more monies to a project that was already in arrears. Not good.
212. Not only not always getting the right amount but not getting all information. For example, we get information passed on to us about congregations doing the traditional things (Confirmations, Baptisms) Youth events, service events) but get no info about congregations that are experimenting with and testing non traditional approaches to ministry and service.
213. No!

214. Being active in the various organizations of the Synod and two Districts, I would have to say I learned more about what was happening while in the lunch or dinner line then I did from any publications. I knew the Alberta-British Columbia District was in trouble because I overheard two gentlemen in front of me discussing - how can the district give out more money on a certain project, when the organization requesting the money was already in arrears on the loan.... not good.
215. What is right amount of information?
216. Unfortunately, the District has not been forthcoming on information about the CEF/DIL fiasco. We read about repentance and forgiveness but the leadership is not practicing what it preaches.
217. In regards to CEF we have not heard anything in the past 4-6 months. We have been told there will be a plan since last year and we are still waiting and more of the people's money is being spent on 'the plan' which we still don't have.
218. Some financial audits would have been useful information for ABC district.
219. Little more folksy; info not always relevant.
220. What information comes from the District? Not sure.
221. Had ANYONE in the ABC district cared about fellow Lutherans, we would have been made aware of the thievery and mismanagement going on long before it reached this point.
222. I rarely receive communication or information from my district.
223. Don't really know what goes on
224. none from District either that I know of.
225. As a Pastor who is also interested in the doings of District I receive most information I need to be satisfied. The problem is that I know where to go to get the information I want and who to talk too if I cannot find the information. Clear and concise information is not disseminated from the top down very well. I feel that we truly fail to communicate well from synod and districts to the individual congregations and members.
226. I receive all the information I want from my District. In fact, the most helpful information, materials and support for our congregational day-to-day mission and ministry has come from the regional partnership with the District. That's OK as the national church body has expertise in those things that do not affect our congregational day to day mission and ministry.
227. Information is "canned" and very late coming.
228. Our district parish services have closed minutes. This seems shady, no?
229. I'm not really sure about "the right amount", but District lags far behind Synod in getting information out in a timely way.
230. Mostly because I do not read enough, yet the amount is fairly good.
231. A little more general information of ongoing events, etc. might be nice.
232. I think the district needs to continue their transparency improvements and needs to continue producing material for laypeople.
233. Our District has hidden behind lawyers and communication experts and failed to provide meaningful leadership in crisis or communicate with congregations about what it was up to for all the years previous.
234. Aside from recent events in the ABC where at times I was confused about what was going on, I generally did get information I needed in a timely way.
235. If there is information I am not receiving - how on earth would I know??? what a silly question

236. Through its publications and email communications, I am pleased with the amount and quality of information I can access.
237. It's available if I want it.
238. Particularly concerning financial matters. What a muddle. It is quite shocking that there is such reluctance to discuss, take ownership or apologize for past errors.
239. Not much forthcoming from my District and not sure if one can trust that any info is reliable.
240. District is often secretive with little more than a president's message in the Canadian Lutheran.
241. Not much.
242. We have reports from the District representatives.
243. Asked for financial records similar to what most congregations supply to their members and have received zip.
244. The ABC District newsletter via online gives updates on current calls, prayer requests, etc. but we have situations going on in our district and the rumor mills turn but we receive no information as to what is going on.
245. Since the Central District office has moved to Winnipeg, there has been virtually no information from the District, as compared to years ago.
246. ABC connect into my inbox and Canadian Lutheran is a great service
247. I receive weekly newsletters by email from the ABC district.
248. I don't receive any information from my District.
249. I would have agreed with this up until Jan. 5, 2015. Now, I have little trust in the amount or type of information that's shared from the ABC District. President Schaeffer continues to focus in ecclesiastical areas that he wasn't elected to work in, and we're given no info about whether Pastor Astley is approving this type of work. The new Board still has yet to respond to requests for more transparency.
250. What information arrives from District?
251. A-BC District badly failed in their communications regarding their CEF.
252. See comment to #11. In the ABC District, mistakes were made when it was known that CEF was insolvent. 1) District should have disassociated itself from CEF and established another name and or fund that monies were to be sent to by congregations; 2) The newly elected officials should ALL have had no prior association to the previous regime; 3) The current ABC District President in meetings regarding CEF in October/15 denied any affiliation with previous regimes when that clearly was not the case. All 3 have lead to further distrust. As I read the ABC Review of the CEF difficulties, monies are requested from Districts under Stewardship plans but no clear reason is given to churches as to why monies are needed-just to follow the Biblical principles. That is not clear honesty on the part of people who lead us.
253. Same as question 11. When CEF was going under for the last how many years, it was just hidden, no one was told. Is this really Christian?
254. The recent ABC District Church Extension Fund debacle clearly demonstrates we were NOT given information by the District.
255. The magazine is good but more could be done.
256. As a member of Church Council I see much more of this information than most of the general congregation. Perhaps a once-a-month pre-service 'announcement' about District (and Synod) news.
257. Other than printed information District information that may be sent to individual churches may or may not be shared

258. Where would I get this information?
259. Not on CEF situation in the past.
260. I like to be informed - just curious that there was no information re ABC District Church Extension Funds. We lost a sizable amount.
261. information about what?
262. Information from District is limited and actually not required. We get information back from circuit meetings
263. It is usually "after the fact info" too.
264. Only to the extent of what is included in the Canadian Lutheran. Otherwise I don't receive a lot of information.
265. Often it seems there is a lack of transparency.
266. In light of this last year, the lack of communication coming from district has been so absent, and this has exasperated the distrust.
267. Specifically, in light of the recent events of the last year, communication has been a disaster. The lack of information being shared has left a vacuum being filled by others (two notable blogs). This absence of information has greatly contributed to a growing distrust of the larger church - and this will not easily be repaired.
268. I believe that the CEF crisis in the ABC District could have been forewarned to the people of that district.
269. If I had been receiving the right amount of information, I would have known there was misspending in the District BEFORE the District was $50,000,000 in the red.
270. The pastor is not updating us much about what is going on at the district level.
271. Currently the only district information I receive is from the Canadian Lutheran. I have no real concept of what is happening in the east district.
272. If requested, yes
273. ABC connect is quite a bit of info every week. I imagine others will drive this down with CEF issues...
274. Sometimes this is too much
275. Depending on the Pastor and the location of the congregation very little information is passed on from the District Office
276. Two thumbs up Ilene.
277. Whatever the district wants to release.
278. thank you for the information that does come through but .... communication and connectivity for most members isn't happening
279. District does not listen to concerns of congregations or individuals.
280. Usually it's more of a question of reading what is available
281. Because of the dis-jointed hierarchy, its hard to tell the difference between the synod, and my district. (which is good that this process is happening!)
282. The EN3 and other information, especially by email, is very good.
283. Not lately in ABC District
284. Seminary students and laypeople need to learn much more about the structure and workings of the district and synod
285. The email notices from our district and other occasional mailings serve adequately.
286. Need more e-mail and internet information on a regular basis.

287. The collapse of the CEF in the ABC district is a case in point. The lack of timely information was an indication of incompetence at the very least. We were left wondering if a privileged group were made aware of the impending demise of the CEF long before others.
288. I don't spend much time reading up on news I must admit.
289. The lack of disclosure regarding the current financial situation that was with held for such an extended period is disgraceful.
290. See above comment. I don't know if we are. We didn't, but I hope we are now. Also there has been a tendency to allow strayed church workers and pastors to continue in their practice. I hope this won't continue
291. the only information that I am aware of is the internet with a regular "update" email with links
292. I know very little about what the district does.
293. little?
294. The same thing goes as in the comments for number 11
295. I receive the EN3, but personal communications are weak. I would like to see a mandatory annual visit of a district rep to my congregation by one of: President, Mission Exec, finance, a committee or board member and/or the circuit counsellor. I understand that it is supposed to be by invitation of the congregation, but it should be a mandatory visit.
296. An annual visit should be mandatory by one of the representatives of the district. This should come as a brief greeting and stay longer to answer questions. No congregational pastor should decide whether to invite these representatives; it should be automatic and expected. It could be the President, Mission executive, Finance person or even someone serving on a committee or the circuit pastor. The congregations would be much more interested if they were constantly learning about what the district is doing.
297. Sorry, I can't think of what I do receive from the District. An article from the District President in the Canadian Lutheran is all I can think of.
298. Generally, but this is mainly through the Canadian Lutheran. Our district does not have the human capacity to do more
299. All the above responses apply - appears to be driven by same hierarchy
300. I receive District information from the ABC Connect, our on-line weekly newsletter.
301. I don't really see info. Not sure how much I should see
302. We used to receive information from the District; but that has seemed to stop.
303. Thanks folks!
304. most folks I talk to don't know what the district does and I am sure there are lots that don't feel the need to know. Ignorance is not bliss in this though, as some think the districts are a waste of church funds. When folks know why
305. Our ABC District has enough problems right now, and I think that Dr. Bugbee is doing all that can be done, right now.
306. Now with our District being sliced to the bone spending time on communications is a bit more difficult. The ABC Connect is paramount to us keeping connected! But communication is always a two-way street. We need to grow in helping our Synod (all of us) to be looking to certain places for the comms rather than just spoon feeding.
307. Obviously they have been doing things outside of public awareness, so even the information given has been comprised of lies and omitted truths.
308. The information is not correct and ends up being politicized to the desires and wills of those in leadership positions

309. Perhaps if I, along with all other members in the ABC District, had received the "right information" and not only the "right amount of information", and I fault the leadership of the District for it's lack of transparency, and honesty, which led to the failure of CEF, DIL and the District as a whole.
310. The EN3 is very helpful.
311. We are kept in the loop by our District on any information that is pertinent to our congregation.
312. We receive very little of value.
313. District information could be more easily managed to non computer members by local congregations.
314. Whole organization is too dictatorial allowing ABC District to be mean, manipulative and discriminate against people.
315. Weekly e-mail news is good. Congregation bulletins and news-letters rarely refer to district or synod. Hardly ever are there specific prayers for synodical foreign missions.
316. Extension fund information was very lacking. So now we wonder what else you're not disclosing.
317. See above comments re information from Synod.
318. ABC district - 4 years without audited financial statements.
319. Web presence need a LOT of work
320. If I need more information, I can ask!!
321. ABC district should have been more open, years ago, about our finances.
322. Very little objective commentary on the CEF scandal.
323. If we received the right amount of information from ABC District we would have known about the CEF/DIL problems years ago.
324. I would be nice to see some reporting of what is done on a District level with the funds that are being sent. I would like to see how much of the mission money that is given to the District is spent on the missions... and even what they are.

13. There should be one strategic plan for the Synod and Districts.

1. ? I am sorry, but could you not be more specific; like What kind of a plan!?!
2. Districts should follow synods lead, not the other way around.
3. Some congregations are different, if they people are three and four generations, they may be okay with the same music and liturgy, but if they are mixed, they want some thing more uplifting.
4. I don't understand.
5. I don't understand.
6. each district is different with unique strategies required for each.
7. One basic plan - details left to districts as each area has different needs and strengths.
8. Probably, but I have a hard time envisioning how it will work. Maybe we need different plans for different sized congregations.
9. I thought there was only one plan for the Synod.
10. As far as I know, there was only one plan overall.
11. With geographic considerations and respect.
12. It would help keep unity throughout L.C.C.
13. Yes, but it has to be localized to bring the Good News of salvation to all people.

a. the country is so diverse and districts so different I think this would be difficult - easy to manage from the top I suppose but the question of whether it would be practical or relevant in the districts would be the question.
14. As long as God is in charge, do we need man's plans.
15. They should have the same goals with Synod having more control over the Districts.
16. Yes, if District is Synod in this place, there should be one strategy, but with diversity of the church across Canada, there should be freedom for regional foci or even regional strategies that proceed out of the main mission and global strategy.
17. To ensure consistency in efforts and one direction for LCC, there must be one plan. If there are unique considerations for a District those should be included in the national plan.
18. Districts can make their own addenda, though, to fit local circumstances, but we should all as a church body be moving toward the same goals.
19. There is a need to reduce overhead, fewer clergy in admin positions means more clergy in congregations.
20. Different areas may need to use different techniques, within acceptable limits, to achieve the same goal.
21. (over all Plan???) They have to work together for the greater good. But it depends on one's understanding of the question - not necessary at times.
22. Get rid of the districts - use email or facetime.
23. Only if that strategic plan focuses on teaching/preaching Christ and Him crucified for all and not business based strategic planning.
24. "Strategic plan" sounds far too much like a business buzz word. The Synod and Districts should, however, indeed be of one mind with pastors preaching the Gospel in its purity and administering the Sacraments
25. everybody should work together
26. There has to be some allowance for differences in districts.
27. I assumed this already happened with a synodical plan which was then carried out at the District and congregational level.
28. Could help avoid possible duplication and be more streamlined.
29. Dos this imply Districts and Synod remain?
30. I answered "agree," only if the strategic plan outlines underlying goals and objectives that further defines how the strategic plan can be implemented regionally.
31. amalgamate 3 Districts into one.
32. Though local situations/needs may vary. Yet all members should be growing in sensitivity to sharing the Gospel.
33. I think the work of districts and synod are in some ways unique and therefore a single plan may not be the best. However, this is a rather vague question in that it doesn't elaborate on what this strategic plan would include.
34. See Matthew 28:18-20. Please don't waste time trying to develop a new strategic plan.
35. I agree, but with the recognition that the Districts will have different contexts, and this should be allowed for in the way that the Synod coordinates things overall.
36. One strategic plan that is regionally inclusive and strategically coordinated.
37. Cohesive effort is usually more effective, however, needs of Districts can vary considerably. Communication between Synod and District should be a two-way street - "head office" needs to have open ears.

38. I cannot agree or disagree with this question because it presupposes that districts will continue to exist as they do now. That is a presupposition that needs to be challenged. It is understandable that the strategic plans for one region would be different from another. But are not our districts so large already that they contain congregational situations and regional considerations that are dissimilar? I think Districts should be dissolved entirely. But planning can still happen on a regional level (however large we decide those regions to be).
39. Yes, there should definitely be one plan and one that is communicated clearly to each congregation to reduce the risk of different opinions as to what being an LCC congregation means.
40. Will it simplify things?
41. The over all plan from both the Synod and the district should be the same. Some local projects should only be in the hands of each area or District because it is best understood there. Both though should be on the same page as to the direction everything is going.
42. without one plan, chickens running around
43. As per the thesis of Walther (specifically 6,7,8, 9, and 10). the authority of the ministry is instituted by God through the congregations and laymen have the right to pass judgement. As such, as individual congregations, within the districts should have the right to direct regional strategic plans, separate from the synod. The synod does not have the authority to implement one plan for all.
44. this would ensure unity.
45. Taking into account the different needs, of course, of different geographical regions, Congregations of differing sizes and financial strengths, etc. etc. But the current "silo" approach has to disappear, as does the strong protect-my-own-turf outlook of too many of our Clergy and Office Holders.
46. The more layers of control we can eliminate the fewer power struggles we need to deal with.
47. The plans are usually an exercise signifying nothing
48. This is just common sense. Why duplicate or compete or over-complicate issues, financial and otherwise?

a. but it may be difficult to have a "one size fits all" right across Canada as each region may have different thoughts on how things should go.

49. Too much centralization! Regional variances are large and in need of more facile considerations.
50. Basically, I think cohesive efforts are always more effective. Communication is not a one-way street.
51. I think different regions, circumstances, and provincial politics can have a large affect in different places, and so a "one size fits all" approach may not be appropriate.
52. Question 13 & 14 do not allow further options! Small homegrown initiatives are good when done regionally; -
53. Not all fit one mold.
54. I think we could accomplish more working together.
55. I would hope these two bodies have common goals but because each region of Canada is different (and I have lived in all three to know this is the case) how their goals are accomplished will be quite different.
56. Our country is too vast for one plan to fit all areas.

57. With three, or more, different characters and situations I don’t see how one plan is effective others than the great commission. Simple and straight forward. The Districts should be allowed to have their own, plan. Perhaps, shared and over viewed by others.
58. Input should be sought from Districts when developing the synod strategic plan.
59. The effectiveness of a single strategic plan depends on the people involved in the process, and whether it functions with a team approach or operates as a dictatorship.
60. Geographic differences should not be ignored.
61. With a synod as small as LCC, there is no need for separate planning, let alone 3 separate districts.
62. Wasn't there?
63. I wonder if the Districts as they are presently are necessary in a restructured Synod. Perhaps there could be 3 synodical persons, each responsible for 1 area (or maybe 4 if the areas would be better divided differently than the districts are now).
64. There should only be Synod and no Districts in a church body of our size.
65. Common mission statement. Implementation needs to be tailored to match the dynamics of the societies within each district, each city, and neighbourhood.
66. I believe one specific and common direction or strategic plan for Synod would help our church body focus its' efforts effectively, particularly if this plan were missional. However, I think each district or region would have to look at different ways of carrying the strategic plan based on geographical and cultural contexts of regions and communities.
67. it's very naïve and outdated to believe that one plan can be created and applied successfully for all. Clearly you don't understand or appreciate the different needs and opportunities in various communities. You're not the federal government.
68. Yes, one plan, but regional differences must receive due consideration
69. Strategically one national plan is needed, tactical execution should be left to Districts.
70. Refer to common goals to advance God's kingdom and will.
71. We should all be trying to grow the overall ministry. Easier said then done, I know. However, the strategic plan should be to try and send out the same message. New initiatives can be tested or tried out in one district, but if it is overseen by the Synod, and it is successful, it becomes simpler and quicker to roll this out to all of the Districts. Again, we should be moving towards the same goals.
72. They should certainly have the same goals and objectives
73. The Synod only gives what information they want to give like surveys anything can be slanted to say what they want...not very truthful
74. if its proactive
75. Strategy produces results. It has become whatsoever works, it's okay.
76. As long as it is Christ centered
77. Define "strategic plan"
78. I think there are too many differing factors to have one plan- distance, population, density, etc.
79. This is a loaded question. It assumes the Synod and District should be developing strategic plans. At the congregational level, strategic plans often have little buy-in within the structure of a synod because it is merely busy work that has been done by office-holders. The plans become large and burdensome as those who create the strategic plan strive to put their hobby-horse into the plan. Those who agree with the strategic plan will engage. Those who disagree with ignore it. The more the plan reflects the big picture of Scripture, people will

follow. Using the LCMS as an example, "ABLAZE" didn't have universal buy-in; it seems as though "Witness, Mercy, and Life Together" is much more broadly accepted because it more fully reflects the full counsel of the Word of God.

80. A unified approach.
81. The Districts should be dissolved and we should have one strategic plan for our congregations under one Synod.
82. I thought the "strategic" plan is Matt. 28:18ff
83. But I am not qualified to give a reasoned answer
84. The Synod should be trying to follow along side to serve the Districts however they are told to. Allowing autonomy between the districts can be a healthy thing though.
85. I think that would be difficult as the west and east have different needs and desires. Not that it would be good to have one platform but it doesn't work in a country as diverse as we have.
86. The power of the church is the people. The people appoint a localized district to serve them. The districts then have synod as an advisory committee, which places synod at the bottom of the list of power. There should not be one strategic plan, but the districts should sit synod down and converse about how synod can best help the districts, not lead them.
87. There should be common goals but the districts should be able to apply the common goals locally. The country is vast and diverse a 1 size fits all may not work.
88. Depends on what the restructured LCC will become
89. Good idea.
90. Perhaps an integrated plan linking synodical objectives to district plans would be a better approach.
91. Not really sure as to how they interact now but coordinated planning makes sense.
92. Yes, but not just plan but honor and act on it in a timely manner, and that is not years.
93. I would think that it would be difficult to have one strategic plan. I think the district plans should however be "in sync" with the synod.
94. The districts are part of the Synod and as synod we are to walk together. To have completely separate goals/plans between Synods and Districts does not seem appropriate. To perhaps work together on different parts of the whole would be a very good thing.
95. There must be recognition of the differences between Synods and Districts and even between Districts and Districts. We must recognize the differences to bring to each area the plans that Synod is proposing. Perhaps one general plan, but then that plan needs to be honed to satisfy the certain area that it is to work in.
96. If there is tight integration and by-in by all Districts it will work, otherwise some could end up feeling their needs are being ignored. This makes it harder and slower to make changes, get things done. Democracy feels better when you are part of the majority.
97. AND one Canadian office and therefore less expense in property/hard costs and certainly much less in personnel costs.
98. Synod should set the course and the districts fall in line to support that in their region.
99. that way the church is working towards the same thing.
100. need more info
101. Don't know or understand enough on this subject to make a decision.
102. Only if they become one entity
103. The strategic plan for the synod should be unity of Doctrine and Practice normed by the Bible and the Confessions.
104. All under the great commission

105. since there is a different kind of ministry in Eastern Canada than in the West
106. Unless the Districts don't exist anymore.
107. In today's economy it could serve LCC better. The young people seem to be on the fringe and the senior are taxed to the limit making it impossible for them to continue to support our district as well as a Synod and the local congregations.
108. Otherwise we should substitute another word for "synod."
109. Not specific enough
110. Not sure what this means...I have never answered these types of questions before and don't really know much about present structure so I guess I need more examples of what a strategic plan would be versus something else...like isn't there always a plan already?
111. Should there be a "strategic plan"?
112. We have limited resources and need to ensure there is no duplication of effort or working against one another.
113. A strategic plan that can be modified to meet local needs.
114. Unity in vision and plan brings us under the umbrella as one
115. I doubt if the resources spent on developing "strategic plans" are ever justified by the dubious results obtained.
116. We are not a big enough organization to have separate strategic plans.
117. The general plan should be good for all, but local circumstances should still allow for diversity.
118. It is helpful to have a clear direction and plan, but this is only effective if communicated clearly and in an engaging manner. There are many challenges in planning so broadly. Could there be a Synodical plan that is more general that districts could then add details to depending on their regional needs?
119. Depends on whether districts remain separate entities. If restructuring results in the flattening of the church structure to the point where districts no longer have autonomy under their own presidents, there is no point in separate strategic plans.
120. I think that planning could be streamlined by having one strategic plan, with the proviso that care is taken to recognize the individuality and particular needs and challenges of each region under the Synod umbrella.
121. What do you mean by "plan"? Business plan? growth plan - would be nice if everyone were together.
122. Yes, one strong, cohesive strategic plan for all of our Congregations would be of value.
123. Given the size of LCC, it seems odd that there would be differing strategic plans.
124. While I believe the Synod and Districts should be separate and have primarily control over their own decisions I also think that the plans and strategies between the organisations should be consistent and work in tandem to be more effective and efficient. If done properly I would even agree with a system that delegates certain authorities to the Synod and others to the Districts, as it is in some cases now, that might be similar to the way in which Canada and the provinces split authority.
125. Perhaps one overall plan would be good that would then form the basis for each individual district.
126. Not enough information on this.
127. Districts should see themselves as "Synod in this place." Of course there is a role for their own planning but it should be viewed as part of a broader strategic plan for the Synod as a whole.

128. The district strategic plan should fit into the national one. Because of our tremendous geography we need some regional adaptation/modification though.
129. An agreement on shared primary deliverables between the Synod & Districts, with a safeguard tracking & and sharing of secondary deliverables focusing on each own regional plans, with financial monitoring oversight to single budget.
130. The response and support for any given project would be better if these things were coordinated between District and Synod.
131. With respect, I think this question, and where it comes in the survey, shows the weakness of this survey, methodology, and process. I think a better question is, "What is the most appropriate structure for our church body?" with options given to help the respondent decide. The wording above assumes we should have both a Synod and Districts.
132. I agree as long as regional differences are accounted for in the execution of the plan.
133. If you mean by this question that we should all have the goal of reaching out to the unsaved with the saving grace and forgivingness of Christ, then we should all have one "plan." If, however, you mean that all the districts and synods should have one organizing body then I strongly disagree. This is a huge country with much regional diversity and it is hard for one governing body to know the needs of people throughout this sprawling country.
134. Keep it transparent!
135. We need better mileage from what we are engaged in, and more cooperation and coordination would weed out pet projects.
136. There should be space for geographic and human resource variances.
137. In that plan we need to consolidate to one seminary with some urgency.
138. There should only be ONE Plan and there should be NO Districts.
139. It should be an overall plan for the synod and how it will be done in each district.
140. Based totally on scripture. At the present it is not.
141. Probably a good idea, but there are indeed regional differences that need to be factored in.
142. I think we have that. To evangelize the whole world. Our well trained pastors should lead more with mission calls. Our lay people could do many of the work that pastors do. Pastors and lay people spend too much time in meetings. Personally I think Pastors just have too much clout in the church. I wonder how many pastors and how many lay people are on this structuring committee? Likely more pastors than lay people.
143. I think so, but if possible districts should also have strategic plans that could be unique to their district
144. need to work hand in hand
145. If it covers all the interests, problems, concerns of varying areas, e.g. rural/urban population, vast distances to travel between congregations.
146. Unity of Doctrine and Practice normed by the Bible and the Confessions.
147. The synod's strategic plan should form the basis for district strategic plans, but because they have different things to do, the district strategic plans need to differ from the Synod's in the details.
148. They should work together, but do their own things regionally
149. Overall, I'd say "yes" (esp. as it pertains to the Great Commission.) I could see local/district strategies varying slightly from the blanket synod strategy
150. This is not the federal and provincial governments Plan TOGETHER to be together
151. If only one plan, then flexibility is needed to adapt it to any unique needs of the District.

152. We are small enough that we need to eliminate duplication where we can. But there are a lot of differences between what BC churches need and want, and what Ontario churches need and want. Where there is common ground, elimination of the duplication would be helpful. However, forcing BC to do things Ontario's way or vice versa would only result in further losses of members.
153. I'd go farther and say there should be no districts at all - just one synodical body. This would require a few more staff at national HQ to ensure that parishes all over the country receive assistance when necessary.
154. Why not, with some variation depending on were you are and the culture you are a part of.
155. Having multiple strategic plans (and multiple Districts, for that matter) is unnecessary reduplication and a waste of resources for a church body as small as ours.
156. Rather than reduplicating efforts, it would be best to have a unified strategic plan.
157. This is a pretty vague question. Frankly, there shouldn't be districts at all, except for organization purposes. This church is too small to be fragmented like this. All the resources and planning should be centralized.
158. How many plans are there at the moment? Do they each have their own individual strategic plan?
159. This is a hard question. The overall strategic plan for the synod should include the districts in the planning. Somehow the strategic plans of both synod and district has to get down to the grass root member and the congregations. It is hard to engage the average member to become 'interested' in things both on the synodical and on the district level.
160. I agree in so far as it is a general principle. However, "one size fits all" seldom does. If we retain some form of "Districts" (and I am not convinced this is necessary), their strategic plan should complement a synodical strategic plan.
161. I believe one specific and common direction or strategic plan for Synod would help our church body focus its' efforts effectively, particularly if this plan were missional. However, I think each district or region would have to look at different ways of carrying the strategic plan based on geographical and cultural contexts of regions and communities.
162. There has been some sort of disconnect between Synod and Districts. In Central District, this was not a big problem, probably because of their nearness in geography. However, in ABC District, there has been a kind of aloofness, perhaps given its financial strength, there was a desire for more autonomy? With the financial strength gone, and a new Board, perhaps a better relationship can be forged.
163. If "strategic" means overall moving ahead, then yes.
164. For issues that are nationwide/global.
165. what would this be. explain the one strategic plan.
166. Differences among Districts--language, culture, geography, financial climate--make one nation-wide plan impractical. Different needs would not be adequately met. The further removed the planning, the less it is likely to meet the needs of individual congregations.
167. Synod and Districts have two different focuses - one nationally and the other at much narrowed. It seems to me that Synod should develop its "strategic" plan. From this the Districts should then develop their plans to complement the Synod plan. The District plans should be developed so as to permit Synod to successfully execute its strategic plan. To use military terminology, Synod should think strategically and Districts should think tactically.
168. This sounds like a good thing. Be on same page but I don't know. I'm not involved in either.

169. We absolutely must have the same goals and plans. Having divergent plans has resulted in our districts being far from each other on matters of doctrine and practice.
170. Synod should have a Strategic plan (Needs updates more than every 6 years)
171. Not sure what this would involve.
172. I believe the Synod should be responsible for the overall vision and direction that LCC wishes to accomplish within Canada and its mission mandate outside of Canada. Additionally, Synod should remain responsible to ensure that Pastors and Congregations are adhering to their Constitutional commitments. The vision should be determined by convention and will need the support of it's charter congregations.
173. Let's go one better and possibly eliminate the Districts, or at least shrink their size and authority.
174. I think it would make transitions between districts a lot easier for pastors who are called out of their district if there was one system for all the districts in a synchronized fashion. However, some small adjustments may need to be made to accommodate the uniqueness of each district. Overall however I think this is something to strive for.
175. I can't answer these questions because I don't know what the advantages/disadvantages would be to stay separate or join together. I don't have clear information on what the mandates are for the Synod, as opposed to the mandate of the individual Districts. Are there a lot of duplicate services provided or does each entity have its own agenda?
176. unified strategy is important among districts
177. Though I'm not sure what is meant by "strategic plan".
178. There should be one plan on a Synodical level, but each District should have the freedom to plan strategy for itself with its own conventions.
179. There should be an over-riding plan if we are going to be a Synod and walk together. But there must be room for individual Districts to consider and handle issues in their own area.
180. The plan needs to show plainly how it can be carried out through Synod, through District, through Circuit, through congregation.
181. We're a small synod, and we're all in this together and we should act like it.
182. We need to cultivate a spirit of unity in LCC instead of a federation of districts.
183. We are a small, shrinking group of Christians (hopefully this can change.) Duplication of effort is a waste of time, energy and money.
184. Basic plan.
185. Synod should have the strategic plan (NOT just every 6 years) - Plan ahead but adjust the plan as conditions change.
186. Agree, but there still needs to be room for regional differences. Leaving this planning at a purely District level will only continue the divide we see between East and West in our church. The more that we are required to sit at the table together and make plans together, the more we will be able to walk together.
187. The use of resources is used more efficiently this way. This also keeps the districts on a straighter path regarding doctrine and message.
188. I somewhat agree, but there may be different needs in the vast regions of our country.
189. Then the Districts can tailor the plan to their settings.
190. Analyses may agree or disagree - no data
191. Sure... but understanding must be made that as a national office we also have relationships beyond our country's borders, unique ones that our mother synod, LCMS, cannot have (Ukraine, Cambodia - all due to past country involvement in wars). LCC cannot become

only in-looking at Canadian needs, we do have a responsibility to our brothers and sisters throughout the world... who knows, someday we may need them (see the importance of the African Anglican churches calling the N. American churches to repentance!).

192. If the districts are disbanded, I would agree. I do not agree if the present structure is kept--does synod know about regional mission opportunities? Do districts know about international mission opportunities?
193. regional differences need to be taken into account when strategic planning is undertaken.
194. There should be a Synod overall Plan and looking ahead 6 years is good - however it should be considered and revised as needed as times and conditions change - who can predict the needs etc. in 2022???
195. While I believe the Synod and Districts should be separate and have primarily control over their own decisions I also think that the plans and strategies between the organisations should be consistent and work in tandem to be more effective and efficient. If done properly I would even agree with a system that delegates certain authorities to the Synod and others to the Districts, as it is in some cases now, that might be similar to the way in which Canada and the provinces split authority.
196. Strategic plans should be specific to district, to address specific details
197. Especially with regard to Doctrinal and financial matters.
198. While having an overarching plan is important--the various regions in LCC vary so widely that there must be freedom to operate in different ways and directions depending on the situation of the area.
199. Certainly the goals should be seamlessly worked through synod which includes each regional area of the country.
200. At present the Synod and Districts have respective responsibilities and require their own strategic plan. The plans can be coordinated and provide mutual support.
201. We should all be working together but still have our own identity.
202. In general, yes, I think so. We should do more together. I am ambivalent about whether there should/must be a strategic plan or not.
203. This is an invitation for us all to continue to hop on our horses and ride off in all directions to the confusion of all and the accomplishment of very little.
204. We are all members of LCC Synod, therefore, we should have a common strategic plan.
205. aren't the needs of the Districts different from one another?
206. One strategic plan for Synod but just do away with the districts since they are just another level of bureaucracy
207. Sat, plans are necessary in any business success so why would the church not need one.
208. We all need to be on the same page and united as a Synod to maintain LCC.
209. Forget strategic plans, how about following the most basic Conflict of Interest rules, so that pastors do not decide their own pensions.
210. Yes, and it is called the Great Commission.
211. This is tricky because it doesn't allow for more local planning.
212. East district by virtue of land and cities have different needs and abilities. I'd do away with overarching pie in the sky ideals and support district (or region) level work.
213. Synod should remain focused on its international work. There is more than enough work in this area for the Synod staff.
214. It depends on what is meant by 'strategic planning'.
215. I would think different geographical areas have different needs and experiences.

216. There should be no district.
217. It doesn't seem that either group can get it together - perhaps we have a better chance of success if two groups try.
218. An overall plan should be set by the Synod with some flexibility for the districts to reflect regional differences and priorities.
219. A truly effective strategic plan will take into account the variables that exist within the LCC church body as a whole, so that strengths are maximized and weaknesses are identified and rectified
220. "Strategic plans" are for corporations.
221. If we are all working together and walking together toward the same goals and objectives, it would be helpful. Then also the Synod/Districts can together develop means by which our congregations can better achieve those goals. This is of course with the understanding that God will work through us in our proclamation of the Gospel of Christ crucified and risen.
222. I disagree not because I am against the Synod and Districts doing things as one but because I don't know how a District can even do this as the churches and their needs vary greatly (i.e. one city with several Lutheran congregations vs. one congregation hours away from the nearest one)
223. actually we could do away with the districts
224. The overlying goal is for the increase (both numerically and in the life of the individual Christian) for the kingdom. But there are varying cultures within our churches so the method of doing this will differ (even within a District).
225. Geographic differences, cultural differences, First Nation populations, immediate emergencies. If the one strategic plan cannot take these things into account, probably not a good idea.
226. The plan for both Synod and Districts should be, first and foremost, to proclaim the Good News of Jesus Christ to all, and to stay true to the Word of God.
227. I'm suspicious of "strategic plans". The Church is not a business--if this had been realised out West. ...!
228. Are we talking about organizational aspects of the Synod and Districts? I think in this day and age of technology we could eliminate overlapping areas of finance, missions, etc. to save $$.
229. Depends what structure we end up with

230. Let’s see what we end up with once there is restructuring.
231. Agreed. All 4 entities should be working together towards a common goal. Easier said than done.
232. Geographic differences need to be taken into consideration.
233. Geographic and ethnic concerns for example mean different strategies may be needed.
234. We have to coordinate our efforts to be effective in our key service areas. The resources the Lord has provided us through his people are precious and we have to make the most efficient use of them. We cannot possibly do that under our current structure, where Boards only focus on their districts in isolation.
235. we need to all be on the same page
236. local strategies are important
237. I would like to see the dissolution of the districts and a new and more effective structure put into place to enable us to move forward in a new way to a new day with the Good News.

238. we all need to be on the same page
239. Everyone should be on the same page
240. I really don't know what goes into a "strategic plan" for a church.
241. Not qualified to know!!
242. I am not sure of the benefit of this. I think generally we all need to be on the same page, but each District has different issues. All parishes are not created equal, some are more conservative and others less so. I believe this has to do with region.
243. Absolutely, avoid overlap and duplication, keep expenses low but and that’s a big pause, get a professional product.
244. Each District has its own context to work in so it doesn't make sense to force all of the Districts to share a "strategic plan."
245. I'm surprised there isn't just one plan. The Synod should build the plan and the Districts plan should tie into the Synod.
246. They should be a support to congregations and not an instigator of action.
247. For a church as small as we are, this would be helpful. I believe more or less we do operate toward similar goals. A strategic plan however also needs to respond to local geographic needs so there needs to be a certain amount of flexibility.
248. That should have happened long ago
249. We are Lutheran Church of Canada.
250. -strategic planning leads to too much navel-gazing and requires too much time and effort for their value
251. Each District is different from the others in numbers, issues, concerns and in the solutions that will work to resolve issues and concerns. I believe an overall Synod strategy should be in place but that each District should have their own strategies on meeting the Synod strategic priorities and their own District/Regional strategic needs. While it is an additional step in achieving the overall combined strategy (Synod and Districts) such a strategy is needed to be effective
252. We need to plan together & assist each other in working the plan, Each District is distinct, & we need to ensure that services & programs are developed & operationalized by local congregations.
253. They should do the plan that makes the most sense; unless there are multiple plans that make sense, just one should be presented.
254. Would Districts lose their autonomy?
255. I think certain things can be planned by the district but other things (the bigger stuff that is generic to all churches) can be planned by Synod.
256. Maybe this will make things more efficient?
257. While the overall plan is the same, the way in which it is achieved must be tailored to the needs of those living in the districts. What works in BC may not work in NS.
258. More to the point: we should abolish the district system. The amount of members we have in all of Canada is less than many US LCMS districts.
259. BUT in conjunction with each other. The 'major plan' should be how to serve, up-build and encourage the Synod family, and how to share Christ with all and do that efficiently with the resources that God gives.
260. After all, there is only one great commission for the body of Christ. One strategic plan can have multiple avenues to meet local criteria.

261. We are all supposed to have the same purpose and objective, right? And it is the great commission right?
262. Would like to understand what this means to the districts especially if there are varying needs in each district
263. They need to work together more.
264. Other then the fact that I would like to see Districts gone, and, depending on the size of the province, zones set up.... yes! How many mission executives do we need? One, at Synod level, with the job being part of a Vice-President's job descriptions. 'Districts' should looked for local missions to support.
265. Needs differ regionally. Plans should reflect those needs.
266. As there are different needs in different parts of the country, one plan may not be effective everywhere.
267. Really - aren't there too many layers within LCC?
268. No districts. One synod. LCC is not big enough structurally to support the districts, centralizing would be more effective.
269. This country is far too small for every region to have its own plan....
270. United we stand.
271. Lutheran Church Canada is a very large organization geographically but relatively small organizationally. Having differing strategic plans for an organization based on geographic zones when it has a small population is not really effective.
272. It should be a unified plan for all members of each congregation so that God's light may shine in the world that desperately needs it.
273. It should be coordinated, but not a centralized plan.
274. One plan for both Synod and Districts would be good so that all parties are aware of what the plan and its goals are so that all are working for the same goal by each of the various districts otherwise each district would be working separately and doing their own thing and avoid duplication and not being aware of what other districts are doing.
275. If Synod is to walk together then we actually need to walk together in doctrine, practice, planning and vision.
276. Everyone should be the same
277. To my knowledge our District has operated with the LCC Synod Vision, Mission and Ministry. The work of the District was to take the LCC National Synod Vision, Mission and Ministry and implement it on the regional basis. Regional planning based on a national vision is necessary because the "nuts and bolts" of a plan that is nationally/centrally formulated typically only meets the region right around the central location.
278. One body, one church.
279. Depending on the "new" form of the districts/synod this issue can be re-assessed and decided upon.
280. Big Picture planning should be done by synod, with district representatives present. Detailed planning and implementation should be done by either synod or district, depending on the issues involved.
281. Potentially. Not authoritative, but more unity would be nice. The Church body does feel quite divided currently, yet we are one church body.
282. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
283. Underneath the strategic plan we still need some flexibility as there are differences in needs of the districts.

284. If you want to walk together in synod, we need to generally agree where to go.
285. "Big Picture" planning should be done at national level. Details worked out in collaboration with districts.
286. I think that we will be able to make the best use of our resources (both of time, money and people) if we are all nationally working toward the same goals. To do otherwise divides our already limited resources.
287. If I think the districts should be dissolved, how do I answer? with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
288. Overall plan that districts may take part in!
289. Yes, strategic.
290. The challenges are not always the same on the two levels.
291. I am not sure how much variation there is in various parts of the country. I also do not know what such a plan might be. This is not a question that can be answered properly.
292. As the districts are part of synod, one strategic with input from and sensitivity to the needs of the various parts of the country would be best.
293. How could there be one plan without looking at local needs
294. One strategic plan - no districts.
295. Could there be savings by changing the administration, perhaps having only one national office with more vice presidents (i.e. do we need districts??)
296. There should be agreement on broad strategic directions with allowance for regional variations on the actions that are appropriate to meet each strategic direction.
297. As noted elsewhere, there should be one body and therefore the strategic plan would be one.
298. Let's simplify the system & combine these.
299. I'd like to agree, but is this realistic? Canada is a big country with diverse needs/issues/supports available. Is it possible to provide fair measure to each area?
300. There should be a common plan but the implementation may need to be tailored to the local situation,
301. Of necessity, strategy may vary considerably from urban to rural areas.
302. We need to actually start working together, as the word 'Synod' would imply.
303. Each district has its own unique challenges and where focus needs to be. If there is one strategic plan for the Synod and Districts, it has to recognize these differences. It may be very difficult to come up with a plan that would work across Canada.
304. Whatever will encourage greater unity among us across the country!
305. All are doing very similar work just at different levels. Overall objectives should be the same
306. Considering that District is just an arm of Synod... yes. But really... we should just get rid of the Districts all together.
307. Yes, and fewer people at the top
308. it would be good if they would be on the same page but the chances are slim that it would be productive and constructive
309. The Synod should distribute and working plan to the districts who would add to and enhance to fulfill their local mission.
310. Not really necessary if the goal is continuing Christ's ministry. Some independence is good.
311. This is an odd and generalized statement. It can mean many things and so it is difficult to agree or disagree. I believe we already have one strategic plan in that we want all people to believe in Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour. If by "strategic plan" it means that specific ways of feeding our own people and reaching out to others are dictated and nothing outside

the "plan" is tolerated, then I would say no. If by "strategic plan" it means that we are all committed to the same overarching mission and the plan is a "vision" of ways in which we can accomplish this, then it could be a fine way of giving a framework in which congregations can work in their specific context with their specific members and their gifts and talents.

312. Each district has its own unique priorities
313. don't have information to comment
314. Too wide of a scope to meet the particular needs of each district, however the overall strategy needs to be common, following God's Word.
315. We cannot survive financially trying to run 3 districts and a synod. By the time the new strategic plan is formed I believe we will be blessed to still have enough solvency to operate a synod. It pains me to write this but I believe part of the strategic plan should be a plan to help congregations survive and thrive should the district and the synods become insolvent. Have we considered that perhaps it is God's will for the synod to die so that we might be re-birthed with a new vision for how we can do ministry together? We should at least pray about this and seek God's will - we should not be planning because we want a church - and a church that remains the same at all costs. This church body has already lost most of its youth.
316. Two different areas of work.
317. What do you mean by "plan"?
318. I have no idea what strategic plans each of these has. I think we have a sleepy organization. There is not that much interest in finding out where the Lord is working and following. The strategy seems to be to keep the Lutheran club going!
319. It would be great if they would be on the same page but the chances are slim and that it would be constructive and productive
320. I would agree that there should be one strategic plan for the Synod and its included regions. But this question presumes that there should still be Districts so I can't agree.
321. It would be great if all were on the same page but again the chances of anything being constructive and productive - have my doubts
322. They should definitely be congruent. We should not be straying for our own purposes. All should be clear to all congregations.
323. I really don't know what goes into a strategic plan for a church.
324. Subject to area requirements and needs.
325. If there still is a Synod and Districts in our future we must be working together towards the same goal-- the best way to keep Jesus as Savior most important, not our human authority.
326. Absolutely, avoid overlap and duplication, keep expenses low but and that's a big pause, make sure it is a professional product.
327. How could I have an opinion on this? I don't know enough about how planning is currently being done. Even though I am a pastor serving a congregation, I do not consider myself part of any of current planning by Synodical nor District officials.
328. Let's not duplicate so many "executives" and get back to grass roots in the congregations and get some of our executives back in parish ministry.
329. There are 'hands' and 'feet' and 'eyes'. But, there is one 'body'. We are one Church. But, there are different conditions in rural, urban, mining, forest, fishing, large congregations, small, French, English, Spanish, Punjab, ...
330. Different synods may require different strategic plans to meet their needs.

331. This plan would consist of the needs of all Districts and can still be implemented through the districts. It would be a plan to make sure we are all working together with the same focus and direction.
332. In an overall sense, I agree with this statement. However, different districts have different needs, therefore the carrying out of the strategic plan in each district may look different.
333. We are a district strong nation.
334. Sounds good if it would work. Or is that too large an area to cover.
335. Not sure about this as then you have to problem of making sure that all parts of Canada are heard and it works for all areas.
336. There should be one Synod. Canada is too small (population vs geography) to go about separately like we do now. Districts are a duplication and a great additional cost
337. We are too small a group not to work together. I believe there could be a more efficient way to provide administration and services to LCC.
338. They can still allow regions to operate according to region.
339. Only one administrative and planning group is required for LCC
340. I think the strategic plan for the Districts should flow out of the strategic plan for the Synod.
341. providing it is practical and compatible with geographical and parish differences. We don't advertise ourselves. I think God expects more from us.
342. Referring to December 2009 Canadian Lutheran magazine. Strategic Directions Document.
343. I need an example of what the current strategic plan is. I cannot imagine any layperson knowing how to answer this question. Please provide tangible examples.
344. Big country.... widely separated .... some animosity, some misunderstandings
345. LCC is too small to accommodate (and afford) four layers of planning. Duplication of planning and administration is wasteful and frustrating. This one level of planning must be able to take into account the huge diversity that is Canada from east to west.
346. If we are to walk together we ought to plan where we are going together. Our confessions ought to guide us as we do so.
347. Yes, working together and in the same direction seems obvious.
348. We need to all be on the same page going forward.
349. We have to be working together, and not separately.
350. They're all different backgrounds and situations.
351. Maybe?
352. I agree in principle, but this strategic plan needs to acknowledge the diversity of mission and pastoral concerns that reflect the geographical and demographic diversity of Canada.
353. not all Districts are equal
354. The district strategic plan should fit into the national one. Because of our tremendous geography we need some regional adaptation/modification though.
355. Such a plan must be fueled, anchored and enacted locally
356. For the church to foster mature disciples of Jesus who bring God presence into every area of life and work and creatively impact the community where they live.
357. The right hand should know what the left is doing
358. We have a strategic plan. It is called the Holy Scripture. Having an overarching outline as to how we think we should operate and making sure everything fits it to a T, may work fine as far as the secular and worldly are concerned but make no sense as far as I have witnessed. To my knowledge our mission starts in various parts of the world have come about as a result of God opening doors and not our strategizing.

359. In my many years of serving, and with some background in strategic planning, I have not observed good planning of either District or Synod, with one exception, Lutheran Foundation. Furthermore, planning must begin with the congregations/circuits from which District and Synods plans should arise. Yes, it may be messier/complex, but we should not be a top-down organization, we are a church family.
360. Okay- there needs to be at a high end level a plan but not at the point of constraining the differences of the districts to be able to implement the plan as required for their area.
361. Working together will save money and time. No need to duplicate services.
362. But, requires a structure for input from districts, toward common goals.
363. A strategic plan for the Atlantic provinces may not fit in with the prairies or downtown Toronto
364. Having a synod and districts is creating a top heavy organization. The districts and synod's strategic plan should align (but the tactics to get there should and can be different); or the should become one body with regional VP's instead of districts and the Synod.
365. Is there currently a separate strategic plan for synod and districts?
366. There should be some general planning but each district has special needs.
367. with district / Regional variances
368. I think that Districts should simply disappear. This is an inappropriately leading question
369. Not sure why we even need to have "strategic plans." We already have, in effect, such set forth in our Lutheran Confessions; for instance, "Everything in the Christian church is so ordered that we may daily obtain full forgiveness of sins through the Word and through the Sacraments" (LC, Second Part, 55).
370. yes, better use of resources
371. strategic plan for what?
372. That would make a lot of sense, so everyone would be on the same page.
373. We should abandon the districts and just have one central Synod run from LCC office in Winnipeg.
374. There should be some latitude allowed for each to address local and national issue.
375. Emphasis likely changes region to region.
376. The Synod and the Districts can share a common overall mission in sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ with others in their communities & provinces. However, how they endeavor to accomplish this common purpose will inevitably vary from province to province. For example, the strategies for doing ministry in Alberta may differ greatly from those used by congregations in Ontario. Yes, we are all one Body in Christ, but we are also many different parts and each part has its own role to play.
377. I think there is some planning that could be separate, but financials should be overall. I don't understand how this all could have happened with the CEF when there is such a large organization in charge.
378. Yes - let's all get on the same page and work together!
379. Every district has different needs and problems, geographic, ethnic, and age differences.
380. There needs to be much more coordination between the Synod and Districts in two areas especially. These are Outreach and Fund Raising. These are more closely related than you would first think. If you do not have an active and growing membership, you will not have successful fund raising. It is that simple.
381. Absolutely, avoid overlap and duplication, keep expenses low; but and that’s a big pause, get a professional product.

382. common goal work to promote Jesus
383. We have roughly the same membership as some Districts of the LCMS. Despite the geographic realities we have in LCC, the strategic plan isn't really affected by this. Common goals, common mission.
384. Each have their own concerns.
385. As they are organized now, the synod has a different level of responsibilities than the districts. If someday there is a merge of responsibilities, then it would be another matter.
386. Strategic plan with regard to what? Financial planning, vision of outreach? What does this mean?
387. We are all different.
388. If the district can't get things together, perhaps the Synod can. The One Strategic plan should begin with repaying every investor in the CEF and DIL back in full. Until that is done, there is no integrity in the District or Synod.
389. Strategic planning is a challenging process and requires more than simply scheduling events or stating objectives or making statements that are framed so well that no one can object. A national strategic plan would look at the church's resources and both articulate strategic directions but would articulate operational plans (with measurable targets) and the human and financial resources devoted to their achievement. It could be a departure from our conventional resolution approval processes to setting work in process.
390. We cannot afford multiple positions and boards if one coordinated voice and governance would clearly define LCC no matter which church or province we are in. "Divided we fall"
391. The districts should have some leeway in evaluating the needs and opportunities in their respective areas and responding accordingly.
392. I believe each District has different local issues to deal with and the Synod is probably more global. I would like to think that all the strategic plans (Synod & Districts) should start with how they are going to spread the Good News of Salvation through Jesus Christ, God's only Son.
393. Hopefully a good plan that makes sense for all districts. Likely different districts would have different strategies for implementation
394. ... and it should be along the lines of "Go and make disciples of all nations.... baptizing.... teaching."
395. We already have one! Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15.
396. LCC is small and there is no reason to have so much duplication in roles and costs. Our whole synod is smaller than LCC districts and can work together.
397. Districts need to go.
398. If we are to partner together and keep unity it is important that we are focused on one plan.
399. If we are to be united in our mission and purpose, there should be an overall strategic plan.
400. The districts should be able to run their own affairs under the umbrella of the parent organization.
401. Should be unified need Synod and Districts.
402. Is that not what "walking together" means?
403. Strategic plans are of little value to the church. Districts and the Synod have them, but what fruit have they borne? Very little. SPs help in the business world, but offer little value to the church. Having a strategic plan for the Synod and Districts will not prove beneficial. The Jewish proverb may be true: Man plans, and God laughs.
404. Yes, but each district may have specific means to achieve this goal.

405. I offer no suggestions for what this should look like, however, if we are in fact one church, with one Head, I think we should be under one governing body and have one plan. May we prayerfully consider what that structure and plan should be.
406. Strategic plans are generally not very helpful, especially in the church. We've done them in the synod, districts, congregations, and seminaries, but to what good? They rarely deliver any fruit that they promise. The old Jewish proverb may actually be true here. Man plans, and God laughs. I believe we should not have ANY strategic plans. They don't make a difference in the life of the church in the long run, and if anything, can only cause harm. God's word is the best strategic plan.
407. On a higher level, we need to be unified in our direction and this direction needs to be defined by the Scriptures and our Confessions. How the application of this direction manifests itself "on the ground" in the wide variety of contexts where we are located across Canada needs to allow for some flexibility. So long as the plan is i) in line with our Lutheran identity, and ii) not too cumbersome (i.e. - overly detailed and prescriptive) I believe it could serve our church well.
408. Why reinvent the wheel... also working together for a common goal creates unity.
409. There may be value in having one synodical strategic plan with some more "Regional" specific components to better address the potentially diverse needs across the country.
410. Every region or District within our Synod has their own unique challenges that may not be a concern in a different area of the country. We need to be geographically aware of the differences each region has and adjust to those needs.
411. I agree with this with some qualifications to agreeing. Districts should basically have the same strategic with the exception that the difference demographics and geography needs to be taken into account. This will have an impact on specific needs in the different regions of our country, and these needs need to be recognized.
412. Strategic planning at the synod & district level is silly. Instead the focus should be on the spiritual care and ecclesial oversight of the pastors actually doing ministry.
413. Our Synod and Districts should work in harmony.
414. Over overall plan for the church body, but also see next comment in point 14
415. Streamlining processes need to occur, but this mean purging the current administrative.
416. Must allow for regional differences
417. There may be regional differences that might stand in the way of a single plan
418. There should be one strategic plan lead by Synod. The districts should be minimal and split into two, a west and east.
419. Focusing on the basics ... while empowering congregations and mission organizations to take the lead in identifying strategies best-suited/needed for their communities.
420. Certainly in general terms - the great commission, yes? Specifically, the individual congregations must determine how best to meet the needs of their area.
421. I thought that was what it meant by 'walking together'.
422. It is my opinion that the ABC District marches to a different drum than the Eastern District, thank heavens!
423. We all need to pull in the same direction. That being said, if Synod remains divided into three Districts, each District should have input into what that direction should be relative to their needs.
424. This would avoid a "watering down" of focus and emphasis, since Synod and Districts currently function as largely separate entities.

425. Synod needs a strategic plan for the areas that are entrusted to it and, likewise, Districts need a strategic plan of their areas of responsibility.
426. I'd argue the future of Synod just shouldn't involve the districts.
427. Strategy needs to reflect the specific contexts of oversight. i.e. strategy in Regina will likely be different than what is needed in Toronto.
428. This presumes there should be Districts - this question is happening way too early in the process.
429. .....provided that Districts are retained in this restructuring process.
430. Depends on the form of structure to be taken. they double on some things at the moment but are indecent on some.
431. While each District may be challenged to implement that plan in a unique way, the overall objectives and direction need to be united.
432. Our problem is that we are three districts with vested interests. We need to be one Church in Canada-- we only have 300 or so congregations!! We can't afford to have four structures, two seminaries, and maybe even two distinct theologies that underlie our decisions. ds
433. with different "sub plans" tailored to individual districts and regions within districts (e.g., an approach that works in Greater Vancouver may not work in Saskatoon).
434. There should be one strategic plan that aligns the vision and mission of LCC, but individual operational plans as to how that will happen in the various geographic areas of the country. Even within a district, the goals and strategies required/implemented may be varied.
435. I think it would bring more unity to our synod.
436. That makes sense. We are not a large synod. Districts in the LCMS have more congregations than LCC.
437. Again the presence of four plans for 70,000 members is absurd. Naturally a unified plan would have sub-sections for districts, but it should be a unified plan, where each district understands its place in the broader entity.
438. Absolutely! We are one church. One vision. One purpose. One mission.
439. ~ if the Districts and Synod stay separate with different Boards there would be logically things that work in one District that may not be as effective as in the next, if the day comes we are just Synod only then some programs may have a slightly more challenging time. Unfortunately, I can't picture specifics, but having lived in all three Districts I do realize "one size" doesn't fit all. Where there are District level items this doesn't preclude sharing between Districts.

14. The Districts and the Synod should plan separately, as they do now.

1. See 13. Your questions seem to be so vague that I start disliking this whole survey. And also there was not enough “advertising” in the congregation about this survey and too tight a deadline. This whole thing seems not thought through and planned very well.
2. 1 Bride - Church
3. but with focus to common goal, sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ.
4. Plan and amalgamate your plan to save costs.
5. What a waste of time and energy.
6. I think at best some coordination is needed.
7. Enhance communication so each District is informed of what others are working on/planning. This would help us grow!

8. Planning and working separately gets away from working together. Separate districts allow for separate "empires"
9. Enhance communication so each District is informed of what others are working on/planning. This would help us grow!
10. Agree (for the Districts). But must be enhanced so that other districts are informed of their plan in a timely manner.
11. It should be one.
12. We need more unity - broader thinking.
13. Overall the goal is the same but the application has to be localized.
14. Why are you copying yourself? Same question as 13.
15. Each district needs to plan but there needs to be a central or key focus for the Synod.
16. I think they should plan separately, but also be in regular communication with each other to avoid unexpected surprises.
17. There needs to be agreement and cooperation.
18. Planning separately does not support a consistent, cohesive direction for our church.
19. Everybody should be on the same page.
20. This makes zero sense in a church body as small as ours.
21. There should be coordination where possible, but different Districts may have different needs and priorities.
22. They can plan separately to reach the one strategic plan.
23. You cannot have a team of horses with one pulling one direction and the other pulling in the opposite direction.
24. There is a need to reduce overhead, fewer clergy in admin positions means more clergy in congregations.
25. Depending on what subjects?!!
26. Who cares?
27. Synod should be more unified in its mindset walking together in the Gospel. A Bishop at the head of Synod with a college of Bishops, including the District level would help in this matter.
28. separate plans cause division. communication is important.
29. Should work well if district takes hold like a family -> grandparent ->parent -> children passed down "can be" effective.
30. Clearly there is room for improvement but Districts are very different as are their customs, congregations and communities.
31. I think we would be better served if we did this jointly.
32. Should work together
33. Dos this imply Districts and Synod remain?
34. As technology draws us closer together, there is no reason why we cannot plan at a synodical level. It would also aid in drawing us closer together as a church. We would discover that we have more in common when it comes to the challenges we face.
35. I feel at this time that we have to unify and stand as one, as the world becomes increasing hostile towards us.
36. The work of the church in Canada I believe is different from the work of LCC on an international basis. To that end, the plans might look quite different. I do believe that the planning should be done in conjunction with each other.
37. "Walking together."

38. For 13 & 14, I'm reflecting the common consensus I think I've heard, with the idea being "this is too much, we've got to change." However, I'm not aware of the variations of need that may lie behind the districts -- is it truly practical to try to put everything under one plan? If so, it seems good; yet it would seem there needs to be adaptability to address truly different kinds of needs in certain areas of administration.
39. I agree that each district has unique needs, but Synod should be the umbrella over all. Not to say that there is never exceptions to the rule.
40. What ever works best.
41. Canada is a big divergent country, each geographical area probably has different needs, i.e. far north versus heavily populated south. My pastor has in-depth understanding of the needs of his parish that Synod probably would not be cognizant of.
42. I cannot agree or disagree with this question because it presupposes that districts will continue to exist as they do now. That is a presupposition that needs to be challenged. I think districts should be dissolved entirely. However, planning can still happen on a regional level (however large we decide those regions to be).
43. Working together is important so that all LCC congregations are in line with the doctrine of LCC.
44. Districts are there to look after their own, whereby Synod would need to divide their efforts among three districts. The choices the Synod makes might cause dissention among the three Districts if each District felt their needs weren't being met.
45. There should be an overall view that is the same for both. Some local issues should still be handled by each District but the direction and LCC plans for expansion and delivery of the word should be done as a whole. Each District should have its' say however at the end of the day everyone should be doing the same thing.
46. results in confusion, missed opportunities, duplication, etc.
47. Districts are there to serve the needs of their own areas, whereby Synod would need to divide their efforts among three Districts. These choices might not pacify all and cause dissention among the Districts. Also it is good to be able to put a face to those you are dealing with and know that your concerns / ideas / opinions are being heard.
48. This is in keeping with the Thesis of Walther, which were approved by a convention of the Missouri Synod at its founding to become the official doctrine of the synod. If the synod begins dictating plans for the entire church, our church becomes a top-down organization. This would be unacceptable as it would not be in keeping with doctrines upon which our church is based.
49. The planning should be done together with all districts involved and preferable more lay people than clergy. After all are we not a "grass roots" church. Whoever plans must ensure that the will of God is uppermost in the equation and the end result will give glory to God.
50. I am all for streamlining. The church has too many committees and conventions as of now.
51. But better accountability both ways.
52. Canada is a big diverse country, each geographical area probably has different needs, i.e. far north versus heavily populated south. My Pastor has an in-depth understanding of the needs of his "parish" that the Synod would never be cognizant of.
53. Separate plans, maybe, but they should be in chorus with each other.
54. However, central coordination (resources etc.) are useful as to avoid reduplication as well as finding people – resources with special skills.
55. In some areas it might work but some areas are very different and need special alternatives.

56. There is some need to plan separately, but also there is a need to be in communication with each other so districts and Synod are more coordinated in their efforts and conjunctive when and where they can be.
57. The Districts need to make it mandatory to follow the synod plan but also add their own details as long as alignment is maintained.
58. Although this allows for flexibility and unique district styles of function, it also permits districts to pull in their own direction and create their own heartache.
59. Again, this question is not necessary, it reiterates the same point as the previous question (#14).
60. It seems to me there are duplication of resources at District and Synod.
61. To what extent is planning done separately, or in common?
62. But working towards the same strategic plan
63. I believe one specific and common direction or strategic plan for Synod would help our church body focus its' efforts effectively, particularly if this plan were missional. However, I think each district or region would have to look at different ways of carrying out the strategic plan based on geographical and cultural contexts of
64. Agree, however you're forgetting that the parishes should be at the forefront, not district or synod.
65. Districts should be given tactical responsibility.
66. Refer to the execution of plans to specific needs of each district. Not in conflict with the common goals of the whole Synod.
67. But towards the same strategic plan as the base
68. I think there needs to be more open communication and less duplication
69. what amount of money is required for doing it separately and why is it done?
70. Too many chiefs (cross duplication and legalism creeps in.)
71. There needs to be communication. Avoid duplication.
72. Again, the question assumes the work of the District and Synod is to develop a strategic plan. Secondly, it seems as though it is a "tail wagging the dog" question. This survey should be about developing a structure for the Synod. The planning would be a function of the structure that is in place, which we would find a way to work within.
73. Using "One Strategic Plan"
74. The Districts should be dissolved and a new Synod structure put in place.
75. This autonomy allows the districts to most effectively conform and help serve the churches that make up the districts. An overarching body over all of Canada trying to serve all individual communities would be a complete failure.
76. Synod should serve the district.
77. There should be some level of integration of District plans with those of Synod
78. If you are restructuring, you should work together as a team.
79. It should be shared. Certainly planning at a District level is best for District level things. If it is not already it should be defined what is planned at a Synod level and what is planned at a District level
80. We are LCC Canada! Can't function the way it is going, too much decentralized power and vertical silos, kingdoms.
81. Working together could allow us to more effectively use resources.
82. There needs to be a PLAN, but that plan must be flexible enough to recognize the differences between the Districts and Synod to deliver to each area. The same general plan is

presented to cities and to rural areas always keeping in mind that each area is vastly difference in working ideas, manpower and presentation.

83. IF indeed "Districts and Synod plan separately, as they do now" why is that so? It seems that this is a strategically placed question to deflect Synod responsibility for the CEF disaster to me.
84. Do the Districts plan? If yes, what do Districts plan?
85. need more info
86. Don't know or understand enough on this subject to make a decision.
87. If they stay as independent entities
88. I'm not sure I know all aspects of synodical and district planning. Districts should plan their own district conventions and such. However, if this involves planning "how to engage the present culture with the gospel" or "how to meet the needs of the community in it's context"...I am opposed to such visioning in principle. There is one gospel, one church, one lord Jesus Christ and one devil wolf who scatters the sheep. Therefore, there is one strategy for ministry: preach the gospel when it is convenient and when it's not. No gimmicks or programs are necessary. I believe the church today obsesses too much over such things as "finding new ways to meet people where they are at." The bible tells us where people are at. If they are outside Christ, then they are at war with God and probably don't know it. If they are in Christ, then still their struggle is not against flesh and blood, but the spiritual powers in the heavenly places. From one side of the globe to the other, we all inherit the same sin from the same Adam; and need the same salvation from the same saviour. The gospel is the program.
89. the synod should plan the "big picture" and the District plans in greater detail and personalizes it to how it suits their district and specific areas
90. For the same reasons as already expressed.
91. I get the feeling from these questions that you are moving away from 3 districts to one unit. And I am just on the fence (i.e. don’t know enough) to decide whether that is a good idea. I imagine the restructuring moves at avoiding crises such as that faced by ABC in the future, but then what if the crisis had been for the whole church rather than compartmentalized into one district had such a merger happened earlier. I just don' t know. I have been part of East District and ABC in the past and appreciated at the time how each district catered to the needs of such different regions.
92. as long as they avoid overlap costing extra admin costs
93. Synod should always be aware of what goes on. In all three Districts.
94. There has to be some continuity
95. We are a small denomination with limited resources and we will in all likelihood continue to decline as most denominations in the western, developed world are. We don't need to "over-plan".
96. there should be geographical representation
97. Districts and Synod can plan together and plan separately according to local conditions
98. What does "plan" mean? - Developing strategic plans or merely coordinating various activities carried out at various levels? (Responses to this question will be all over the map, depending on how responders interpret this.)
99. Planning separately is also effective, considering the differences that are seen in the various regions and provinces. Planning separately allows each district to address regional needs but it does hinder a unified vision.

100. See above. It depends on the structure. The districts executing a centrally developed plan would seem to make sense in a flattened church structure.
101. Part of the strength of the current organizational plan (at least in theory) is that it allows geographical areas to focus on the specific needs of their particular area.
102. Causes problems, misunderstandings, power struggles, you name it.
103. I think one plan would assist in providing further understanding, the same communication in each geographical area, not to mention a common bond. Additionally, I think we get caught up in these initiatives and meetings for four levels (three districts, one synod) which shadows our focus.
104. This does not seem conducive to efficient administration.
105. Do we need both?
106. If it is possible it may be good. Each district has its own character and it could prove challenging with some districts being more liberal than others.
107. I question the accuracy of this statement.
108. because of our over governance.
109. see above. I disagree with the presupposition of the statement.
110. If the majority agrees with this statement, both the Districts and the Synod should ensure all plans fit within the overall plan put forth by the Synod.
111. I have had the opportunity to visit a number of LCC churches across Canada and there are huge variety in these congregations which I see as healthy and necessary. I have great fear about having one governing body. When you go through a call process, for example, it is very reassuring to know that your district president knows you, knows your particular congregation and can help you in the call process because of in-depth knowledge of its pastors, candidates, and its people. This would be lost if there was only one governing body and I BELIEVE CONGREGATIONS WOULD BE NEGATIVELY IMPACTED.
112. Its time for change.... lets not turn inward and keep church members second guessing. Do we need 4 Presidents, do we need how many first Vice Presidents how many second vice presidents this goes on and on! Please....get with the 21st century Run Gods House like we mean business!!
113. I think there needs to be some overlap in planning but that there are certain individual needs of districts that need to be evaluated and addressed separately.
114. Not convinced that we really need the infrastructure and inherent cost of separate districts.
115. Ineffective use of resources.
116. There should only be ONE Plan and there should be NO Districts.
117. After the overall plan for the synod is done.
118. Another trick question
119. Probably better to do this together.
120. If you follow #13, then #14 does not make sense.
121. Plan what? Their own district conventions, yeah I suppose. Plan "how to engage the present culture with the gospel" or "how to meet the needs of the community in its context", Absolutely not. There is one gospel, one church, one lord Jesus Christ and one devil wolf who scatters the sheep. There is one strategy for ministry, preach the gospel when it is convenient and when it's not...no gimmicks or programs, just do it. You don't need to meet people where they are at. If they are outside Christ, then they are at war with God and probably don't know it. If they are in Christ, then still their struggle is not against flesh and blood, but the spiritual powers in the heavenly places. From one side of the globe to the

other, we all inherit the same sin from the same Adam; and need the same salvation from the same saviour.

122. However, see previous comments. The districts should not (and I think, do not) plan in isolation from the synodical strategic plan. Therefore, I do not accept the premise of the question that synod and districts plan separately.
123. but they should be complimentary
124. They should work together, but do their own things regionally
125. I think there is value in both a collective synod plan, as well as district/regional plans. One blanket plan may not best suit the needs of certain localities.
126. District plans should support the one strategic plan of Synod.
127. There should be some good reuse of planning efforts. After reuse, the Districts' planning could be coordinated across all Districts and be revised accordingly.
128. The old model isn't working, at least in ABC District.
129. If the Districts and Synod plan separately, we aren't walking together.
130. Allow for diversity, celebrate your diversity, but don't let it keep you from working together.
131. No. The current set-up isn't working well. There's not enough sharing of resources between districts, and there is a lack of common purpose.
132. However, as stated in #13, plans need to come together somehow. This would show that we are all engaged in this together.
133. I believe one specific and common direction or strategic plan for Synod would help our church body focus its' efforts effectively, particularly if this plan were missional. However, I think each district or region would have to look at different ways of carrying out the strategic plan based on geographical and cultural contexts of regions and communities.
134. Assuming that the structure of Districts and Synod remain the same, I think there would be value in beginning planning together and working in the Districts separate to carry out plans in light of the regional contexts.
135. Districts may have challenges that must be addressed and one-size-fits-all won't work.
136. For issues relevant only to specific districts/circuits.
137. don't know anything about either so can't make an opinion
138. Pooling resources including plans should be one of the main functions of the Synod. Why duplicate? Why experiment if something has already been successfully tried elsewhere?
139. Because they have two different focuses, they should plan separately. As suggested in question 13, however, the District plans should fall out of the national Synod plan. The District plans should support the national plan.
140. Redundant question
141. The theological divisions in Synod are apparent by how different districts plan.
142. Using Synod's plan and then adapt to District
143. Not well-informed.
144. Districts and Synod plans should promote a cohesive plan that strengthens each other
145. Synod needs to remain aware that there are cultural and economic differences from one side of the country to the other. Districts are necessary to identify and manage these differences. Currently, each congregation manages its own territory with little regard for the national focus. Additionally, most congregation members have no idea what LCC's vision might be.
146. One vision, one mission. Let's work together... What would be bad about that?
147. I think that separately, we can concentrate on individual mandates while still working for the common good.

148. separation of some practices between districts is likely required.
149. They should plan separately in those areas that are specific to their areas of responsibility, but work together and cooperate with one another to support each other at the same time.
150. one plan for all
151. Yes -- because of the differences in areas of the country -- BUT there must still be an over-riding commitment to the path we are "walking together' -- and the having of a co-operative spirit. The problems exist when "region" trumps togetherness
152. But this would be true only in certain areas.
153. We need to cultivate a spirit of unity in LCC instead of a federation of districts. Redundant question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey.
154. No need for three district offices, but still need geographical representation.
155. Don't need # numbers. Someone local
156. Synod should have the basic strategic plan and the District adjust the plan were needed for better implementation in the District.
157. They should plan overall strategy together, allowing for different approaches in different regions.
158. No data to indicate if a change is required
159. I believe that there will be need of local arrangements for church activities in some way, shape, or form. Whether that needs a district structure and office managed or not, that needs to be determined. If the areas are small enough (and therefore manageable enough), could the pastors share the responsibilities to arrange events themselves without a district office and staff?
160. I have found over the years that some districts are more open to mutual planning with the synod, in the sense of similar convention themes, agreeing to ideas and programs that do not protect their "turf."
161. While strategic planning needs to be done at the district (regional) level, coordination between the districts is essential.
162. Synod should provide the Synod Plan with Districts adopting according to District needs and opportunities.
163. Don't know enough about this.
164. Synod should have some sort of master plan and the Districts can adopt and adapt as necessary.
165. for the love of God - join committees and work together - save some money please.
166. More congregations & people joining forward in same direction(s) more successful.
167. I think that they can definitely plan together for certain areas and projects, but also need some freedom to respond to particular needs and concerns for their particular areas.
168. We are too small to have separate districts and an overarching synodical board.
169. At present the Synod and Districts have respective responsibilities and require their own strategic plan. The plans can be coordinated and provide mutual support.
170. We need to maintain our own District as well as working with LCC.
171. Plan together nationally, then you can carry out the work separately.
172. If the Districts are to continue to be part of the structure. The crisis with the ABC District seems to highlight a real disconnect between the District and National Church. The National Church seems to have little idea of what the District is doing, lax or non-existent financial

oversight and little influence. At least that is the perception of someone very much on the fringes and with inadequate information to make a more informed judgement.

173. Currently, we do not, as a Synod, share the Gospel of our Saviour with the 24% of Canadians who speak French. Either we change our ways or we change our name to designate our English - only status and structure.
174. Districts should still fall under and be responsible to the Synod
175. Could be combined as goals should be similar (survive).
176. We need to be united. Too many things are going off track with individual districts. We need accountability and transparency.
177. Forget planning, we are now in survival mode. Planning involves staff, meetings, travel, etc. There is no more money, it has been promised to the pension plan.
178. Geographical representation is required
179. I suppose it would be useful to combine efforts so that doubling of work doesn't happen and that regional-specific results do happen.
180. BUT communicate and share resources!
181. The Districts of the LCC each have unique challenges and opportunities. The task of addressing the needs of each Province, the varied urban/rural, economic, and cultural contexts, would be an overwhelming task for one level of our Synodical structure. As well there is a vast difference in the understanding of the Mission and Ministry of our church as you travel from East to West.
182. Each region of Canada is very different. Even within provinces there is significant differences between people and communities. The varied contexts call for a localized, regional mission and ministry planning. A centralized, one-size fits all plan simply won't address the ministry and mission of our congregations and church workers.
183. They need to work together on some things I would think. In my mind it would work best if the Synod responds to the needs of the Districts and not the other way around. Synod should not be telling the Districts what they are to do.
184. The synod should remain; the districts should be abolished.
185. I agree with caution - I think there could be a lot of benefit to coordination and sharing of efforts. There has to be a willingness to work together for the greater good of both groups
186. Planning collectively should strengthen overall programing
187. I feel one body the Synod would make LCC much stronger, with a better organized body were members would become aware, involved in the workings of the church and their service to God in unison.
188. The Districts are arranged geographically not by the 'culture' of the churches which is the largest factor to how the churches can do ministry (e.g. one city has many churches while another church
189. Both should focus on a common theme, but carry out their ministries in ways unique to each area.
190. It is the LCC. Why do we have districts? It feels like Canada with it's provinces and territories, different rules for different areas
191. Should co-ordinate to avoid duplication & conflict.
192. Before the vast improvement in technology and ease of travel, the District geography was a challenge. That is no longer the case. It is time to work and plan together under one corporate structure.
193. It should be a joint effort not separate.

194. they need to be on the same page-so is there a need for District as it is now?
195. is this not the same as question 13?
196. Decentralize Planning and Authority.
197. The Districts should be dissolved. The Synod should take over the necessary services. There should be a more effective means of pastoral care to workers and congregations put in place. I wonder whether the Circuit is an effective agent for our mission and ministry today.
198. ???????
199. You could have the Synod going in one direction and the District going in another.
200. Separate is more locally oriented, but costs more to administer and run.
201. I thought the whole point of the "synod" was to be a Family Walking Together in Mission and Ministry. How can you do that if all the members of the "family" make their own plans?
202. Let's all get together so we are all on the same page in the same book.
203. -definite need for more unity and continuity -does Synod always know what each of the Districts is planning, and if not, shouldn't it?
204. They need to do both. Plan separately yet respecting each others common interests and beliefs. I believe that Synod's plan should be held to be the more highly regarded and it is only when the District can demonstrate that it needs to apply itself differently, to meet the needs of its congregations, that it varies from the plan of Synod. At no time should the District plan contravene the doctrine, principals and values set out by Synod.
205. I do not understand the question.
206. We are dying as a church body - We need to make a plan to either radically change what we are doing and hopefully begin to grow or else we should be graceful about dying with some dignity.
207. I think certain things can be planned by the district but other things (the bigger stuff that is generic to all churches) can be planned by Synod.
208. Maybe one strategic plan might make things more efficient?
209. As per #13, there should be no districts.
210. After developing 'one strategic plan', the Districts can implement their own ideas/plans on how to best carry out the 'plan' within their district/area.
211. Wasted energy
212. Two layers of planning are not needed, get rid of the districts.
213. I think separate plans are good - but there should be some kind of over-arching or umbrella plan
214. using co-ordination, synchronization, and partnership as operating guidelines.
215. Although plans should reflect regional needs, there should be a way to identify opportunities for working together and to coordinate/cooperate.
216. Planning should be made as a group with all districts and synod combined
217. Seriously? This is the same question again. ONE SYNOD. NO DISTRICTS. Planning separately has gotten us to this place. To really make a change we actually need to CHANGE.
218. While different areas have different needs, it isn't clear that planning at a "district" level makes any sense... often a circuit or a congregation will need its own plan to suit its circumstances.
219. But the plan must be fair not leaning towards the west.

220. If we are all members of the body of Christ, we all need to be on the same page. It's OK for each District to plan separately up to a point. All District plans should mesh nicely with the plans of the Synod.
221. This is not how it works. No one plans completely separately.
222. Just so long as the outreach works and the congregational support works is fine. If planning together is more effective, then that would be a good thing to try.
223. Different regions have different needs.
224. At one time that could have been so, but now, to make our Synod stronger it should be one!
225. All districts should be planning through a joint meeting as to who is doing what, when and where a more cohesive group with a joint group overseeing that the plan is implemented and monitored periodically. so that if problems arise they can be resolved immediately before going ahead with the next step.
226. With the world as it stands today, we must be united.
227. We should stop pretending it is 1990 and we are part of the LCMS and truly become a Canadian Church with a Canadian made plan and model for how we operate together as a Church body.
228. This assumes/suggests that the Districts and Synod plan separately and in a disconnected manner. That has not been my experience. The Synod and Districts are connected and the vision of the Synod is implemented in the Districts/regions. Unfortunately, because the congregations are not included in this survey a complete picture of how our "body" operates is lost. If the congregations currently make up the "Synod" which is represented "regionally" by the Districts, then what the congregations do in their planning is also important to the other parts of the body. In fact, I would suggest that what the congregations do in their planning and implementation of mission and ministry is the single most important factor in the health of a Synod. This is true for the local and regional footprint of mission and ministry as well as the "shared support, education and international mission" that congregations do together on a National level through the Synod.
229. Really do not know what they do or how they do it.
230. A waste of time and effort.
231. Districts should have a greater amount of contact between them. There is little understanding between the people of each district. The specific "strategic plans" may not necessarily need to be the same between districts, but the communication between districts should be greater and the greater plans of synod should be common for all districts.
232. Each should have one larger goal, yet because it is not authoritarian, each district can plan as well.
233. There should be communication and joint efforts in planning ahead with a freedom of flexibility for each District to adjust plans to fit their circumstances.
234. "As we do now" is not working. If we're going to plan everything separately, maybe we need to just operate as separate and individual congregations.
235. I would have thought that there was already some co-ordination, and that district plans were not made
236. I think the needs of our congregations can be met without the district structure
237. Each does and should have distinct areas of ministry they concentrate on, but an overall, central purpose needs to be maintained front and center.
238. Agree but they should still consult.
239. I do not know what they are doing and so I cannot comment in a vacuum

240. Absolutely not. Get rid of the districts.
241. No one knows what the other plan is doing. Have them work together.
242. Do we have enough members to do this successfully?
243. I'd like to disagree, but is this realistic? Canada is a big country with diverse needs/issues/supports available. Is it possible to provide fair measure to each area?
244. If we can't agree on a common goal, then the only alternative is to going it on their own.
245. There should be one synodical plan with district and local implementation
246. It is best if their planning were coordinated, after all, "synod" means walking together.
247. We are a small Synod, don't know why we don't help each other more throughout the districts and Synod.
248. We should get rid of Districts entirely. We don't need them.
249. Coordinating reports and goals (annually/semi) between the two is a must (e.g. if resources can be shared etc.)
250. See comments on #13. If the "strategic plan" is more like a vision and/or mission statement, then separate planning will take place in each more local context.
251. Why a Synod?
252. That is clearly not working. The number of our congregations is going down and down and down. Whatever we do in the future needs to be done together.
253. Where does the Holy Spirit come in here? I wonder if there is much listening and waiting on the Lord.
254. Again, presuming that there are still Districts (which I don't think anyone should presume), the "division of labour" between national and regional needs to be seriously examined and overhauled.
255. Would like one center
256. They should all plan. The Synod should set the model and Districts should plan separately to implement the Synod model within their own districts. Each district in Canada has its own special needs and idiosyncrasies and hence they plan to utilize the Synod model in their district.
257. If we are not working, planning and thinking the same, we are doomed.
258. Share information and planning to make it more uniform since our goals should be the same: "GET THE GOSPEL OUT THERE". I don't believe we need the same number of executive positions since our church numbers are shrinking. We need to be more efficient and better stewards of both time and treasure.
259. I'm not sure this works any longer. I don't know if we're big enough for this model.
260. The Regions strategic plan should be the same as the Synods plan with the District flavour.
261. Plan separately to support their own people. Report to each other what worked and what does not work. Support each other.
262. Not an efficient use of resources.
263. See comment above. There needs to be a common goal for the entire synod - it's the carrying out of the plan that will look different.
264. They can plan together, but the district maintains its own autonomy.
265. Duplication of services is expensive in both time and money and the District and Synod plans should be the same. After all, should not the goals be the same? We are a Church not competing political parties.
266. One master plan. This should be a no brainer. If we had this in place ABC would not be in the mess it is now

267. Left hand.....right hand.
268. The planning has to be coordinated.
269. The Districts need to plan referring to the National strategic plan. The congregations need to plan using the district's directions.
270. it depends on what topics. some issues are local based like Canadian missions. I need some more information.
271. Are we one group, or are we not? Are we duplicating efforts? Do we all support one another?
272. There is a need for district planning and joint synodical planning so the districts have the same goal.
273. It appears we have created an "us and them" relationship which can't be beneficial.
274. In my opinion, district planning is from the bottom up. Synod planning is from the top down.
275. Need a National Plan
276. The District must look after their own flocks first, but still be part of the overall plan of Synod, i.e. missions overseas, etc.
277. All plans must be compatible
278. Probably
279. All involved need to plan for strategy - the concern should be the strategy and action, not who initiates it. Strategizing need to be an evolving, continuing modus operandi
280. I think some measure of unified planning should happen to set broad goals.
281. It's time to get rid of districts as they currently operate and seriously centralize our planning under a national bishop (or president if you prefer a Latinized form) who serves as our shepherd, as well as CEO. I do give thanks to God that all of the presidents of LCC, in my experience, have been richly blessed as shepherds. And by the way, they, and those who assistant them currently as district presidents, have been properly called by the church through the congregations of their respective synod or districts to be pastors. (Thank you for the opportunity to let off a bit of steam.)
282. The key drivers should be determined by congregations/circuits. Districts/Synod plans should arise from those key drivers.
283. Okay- there needs to be at a high end level a plan at synod but not at the point of constraining the differences of the districts to be able to implement the plan as required for their area.
284. One central office is all that’s needed.
285. Once simple plan that is achievable is better than separate plans that will never come to fruition
286. They should plan in unison, striving for the same goal and helping each other solve each others problems.
287. Answers my question #13.
288. We must "WALK AS ONE" Keeping separate district is not moving forward but retained the old format
289. The key differences within synod is not between the geographical differences between the Districts BUT between urban and small towns and remote areas.
290. Again, the CEF debacle leaves the impression that the executive of the ABC district is not capable of planning anything. Perhaps the Synod could do a better job.
291. Is that effective right now?
292. To accomplish number 13 there will need to be joint planning meetings.

293. Better to be more on the same page.
294. Waste of time and money
295. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
296. They should work together for one common goal!
297. The left hand has to know what the right hand is doing. Also, see my previous comments.
298. if synod could set an agenda/vision for the next year,3 and 5 and let districts develop plans that support the vision and share with other districts be positive
299. common goal Jesus
300. They do plan, right?
301. If a streamlined decision process results in shared goals, fewer administration and overhead costs, this might be worthwhile.
302. If even one district of our LCC cannot handle its finances with integrity, then keep it all under the one umbrella of the Synod.
303. Overall ministry planning and delivery and its effectiveness can be improved with joint planning efforts
304. Seems confusing to have too many chiefs
305. Why would we plan separately when we are one for all & all for one? You know who I mean!
306. I reckon their plans would be similar.
307. Geographically it makes sense for the districts to continue working in smaller areas rather than taking on the whole synod's geographical space. The congregations would be better served by the district workers rather than having synodical workers who would be less knowledgeable about the individual churches. However, the districts could all be more unified under synodical supervision and the finances could be more evenly distributed to the districts.
308. I fear we lack unity right now.
309. If we centralize we will do even less as a body. Either less at home or less aboard. Please don't do that. Area or Districts need to do more together to locally take ownership of reaching out to those in their region. If it is a top down (or centralized plan) less service and outreach will happen in each area!
310. They should plan all together, though every community might have different needs.
311. There is too much duplication in cost.
312. Perhaps if one had paid attention to the other, we wouldn't face this fiasco of destitute parishioners.
313. There are many parts of the body and together we are stronger. No one part is more or less important than the other.
314. Just as there are many parts of the body we need to be united in meeting our mission opportunities across Canada.
315. Synod Theological. Districts administration.
316. As all plans there may be differences in priorities in differing parts of the Synod
317. Districts and the Synod ought to merge to be one.
318. They should plan together, not in a strategic plan sense, but walking together in doctrine and practice.
319. I would support a model wherein the synod sets the course for the church (mission/vision in planning parlance) in concrete but general terms, but the route we take to arrive at the destination ("strategic plan" in planning parlance) is established by our districts in dialogue

with the congregations and pastors in the respective districts. The synod framework should appropriately restrict heterodox practices while allowing congregations SOME flexibility in their planning.

320. That does not encourage unity and the best use of our resources.
321. I think there are still programs that need to be planned by district or broken into larger regional areas for the various parish service ministries as distance will become problematic for planning and running higher level programs. The larger vision, budgets, policies, guidelines would be well served at the Synod level though.
322. As per comments above. However, there would obviously be some issues that would apply to all the Districts as a whole.
323. We need to work closer together to create efficiencies where possible
324. Each district has different needs to the plans should be separate.
325. Dumb.
326. Stupid waste of God given resources.
327. To meet the needs specific to their area.
328. There doesn't seem to be much if any real plan
329. Synodical and national planning for stewardship and evangelism and bible studies. Schools and missions done by the district.
330. The goals should be the same. We may have different projects.
331. How can we be walking together as a Church (as we so often love to describe ourselves) if we're all walking in different directions with different plans?
332. I'd argue the future of Synod just shouldn't involve the districts.
333. Again - another question that's not needed. Covered in #13, so I answer again: This presumes there should be Districts - this question is happening way too early in the process.
334. see #13 above. In a perfect situation Districts would be eliminated.
335. Depends on the form of structure to be taken. they double on some things at the moment but are indecent on some.
336. there should be more coordination, subject to my comment under question (13).
337. Separately, but with a similar "bigger picture" to align the Synod.
338. Planning together will bring unity or at least fruitful discussion on differences in opinion.
339. Our church body is not that large or diverse that we cannot work together.
340. I think that there will always be a need to plan things separately (such as local area missions, regional gatherings and support of church workers). However, much of the planning seems to be repeated in every District.

Section 2: The Restructuring Process

15. The current LCC structure should be open to a major overhaul.

1. Why?
2. Perhaps provide interim professional church workers to assist in struggling congregations. More training could be provided to Pastors in dealing with social issues.
3. To a lay person it's not very clear what is being done. Must be a simpler, less expensive (man power & $) way.
4. What the result should be, I don't know.
5. Hope we can respect and believe the word of God but still INCLUDE OTHERS.
6. I have decided not to answer most of the questions in this section, because I believe most of the lay people in the pew are not familiar with the workings of the district or synod to comment. What are the problems now beside the current situation in the western district? What needs to be changed. We need to be made aware of what is working well and what needs to be changed. I think the survey would have much more impact if more information had been given before the survey was sent out.
7. I believe they are too rigid and not receiving enough of other faiths.
8. L.C.C. should be one structure. This would save money and duplication and help keep unity better.
9. There is always room for improvement but I don't see any need for "major" overhaul.
10. But timing could be wrong especially because of CEF in ABC district.
11. Synod should be in charge, if that's major or minor I don't know.
12. What are the options?
13. The calling process for congregations calling a pastor is absolutely ridiculous! Can't find a "good fit" for your congregation by choosing off of 2 lines of info on a pastor!
14. The present structure has numerous major, moderate, and minor problems that needs to be addressed and resolved.
15. Less bureaucracy needed. More money should be spent at the individual congregation level.
16. Who believes an American model can be effective in the Canadian context? we had an opportunity a decade ago to reorganize and we missed the boat. great ideas about one body with smaller regional structures were submitted and the powers that be protected their own territories. We need a system where synod resource people are assigned to a geographic area that is hallways manageable in area and population. get resource people close to the congregations. Use part time people in areas that can't support the cost. Think about why we need resource people in the first place -- to grow ministry in congregations.
17. Yes ... hopefully to determine the right shape and structure of the church.
18. if we survive this at all. poor LCC actions helped create where we are.
19. I think God is giving us a strong message that it's time for a change. A challenge can turn into a real opportunity if we pause and consider What Would Jesus Do? Stand firm, forgive and never turn away from what we've been called to do in our communities - share the Good News and care for each other.
20. Too outdated - does not meet the needs of the modern world

21. What exactly is it that seems to be needing a major overhaul. The congregations should be kept abreast of all changes.
22. Agreed. However, the extent to which this survey will provide useful information toward that end, remains to be seen.
23. LCC has to be open to this, if it desires to be seen as credible by its member congregations.
24. Why not? I was at the founding convention in 1988 when we essentially copied the format of mother LCMS, a much larger body. It seems time to adapt to our Canadian reality so as to be more efficient and, hopefully, effective.
25. What do you want to change?
26. I thought LCC was doing o.k. until recently, so feel a major overhaul should not be needed.
27. If it can be done to increase effectiveness and efficient use of resources, then it becomes good stewardship; but not just for the sake of change, i.e., because it is perceived as necessary, so many say so, and we "have to do something".
28. Not major... just "tweaked"
29. Fix what needs to be fixed, don't fix what isn't broken.
30. Should be open to a major overhaul if it would be beneficial
31. Do not know
32. LCC needs to open up. For example, open communion - who are we to judge what's in someone else's heart.
33. It was good except for CEF Catastrophe. Continuing changes are always good - time changes things.
34. Well, ABC is not working so it has to in some way.
35. We should restructure Synod with a college of bishops along the lines of the Scandinavian Mission Provence Churches, or along the lines of the SELK as another option. We should avoid gimmicky "business model" style structures
36. There's a good chance that the LCC structure will be majorly overhauled one way or another in the coming years. Best we overhaul it in the way we want to now, before that decision is made for us.
37. it should be done slowly and carefully
38. We likely cannot sustain things as they are especially in the long term.
39. If it's not broken don't mess with it. However, it is never so successful it cannot be improved.
40. As our Western society crumbles, we need to use this time to strengthen our position, cement any cracks and weaknesses and unify as one.
41. Those currently in power should not lead the restructuring process.
42. I think it should be open to it. That does not necessarily it mean it should happen. It depends on other details.
43. I know we're Lutherans, but we need to realise that sometimes change is a necessary and good thing. After more than 25 years of the current LCC experiment, we need to evaluate where we currently are, and be willing to act drastically if the changes we sought to effect with the creation of the LCC are not actually being met.
44. I feel that although LCC can 'pride itself' on standing on the inherent Word of God, there are times when it could be more flexible. In that I mean that, there are times to err on the side of Grace than to follow the Law to the letter. An example of this would be the role of women in the worship service. In a small congregation such as I attend, when our pastor is away and the service falls to the lay persons, we have 3 men in our congregation who would be eligible to lead the service. None of them are comfortable to do this. My question is this . . is

it more God pleasing to not hold a worship service than to have a woman 'read' the sermon that the pastor wrote???

45. If this is what is needed.
46. Care will need to be taken to prevent schism, as we have seen happen when other Protestant churches have instituted major changes.
47. We are over governed for a church body our size. We should be willing to make a big rethink in how we structure ourselves.
48. I don't understand the need for an overhaul. Is the LCC not based on the teachings of Luther? Has what the LCC believes changed?
49. This questionnaire in itself shows a lack of insight into what is needed.
50. Any simplification and lower costs would help.
51. The District level is something good for most local issues we can not assume that each District in practice follows what needs to be done. Changes are something all Districts should make together and insure that the reason we have this church body is being upheld and insuring that more people end up hearing the word as it should be heard. Although some approaches are different from east to west, what we are doing and what we stand for should never be different and if there is then this needs to be corrected. Major changes in funding such as the Church Extension Fund should be done over the whole church body and not each District. We need t insure that if the church extension fund is a proper useful tool for bringing the word to people then it be done with as limited risk of failure as possible. If there is investment through this, we need to see protection in place to minimize the risk of major loss to investors. If the church feels that it is against what we should be teaching, then as a whole the church body should remove such investment schemes totally. It is as much a fundamental issue as a risk to investor issue. We need to sit down as a whole from coast to coast and review what is working and what needs t change. Earmark those we can quickly solve and get them done immediately. Those issues that need more time we need to tackle on an ongoing basis one at a time and get them resolved properly. By doing this we can insure unity across the country as well as insuring all are adhering to the doctrine.
52. Not saying it needs it, but if it does, then do it.
53. probably essential to move forward
54. This questionnaire in itself shows LCC put this together in a hurry without much thought or effort.
55. The structure in place should be adhered to. Issues have arisen when the structure in place is not adhered to. For example, the sale of Concordia college, where the board made a decision without consulting the districts and therefore the congregations. That was wrong. The structure is sound; however, it needs to be adhered to.
56. I do not know
57. The overhaul should be primarily done by lay people who will act in a Christ like manner.
58. do not understand
59. It has too many administrators for a relatively-small organization.
60. Again, the words .... Is the LCC not already OPEN to an overhaul, major or minor? "Open" does not mean doing anything at all, major or minor, overhaul or tweak. I would think LCC is not CLOSED to exploring any possibility.
61. Should be open to discuss what changes would benefit the strength of LCC.
62. We need to have open minds and be open to guidance of the Holy Spirit and much prayer and even more work from the membership to bring ideas forward.

63. Care will need to be taken to prevent schism as we have seen happen in so many other Protestant churches when they unilaterally implemented major changes without full support of the laity.
64. What qualifies as major?
65. But not merely for the sake of change.
66. What does major mean?
67. Open communion and pulpit exchange need major consideration.
68. I think all 8 services would be improved if it came down from Synod.
69. Even though I do not necessarily agree that a major overhaul is required my understanding is that the idea of restructuring was introduced at the last synodical convention and that the delegates voted in favour of pursuing the restructure.
70. Why? It is still not understandable to many as to what the problem is.
71. Massive change can cause too much confusion for everyone involved.
72. I would favor all Districts or Regions--whatever the name--to be under one Synodical Board. The role of synodical vice presidents could be that of ecclesiastical leaders on a district/regional level. The role of circuit counselors could perhaps be extended.
73. My perspective will be clearer as you read through my responses.
74. We need to look at how we can make this work in Canada --not do a leftover of the LCMS structure.
75. Cut administration costs
76. Our governance model and synodical structure is too big for a small church body.
77. Synod and District clearly need to re-evaluate parish priorities. Leave the egos, the bureaucracy, you're not qualified financial managers, and are buried in policy that is irrelevant to church members in small towns and cities across the country.
78. Changes may be needed in light of the current ABC CEF crises be it major or minor depends on how the issue is resolved.
79. Periodic review and contemplation should take place. When necessary, make changes.
80. Not sure what "major overhaul" would encompass.
81. Too many tiers of management, simplify the process and the message and goals.
82. Yes, the LCC needs a total major overhaul but you will make that same silly mistakes and flood the platform with all ministers and very little lay people. You do not think that the lay people are capable and thing only ministers can make these decisions...that is why you are in this terrible mess
83. Again, I don't know...but I do know that participation in church is declining and we need to change that with a strong vision and by people interested in fulfilling God's word
84. What does the change look like?
85. We would have to know what the overhaul would look like first.
86. What is LCC structure - very little is know to parishioners
87. Could some of the services (boards) be combined? Hold meetings on line.
88. Too much bureaucracy
89. We should be open to the best model of structure that meets our needs and is Biblical, regardless of whether it is only tweaking or providing a major overhaul. This question basically asks, "how much work should we be willing to do?" which is the wrong starting point. Start with the needs, then develop the structure.
90. ? Is it Time?
91. The Districts should be dissolved!!

92. I am just not qualified to respond
93. We should not be looking to restructure our theologically based Waltherian structure. Instead, we should be looking at how we have attempted to hold power as synods and districts over the people and how that has caused failure in the church. Districts and Synod are meant to serve the Church of individual congregations, not govern and hold power and authority over them.
94. Yes, it is time to review our structure. There is some duplication and some service that we provide that can be handled outside our country better. It may come up later but even though we want to have "home grown" Pastors we are too small to have two seminaries let along one. we would be better to develop an bursary or scholarship fund in Canada and send our students to the bigger seminaries in the USA.
95. The structure of power, from most to least: People District Synod That NEEDS to be maintained.
96. Wish I knew a little more about nature of problems or things to be improved and the different potential models of how to restructure versus how synod is structured now in order to answer better in this section.
97. As long as there is enough financial separation between the districts the structure is OK.
98. Depends on the how weak we find the current structure of LCC is now.
99. We have to trust our leadership to figure out what is the best plan for our church going forward.
100. I'm not certain that it is needed but it's ok to be open to it.
101. We should be cautious that we do not let the situation in ABC district cloud our judgement regarding the overall structure and operation of synod and districts.
102. More info on how they currently operate is required.
103. Yes, but it has already had many that have offered their help, with Prof. expertise in laity or ignored when reports produced. Not hopeful this one will solve anything. No accountability and not enforced with right approach with appropriate consequence. Moses and other leaders including Luther used much stronger drastic measures. We have done too little too late. By the time this latest survey after town halls etc. and convention election and resolutions happen is too little too late, there will be very little left by the time this latest project is published. The Pastors in District should have had a plan to act on Jan. 5/2015. They did not on their core business and still don't on spiritual matters. The pulpit is tainted in some of our Churches.
104. I don't see the need for a complete overhaul based on the knowledge that I have.
105. I suppose my question is what part of structure are we changing? Or are we reflectively looking at how synod is set up and whether we have truly been following that structure? Our structure should look at where we are situated in the world, though, and what strengths and challenges we face as we walk together as a confessional Lutheran church body in Canada.
106. I object to the word "major". I am certain we could tweak the structure and do some overhauling, but I shudder at the word "Major" as a large overhaul will lead to confusion, misunderstanding and upset. Change is usually not handled easily. Structure changes may have to happen over several years
107. should be open to major overhaul, if this is what is deemed as necessary. Not change for change's sake.

108. This door should not be closed. If needs fixing, fix it, if after due consideration it is decided it's good, then celebrate success and leave it alone. It should be open, but may only need minor refinements.
109. There needs to be good stewardship of the resources available. There needs to be clear accountability and enforcement of whatever rules and regulations that are set in place. I believe that the ABC CEF situation was not adequately overseen by Synod and that was a grave error that could have been avoided. We need to learn from this and have safeguards in place so any type of trust eroding situation such as this cannot happen in the future. The buck has to stop somewhere and everyone needs to know where. Someone has to admit responsibility for the actions of those in leadership.
110. We have talked about this for far too many years. It is time.
111. It would have been nice to have had information why we even need restructuring
112. The structure we have been using seems to have been successful and good for the church as a whole.
113. need more info
114. All I have heard so far is something to the effect that we have tried to fit a big constitution into a little synod and it has proven inefficient. Maybe so, but specifically I haven't heard what the problems are. I'm beginning to wonder if this is not trying to blame the structure for the sins of the people. Yes, our synod has failed on numerous fronts and especially of late. However, why should we believe these failures are inherent in the structure? If my boss asked me why I repeatedly show up late for work and I said because my car won't start; it might be reasonable for him to suggest that I buy a new car. But if the reason my car won't start is because I don't turn the key, then the problem is not with the car but the driver. I am becoming convinced that the problem with our synod is not the constitution, but with the synodical officers not "turning the key". The problem seems to be with synodical officers who are not exercising the duties of their office (Ecclesiastical Supervision) and instead spending time and resources doing other things they shouldn't (EnCharis). The problem also seems to be with members of synod--congregations and pastors--disingenuously retaining the Lutheran name while moving farther and farther away from Lutheran Doctrine and Practice. It is evident to me that our beloved synod is in disagreement, and yet it appears impotent to talk openly about the things that divide it. This leaves officials and members to retreat into themselves and do what is right in their own eyes. The system requires everyone to do their job, but the reality appears to be that no one is doing their job and at the same time wondering why the system won't take them anywhere. The constitution is being ignored in letter and spirit, and because of it, Ecclesiastical Supervision within the synod has become in my experience a legal fiction.
115. The synod needs to be an organization of congregations, NOT pastors and congregations; and should only have clergy advisors just like LLL and LWML
116. Again, I am not someone who knows about inner workings of large organizations to understand how it works now versus options of how it could work.
117. need to open up all Districts into one Large District
118. don't really much about but overhauls cost time & money which could be used to further the gospel instead of useless admin
119. The synod would do best with neither a "restructuring" nor a "major overhaul," but it does need "severe pruning back" of "dead and diseased wood."
120. If you are looking for total destruction.

121. No overhaul should be contemplated until it's clear what isn't working and why a change is necessary. e.g. see answer to #17 and #21.
122. od.
123. I agree that it needs to be reviewed always. Some things are too rigid and are too legalistic and distract from the simple message of salvation, so mankind has to study everything to death and make it legalistic and impossible for simple humans to feel good with it.
124. We can not attempt to be like the much larger LCMS. We are a large country with a small population. We need creative solutions for managing ourselves. We need to use technology (websites, skype, email, conference calls etc.) to make communication as cost effective as possible. We need to simplify, remove and streamline positions that are redundant or ineffective (organizational/business) and add positions that are desperately needed (ecclesiastical).
125. Only if one fixes what needs to be fixed and leaves alone that which doesn't need fixing. Complete financial disclosure would be helpful.
126. I believe that one body could provide direction through the membership of our congregations to reduce the man hours consumed by potentially four different entities in our midst.
127. For the questions in this section (15-21) I am putting my trust in those who are in charge of these matters, whether the required change is major or minor. I have not been part of LCC for very long. All I can draw on regarding restructuring is my experience as a serving member of the military. Sometimes major changes in Command and Control are necessary, and are a normal part of effective operations. Some changes have a lasting impact though, e.g. when bases close and we sell off prime real estate and assets, we cannot get them back. But, of course, the military is not the Church.
128. The basic structure of the church in that the members of the church make decisions collectively in a democratic manner is very important to me. I would not agree with a structural change of this magnitude. If the church were to organise itself into a top down structure in a manner consistent with, say, the Anglican church, it would fundamentally alter one of the reasons I feel the Lutheran church fits well for me.
129. I think re-evaluation is healthy and may lead to a better way to do ministry in the Synod.
130. What does major overhaul mean? What is involved?
131. Overhaul if necessary but not necessarily an overhaul simply because it can be done. There needs to be a good reason to make major change, not simple change for change sake.
132. Without change, there is never improvement.... just decay.
133. I believe we are over-governed and could save resources if we made the structure
134. simpler.
135. What are the problems?
136. we should always be looking for ways to make things better but I don't see this as the crises in our church. I see the crises in our church as being our inability to make our loving saviour and His message of salvation relevant to a world that is growing more and more secular every day. Me don't change the message but we certainly have to change the method.
137. If we are going to make any changes, we should be open to major changes as well.
138. Reduce bureaucracy and infrastructure.
139. LCC is over-governed and accountability is missing.
140. After 28 years, let's review every area.
141. We have had restructuring processes but someone usually objects. I remember one time when all three District presidents opposed the plan and 3 years later they retired.

142. Might wake us up.
143. Nationally we are too small to have separate administration for these districts and nationally too
144. It's top heavy.
145. All I have heard so far is something to the effect that we have tried to fit a big constitution into a little synod and it has proven inefficient. Maybe so, but specifically I haven't heard what the problems are. I'm beginning to wonder if this is not trying to blame the structure for the sins of the people. Yes, our synod has failed on numerous fronts and especially of late. However, why should we believe these failures are endemic to the structure? If my boss asked me why I showed up late for work and I said because my car wouldn't start for the dozenth time; it might be reasonable for him to suggest I buy a new car. But if the reason my car wouldn't start is because I repeatedly neglected to turn the key, then the problem is not with the car but the driver. I am becoming more and more convinced that the problem with our synod is not the constitution, but with the synodical officer not exercising the duties of their office, and with members of synod--congregations and pastors--disingenuously retaining the Lutheran name while moving away from Lutheran Doctrine and Practice. Our synod is in such disagreement that it can't talk openly about the things that divide it. This leaves officials and members to retreat into themselves and do their own thing. The system requires everyone to do their job. The reality is no one is doing their job and wondering why the system won't take them anywhere. The constitution has become a legal fiction, and the synod has almost caught up to it in that respect.
146. It all depends on what is perceived as wrong with the current structure & what the purpose of restructuring is, neither of which has been clearly enunciated to date.
147. Whatever would enable us to achieve our goals.
148. Why is this necessary? What are the objectives? I believe we require more information!
149. trying to accomplish this could result in attempting to do too much at one time and have a detrimental outcome due to too many unforeseen questions that arise
150. Change is certain. Growth is optional. We should always be open to looking at best practices, and managing a PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, and Adjust) model for church/circuit/district/synod operations.
151. I haven't seen any diagnosis of problems requiring structural changes.
152. The structure we currently have was patterned after the American experience. We need to take the Canadian context (large geography and small population, especially a small Lutheran population) into consideration. The districts unnecessarily reduplicate services that a more unified national office could provide. The administrative bloat of the districts could then be eliminated. The continuing need for regional ecclesiastical supervision would be better served by reconfiguring the districts/circuits (with a name change to "dioceses") and setting up spiritual (rather than administrative) leaders in these new regions. These leaders (most appropriately called "bishops") would provide ecclesiastical support and guidance to the pastors/deacons/congregations in their diocese, while pointing administrative questions/concerns back to the national office.
153. Open to see options.
154. I would use the word "could" instead of "should". In light of the current situation in the west, it is important to look at why it happened, what will be the short and long term outcomes and what will be the consequences. Then restructuring might begin to occur.
155. Our governance model and synodical structure is too big for a small church body.

156. I think that we need to come to this matter with openness to new approaches and structures.
157. "Overhaul" should be "review". Statement seems to be looking for carte-blanche go-ahead to whatever.
158. Don't know anything about LCC. Should be explained
159. Not sure why it needs restructuring. What, exactly, has not been working? Is it because there is no growth in membership? Because of the CEF crisis in the ABC District? Because of money problems?
160. Redundant to #16
161. There are a lot of good things in place however, trying new things to help certain areas could be beneficial such as outreach of keeping people informed in areas, inviting others to church events & meetings, trying to get the word out.
162. Not saying the overhaul needs to be major, necessarily. However, we shouldn't oppose major changes due to our natural aversion to change and the upheaval it brings.
163. There needs to have a change. We need to answer to a large body only.
164. Our membership numbers dictate that we require only one board of directors, one body, one convention, total amalgamation of the districts.
165. No need to re-invent wheel - Only fix areas were change will result in a smoother more efficient way to accomplish the goal
166. Major or minor overhaul should meet the needs of working together
167. I believe changes are necessary although I am not educated enough to know the full extent of LCC's authority or mandate.
168. now is an opportune time to be open to an overhaul, especially with ABC being forced into its own overhaul.
169. One could be open to a major overhaul if that is what is needed. One must look at what works and what doesn't. Cost effectiveness
170. What we have was built up on theological and practical grounds over a period of many years. It would be foolish to believe that we could do better by sitting down for a few hours and changing things without exploring first why we are the way that we are today.
171. It is dying -- and needs total revitalization!!
172. We should not try to fix the things that are working well.
173. change is always good = moving forward instead of backward, or stuck with old rules/opinions
174. I have been a LCMS / LCC church member all my life. I see tremendous opportunities being missed as we are stuck in a rut. Example from the 1960's: Mom loved the music from Tennessee Ernie Ford, but there was no way our ministers would allow any music to be used that was not in our Hymnal. Incredible! Today is not much different in most of our LCC churches, and a much of the contemporary music is so uplifting. Unfortunately, this music is often criticised for being "entertaining". However, what is wrong with bringing people into the church and then sending them out the door after hearing the minister's message and having a song in their heart for the following week?
175. We can safely get rid of the districts. The circuit level is much the more important structural level. And on principle we should be open to anything if only to understand something enough to refuse it.
176. If there is not going to be a serious and major overhaul, then please stop the restructuring process now. All three Districts and the previous Synodical conventions formally and

resoundingly asked the CCMS for a major restructuring. Proposing anything less would be to snub to the congregations and members of Synod.

177. We are not the LCMS so is time we stop acting like them.
178. Long overdue
179. Have competent people administering this.
180. No need to re-invent the wheel - but fix areas that will benefit from change if the result is a smoother more efficient way of achieving the goal.
181. We should feel free to scrap every notion we have of the structure of LCC and start from scratch. I'm not saying that's necessarily what we need to do, but if we feel that the issues we are facing are founded in core central principles, then we should not be afraid to abandon our entire model and seek to find/build something that will better allow us to proclaim Christ as we walk together.
182. This sounds like a desperate and an unnecessary move. When you start saying major overhaul I'm thinking big box no message charismatic church. No thanks.
183. but let us hear what is going to be proposed first
184. Would we be open to different regional divisions (by Provinces or larger Circuits) with a Scriptural-type Bishop/Overseer, who could actually be able to connect with people and workers more effectively?
185. If there is a radical idea that would best serve our needs as a large country size-wise, but small church in number wise, then we should look into it rather than just going with the status quo.
186. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
187. Let's "blow it up" and start from scratch.
188. No need to re-invent the wheel - but fix the areas were needed for a more efficient smooth operation eliminating overlap if advisable.
189. Be cautious and take in multiple contributions of thought and guidance. Much prayer & financial responsibility needed. Consider opportunities to have joint ministry with other Christian denominations for some programming (e.g. children's, youth, family, Bible study programs etc.). Consider in some communities, to have joint parishes with another denomination, when having multiple small churches is not viable. Need visioning for the future to open our doors and be more welcoming and flexible. Consider how Christ would have the overall Christian church structured in this decade and going forward.
190. Don't know enough about the problems.
191. I think Pastors have the best opinions, experience, etc. with this question.
192. not working now - or we wouldn't be having this discussion
193. There is too much structure. Not many understand it.
194. Not sure if I would use the word, "major", but certainly an "overhaul" would be appropriate.
195. Not educated enough present situation to know.
196. Obviously we weren't doing things well. Society/culture has been undergoing a major change and we need to adjust our practices so that we can win more for Christ.
197. Prior to the formation of LCC the proposed structure was rejected and the LCMS model was adopted. After 25+ years we have finally acknowledged that Canada and its Districts are unique. However, when form follows function we need to have a clearer understanding of the function before we design the structure. At present it appears that a particular form is desired to meet some specific agendas.

198. We are currently far too bureaucratic for our size. Too much replication of positions and offices between synod and districts. Very unwieldy.
199. With a small population and a vast area to cover, we need to use our resources wisely.
200. With all the challenges which face the church, it would seem that a full structural review is warranted, and a willingness to consider radical change be made clear to everyone.
201. I am not certain that we need the structure we currently have. There may be some need for Districts, but not under the current structure. If we maintain Districts, there should be more accountability to Synod. I tend to lean toward elimination of the Districts, but feel there is a need to have some form of local governance, i.e. Circuits
202. Currently, we do not, as a Synod, share the Gospel of our Saviour with the 24% of Canadians who speak French. Either we change our ways or we change our name to designate our English-only status and structure.
203. How can a lay person know this???
204. I believe we "must" be open to a major overhaul.
205. It is not necessary to have 3 separate districts just because Canada is geographically a large country. We now live in a time when it is easy to communicate with people across the country in real time. Technology has made it easier. We need one system in place to create unity.
206. Combining services just makes sense.
207. Reduce overall staff to 10% of current LCC and District staff, and open conventions to the entire church so that there is no guarantee of 50% of positions and 50% of votes held by clergy. I suggest more like 5% for clergy and 95% for laypeople. The mess of the CEF and Pension liability is a result of this skewed idea that Pastors are special and therefore should control both the District and Synod levels of the church. This power has been used to enrich pastors and destroyed the financial stability of congregations.
208. Go slow.
209. Whatever happens should be done with great care to examine what are the priorities of Synod, the cost of those priorities, and what can be done without, while not compromising the proclamation of the Gospel.
210. Efficiency, maximizing the use of technology, doing all we can to streamline structure in an affordable, common sense method.
211. Perhaps we need to try to follow the structure that we had. The synod President needs to use the authority he was given.
212. The leaders of the church should visit all congregations
213. The basic current LCC structure is just fine in serving the needs of our local congregations and church workers. We have a national office that provides national services to church workers and focuses on international outreach. We have local circuits, circuit forums, convocations and District church worker conferences where God's people can meet to discuss mission and ministry opportunities and challenges and develop plans to address those matters. We have three District Presidents who provide ecclesiastical supervision for church workers and congregations and who are assisted in this work by local circuit counselors. The structure doesn't need a major overhaul, but may need some tweaking. What needs to change the "broken people" who fail to utilize the structure we have. Some pastors avoid circuit meetings. They roll their eyes when the subject of circuit forums is raised. Congregations act as silos. Laity are disengaged from the process. No matter what structure

you create, you will still have to address the negative attitudes and values that undermine the current structure.

214. In fact, not knowing what this survey would be, some pastors have worked out entire new structural ideas. Basic to most of the plans and ideas I have seen is eliminating the Districts as currently constituted altogether, leaving Synod and Circuits (which would be enlarged), possibly functioning in 3 regions (along the lines of the current districts) but where regions have no power structures of their own.
215. If it is felt that restructuring would be advantages, then by all means do an overhaul. If the restructuring is being done to get the west out of their financial problems, then I'm against it.
216. The districts should be done away with.
217. Not understanding fully the issues and challenges, I can not say one way or the other. We should always be open to looking at all aspects - be careful not to throw out the baby with the bath water - we do have some good things going for us -how do we figure out what are the things that need to change.
218. A major change in governance is required with checks and balances of authority, increased transparency and accountability to the members of LCC, and vigilance with regard to conflicts of interest.
219. I do not think that categorizing change as 'major' or 'minor' is even relevant - if somethings need improving, then make the change necessary to make it better. If something works effectively already, then let it continue as is. Don't just change for the sake of change or to meet a unit of measure - change to make what is broken better.
220. I do not have enough information to answer properly
221. We have for too long operated as three district that have formed a synod and not a synod that has formed districts. We have operated almost as separate church bodies within the synod. This needs to change.
222. Due to the recent issues with ABC CEF, decline in missions and church attendance require major changes.
223. I feel the way our church is now, with the help of God, we have to keep the lambs we have now and bring more lambs in, we have to work out a plan to have our young people return to church and carry on the work which will be left to them in the future
224. do away with the districts
225. I'm assuming that the major overhaul means that Synod "replaces" the Districts. This is a knee-jerk reaction to the CEF Crisis in ABC District.
226. Why change what is working? It appears that the CEF was the cause of some problems and this should be addressed. In conjunction with the CEF, ABC Dist. problems should be addressed.
227. we live in the past...and if we don't do something soon we will be a dying church like the Shakers
228. Simplification would be good, but you can only pare down so far. ...
229. What would a 'major overhaul' entail? This is so vague!!!
230. We should always be open to change.
231. Should only have one location.
232. The current structure is outdated and over-governed. It is in-effective for meeting the current outreach needs of our Church Body both in Canada and around the world.
233. Minor adjustments more likely needed.

234. The entire church should be changed, with an emphasis on basic governance and direction as well as effective pastoral care, an effective use of our funds, and an effective use of our gifts and people. We need to become a church that is seeking to be a voice for the gospel.
235. Current structure is too costly and ineffective. Many services are duplicated including board of directors, Church Extension Fund, Accounting and Administration.
236. Needs more structure, more accountability, goals should be all the same. Dissolve Districts.
237. Open -- perhaps -- but I don't believe a major overhaul is needed.
238. Trim it down. Too cumbersome!
239. I believe, from what I am told or have read that our mission outreach is still providing care and spiritual help.
240. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. Various time in the past, LCC in convention, proposed change; in Hamilton ABC did what it could to prevent any change. It still did not get off the ground, no one could get a structure that all wanted to buy into. However, that is not necessarily the problem, LCC formerly and currently doesn't practice what it preaches [re: ABC leadership]. It was not the structure that failed but corrupt leadership. Therefore, LCC should be open to change and at the same time LCC does not have to change just for change sake. Perhaps if we had Christian leadership and followed the current structure; it would work.
241. Currently there is no way to hold anyone in District or Synod to account - this needs to be fixed so that nobody is "above the law" and can be brought to justice if they breach our articles of faith or otherwise conduct themselves in a manner inconsistent with our faith and beliefs. The current structure also reflects a time when communication was expensive and it wasn't possible to have a video conversation with someone remotely. Having an elected leader decide cases of adjudication leaves the system open to abuse in that the DP wants to get re-elected, and making an unpopular decision puts him in a conflict of interest position. Investigation and adjudication needs to be done by two separate groups of people so that justice is done and seen to be done.
242. A major overhaul would indicate there were drastic problems in the Church and without these changes the Church will die. So let's not get crazy.
243. I believe that with a church group of 70 K communicants nation wide, to have the current structure is expensive, inefficient and unnecessary.
244. Cost is the central motivator.
245. I do not think that we require any changes to the way the worship services are conducted, or change the hymnal, etc. I like the traditional form of worship. Administratively, many of the resources could be shared. One think one Seminary would be sufficient.
246. A model of autonomy should at least be considered in our church polity. Have more scriptural elders and substantially reduce the greater church hierarchy (and overhead). Harness local initiative and communication methods to more spontaneously organize into larger multi-church projects.
247. We should combine Districts into Synod. District Presidents can work out of Synod. The rest can work in their home congregations. Funding three district offices with continually growing staff is burning up money that can be used for real missions. Synod and District should measure themselves like Charities, i.e. a greater percentage of funds into missions, lower percentage into office staff.

248. Need to be aware of and ability to serve local needs, without losing the need for and access to centralized doctrine control, centralized pool of funds and resources to achieve effective and efficient programs and services across the entire country.
249. Canada is a big country, geographically. Thus, there is some merit in retaining 3 Districts, to allow for regional differences.
250. I can't say this enough.... Include women in the ministry
251. In my mind, there should be no significant difference other than geographic between plans/goals/objectives and even styles perhaps, between congregations in Ontario vs ones in BC. There may be variations between congregations due to city vs country or age demographics, but other than that, we are 'all one'.
252. Why? Is there a problem with the way things are operating now?
253. Present structure over governed. Do we need three Vice Presidents of Synod.
254. This might be a necessity, given the general decline in the membership and the increasingly secular nature of society. Of course, this is something that can be investigated.
255. If it works why fix it?
256. We only need one level, not two, above the circuits.
257. especially the ABC district who created the disaster
258. especially the ABC District created the disaster
259. Only congregations should be members of synod. All church workers must not be members of synod but must be advisors in ecclesiastical matters to the synod. 2. The position of synodical president must be re defined into 2 areas of responsibility so that a qualified lay person is president with responsibility of the management of the synod and one clergy is elected to be the spiritual servant of the church with responsibility to inform the synod on all matters ecclesiastical. 3. Districts are to be eliminated so that the synod consists of synod and circuits. Appropriate changes are to be made in personnel so that congregations are well equipped to carry out the mission of the church which is the great commission. Many details will have to be resolved in the process but the body of Christ will be much more efficient in making disciples of all nations.
260. We need to eliminate districts.
261. Only congregations should be members of synod. 2. Synod needs to be a lay organization (same as LLL and LWML) with clergy as advisors not managers. There would be an elected LAY synodical president (to oversee and manage the business of managing a national church with an elected clergy synodical advisor and spiritual / ecclesiastical servant to keep the Bible front and centre in all discussions and decisions. Circuit Counselors would continue to be elected as they are now with appropriate responsibilities to extend the mission and outreach of the church. Since God did not suggest but commanded, congregations and church workers will need to be accountable to God through the synod using appropriate well balanced evaluations to keep on top- of the mission given to us. 3. Districts need to be eliminated leaving the synod and circuits with responsibilities and personnel provided so that no aspect of ministry falls through the cracks.
262. A structure should be determined first before one can comment on if it is major or minor changes
263. One Synod, divided into zones, zones with working leaders, much like the LWML-C or LLL.
264. Whether it happens or not, they should be open to one.
265. I'm not involved with the structure of the synod so I don't know if it needs to be overhauled.

266. If you want to see Lutheran churches survive, things need to change. We cannot carry on as we have over the past 50 years.
267. Without a major overhaul I do not believe there will be any confidence in the LCC. What you have been doing so far has not worked.
268. I believe it would benefit the organization to merge the 3 districts and have a single organizational unit (synod). The geographic areas could still have offices/managers/supervisors but having a single body to report to would benefit an organization of our size.
269. Funds and membership seem to be declining
270. These things should always be possible if they are more effective in achieving the goals, & spreading the gospel.
271. If material received from the membership indicate a major overhaul, so be it. Change does not come quickly or easily it is essential to listen to the membership as our congregations are the ones most affected.
272. LCC has become irrelevant in today's society.
273. It is adiaphoron and therefore we should never be opposed to it, yet now does seem like an opportune time for this.
274. In this age of advanced communication, it is folly and wasteful to maintain 2 levels of structure i.e. national and district
275. A review of the current structure would be good to see what improvements could be made or what could be changed or deleted and if a major overhaul is required.
276. If it can bring Jesus to more, I'm agreeable. If it is a dream and consultants come in for their $$ and decide on job reductions, changes for their profit and take time and money and in the end nothing happens as has happened in many large corporations, I say save the consultant’s fee and figure it out with the strong of the organization.
277. No safe half measures that accomplish little. As a numerically tiny Church body we can no longer support a top heavy administratively rich structure that has not change very much since LCMS days. We need to think outside the box in a creative way to solve this crisis that seems ready to swallow us and take us all down together.
278. Yes, the current LCC structure should be open to a major overhaul. However, the Synod (National Body) has already determined beforehand that it is not open to a major overhaul since it has stated that it will not look at the congregational and church worker level of our structure. This is unfortunate as the congregational and church worker level is the most basic "foundational" part of a "Synod" structure. After all, just who is doing the "walking together" (synod) and if the foundation is not sound the structure will fall (fail.) Structural change must also include the idea that both seminaries operating in separate geographical locations must be at least combined into one physical seminary location. At the same time, it could be considered that a main task of the Synod full-time staff (President/Bishop, Executives) is to serve as teaching staff at the Seminary. Our international education and outreach strategies in mission stations could be duplicated for our own use in Canada. Currently our seminary education is geared towards furthering an academic career past the M.Div. as it is credited internationally. That level and type of education is not necessary for foundational mission and ministry congregational work in Canada.
279. Lack confidence that this can happen.
280. It should be open to it at least.

281. Our current structure is cumbersome and far too mimics the LCMS model. Since we are so much smaller I think we should restructure to a simpler model.
282. We should not be seeking to preserve the status quo. Change is not an option but a necessity.
283. It is not clear what practical difference an overhaul would make to a given congregation
284. We need to be open to making whatever changes are necessary in order to make our church function in the best way possible. If this means major changes, then so be it.
285. Women should be able to hold positions of office.
286. Is eliminating the district level admin and support while leaving our current synodical structure of membership, representation, voting, and practice alone "a major overhaul"? or is it "minor structural refinements”? or is it in between? - the question is too vague - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
287. This is a possibility that should be considered.
288. The structure isn't the issue. The distrust that ultra conservatives have of anyone that doesn't think the same way they do is very detrimental. People seem to care more about structure, and worship practices and their church buildings rather than how can we reach people that don't know Jesus, and show them that he is someone they would actually like to get to know. Quit the fighting and be supportive of each other. When people look at us, they should be able to catch a glimpse of this Jesus fellow we are talking about and be curious to get to know him.
289. For various reasons, some of them very unfortunate, there is presently an acceptance that major changes are necessary. Let us proceed!!
290. Absolutely. We should have defined ourselves different from the Missouri Synod years ago, and we have the opportunity to do so now.
291. We are too small a church body to have so many governance bodies. Our large geography and regional variations, however, has to be considered in any new structure.
292. All options should be examined - if major changes are necessary now is the time to do it.
293. We need to cut costs for conventions and the number of them we have.
294. Sharing of administration, conventions
295. If there are issues change some structure.
296. Being open to an overhaul does not necessarily lead to engaging in such an overhaul. Rather, I believe we need to
297. be open to an honest and critical examination of LCC structure. It can be just as harmful making change for the sake of change as making no changes at all. If overhaul is not deemed as necessary than we do not have to engage in it. However, that shouldn't preclude us from exploring the benefits or lack thereof.
298. There is a time and place to request broad input. Restructuring an organization is not the place. Leadership needs to have clear goals in mind and have the gifts to carry them out and if the structure is getting in the way of accomplishing those goals it is up to leadership to propose structures that it thinks will best serve. Certainly be open for input but to start by asking for suggestion from everyone - no matter how well informed - while "democratic" may not be helpful.
299. Not sure about MAJOR overhaul. It seems that some necessary overhaul would serve LCC's objectives and purposes better.
300. We need to change, it is obvious, everything should be on the table.

301. I think it needs to be determined what works and what doesn't work before you try and change everything. I definitely think that there could be some sharing of resources which isn't done regularly now.
302. Change is necessary. The malaise that has set in among many of our congregations and church workers is deadly! Shake things up!
303. We over governed for a church of our size. It would be more effective and better stewardship to do our work under a more streamlined structure.
304. Get rid of Districts.
305. we need fewer people in charge
306. we need more lay people involved in the execution of direction and structure not just pastoral direction
307. Short of a major overhaul, the basic mission of LCC will be lost. The octopus has too many tentacles to survive.
308. I'm not knowledgeable or qualified enough to comment.
309. It can be good to exam what we are doing and why we are doing it and why we are organized in the manner we are and if it is accomplishing what we think we should be doing.
310. basically the system seems to be working fairly well now
311. not enough information
312. Some gentle reworking perhaps, but overall the structure is sound and working well I believe
313. Obviously
314. I would like to see a massive shake up and wake up. As an aging club we will soon be dead. God is very active in today's world. There is an amazing revival in the Middle East, yet there is no interest or awareness in the LCC.
315. We need more lay people involved in the direction and structure of LCC and not just pastoral direction
316. An absolute necessity. I think the #1 question we need to ask is, "if we were starting from scratch today, what would we do?"
317. We need more lay people involved in the direction and structure of LCC (not just pastors)
318. I have been an LCC member for approximately 35 years, served as treasurer, elder, head elder and chairman and I have never seen a flow chart of the LCC structure.
319. I agree with a major overhaul of LCC structure if an overhaul means more support, funds and communication to the congregations and less time & funds focused on administration.
320. Yes, the old LCMS model no longer works for us. The Central District may have a problem existing as is now
321. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. Various time in the past, LCC in convention, proposed change; in Hamilton ABC did what it could to prevent any change. It still did not get off the ground, no one could get a structure that all wanted to buy into. However, that is not the problem LCC formerly and currently doesn't practice what it preaches [re: ABC leadership]. It was not the structure that failed but corrupt leadership. Therefore, LCC should be open to change and at the same time LCC does not have to change just for change sake. Perhaps if we had Christian leadership and the current structure it would work.
322. Part of me says we need a major overhaul. On the other hand, I fear what kind of Synod we might produce if we attempt a major overhaul. Recall, here in Canada the Districts created LC-C, unlike the LC-MS which created its Districts. A "major" overhaul would require re-

thinking the reasons WHY we do things the way we do them. That process might take decades and require some theological debates and possibly even conflict or division.

323. A 'major overhaul' should be the result of a desire and a need to improve how the LCC can improve their existing congregations and to extend God's church. It should not be a panic reaction to a human failure in of earthly financial decisions.
324. With the limited knowledge of the structure and workings of the synod, I believe it is functioning well. Just make sure there is always a component of on going evaluation so that minor adjustments can be made if so lead by Holy Spirit and circumstance
325. It is a very good process to go through and worth while to do. You will be amazed how much work it is but worth the journey. What comes out of prayerful discussion and respect for all options. Now is a good time to do this as we are losing our young people. I am one of the youngest in our congregation.
326. Originally based on Missouri Synod model in USA. This also a no brainer
327. We need to assess everything that can be done to make LCC a more efficient and cohesive structure that meets the needs of our Church in Canada.
328. We have too many Pastors in administrative positions.
329. I don't think the structure has changed for a long time and I'm not sure that what we currently have is working effectively.
330. Need an easy to read org chart to get a picture of the current setup.
331. A flowchart should be created that is easily understood.
332. I believe that our structure is too American and should follow some historical models, like in Europe. I know that the idea of "bottom up" authority flow is popular language, but, frankly, I do not believe it aligns to biblical models. I have no issue with a top-down model, as long as there is accountability at various levels.
333. If you are going to do it, do it...don't just patch it.
334.
335. I did not think or feel that the structure of our LCC was so wrong??
336. In the years of my church involvement the church bureaucracy has increased greatly, yet the membership has been in a steady decline. With modern technology less people should be required to get out relevant information.
337. While I am not sure what the best structure would be, I feel that major change is needed. As a young pastor (ordained about 6 months ago) I am concerned about the sustainability of our current structure. I would like there to be an LCC in 40 years when I approach retirement. For that to happen we need a structure that is less costly and burdensome. I think that we have an opportunity right now to establish something that will free up opportunities for ministry across Canada financially and otherwise.
338. Yes, and frankly, we need more than structural change. I am becoming increasingly convinced that our church body lacks vision for what God can do through us, and the words of Revelation that speak of lukewarm Christians is convicting. We need to start this process not looking at the wrappings of our structure but the core of why God has gathered us together as a church in Canada in 2016. Once that is acknowledged and agreed upon, only then should we design a structure to support it.
339. We need to be open to meet the needs of modern day society or I am afraid we will lose most of our future.
340. There is too much bureaucracy - how much of our mission dollars get to their target?

341. We are a dying (shrinking in attendance and struggling with focus and vision for ministry) church body, and the current governance model does not meet our need.
342. Yes, church numbers are declining. I went to Sunday School in a small country church with about 30 other kids. Now our Sunday School is lucky if they have 3-4 children on a Sunday.
343. Change is not necessarily for the better.
344. There is always a better way but there is no point in an overhaul if the result is not excellent. We must destroy to better rebuild - if not, let sleeping dogs lie We are top-heavy for a small organization when considering district and LCC administration - Moving the Central District to LCC office seems wise Even without an overhaul, perhaps it would be advantageous to move all offices to LCC church buildings - surely that could be done - or use the buildings to house new congregations!
345. The Lutheran church needs to move with the times and be more open with regards to ALL people.
346. I think the leadership could be stronger within the current structure
347. I love my Church, but we have become sooooo consumed with our own history. I remember when the Church was run by unschooled fisherman. What happened? now everyone in positions of influence has to have a PhD. Sometimes I think too much knowledge is a bad thing. Pastors think they are the smartest people in their church, and unfortunately they often are, and unfortunately they like that. I think there is a difference between knowledge and wisdom, and we tend to strive for knowledge. its okay, but someone said it puffs up.
348. Although some modifications have been made since the founding convention, it is not the structure for a national church for a country whose population is so widely scattered.
349. Ah, yes but, Careful. 1) There are things that we value and things that are working in some areas. 2) Then focus on what is not working and ask the 5 whys to get to the root cause.
350. With much examination and thoughtful, prayerful decision making
351. But, not change simply for the sake of change.
352. I'm not sure major is the right word if it means throwing out our historic structure of convention representation.
353. Having a synod and 4 districts over only 300 congregations is top heavy. Things need to be refined and overhauled to form better lines of communication to the average lay person.
354. I don't know enough about the current structure to comment.
355. "The question facing us is not, What may we retain without sinning? But, how shall the church be constituted that is patterned after God's Word and the principles set forth and proved in our official Confessions?" Preface to the First Edition, Dr. C.F.W. Wlather - Kirche und Amt
356. "Be open" the operative words here?
357. Since a certain outward structure or form of church government is not biblically mandated, we should always be open to such changes.
358. I feel that LCC shouldn’t have district offices in ABC, Central, and Eastern districts. The money saved by eliminating these offices can go toward building a better church structure. One president and staff to handle everything for LCC. A savings of $630,000 from ABC district alone will help pay for building more churches and supporting the office in Winnipeg.
359. Get rid of anything related to financial dealings and investments and allow organizations that specialize in those areas carry out those duties.

360. The statistical downward trend indicates we cannot continue to support the present structure. Our low population density in Canada requires a different model than Missouri Synod.
361. And independent and open faith based.
362. The time has come, if not now, then when?
363. No more need be said!
364. I do not have enough information about the structure.
365. Changing times may require a drastic change or not. Regardless though, the church organization needs to be prepared to make changes if the church members feel they are needed.
366. if this small church body cannot fulfill its purpose the way it is now, maybe a hard look at ourselves as a group that can stand by ourselves needs to be looked at. why not join back with LCMS?
367. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. However, LCC formerly and currently doesn't practice what it preaches [re: ABC leadership]. It was not the structure that failed but corrupt leadership. Therefore, LCC should be open to change and at the same time LCC does not have to change just for change sake.
368. The Synod and Districts have never operated according to the Constitution and Bylaws of LCC and the structure is based on a 3-million-member church body, not a small church body like the LCC.
369. Something very different needs to be done within the current LCC structure. Everyone in the congregations should be involved with this overhaul restructuring.
370. We no longer need or can sustain the current structure which we imported from the LCMS. We must cut redundancy and waste.
371. Depends on what needs to be changed.
372. I am not certain that a major overhaul is necessary, but it is important that a major overhaul is maintained as a possibility.
373. Need a FRESH start!
374. Key: Integrity in finances, . . . and not gambling CEF funds in Ponzi schemes.
375. Better and more effective stewardship of our national resources and administration of God's gifts tot eh church can result from a frank, open and objective review of our structure and processes. If we had to start from a blank page tomorrow to build the structure of Lutheran Church Canada, given all that we know about or strengths and weaknesses, it is unlikely that we would resolve to make ourselves a reflection of our present-day image.
376. 1. Maybe let’s revert to the Missouri Synod as we never had these problems when we were with them
377. "Open", yes, but not with any pre-conceived conclusion.
378. Agree only if good reasoning is supplied to do so. So far I don't understand why a "major" overhaul is being considered. What is so terribly wrong with the existing constitution?
379. Immediately Replace anybody that had connections to extension fund management. Not sure about structure. Except that current structure has not disciplined and dealt with apparent extension fund thefts and financial mismanagement
380. We have far too many people in Governance and not enough people actually doing anything to improve the difficulties many congregations are facing, because far too much of our Offerings to the Lord are used to pay salaries, rather than assist churches and our world-wide Missions.
381. If it's needed, sure.

382. If there is a way to do things in a more God pleasing outreach oriented way Lord lead us to that.
383. Depending on the cost, this may be a viable option.
384. The district administrations need to be dismantled.
385. It is my opinion that with the mandate from all the Districts we should not leave any stone unturned. Whatever it takes to meet the needs of all it shouldn't be fear of change that limits what God has planned.
386. I am sorry but I am going to cease to answer the survey. I obviously do not have enough information, as a lay person, to give you feedback of any consequence.
387. critical word is being open - not try to fix something that isn't broken
388. critical word is being open - don't fall into the trap of trying to fix something that isn't broken
389. As a Church body we should always be open to major or minor overhaul. However, LCC currently doesn't practice what it preaches [re: ABC leadership]. No structure whatever it may be can over come corrupt leadership.
390. Get rid of conflict let District look after their congregations and missions in their area.
391. I have no problem with things on the synodical level. But there needs to be more refinement and removal of redundancies on District levels. The position of "President" should be renamed "Bishop" to maintain our Biblical and catholic (i.e., church universal) naming traditions.
392. We are all LCC, but appear like a splinter group. We need to remember that we have only one goal.
393. We should still organize ourselves as a "synod" because I believe that model reflects our ecclesiology best, but how our synod organizes itself should certainly be open to debate and reform.
394. The corporate structure should be abolished completely, and replaced with an ecclesiastical structure. The root of the problem is trying to run the church like a business: setting goals for success, vision/mission statements, boards and committees, financial investment. The only goal we have is to deliver the Gospel to those within and without the church, using the offerings freely given by those who respond to the Gospel.
395. No comment necessary here!
396. District has been dysfunctional since LCC was created. It is even questionable if LCC is too small without districts. Doing nothing is a sign weakness and poor leadership. If financial resources are not going to grow we need to organize and run the church more efficiently and effectively. A review of what services are necessary and how can these be delivered a lowest cost. There are numerous congregations that have huge buildings that are under utilized and yet Synod and districts still operate out of independent buildings instead of renting space in a local church building or sharing resources and operating costs. Part of this also relates to struggling local congregations that are shrinking in membership and funds but have large properties to finance. LCC should take the lead to look at how to consolidate congregations where geographics make sense. LCC should take the lead to lean on congregations that strong financially to support or get other financially struggling congregations or mission congregations off subsidy and eliminate their mortgages. We are all part of Christ's Church not local congregational islands. Without the higher level of leadership local congregations will never look to consolidate until they have reached the dissolution point as most members have passed away. This is also another way of operating more efficiently and managing the

gifts that God has given us wisely. In time, growth can occur in geographic areas that may need to be closed and consolidated

397. In regards to the CEF .... YES....but a major overhaul is probably not necessary.
398. Major is a very strong word. I believe adjustments need to be made, but not an overhaul. I do not believe we are broken; we are just "out of tune".
399. There is a duplication of services/work/plans/procedures between Synod & ant one District.
400. If it works well, as it does now, don't fix it.
401. I believe our structure is too top-heavy and does not adequately provide for the needs of our congregations. Given the size of our Synod, it may make more sense to carve the Districts into smaller regions, so that the appointed supervisors will, realistically, be able to visit the congregations they are overseeing, and the offerings that would normally go to the District (not including designated Synod offerings) could address the needs of the local region.
402. We should always be open to change, but not change for the sake of change.
403. How can the entire structure not be altered? There is too much secrecy, private deals cloaked within LCC's administration. Record keeping and Records Management is a huge problem within the church. e.g. ABC District CEF fiasco. If the archive (LHI) would have been properly funded and supported all documents regarding funds, etc. would be there. The archive should have saved the ABC district.
404. Too much administration for a small overall population of LCC members.
405. I'm not sure that we need Districts as they are now. We could do with one Synodical corporate head, a business manager (not a pastor) with a board of three or four bishops to care for regions, the size of which could be identical to our districts now. I would not want any pastor to hold the position of CEO in any level of our structure. We would never have a pastor serve as chairman in a congregation, this should go double for our national church body. No man can serve two masters, and if I want a supervisor who is my pastor, first and foremost, so he can be my pastor. I don't want a pastor who has to be a CEO which takes him away from his pastoral calling. This is shoddy pastoral care. Having said that, perhaps it would be best to have a Missions exec who coordinates our missions internationally, with assistants who are coordinate our missions in each region, possibly working part time alongside a part time call in their respective regions. I feel this way since the work of missions nationally often requires some face to face encouragement, support, and assistance for our pastors and congregations.
406. Districts are no longer needed
407. We should always be open to change
408. If it ain't broke don't fix it!
409. How many ways can MAJOR be said?
410. I don't know enough detail about the current structure to offer opinion.
411. We are over governed and use an inordinate amount of time and money propping up our separate structures.
412. With the size of our membership I doubt that it is necessary to operate a Synodical headquarters and three District headquarters. I wonder if we really need as many full time executives (Presidents, Assistants to the President, and the support staff they have).
413. We should always be open to adjusting our structure to better serve the work of our church. At the same time, we should never assume that changing structure is akin to a means of grace. In other words, all we have to do to grow and care for Christ's church is to change its structure.

414. The LCMS structure adopted doesn't really suit our geography nor the amount of people we have in LCC. I would think a new structure would be a good thing.
415. A MAJOR overhaul is needed. We have great un-clarity in terms of the ecclesiastical and civil responsibilities of our leaders. We're severely over-governed with the three District structure. We need to start from scratch and ask ourselves the question: if we were to be starting this today, how would we structure ourselves? We have way too much baggage. Time to start over.
416. Minor overhaul.
417. It is happening because of financial circumstances; we have no choice.
418. We have not done this before, even when we severed our ties with the LCMS and became a distinctively Canadian entity.
419. Everything should be centralized in Winnipeg
420. possibly, but not really sure. I don't have enough knowledge to comment.
421. We need to avoid duplication and save money.
422. As everyone who is interested in the history of synod knows, our present structure is essentially that of LC-MS, because that was the only form on which the founders could agree. It was absurd then to have a structure suitable for 3 million members fitted to a church of 90,000 (as it was then), and the absurdity has become more glaring as our church has shrunk,
423. Open to change yes... does major change need to happen...Probably but not necessarily.
424. We need to organize for mission in Canada, not try to imitate a structure from the US. Do we need two seminaries--no?
425. ~ many years ago talking with a now sainted pastor and District official we felt that our structure is to unruly and financially not feasible for a church of our size. ~ we felt there should be a Synodical president and a fluid number of vice-presidents in the 8-9 range based on our geography. If the church grew in membership notably even a few more may be needed

16. Changes to the current LCC structure should include only minor structural refinements

1. Only if those are needed! But who decides what would be needed???
2. WE need to look at eliminating districts, or at least District offices. District Presidents should be part time, pastors of congregations, ecclesiastical supervision only.
3. All areas should be examined to find potential duplication of programs/services.
4. It seems to be working quite well as is.
5. Especially all this conferences, conventions duplication of synod/district. too many boards and committee and their members it seems??
6. Whatever is going to be an improvement. We inherited a structure from LC-MS with little real adoption.
7. Would like to see 1 synod with 6 or 7 zones each zone with a VP for ecclesiastical supervision full or part time as required.
8. No need to fix it if it isn't broken.
9. Synod should be in charge if that's major or minor I don't know.
10. Get with the times or the church will fail!
11. No. A major overhaul is needed, albeit not at the sacrifice of Word or Sacraments.

12. Blow what we have up.
13. Let's see what the best plan is and then we'll know how major or minor it is.
14. This is an important point in time that jolts people from being comfortable and complacent and forces us to refocus on the foundations of our faith.
15. I can't answer this question when I don't know what changes are being considered
16. Time to re-think the entire structure without any presumptions about the superiority of what we've always had. and done. It is a major problem in our midst, that we have never yet managed to ditch this bias toward the status quo.
17. What structural refinements?
18. Some changes might be major and some minor.
19. If needed.
20. Only people really involved would know thought - Lay people don't have knowledge in this field.
21. Likely major changes required
22. A change from a Board of Presidents to a College of Bishops would be a miner change structurally, but a step in the right direction ecclesiastically and a move away from an American style political model towards a more biblical model.
23. See above answer.
24. Minor structural changes will not be enough.
25. structure changes s/b dependent upon the needs and effectiveness gained.
26. Much more - not less! - emphasis is needed on equipping laity. For the varied needs of work at the parish level. Circuit Forums were proposed to fill our essential need in every congregation. Too many pastors saw it as "just another meeting". Laity love working for the Lord! But they need training and they are not getting enough of it!
27. I feel that we need to re-tool our structure to withstand the storms ahead. The times of the old days when we still had a say in our nations seems practically over; we must now contend with a cancerous spread of atheism as well as other religions seeking control.
28. What is minor?
29. Whatever changes finally come, they will need to have overall support and be implemented gradually with in-depth education program, otherwise will lose membership (It's not my church any more.)
30. Do not know.
31. Same as question 15 with additions. The District level is something good for most local issues we can not assume that each District in practice follows what needs to be done. Changes are something all Districts should make together and insure that the reason we have this church body is being upheld and insuring that more people end up hearing the word as it should be heard. Although some approaches are different from east to west, what we are doing and what we stand for should never be different and if there is then this needs to be corrected. Major changes in funding such as the Church Extension Fund should be done over the whole church body and not each District. We need t insure that if the church extension fund is a proper useful tool for bringing the word to people then it be done with as limited risk of failure as possible. If there is investment through this, we need to see protection in place to minimize the risk of major loss to investors. If the church feels that it is against what we should be teaching, then as a whole the church body should remove such investment schemes totally. It is as much a fundamental issue as a risk to investor issue. We need to sit down as a whole from coast to coast and review what is working and what needs t change.

Earmark those we can quickly solve and get them done immediately. Those issues that need more time we need to tackle on an ongoing basis one at a time and get them resolved properly. By doing this we can insure unity across the country as well as insuring all are adhering to the doctrine. One thing that we need to make sure of is that what works at a district or area level remain that way. Do not throw out the good ever. If there is to be limited or no District levels in the end, we need to insure the practices that are working at those levels somehow remain that way in another form.

32. The word 'only' in the sentence restricts what might be the only time in my lifetime this restructuring gets looked at. Don't limit yourselves.
33. this would continue present waste of resources, which we can no longer afford
34. I do not think any major changes should be implemented. For that matter, I don't think many changes are needed. If people follow the rules already defined, things will be fine. Stop trying to concentrate power and influence. This only wastes money and negatively affects the church.
35. I do not know
36. There is so much wrong at this time that we need a major overhaul. We have too much MAN based instead of Bible based.
37. Why be convinced IN ADVANCE that the only changes needed are minor? Doesn't this mean having blinders on?
38. Minor or major changes as needed to make the LCC strong.
39. We don't need to worry about minor change as this will evolve anyway as most people (pastors included) resist change! We need to START and let God lead.
40. Whatever changes are finally proposed, they need to have majority support and be implemented gradually to prevent loss of membership (people saying "it's not my church any more".
41. What qualifies as minor?
42. Define "major overhaul" and "only minor structural refinements". I think that LCC should be open to the changes that would be best without restricting what those changes might be right out of the gate. If increased efficiency and mission effectiveness would be the result of a "big" or a "little" change it should be considered.
43. Closed communion is an Un-Friendly excluding discriminating sacrament - Judgemental.
44. Change is now an ideology that conveys that something is broken and must be fixed. What is the problem is what I believe needs to be addressed. This is so the actual problem is not covered with a major change and can reappear later.
45. Potentially, only minor structural refinements may be required.
46. Massive change can cause too much confusion for everyone involved.
47. AGAIN, this question addresses the SAME question as the one above (#15)
48. Then this whole process will be a waste of time.
49. Depending on what is classified a major and minor refinements
50. I would like to see the entire system reformed.
51. I do not think we need the district level of governance. We can do away with districts and replace districts with multi-regional oversight.
52. synod and district have mishandled millions of dollars, have been audited and avoiding criminal proceedings, and you suggest the solution in 'minor structural refinements'??? Clearly show the incompetence of the administration understanding the gravity of the situation. No one has any experience working with a publicly traded financial company! The

same scrutiny, governance and public accountability and reporting should be mandated and expected.

53. Again what is the difference between minor and major?
54. There are aspects that should only be tweaked and other things that need to be totally thrown out
55. Financial demands $9,206,000 to serve god?????
56. We should be open to the best model of structure that meets our needs and is Biblical, regardless of whether it is only tweaking or providing a major overhaul. This question basically asks, "how much work should we be willing to do?" which is the wrong starting point. Start with the needs, then develop the structure.
57. Think Districts are too expensive. Unify for direction and economy
58. Don't know enough about this situation
59. Again not qualified
60. The structure needs to be appropriately looked at and used in order for it to be effective. Sinful human nature causes men to want to wield power when structures are looked at as hierarchical. The LCC structure is meant to show the churches with their mission, being supported and served by the districts and being further served and supported by the synod which is composed of a collaboration of serving districts.
61. Not sure. We need a complete breakdown of what is going on and not an overview. I would agree that there is duplication in many areas that could be consolidated or spread out between the three district offices. Why is everything in Winnipeg?? We have presently three district offices that could take on some of Synod work and do things by teleconference.
62. Any refinements that must be made should be in how much work each level of power is responsible for. Synod should focus their energies on one or two areas - the work of filling vacancies and calling pastors, and local Canadian mission.
63. Wish I knew a little more about nature of problems or things to be improved and the different potential models of how to restructure versus how synod is structured now in order to answer better in this section.
64. it depends on the "needs" and should not be change of change sake
65. As noted above, how serious are those weaknesses in current structure.
66. More info on how they currently operate is required.
67. Pastors in the middle of the "mess" with CEF should be removed to another call outside the District, as of Jan 5/15 till the matters are settled spiritually and financially and legally. The conflict of interest, mistrust and lack of credibility is eroding our institution. Look at any other org that has one? person in the mix: i.e.; Teacher, broadcaster, CEO they resign or are relocated or on leave with or without pay. Not allowed to continue to fester, not perform, lose members etc.
68. There are always things that we can do better, but there are also things that are done quite well. Small measurable refinements would be preferred.
69. Are we being effective? Are we actively following the structures we currently have in place? I think we are facing struggles as a Synod that may need more than minor structural refinements, however I also know that I have a limited knowledge of the whole picture.
70. I don't think things can be patched. It is necessary to look at the entire structure and build things from the bottom up again.

71. once again, I say, it would be wise to do this slowly and likely over several years so that mistakes (and there will be mistakes) maybe corrected without too much upset to any general restructuring.
72. Not knowing exactly what the LCC structure is currently makes it very difficult to state an opinion really.
73. The time for tweaking is long past.
74. I'm sure the average lay person doesn't have any idea as to major or minor overhaul.
75. If those dealing with these issues see a need for minor structural refinements than I would have to trust their decisions in this matter. Unless more information about refinements was passed on to me so I could make further decisions regarding this.
76. need more info
77. This would depend on the refinements. As I stated above, I think the constitution may be fine, if only we would follow it. I would affirm minor changes in areas to define more precisely how DPs and CCs need to be enforcing sound doctrine and practice among pastors and congregations. I feel that DPs ought to be more accountable. For instance, it is appropriate I think that a DP should be brought up on disciplinary charges if it can be established that a congregation within their jurisdiction openly invites anyone of any outward denominational affiliation forward for communion, and has done so for over, say two years. There is absolutely no excuse for this to happen in the first place, let alone that the blind eye of a DP allows it to become entrenched for decades until any effort to reverse the practice will and does result in massive casualties and conflict.
78. If we are going to restructure, we do need to plan carefully and strategically.
79. Again, I am not someone who knows about inner workings of large organizations to understand how it works now versus options of how it could work.
80. The wheel has already been invented, if the tire is flat, fix the leak, don't replace the whole wheel.
81. Our current structure is hindering the work of the church and binding us to slow moving methods.
82. Minor changes would not rid the redundancies that prevail.
83. If it is determined that LCC structure needs major structural change, then I trust that those in charge will do what is beneficial and necessary.
84. See question 16. Yes, the LCC should undergo structural refinements to improve the way Districts and Synod interact with each other. These refinements should be focused on improving efficiency, and of the utmost importance it should uphold the mission of the church; to provide for the current members of LCC and to reach out to those currently outside our fold. These all need to be taken into account in light of the modern day and our present culture. Not that we should conform to society but use mechanisms that help us relate and interact with society. These are not major structural reforms but they might be considered more than just minor refinements.
85. I am not sure what is meant by minor structural refinements.
86. Inadequate information to make a choice!!
87. The current LCC structure is broken and may be beyond repair
88. I kind of agree. Usually big changes cause more headaches. Somehow the Committee under God's guidance must consider each change in the light of getting the Gospel to people. And they do not have an easy task. I believe Moslems are the fastest growing religious group. And as you can see, they are a very militant group, wanting to impose Sharia law.

89. Depends on the refinements. As I stated above, I think the constitution may be fine, it's just we don't use it. I would affirm minor changes in areas to define more precisely how DPs and CCs need to be enforcing sound doctrine and practice among pastors and congregations. DPs ought to be brought up on disciplinary charges if it can be proven a congregation within their jurisdiction openly invites anyone of any outward denominational affiliation forward for communion, and has done so for over, say two years. There is absolutely no excuse for this to happen in the first place, let alone that the blind eye of a DP allows it to become entrenched for decades upon decades until any effort to reverse the practice will result in massive casualties and conflict. And the blame is ostensibly laid at the feet of the pastor who wasn't charismatic and loving enough to "bring the congregation through it."
90. Same comments as for #15. I believe that the answers you receive from these questions will be totally meaningless without knowing the underlying reasons for the responses received.
91. unless the current structure proves to be the best structure to achieve our goals.
92. one at a time would produce better results
93. Some things might need major overhauls. Some might not. What's working? What clearly is NOT working? What needs to change? How do we change? Where is God in the midst of all of this? How do we feel the Holy Spirit leading us in the midst of our situation, and challenges? I think if we weigh our situation against the last two questions, no change, big or small, is theoretically "off the table."
94. If changes are required, they may be major. Any changes made should be done as a series of experiments with opportunities to assess the effectiveness of the change and change course as necessary.
95. All of our units of administration -- Districts and Circuits -- are too large. Circuits of fewer than 8 congregations and districts of fewer than 6 circuits would allow members of different congregations, circuits, and districts to know each other and, thereby, be able to work together more effectively.
96. Minor changes produce minor results in our mission to reach the lost for Christ.
97. The objective isn't a minor or major change, rather the objective should be a structure that will maximize effectiveness, to God's glory.
98. Open to see options.
99. Because of finances, I would think that it will require more than just minor structural refinements.
100. I do not think we need the district level of governance. We can do away with districts and replace districts with multi-regional oversight.
101. I don't personally know what will be best, but I don't we should limit ourselves from the start to making only minor changes.
102. Again know nothing about this
103. There is always room for improvement but the basic structure and functions of districts and synod has worked well both in the US and in Canada.
104. I think tweaking is probably needed. Things usually need changes over time.
105. A new structure alone will not fix the real problem of not being in unity in the doctrine of the Gospel or the administration of the Sacraments.
106. Present system in general has worked well - however as with any system improvements often minor changes can be beneficial
107. We should make it less complicated to fit our small church body, taking cues from other small church bodies.

108. bringing the word to people is the highest priority. 'structure' and 'rigorous organizational planning' will one day be completely lost anyway; they are really not that important.
109. We could always tweak a few things when it is clear certain things need a change, but that doesn't mean we should make huge changes that we will live to regret.
110. It is dying -- and needs total revitalization!!
111. Define what is not working, fix it, and bring it together with that which is working well.
112. We have a long way to go to truly follow Christ's directive in ministering to our flocks and to opening the door to ministering to the people who have never heard Christ's message. Also, we have a long way to go to work with those who have been inoculated to Christ's message with a sprinkling of God's word in Sunday School / Confirmation years or decades ago when their parents considered their obligation to bring their kids up in church was done. Of course you can't drag people to church, but when I see a congregation in Regina with the average age of those in attendance is about 75, I think something is wrong with that picture.
113. It's hard to change a system; if we're going to change it, we should change the whole thing while we're at it. The districts have been unnecessary since we left the LCMS, and we won't get a better opportunity to fix it.
114. If there are only minor changes proposed to the next National convention, there will be many very disappointed people.
115. Certain items should not be touched lay/clergy balance for one thing.
116. In general Synod & District structure has worked quite well, however make changes which will be beneficial
117. This would be total disaster. Why bother going through this whole process if you're just going to amalgamate Central District into ABC and East District. Don't you dare.
118. We have to find a way to encourage our members to regard our church to be a place they can use 7 days a week not just a place to go for a couple of hour Sunday morning.
119. Perhaps there are some small tweaks that would make the world of difference... again, what would they be and what would those tweaks do?
120. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
121. We did that in 2002, and here we are again.
122. I believe in general our present has worked quite well however as times change so must our Synod and Districts to provide a smooth and efficient operation.
123. Unsure.
124. no - make a change to fix it
125. WE need to look at major change.
126. Prior to the formation of LCC the proposed structure was rejected and the LCMS model was adopted. After 25+ years we have finally acknowledged that Canada and its Districts are unique. However, when form follows function we need to have a clearer understanding of the function before we design the structure. At present it appears that a particular form is desired to meet some specific agendas.
127. Do it over. Do it right. Rebuild from the ground up.
128. Currently, we are dysfunctional, as described above. We must reach out to all Canadians, not merely 3 out of 4. Christ died for the sins of Quebecois, too. Parish pastors need to be closer to their district's president than our current organisation permits. Congregations need to be more mutually aware and supportive than currently.
129. How can a lay person know this???

130. How do you define "minor structural refinements"? You are sounding to much like politicians!
131. The three separate districts need to be merged and run as one at the Synodical level.
132. Several services could be combined to save costs.
133. The LCC is dying. The solution to this problem is to reduce the overwhelming control of the Pastors in the administration of District and Synod business. The ABC District is insolvent, the LCC is insolvent if the pension liability is recognized. The only part of the church that is solvent are the congregations which are normally run by a council of laypeople, not controlled by a pastors. Why not have pastors fulfill the requirements of the Book of Concord, preach the gospel, forgive sins and administer the sacraments. Pastors have no clue how to run a lemonade stand never mind a financial institution with $ 140,000,000 in trusting church member deposits (ABC District CEF and DIL)
134. We are over managed and our greatest spending outside of staff is TRAVEL.
135. There may be need to make great changes while at the same time communicating that the Gospel of Christ does not depend on man's money-it all is grace that comes from God. Perhaps He will request that we make hard decisions to get back to that focus as well. . .
136. Not understanding fully the issues and challenges, I can not say one way or the other. We should always be open to looking at all aspects - be careful not to throw out the baby with the bath water - we do have some good things going for us -how do we figure out what are the things that need to change?
137. I do not think that categorizing change as 'major' or 'minor' is even relevant - if somethings need improving, then make the change necessary to make it better. If something works effectively already, then let it continue as is. Don't just change for the sake of change or to meet a unit of measure - change to make what is broken better.
138. The renewal will have to be more than minor as it's so easy to slip back into our old ways, and not accepting that it's just the times were living in.
139. Let's wait and see what's proposed. I am hoping that partnership of clergy and laity will be stressed, as is laid down in the NT. Moreover, First Timothy should be closely consulted and heeded, since this is where the NT deals with polity.
140. We shouldn't limit change at any point. Allow for an openness to whatever amount of change will help.
141. considering question 15 has just been asked - is this follow up question not bordering on the moronic?
142. Let’s see a model and go from there.
143. The three Districts of LCC are important to provide the "on-ground" knowledge and relationship for regions that is difficult to achieve with only a centralized office. Planning should be done together and perhaps this would lead to a few redundancies to be eliminated or positions to be create should these opportunities arise.
144. Members need to be protected, financially, for errors in judgement which led to the current ABC crisis.
145. Minor tinkering will not accomplish what we need to do. The ground is shifting beneath our feet with the rapid secularization of society in Canada and the dwindling membership in our congregations. We need to redirect our key focus & resources from that of maintenance of structure, to outreach!
146. This is pretty much same question as 15. If I said SD to 15...then that would give you an indication that minor refinements needed.

147. Having four organizations - Synod and three districts - is inefficient and not effective. Districts are to independent and Synod is left begging for funds that should come directly to it from congregations (Districts were formed to do the work of the Synod).
148. Current structure is very confusing.
149. Not informed enough to comment!
150. I will answer 15 and 16 together - the answer for Synod lies some where in the middle. In terms of Missions, I think LCC is doing a good job to meet the needs as best as they can. I think the Financial ministries are lacking in terms of benefits and pensions.
151. I don't know how to "fix" this, but I must reiterate, the Boards that are elected to the Seminaries and at one time the University, need to be vetted properly. We do not want our Seminaries "shutting" down as our University did. Lutheran Education is a vital part of our denomination. So to answer questions 15 and 16, the changes should be somewhere in between Major and Minor....
152. the role of women in the church needs to be changed.
153. I'm a centralist and to a degree the Lutheran Church should be run like the Catholic Church. We have a President who is like the pope and he should have a team that decides on the direction of the Church. The districts fall in line with the goals and direction of the head of the Church. President Bugbee in this case. We are fortunate to have someone of his intelligence leading the Church at this time.
154. Everything should be on the table, we don't want to do more fine-tuning in 5 years. We should also put on the table rejoining LCMS English District. Through numbers there is strength. Our church lacked nothing when it was part of LCMS.
155. major overhaul and being accountable
156. I must admit I don't know what structural refinements are needed in light of the change to our District and the changing needs at the local level for our large number of congregations in Alberta and B.C. I do know that the size and strength of our congregations is a changing thing and a one-solution, centralized approach is unlikely to serve our problem solving needs very effectively. Structural refinements to achieve the needed results must be sought but I personally don't know what those refinements should be.
157. There are relatively few members in our Synod. Therefore, we may not need 3 Districts. One national structure might be sufficient.
158. There should be major structural refinements.
159. It seems likely that it needs more major restructuring, but I don't know enough to say one way or the other.
160. It may be beneficial to have two Districts Central and ABC combined and Ontario East only from the standpoint of geography
161. I am not sure what changes need to be made but we should be open to changes on any level.
162. I trust that those in charge know what works and what doesn't!
163. time to clean up problems and spread the gospel
164. time to clean up the problems and spread the gospel
165. A synod, broken in to provincial zones, one CEF fund operating independently from the synod and its operating budget.
166. Due to the difficulties the churches and their members are in, more planning needs to be done.
167. A structure should be determined first before one can comment on if it is major or minor changes

168. We need to be one with salaried positions below the Synod level.
169. Depends what it is
170. I'm not involved with the structure of the synod so I don't know if it needs to be overhauled.
171. Blow it up and build it in a new image. What we had didn't work.
172. One church... not four.
173. That would be determined only by looking into things
174. Again, this rests on the results of the survey and information received. There is definitely need for an overhaul be it major or minor.
175. It depends ...I think we should be open to all options.
176. We need radical change that does not cost us $3 million plus a year to operate with less than 75000 members.
177. Even if it should be determined that the current LCC structure of congregations, church workers, circuits, Districts and national Synod office should remain with only minor structural refinements, there are other items that may be unaddressed with only a "structural" (major or minor) adjustment. The use and abuse of power, the health of relationships, a truly shared confession -- all of these are as important or more important than structure. For example, a change of title from "President" to "Bishop" is a small refinement and even has the backing of Scripture. However, if the entire "episcopal" authority and ownership structure is adopted at the same time, a simple centralization of management and the reduction of duplication hardly makes up for the loss of autonomy at the congregational level. The quality of relationships and the Scriptural attitude of Christ regarding leadership and authority should at least be as important a discussion item as rules and regulations and organizational charts. A basic starting point might be "who or what is a member of synod?" and "upon what basis do we hold membership?" "how will we relate to one another in this relationship as fellow parts of the Body of Christ?" and "How and what things can we better accomplish together of Christ's mandate than we can individually?"
178. This strongly depends on what the survey means by "major" and "minor." The general structure of synod/district may remain the same in structure alone, but there are still many major changes that need to occur.
179. There are some adjustments that may be wise. But I don't think we should blow up the whole structure and start with a blank piece of paper. Who is to say it would be any better? I believe the effectiveness of an organization does not just depend on structure, but on the character and competence of those asked to lead and serve the organization.
180. The time for minor changes was back when it was first formed. Now we need more drastic changes.
181. You can have the best structure and people who abuse it and attitudes that never change. While the structure needs to be looked at to see what we have and changed to better suit our needs, these attitudes also need to be looked. What do you do when you encounter church abuse? What are the mechanisms of accountability within the structure and why haven't they been working?
182. We may need to see minor adjustments, even in structure, but do not believe we should blow everything up and start from scratch.
183. If our current structure were streamlined to eliminate duplication and LCC actually operated as it should, things might go okay, but given the tendency of infrastructure to grow for its own sake and our inability to operate as a true Synod up to now, it's unlikely that streamlining something we don't adhere to anyway has much of a chance of working.

184. Is eliminating the district level admin and support while leaving our current synodical structure of membership, representation, voting, and practice alone "a major overhaul"? or is it "minor structural refinements”? or is it in between? - the question is too vague - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
185. Once the process of restructuring is considered the situation will bring certain considerations to light. These may be minor or monumental. Financial matters need major overhauling.
186. Depending on thoughts of those more directly involved
187. For practical reasons, LCC adopted the Missouri Synod structure upon it's initiation, but our smaller size and changing demographics find that it is no longer an efficient setup.
188. We don't have to change everything.
189. What do our leaders think?
190. I fear that this is what will happen. We will tinker with minor things but not address the major issues of our church structure and the top heavy structure we currently have. I see the people working on this restructuring and fear that there is no new thinking here that will result in major changes.
191. Not sure. A great deal of change all at once, would be difficult to implement and to manage.
192. If what is needed is an entirely new model than that is what is needed. let's not try and pigeon hole change into the structure that already exists and that we recognize as not being sufficient.
193. Same question as #`5. Why the repetition?
194. it appears to need major refinements
195. the Church throughout history has been challenged at times to make major changes to how the theology is practiced, governing systems are paired down, the church is brought back to the common member and the love of God through Christ to preached to the people. At this time if one is one of the governing/administrative group things couldn't be better, but for the average congregation member in a small community it is a struggle to volunteer/give enough to stay active.
196. I think it should include whatever is necessary. To preclude major refinements at the outset would limit things that could be beneficial. We should be open to move in whatever direction is best.
197. It is entirely too business-like.
198. It appears to need major refinements.
199. I disagree with this as strongly as one can disagree with anything. We're not set up to thrive in 21st-century Canada.
200. The LCC structure appears to need major refinements
201. The A-BC District has lost the trust they once had due to the CEF fiasco. It needs to either be disbanded or, at a minimum, significantly changed. This means both the structure and the individuals involved.
202. Am open if it can be shown (proven) a minor structural refinement will work
203. Minor structure refinements should be an on-going activity as the Church learns, grows, and changes. It is not a 'one time' activity.
204. Lutherans tend to take undue pride in tradition but in the context of falling attendance and income this would seem to be an ideal time to evaluate everything we are doing to reach the objectives Synod has set.

205. With the limited knowledge of the structure and workings of the synod, I believe it is functioning well. Just make sure there is always a component of on going evaluation so that minor adjustments can be made if so lead by Holy Spirit and circumstance
206. No, it is time to look at everything and make changes.
207. what isn't working?
208. This should be the biggest over haul since changing to LCC. We need to find a way to have lay persons more actively involved. At the end of the day we certainly need leadership and academics for training and leading but I suspect a significant amount of giving to support this comes from lay persons and grass root persons. They need a strong voice as well
209. REQUIRES MAJOR, MAJOR structural overhaul.
210. I don't think minor structural refinements can be the conclusion at this point. Maybe that will be only what is required but this
211. survey and other methods of obtaining input will determine that.
212. depends on what subject. this question should say more and needs clarification.
213. If you are going to open it...do it all or it will end up piece-meal.
214. See comment on 13 above.
215. Reshuffling the current system will not produce something that is sustainable. Let's not do this again in 15-20 years.
216. I don't like the word minor. We need to be open in our dialogue for the best results whether minor or major.
217. Let’s do it right so we are not at it again in 5 years.
218. They should be open to change if it is necessary. People are always growing and changing why should the church not be willing to do the same. With the exception of our Beliefs as recorded in the Augsburg Confessions and the Creeds, we should not compromise in those areas, if we did what would separate us from other "Churches" and what would have been the reason for the Lutheran Reformation.
219. More use of technology (i.e. Skype) to save costs of so much travel for meetings.
220. When you study an organization the structure must be open to change.
221. I mean minor
222. Cosmetics are not efficient, effective or necessary
223. You can start out with minor changes, but an overall long term plan should be put in place for a structure change.
224. an overhaul of the church would be a good thing. shake the church. get people excited. people don't get excited about minor structural refinements.
225. Minor changes have taken place over the past 20+ years and we're still talking about the need for major structural change.
226. It is my understanding that things need to change. Focus on what is not working and ask the 5 whys to get to the root cause.
227. no real change needed. Change for the sake of change is not a good reason. There is less and less structure in today's world and faiths like Lutheranism and Catholicism give society a solid framework to hold onto.
228. This is difficult to answer as I would like to see the results of the survey are before answering this.
229. To go through this pain, for only minor changes is futile
230. While such might end up being the case, we shouldn't think that this is all we should be doing.

231. If one agrees with the previous statement, then it follows that one must disagree with this one.
232. We need to put everything on the table. The demographic challenges before us are huge and we have one chance to get this right.
233. With the demographics showing our aging, we need to be ready to have a smaller church, and many less congregations.
234. I think it's high time to review everything and re-structure in total.
235. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
236. What needs to be done, has to be done and as a member I will strongly support any necessary change.
237. We need a major overhaul and bring all in line with the Constitution and Bylaws as to Governance
238. It will take more than just minor restructuring.
239. As I mentioned earlier, a regulatory body could have avoided the issue of ABC CEF. I would reduce the size of district operations.
240. If it is determined that major changes are needed, then LCC should be open and willing to do so.
241. Let's start all over and develop a structure that would reach our nation for Christ and growth, being faithful to the Gospel and the Word of God . . . rather than continuing with a maintenance mindset and dying as a denomination.
242. Minor tweaking of specific "ailments" would be a disservice to our Lord and the remarkable lengths to which He devoted His grace and mercy to us and to reform Christianity through His gifts to the church like Martin Luther. We need to be bold as Luther in terms of reforming our structures
243. 1.Many problems, we are losing our membership, no young people - we do need serious change
244. Our whole structure needs to be revamped, we are far to small for the many various positions we have pastors and laymen elected to serve in.
245. If it's needed, sure
246. So long as individual congregations are made aware of the existing and/or future structure.
247. I think "minor" is the wrong word!
248. As a Church body we should always be open to major or minor overhaul. However, LCC currently doesn't practice what it preaches [re: ABC leadership]. No structure whatever it may be can over come corrupt leadership.
249. I have no problem with things on the synodical level. But there needs to be more refinement and removal of redundancies on District levels.
250. If, after study, it is obvious that there are governmental, financial, etc. reasons to go with a different model, it would be a tragedy if we only made minor changes to our structure.
251. We shouldn't tie our hands by saying only minor changes or only major changes. However, now is the time to go big or go home.
252. We are primed for some major changes. Let us go forward and be as relevant as we can in this changing world rather than staying with how we have always done things.
253. This is the easy path. We know where that leads.
254. The CEF obviously needs to be critiqued and tweaked so that nothing like what happened in the ABC District can happen again.
255. when possible changes/restructuring are looked at, it should not have any limitations

256. More videoconferencing.
257. It would depend on what the alternatives were.
258. Large scale change needed.
259. We should open to major structural review.
260. Synod needs to be the centre and lead, with the smaller districts implementing their strategy.
261. major/minor (see previous) is rather subjective.
262. Why is this question needed? Answered in #15 - A MAJOR overhaul is needed. We have great un-clarity in terms of the ecclesiastical and civil responsibilities of our leaders. We're severely over-governed with the three District structure. We need to start from scratch and ask ourselves the question: if we were to be starting this today, how would we structure ourselves? We have way too much baggage. Time to start over.
263. The church is crumbling. We need to look to the foundations!
264. This is my current opinion, subject to change if additional facts become available.
265. We should be open to major changes if it leads to efficiency and improved ecclesiastical supervision.
266. We need to build new from the ground up
267. ~ we inherited our system from the LC-MS. With their size it works great. They have Districts larger than our whole church. We need to face this isn't what would maybe ever work in Canada.

17. I am comfortable with the way things are in LCC at the synodical and district levels.

1. Districts have too much power and synod lacks any form of substantial authority.
2. I believe too much emphasis has been placed on "World" missions and not enough time and effort placed on LCC congregations in Canada to give assistance in growing home congregations. If home congregations are shrinking how will overseas missions be supported?
3. We should not stop trying to improve our human efforts.
4. difficult to answer these 3 questions when one doesn't know the current structure or where leaders want to change
5. Two districts would be enough and don't duplicate services. The auxiliaries have their own boards agendas etc. so shouldn't be legally connected to synod. I fear if any of these fail we all do, so arrange safe guards (legally).
6. Somewhat but needs to take more responsibility
7. Some things yes, some no. But I don't have the expertise to say how to change things.
8. Case in point: something went terribly wrong with ABC's CEF management of responsibilities. Synod didn't know until TOO LATE. Communication is key in all organizations.
9. ABC is broken and what I hear Central is wondering if it can continue.
10. Case in point: something went terribly wrong with ABC's CEF management of responsibilities. Synod didn't know until TOO LATE. Communication is key in all organizations.
11. It is obvious that something has gone wrong between ABC District and Synod. Sounds like lack of communications! Communication is key in all organizations.
12. Not comfortable but resigned.

13. Not comfortable but resigned.
14. Always room for improvement.

- but it seems demographic changes are coming meaning a change in the general giving within the church (i.e., the givers who are the senior members are dying) and synod's ability to support current programs, congregations, missions, seminaries, etc.

15. Except for CEF in ABC District.
16. Synod should be in charge over districts.
17. I will not be 'comfortable' until our congregations are growing again.
18. A lot of congregations are failing our attendance is terrible. Nothing being done.
19. I am wounded, never been this upset and betrayed.
20. Too much overlap of boards and leadership structures. However, we don't want to become overly centralized ... we need a grass roots organic model that coordinates servanthood and deals with needs at the point closest to the need ... but consistent to the rest of LCC. Don't drive programs from the top down, but let them emerge from the bottom up (and have Synod deal with things that rise there because they aren't met anywhere else). But synod also takes both a lead and service role -- initiating important priorities and practices; providing urgent responses.
21. Having the presidential structure replicated several times is not necessary.
22. Like I said before why is there a governing body if it doesn't follow the doctrine that it teaches in the seminary. Pastors are taught one thing and then when they get to these different congregations they are not bond to follow those teachings. It depends on what each congregation wants because I sure haven't seen the Synod step up and defend the doctrine they teach.
23. I am comfortable, but there is too much duplication overall
24. Absolutely not.
25. Obviously, we are in need of reform that serves us better. We are not meant to serve the structure.
26. While change is almost never pleasant, it can be healthful. The current structure may have served us well in the past, but I do not think it will do so in the future.
27. Too much overhead in the present structure.
28. As far as I can tell, the structure was not to blame for the ABC district trouble.
29. Lay people are not aware of differences.
30. Sometimes it does seem prejudiced in the EAST but people should be open to more educated individuals.
31. ABC isn't a functional district
32. A more ecclesiastical structure with a college of bishops along the lines of the Scandinavian Confessional Mission Provence Churches would be preferable.
33. This page seems contradictory to previous page.
34. For our size it would seem we need a simpler structure.
35. I feel, now more than ever, we need to make our church infrastructure efficient to handle the tasks ahead.
36. I agree to a point but our churches seem to be slowly dying. We have to start bring young people back to church.
37. I guess I am "comfortable" with the way things are in LCC at synod/district. The question is: is it effective and efficient? I think LCC should be open to doing a major overhaul of synod structure. In particular, the current districts should be dissolved.

38. Do not know.
39. There are many changes that could be done at both levels. Local governance works for many things but are we getting everything we need the way the structure is now? There are some things handled by the Districts that should have oversight or guidance from the Synod level. Funding such as the Church Extension fund should change so that we do not have what is happening occur again. If the practice follows what we should be doing, then the fund needs better protection and administering. Community outreach between the districts should be much stronger unifying our church more across the country. If we are more intertwined, we could find that we have more solutions to problems and better outreach for those to hear the word. Diverse opinions and ways of doing things are very good and help us grow, however if we do not put it into practice across the country we do not grow as reach out as we should.
40. I mean, I am 'comfortable' per se but I don't think that's what's needed right now. Comfort has never won souls to Christ that I've experienced.
41. separate districts are uneconomic
42. The ABC district, although dealing with the fund collapse, is functioning well.
43. I am very concerned about what is happening with LCC as I know it. Of special concern is LCC's stance on Holy Communion. The LORD"S SUPPER is our Master's banquet. He invites us to come-be fed, be cleansed. Pastors are "called servants" but SERVANTS non the less. Does a servant have the authority to deny/refuse to feed the Master's guests including Lutherans from other Synods? This is not biblical and must be changed.
44. I know very little about Synodical level but once again as a small congregation we feel like an orphan much of the time. Very little connection to LCC and our future direction within ABC District or in the Synod.
45. -too much strife, too little accountability -some aspects, functions are good, others in need of change or discontinuation. Also what does "comfortable" mean?
46. But it can't last.
47. Questions 15-17 ... frustrating! Encourage and provide funds/resources to circuits to work on special tasks/ministries with some pastoral oversight of D.P.
48. Unfortunately for the crisis now striking the Church this makes one uncomfortable. Is the structure the problem? I don't know.
49. I am not aware of major problems caused by the current structure. But improvements are always possible.
50. District is less visible and accessible to congregations than has occurred in the past. It seems to me there is less opportunity for involvement of laypersons at the Synodical level.
51. Failure of A.B.C. District's C.E.F. was a shock to me.
52. Too top heavy
53. We have much duplication of service - finance, mission, etc.
54. Conferences are way to long, dealings could be done bin less than 2 days. Synod Presidents should not be traveling the world and district presidents should be actually in the field moving from pastor to Pastor to Pastor dealing and inquiring about positive and or negative issues.
55. Our governance model and synodical structure is too big for a small church body. I do not think we need the district level of governance. We can do away with districts and replace districts with multi-regional oversight.
56. I am deeply concerned about this recognizing the ongoing crisis with ABC CEF.

57. Don't need 3 Districts. A senior Pastor once said A.B.C. District should operate lean and mean. They are spinning their tires, with such a big engine. I agree.
58. Prior to 2016 - District staff in A.B.C. District numbered 12-13. Why?
59. Restructuring usually occurs because of lower membership, less giving, higher costs of everything, etc. If changes Can be made without upsetting the apple cart too much it would be ok with me. I am quite happy with the way things are now, but obviously they have to change.
60. I am comfortable with the way things are, but is this a structure we currently need? That is the question. There is a reason it was raised in convention years ago. Most notably, the districts in convention have already answered it, asking for the change.
61. as 16. unless the challenge is funding and the need for efficiencies and growth.
62. I am comfortable with their intended structure, but not the way our sinful nature has tried to corrupt it by attempting to take power and losing sight of helping the churches proclaim Christ as their mission.
63. But as they were before CEF fell, not with synod's ecclesiastical "intervention". That was a mistake and needs to be revoked.
64. I thought things were working all right but I assume all this is to do with lessons learned after crisis in the ABC district in order to manage things more effectively in future.
65. Hard to say with our District as it is now.
66. Overall yes. While we know of the troubles in the ABC district given the resources of the Synod it has responded well. We have good leadership at the LCC and East District currently.
67. Not with the current situation that ABC District now faces.
68. We need to rethink what we are doing.
69. We can always improve.
70. "Comfortable" is not always best. We can be comfortable with familiar even if it is not for our best interest. I think there are ways we can work to improve "things" in LCC at synodical and district levels.
71. "the way things are”???? This is another ridiculous statement. It is so close to "we've always done it this way" and we all know that is about as lame a statement or reason for anything.... Seriously, I didn't even want to waste my time to do this survey because when I first read through it some time ago, when it first was made available, I couldn't believe how many ridiculous statements I saw.
72. It seems that too often the Districts are king and Synod only allowed to be a bystander.
73. So far I have not been upset with the way things have been done. I believe those involved at this level make decisions for the glory of our God and the best decisions for our churches.
74. Excluding the present ABC situation.
75. 4 solitudes
76. Well, I was comfortable before (ignorantly so in that I don't really understand how it works) but of course the financial problems of the ABC make me nervous and suggest that some safeguards should be added to avoid the same in future.
77. don't really know 'how they are'
78. Could be improved on the level of the Lay members, both old and young.
79. It would appear that there are too few districts to justify a full-blown national/district structure. There appears to be resultant waste: Unnecessary administrators, unnecessarily large number of conventions, etc.

80. Three Districts result in duplicated work and extra expenses.
81. Sometimes we lose control, such as the ABC Church Extension Fund. Just because it involves religion or Christianity, we are too timid and give too much leniency and then we can get trapped in human ignorance and trust. We still need to maintain a rigid business model for reasons of compliance and we need to review local ecclesiastical practices that appear to be more lenient than Lutheranism allows, so that local conditions can still grow congregations without bending too far. My reference to this is the practice of ecumenical hospitality with respect to service Holy Communion. I think Luther made more of Holy Communion than God intended.
82. I am not impressed with some of the extremely "ultra-conservative" pastors who are graduating from the two seminaries. Our congregation had a bad experience with such a pastor and this situation caused many members to leave the church.
83. Obviously something went wrong.
84. I think we need to get back to some basics at every level in our Synod.
85. There are obvious issues with the current LCC and Districts that must be discussed. Thus I am not comfortable with all things. There is somewhat of a split between East and West. The church needs to be as consistent as possible from coast to coast. We share one faith and one mission. Communication and the roles and responsibilities of each part needs to be clear. However, I also do not feel particularly uncomfortable either. I love my church family, I think we are doing important work and I am proud to be a member of LCC. Up until the serious financial shortfall I would have been even more comfortable but current church and world events have led to increased unease. We need to get back on track and focus on what is important, growing in the spirit and sharing the light of Christ with others.
86. Being a member of the ABC district means I am definitely not comfortable with the current situation. The CEF crisis and the Concordia University issue are very distressing.
87. Inadequate information!!
88. We are very fragmented. We don't co-ordinate well across districts and at the National level. Education of ministers is a prime example of things going wrong with little ability to focus on solutions. I despair of the church's future whenever I meet one of our seminary students. Who is deciding that these men are suitable for the ministry? Who is allowing such unqualified people to graduate? How can they get so far along and be so poorly prepared? When was the last time the curriculum was looked at with a view to how a minister is successfully launched?
89. Unknown...
90. No thinking Christian can be comfortable with the agony, confusion and distrust imposed by the current leadership -- or rather the lack of leadership.
91. It has to be reviewed and changes made, so situations like the ABC CEF crisis does not occur again.
92. For the east they're OK
93. Our leaders are doing the best they can. Unfortunately, the church is declining. Two seminaries kind of tells you where things are at. We have two camps. We can't afford two but church politics demands that we have too. We have pastors who have the pure Gospel and some that don't have it.
94. Decisions made autonomously in one district should not be potential liability in another. Also to much resources spread over separate areas.

95. In general, yes, although there are always things that can be improved. However, I do not see major problems.
96. I have been, believing all was well.....
97. I am not comfortable and would like to see just one organization but with the number of churches this would not work
98. Outreach support and research into effective ways of outreach is a big gap.
99. There are too many offices, too much overlap and not enough proper management.
100. The current district structure leads to significant reduplication. We would be better to do away with the Districts and let many of these services be centralized in the national church office. Meanwhile, ecclesiastical supervision on the local level should be redistributed into smaller geographic areas ("dioceses") led by leaders ("bishops") whose primary focus would be on pastoral care rather than administrative functions.
101. We are a small church body; we should be moving to a more unified structure and away from the reduplication which is happening in various districts.
102. We do need to change.
103. Our governance model and synodical structure is too big for a small church body. I do not think we need the district level of governance. We can do away with districts and replace districts with multi-regional oversight.
104. I think that we would benefit from change.
105. Don't know of glitches.
106. Can't answer as know nothing about it.
107. I am not sure what this question is trying to ascertain. Regardless, as a Lutheran for less than 10 years, I don't really know "the way things are" at the District and Synod levels.
108. Some of the actions and words of Synod officials in the wake of the ABC district's financial crisis were not helpful; on the contrary, they created division and offence. In fact, they are very troubling.
109. I’m not involved. How can I know.
110. You can always have room for improvements.
111. I am not up to date on things at these levels. Appears mechanism should be set up to help sister Districts having Physical and Spiritual problems.
112. Too convoluted, not enough support for workers
113. Fairly comfortable with Synod but not with District.
114. firm adherence to the Gospel and proper use of the sacraments is essential but 'Lutheranism' should be nearly abandoned in favour of bringing God's word to those that have not heard it.
115. I was mostly happy with the way things were before the ABC collapse. The way that the Synod and Districts are acting now with one another is a different story.
116. There is no being "comfortable" when you’re on a ship that is taking on water -- and while discussions increase (again and again and again) as the water rages over the sides....
117. We function too often as two complete entities rather than as members of the same family.
118. That doesn't mean we can't improve them.
119. Please get rid of the many levels of duplicate administration so that we as LCC can get back to the commission Christ gave us: Go, baptize and teach all that Christ has done for all people.
120. Odd question.... what have feelings got to do with it? The Bible never asks "how do you feel? comfy? cozy?"
121. Not well enough informed

122. Things appear to work well - but like all management models minor changes can often result in a better use of talent & resources.
123. While I do not want major changes I recognise the need for encouraging new members and also keeping those who drift away after confirmation.
124. I am not comfortable with how things stand right now. At the very least, do away with all the separate conventions and hold one synodical convention every 4 years, have breakaway sessions for the local areas (district? circuits? areas?) for local needs, and actually have a convention to do the work needed (Mom & apple pie type of resolutions should not be needed!).
125. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
126. There is much duplication in areas of communication, conventions, and a strain on finding "warm bodies" to fill positions in both district and synod.
127. Yes - but agree there are probably areas were some changes could result in a smoother more efficient operation.
128. The congregations need to have the power and the information to do the best that we can do.
129. Too top heavy
130. Prior to the formation of LCC the proposed structure was rejected and the LCMS model was adopted. After 25+ years we have finally acknowledged that Canada and its Districts are unique. However, when form follows function we need to have a clearer understanding of the function before we design the structure. At present it appears that a particular form is desired to meet some specific agendas.
131. Current structure is too unwieldy.
132. I think we have duplication of administration between the districts and Synod. While we have regions, and regional differences that need some attention, the whole synod is too small to have 4 different boards and administrative apparatuses. Four presidents haven’t increased Ecclesiastical supervision, so a structure that reduces administration and frees up DPs to be bishops/visitors would be helpful.
133. What we are currently doing from what I understand is pretty much a copy cat of our big brother LCMS... don't get me wrong... I love our brothers and sisters in the LCMS and our affiliation with them. I think this is a partnership that should continue but it seems we basically set up our synod like theirs not really knowing what our needs would be as we became more independent.
134. Things appear to be working in the East District. We have heard about the issues in ABC District and the financial trouble that District is in. I am not aware of issues with the Central District.
135. I am pleased to see the district offices downsizing. ABC once had 14 staff. Centralize the financial part, and leave only a President and secretary at the district.
136. Just a look at what has happened in AB-C District with regard to Church Extension Fund should be proof enough that I cannot be comfortable.
137. They have no common language. The district speaks English. My congregation speaks French. hence it is difficult to speak of any sort of ‘relationship'.
138. How can a lay person know this???
139. A complete restructuring needs to occur.
140. It is not financially sustainable to have 3 separate districts. Too many things are being duplicated. We need one united and efficient Synod.

141. Numbers are down so why try to keep up everything.
142. The LCC is dead, it will just take years for the pension liability to manifest itself.
143. I can't be comfortable because the way things are; is likely hard to afford and lacking efficiency.
144. ABC District problem is a good example that we need to do things differently
145. study all individual churches
146. study all individual churches
147. Ignorance is bliss! I was very unhappy with the unilateral decisions from Synod in the management of the CEF fiasco.
148. Hopefully now DIL is about wrapped up things will improve
149. how are things?
150. would like to suggest streamlining the structure and administration for synod and district. I think we could have one synodical president and three district presidents (or synodical vice-presidents). This would reduce the Council of Presidents from 7 (I believe) to 4. The synodical president would fill the CEO role for LCC, while the district presidents would carry out a more pastoral role to church workers and congregations – dealing with pastoral care, calls and call meetings, peacemaking when there are conflicts. Circuit counselors would still be in place to assist the district president.
151. Comfortable is for your easy chair.... change is good
152. At the District level, our DP is good but I disagree with the decisions and direction of our Board of Directors
153. Our DP is great but many of the elected people of the Board of Directors of the East District work contrary to my desires.
154. Since the collapse of the ABC District I have witnessed a heavy handed approach towards us by the Synod. Comments made at a meeting of Circuit Counsellors, Board of Director meetings, even Glenn Schaeffer's installation lead me to believe that the Synod just wants all the authority, all the power.
155. Refinement of the structure would be welcome.
156. I'm not uncomfortable. "Comfort" depends on the people filling the roles! Structure in itself is not a panacea.
157. There seems to be no leadership from the synod and district levels.
158. Need only the Synod.
159. Change is required. We need to try and assemble our most talented people together to coordinate our efforts. Under the current structure many mission activities undertaken both at the congregation, district and Synod levels are disjointed and often fall off when the individual/s who championed the activity lose interest. We need to prioritize mission endeavors more strategically.
160. one of the biggest concerns is how we look after pastors and how that care is or is not communicated to congregations.
161. As a Non Member - I feel very much an outsider even after 25 years of regular attendance.
162. I believe that LCC has refused to take proper and adequate action to those who caused the fiasco in ABC and therefore all church discipline is suspect [Synod, District, Congregation]. LCC is doing a disservice to those responsible by sending them to their eternal rest without admonishment. Therefore, no member of any church in LCC has to worry about removal [church discipline] regardless how faithful that the pastor is or wants to be.

163. Leadership is trying to do the best they can but economics is driving us to do things dramatically different.
164. If there aren't major changes I will leave LCC and go to a different church body, this is not what I want to do but without change LCC is a sinking ship
165. Do not see much but when we see someone in person, from district, am very pleased with their involvement. They lead with strong faith.
166. Change is necessary, big time.
167. CEF was a wake up call, and still too many at District and even local Church Executive a delusional to think it will blow away. Christians will vote with their Wallets and their attendance. There are a great many Christian Charities that are good Stewards of Gods money and put a high percentage of it into missions rather than dark holes never to be seen again.
168. Change is happening as we speak. How it will all filter out is yet to be seen. However, local influence, support and control is needed to make sure the solutions that are needed are found and implemented in a timely manner. Less centralized solutions need to be considered, while at the same time having the centralized authority remain strong and influential in ensuring that the "standards" of Synod are maintained.
169. -too many things seem to be happening at the district level (ABC CEF; CUE) that the synodical level does not seem to know about;
170. The recent events in the ABC district have given me more of an education that I would other have about synodical and district workings. I am not of the belief that East District is on the verge of a similar situation as the ABC District finds itself in. However, I do believe that a stronger central entity can provide greater consistency and also allow for
171. better financial governance due to some economies of scale.
172. An Episcopal polity should be implemented.
173. I generally agree with the above statement.
174. Certain districts seem to be acceptably managed; other less so.
175. I do not have enough knowledge of either to come to a conclusion.
176. time to clean up problems and spread the gospel
177. How can we be comfortable when our outreach and ministry are not working and membership is declining?
178. How can we be comfortable when this church body is withering away?
179. Working together would make us stronger.
180. I can't say that I am comfortable with the ABC District.
181. Blow it up. We need change from top to bottom.
182. While the synod/district situation doesn't make me "uncomfortable", that is because much of it is irrelevant to my life in a congregation. I am not comfortable to the likely resource shortfalls (financial and volunteers for the exorbitant number of boards).
183. Some things are good but others are duplicated with some districts doing things very differently than the others. For example, youth. ABC has/had a very active and organized youth ministry but not the other 2 districts.
184. We need a made in Canada structure. I feel that we need a Synod for the country. We need 2 Districts: the East and the West.
185. I am comfortable with the structure, but I am not comfortable with how it is being carried out.

186. Haven't been comfortable with our structure for years. Too much duplication and no supervision. No one wants to lose their little fiefdom.
187. There is no visible district support for pastors and congregations.
188. I believe that an organization that is healthy at it's most basic foundation level (in the case of LCC this foundation level to date is congregations and church workers) can bring great blessings even out of an imperfect governance structure. On the other hand, it is extremely rare that a structural re-organization of an unhealthy membership can return the organic entity (corporate existence) to health. Again, dealing with the organization chart of the Synod without attending to the mission and ministry health of the congregations and church workers is unlikely to give lasting satisfaction to the delegates at the conventions who requested Synod work on a re-organization. The current system we inherited from LC-MS is certainly flawed as is any governance structure. However, our current system is completely scalable from a part-time District and Synodical President working out of his home or church office with volunteer Boards, committees and support staff up to multiple full-time staff should the size and health of the region and synod require it. If failing finances are the reason for re-structuring, then centralizing and still trying to assist congregations (the basic unit of synod) to become and/or remain healthy might be even more difficult than under the current system.
189. The leaderships are floundering and have been doing so for many years.
190. I don't think our structure at either level is suitable for our size or for the future.
191. What are "things?" No I am not comfortable with the general pattern of operations, mainly at the district level. The old/current structure has its benefits and I am not against keeping these. However, it is clear in the wake of CEF that "things" are not acceptable as they have been in the past.
192. I "agree" if by "the way things are" you refer to structure. If you mean the way things generally are at the district and synodical levels, then less so.
193. I am very ashamed of how things currently are in LCC at the synodical and district levels.
194. I am comfortable with synod levels and yet think we have one too many levels of "church government" for lack of a better term. I think my answer reflects this but am uncertain.
195. At present, synod and districts are almost useless appendages to congregations.
196. There is always room for improvement.
197. I admit my response here might be a result of ignorance. Although I have kept up with the various news and developments, I am not as informed as I probably should be. However, in regards to my faith and personal pastoral needs I feel that synod and district are doing well and do not have much of an impact.
198. It seems we are using up scare financial and people resources in duplicating structures that might better be utilized in accomplishing a clearly defined goal.
199. Not at the District level, there are many rural parishes in the Central District that need help acquiring pastoral services.

200. We are over governed.
201. I think work needs to be done at the district level with people who know the church workers and the congregations. Relationships are important and take a long time to build and develop. I think there could be a lot more sharing of resources than there is currently.
202. I personally have no beef with the current structure, but would definitely like to see a major overhaul.

203. We have to decrease the number of positions in the structure Not all of these positions should be pastors. Pastors should be in congregations.
204. they are not serving the congregations at the level it is needed
205. not really
206. There is always room for improvement.
207. The district is in a mess.
208. They are not serving the congregations at the level that is needed
209. They are not serving at the level that is needed
210. I have no idea how things are in LCC in synodical & district levels
211. I believe that LCC has refused to take proper and adequate action to those who caused the fiasco in ABC and therefore all church discipline is suspect. LCC is doing a disservice to those responsible by sending them to their eternal rest without admonishment. Apparently to me the only sin in LCC is child pornography. Therefore, no member of a church in LCC has to worry about removal.
212. They need more support from congregations so they can achieve their existing plans and goals, but this is a problem in congregations (some could use district support) and not a problem with the ideas and plans.
213. There are too many polarized views among pastors regarding evangelization and missions. Some are actually opposed to getting the gospel out. The seminaries do not train our pastors adequately and unitedly so little is done to further God's kingdom outside the four walls of our churches.
214. If restructuring is a possibility, then I should not be comfortable "with the way things are".
215. It is healthy to look closely at LCC and district levels.
216. I'd need specific examples
217. In my case ABC is not working at all
218. I feel there is a lack of confidence and some distrust in the districts now that a clean sweep of structure and personnel can address. Just shuffling the same names into different titles and positions does not do the job.
219. The need for change seems to have surfaced although I can't say that I have no confidence in the Synod and Districts. I think any organization that has been around for a while needs to examine itself to determine if how it is currently structured is effective and makes sense.
220. The current structure is not transparent and does not demonstrate clear direction for information and decision making.
221. In some ways I am happy other ways not. I need more information to make this a meaningful question and response.
222. I simply don't know enough about either to make any suggestions.... obviously something has to change
223. The current system is comfortable; I just don't think it is sustainable or even beneficial at this point.
224. It's a mess.
225. Let's get current and not old fashioned.
226. I'm not comfortable with the way things are, but don't have a suggestion to fix it.
227. I do believe that there have been some changes made for the better in some districts before things were too far gone but the situation in the ABC District was let go too long. They have made changes now but only because they were forced to do so. We should be willing to be more proactive in our Districts and Synod.

228. Unless I was a pastor, how would I know that
229. Information sharing should be done in a concise information sharing manner. It would be nice to get the facts about LCC matters, without "fluff".
230. Synod seems to be a distant entity while the district is what impacts the congregational life.
231. Still unless there are a will and means for a drastically better structure, there is no point in wasting valuable time and resources and being distracted by restructuring
232. Every organization should look at their structure every 3-5 years at least for review.
233. There could be stronger leadership to move forward.
234. the big church has become, dare I say, irrelevant. I don't want it to be. I love my Church. But it seems to have lost focus. Unfortunately, I don't know what will fix it. I think it has to start from the bottom up, not top down. I have not been to seminary for a long time, but my impression is they are pumping out theologians and not pastors, and certainly not evangelists. whatever happened to evangelists?
235. As far as I am concerned, Presidents Stanfel, Winger, Maleske and Zabel have all be used wonderfully by God in the East District. Did they err? Yes, of course, as has every pastor and lay member of our synod, miserable sinners that we are. Even with the members of various boards and committees with whom I have disagreed, I have been thankful that they cared enough to serve. However, I cannot see us sustaining our current structure and, more importantly, I see it as being poor stewardship of our resources.
236. Get back to basics, drop services and LSO's that are "nice to have".
237. Favor one church Synod and not three
238. changes need to be made, so this is a great place to start!
239. While we in the East District are comfortable, the pain in the ABC District is felt by us all. As one body we walk together and feel the pain.
240. Because of what was allowed to happen in the ABC District.
241. The synod seems to be a federation of districts that operate independent of each other and the synod. If that's what we want, then let's say it. If that is not what we want, then the degree of independence of the districts needs to be curtailed or the districts themselves, as presently constituted, disbanded
242. Yes, I am comfortable. BUT, the demographic challenges before us and the subsequent financial challenges which will follow are huge.
243. This is one reason we got in so much trouble in ABC. No one was watching the purse and it created a problem to big to fix. people lost thousands of dollars to never get it back.
244. We are not over governed, we are spending more on government than we can afford.
245. I don't see maintaining the present arrangements as realistic long term, so this is our opportunity to make it more lean.
246. Obviously the financial area in our district was lacking in management and trust is needed. This is one area that for sure needs changing. As well the supervision of people working in our churches and schools, and our districts/synods. They need more skilled spiritual supervision, and care for their souls. I know of situations where this has been lacking.
247. Because there's not a great flow of information from either the synod or district it's hard to say what these boards/pastors etc. are up to. Perhaps there needs to be digital forums for discussion.
248. "Comfortable"?

249. I believe that LCC has refused to take proper and adequate action to those who caused the fiasco in ABC and therefore all church discipline is suspect. LCC is doing a disservice to those responsible by sending them to their eternal rest without admonishment.
250. Do not know what goes on.
251. There could be a merging of functions.
252. I think the structure is fairly good overall, but there are some antiquated beliefs, teachings, and practices that need to be changed if the Lutheran Church is going to remain relevant with today's society.
253. Integrity has been lost - Like little bo peep who lost her sheep and doesn't know where to find them. We just can't leave them alone and have them come home. To regain integrity, the LCC must bring restitution to the CEF and DIL depositors.
254. not sure on this one, I do find it hard at times to follow,
255. I appreciate the great efforts of our church leadership but I believe a national Lutheran Church administration could vastly better serve our Lord and the membership of LCC
256. I simply don't know if there are issues which are causing tensions between the two.
257. 1.has not worked - see above reasons and shortcomings
258. Things are still getting done in our congregation. We have revised our constitution to reflect more authoritative power being granted to the pastor, which I am okay with, but I don't see this as a major change.
259. Currently have lost trust in anyone that may have had some say concerning extension funds.
260. I know no other.
261. Again, I prefer that we have unity in both synodical and district.
262. We get comfortable with most things. Lord help us to be less and less comfortable as soldiers passing through to a better land and to do/change what needs to be changed to make more disciples/followers who make disciples/followers of you our King.
263. It seems like the dangers of districts operating without proper oversight and corrective power has been revealed.
264. We have ineffective leadership on 2 levels.
265. I was comfortable with the way things are, until ABC bankrupted the church.
266. It is clear to me that the mandate has been given across all Districts in LCC that restructuring is requested.
267. Administrative guidelines sorely lacking, hence our mess.
268. If we learn from our mistakes and grow from it.
269. I have no problem with things on the synodical level. But there needs to be more refinement and removal of redundancies on District levels.
270. If after review of the structure it is decided that the current structure is the best choice, so be it. The review is absolutely necessary at this time. I believe that if an thorough review is completed that changes will follow. We do not need a split in Eastern and Western thinking and doctrine. I believe that LCC needs only one seminary, with all pastors being given the same education and preparation for God's ministry.
271. Should we change is only part of the issue. The bigger concern is to what should we change.
272. I love and respect our leaders, but I believe that there must be better ways to i) steward our resources and ii) support congregations in mission and ministry than we are currently doing.
273. Comfortable because we've all learned how to manage, manipulate, or bypass the current structure.
274. i don't know enough

275. again no comment necessary
276. Improvements need to be made. But we must be careful not to "reinvent the wheel".
277. I don't know enough of the way things are in LCC to be uncomfortable
278. B.C. tends to be left out with many more events held in Alberta I'm satisfied with synodical administration.
279. While comfortable with the status quo we should have a 5 or 10-year review to confirm that all is well, and look for opportunities for improvement.
280. There is so much distrust towards our district at this time that something major must be done to bring it back.
281. There needs to be the changes mentioned above at the district level.
282. We cannot afford the staff required to run the District as envisioned by the Handbook. The 3.97 Provisions "a. Each district shall provide through its structure for the following functions: Reconciliation, Church Extension, Communications, Congregational Constitutions, Congregational Services, Missions, Social Ministry Services, Stewardship and Financial Support" ... this is too tall an order for a DP and one or two paid staff! Reconciliation should be the DP's job (with assistance from trained Intern pastors and Circuit Counselors); Church Extension should be dropped; Communications and Congregational Constitutions should go to Synod; Congregational services should be reduced to working through the call process (with assistance from Circuit Counselors); Missions should be self-promoting and self-supporting. let those that rise to the occasion thrive, and let others die; Social Ministry Services? Not sure what these are; Stewardship in terms of developing and promoting programs is not a good use of District's time or resources; and Financial support could also go to Synod.
283. This question is too vague and imprecise.
284. Too many bureaucrats, too much governance, not enough pastoral care. Two of our three Districts are in the tank financially now, with each of the three going their own way, while it seems like Synod has no possible means to supervise anybody.
285. My involvement at synod / district levels is quite minimal....so, yes, I'm comfortable (I'm not sure comfort is a good thing).
286. ABC District has been an abysmal failure. I'm not only referring to CEF.
287. Again, we need a MAJOR overhaul. Things aren't good. We're not structured to be effective in the work God's called us to do.
288. I am comfortable with them, that does not mean that a new way isn't better.
289. Unless we do critical work on restructuring, we could lose our beloved Church!
290. I think the disaster in the ABC district clearly shows that relations between synod and districts are unsatisfactory.
291. It is an extremely costly and top heavy system that does not get us into mission: i.e.: where are our hospital, university, prison chaplains?

18. The relationship between my congregation and my District is healthy.

1. My district is limited in what it can offer individual parishes but apart from lack of programs it healthy.
2. How are we to know?
3. We have pastors from our district visit us at times.
4. Even though we hear little about district matters from our pastor.

5. to the best of my understanding.
6. Except for CEF
7. Good right now. But I understand this is temporary.
8. It is getting better with time and prayer. Again. We are not close to a main centre so we are often left out.
9. It's been off and on - it's hard for district to relate to a small congregation like ours.
10. The mismanagement of the church extension funds has created distrust.
11. Recently we have had much contact and help from our district due to parish problems.
12. When you have a High Church minister they ignore District.
13. There appears to be a good rapport to communicate freely.
14. ABC District with concerns regarding CEF. I think LCC will roll differently with building relationships.
15. How would I know?
16. we have broken families in our churches, district, LCC and no trust among us, feel like this is WW2 or Communism not sure who to trust, we are still healing from that trauma, churches were safe for yrs. in this country but not anymore.
17. In spite of our structural flaws, I am always saddened to hear my fellow Christians use language of they and we.
18. I have no idea of the potential that the District might provide. Perhaps the pastors are engaged with the District and feel great support. As a church member I feel no connection to the District.
19. Only a few members of the congregation are really aware of what is actually going on. There is a very small group that is pushing for what they want without even having congregational meetings or even providing documents for the members to read and think and pray about.
20. The CEF debacle has completely poisoned the trust.
21. There is a lack of trust on our part. Perhaps we have to move on and we will, but not until we see tangible evidence that our church governments are willing to consider overhaul.
22. I have a good relationship with the district. My congregation is generally good with district, though there is some apathy. I sense that many are not knowledgeable but would surmise it is due to their failure to take in the information made available, not the lack of availability.
23. The congregation is divided. I believe that many congregation members have been left in the dark by Immanuel Lutherans current Chair Person.
24. Not healthy at all... there is very little feeling of "synod" walking together - between congregation and District. Pastor does not promote "togetherness"
25. This question can't be answered.
26. Do not know.
27. We only hope - I think so.
28. It may be. I don't ask.
29. My congregation is a mission church and therefore neither has a lay vote or pastoral vote at District convention. Offering Missionary pastors and mission congregations a vote would help create a better relationship with District.
30. In my view it is in our District. Obviously not in ABC right now however.
31. There is no trust
32. I believe our congregation has very little to do with the District other than when we are calling a new pastor and someone MIGHT come out that day.
33. Not in the ABC District.

34. the appearance of District executive person is good from time to time even though it costs money.
35. A healthy relationship requires great two-way communication and transparency. I don't think we have that right now.
36. Many members of my congregation are deeply skeptical of our District's effectiveness.
37. My own feelings as pastor are positive toward district. There is skepticism by some of the leadership in the congregation at this time.
38. I believe the relationship has somewhat improved in recent years, but is not as good as it should or could be. I feel as if my congregation has in many ways been "blackballed" by my District.
39. See other comments.
40. I hope so.
41. Currently with where I have moved to I see a very healthy relationship with the District.
42. I'm a woman and barred from participating in any church office that would allow me to see what the actual relationship is between my congregation and District.
43. CEF failure has directly affected both members and the congregation itself, trying to restore trust in this relationship is pointless
44. much suspicion and hard feelings due to failure of CEF
45. My congregation fully participates in district activities.
46. Not much interaction that is visible to a Lay Person, even one who has been in various Leadership Roles within the Congregation. The "help" provided by the District through our Congregation's Vacancies and Call Process has been of particular frustration ... as has the District's vetting of recent Constitutional changes adopted by our Congregation.
47. At the moment we are still reeling from the impact of the ABC-CE mismanagement of our funds.
48. I really don't know how my congregation interacts with the District. Our pastor is a wonderful link, and I trust him implicitly to communicate what he knows about District matters.
49. We have struggled to find our place within LCC/ABC District for sure with our congregation
50. What does healthy mean? It might be healthy but is it good or sufficient?
51. Don't really know.
52. Not sure how you judge that
53. My pastor has spent a great deal of time explaining the relationship of our congregation to both the District and Synod.
54. There's always room for improvement.
55. District and Circuit responses to various needs of the parish is great. Unfortunately, members of the Church are struggling with doctrine and practice, simply because they are not aware of their own Church. Especially when society and even area churches have departed from sound doctrine and practice.
56. We do not have problems but our pastor could do a better job of relaying District information.
57. District is less visible and accessible to congregations than has occurred in the past. I am not as informed about district missions and do not anticipate a visit from our district president unless entering a call process.
58. The CEF and DIL has crushed trust and relationships between congregation and District.

59. I really do not know what the District is doing for my congregation.
60. Don't hear much from District
61. As far as I know it is.
62. As far as I know, it is. We don't have very much contact with "District" and we don't seem to have any conflicts regarding doctrine or practice.
63. what relationship?
64. I am answering these questions as a member who has recently experienced a very difficult period of the past 6 years, and just a year ago this situation got resolved. Our situation: Our congregation had major issues with the performance of duties of our pastor, and it took many years to get resolved. Average weekly attendance dropped almost in half, with many of those members never planning to return. While I personally do not fault any one individual in the District, due to the many HR and legal issues, but many members do not have a healthy relationship with the District because of the lengthy time it took to get the problem resolved. Some major changes probably need to be made to prevent situations like this from happening in the future, as you have lost numerous members to other church organizations or are no longer attending church at all.
65. Again have no idea.... a lay person simply going to church and just doing their thing will have no idea of district and congregation is healthy
66. I attend church regularly and have not seen much of what the district is actually doing so cannot comment on this either
67. Our members really don't care or know. Worship service is focus.
68. Not enough interaction to know
69. Circuit Too.
70. The CEF and DIL crisis has shaken our congregation and myself personally. I have lost my trust and faith in the District, the leaders and the Board.
71. ABC district is currently trying to serve its congregations. The Synod of LCC is currently trying to abuse the structure and abandon servitude in exchange for trying to take power and extort money from ABC District by claiming they are dead.
72. Not sure if it is or not
73. Historically I believe it has been ok, however in the recent past with CEF it is difficult to see whose interests are being served.
74. I don't know.
75. See #16. Rotten to the core. Nominations committee told who was in conflict and did nothing, with a slim lead Pres. getting in with 12 yr. of conflict> rammed through before the CEF DIL 2 hr. education presentation unfolded to educate the delegates. Delegated voting with no background on what they vote on, not having read the bylaws, constitution or handbook. Need to have witness sign with them they have read it before accepting a nomination to be delegate. Given 50% are Pastors, we have further conflict. no enforceable conflict of interest or moral or ethics bylaws. Offered to do them by laity with much credibility and were turned down. Told it was fine by Pres. of District. Fine for who?
76. We do communicate and work together.
77. I feel we have no relationship between the District and our congregation except for the requests we get Mission money and funds for our share of conventions etc. At one time we worked very closely with District to get our building renovated and a pastoral care for our congregation.

78. In general, that is true, but there are some questions, especially about CEF in the ABC District
79. I am not sure who in the congregation this statement is referring to, do those who wrote it know? If it means the staff, I have no idea. If it means the members, I would say absolutely not. The trust has been broken and all that has come forth has been secrecy, excuses, hiding behind "we cannot discuss this because it is a legal matter, before the courts". Open and honest communication has not been happening. No appearance of remorse or repentance for what amounts to misleading and theft of funds entrusted. The CEF funds lost were NOT donations. Even if they were, mismanagement would be terrible.
80. Pastor Glen and Pastor Bugbee do an outstanding job of doing God's and the Churches work in situations which must sometimes be over whelming.
81. before the CEF fiasco
82. It is not healthy in that my congregation sends its substantial mission offerings and the district leaves it alone to do it's own thing. That this happens is not simply my assumption, but it was the expressed sentiment of a former chairman of the congregation. The District and my congregation avoid conflict by avoiding one another. Lack of conflict appears healthy, but it is not. It's as if you would consider a couple that lives in separate houses as having a "healthy marriage", because they never fight. Of course, the reason they never fight because they rarely cross paths with one another.
83. In my experience, have not encountered major issues but I have noticed varying degrees of such relationship. At my previous congregation, we heard often what was going on in district, etc. did things with other LCC churches (reformation service, etc.) this was in southern Ontario. Now that we have moved to Eastern Ontario, I don't really hear anything from the District level and we have no involvement with the other LCC churches in town.
84. District Pastor leaders and lay leaders have lost $ 100,000,000.00 of lay money because they were too proud to admit they made a mistake, early on in this process. Pastors are not CEO's
85. Don't know.
86. what relationship?
87. As far as I am aware.
88. After the CEF fiasco I'm not sure what our congregation thinks about District, but I suspect the relationship has suffered.
89. Congregation members are very upset with the District's role in CEF DiL situation.
90. District has been a tremendous asset to our congregation over the years. From a lay/business prospective, the relationship is very good.
91. We definitely respect and appreciate each other and the common efforts that go into making things work for everyone, and still following the Lutheran Confessions.
92. We have sought help from district a number of times over the years and been brushed off or ignored.
93. I guess so -- there really does not seem to be much involvement between my congregation and the District. We are on nice, friendly terms, though.
94. Depends on who you ask or what you need.
95. I think overall our Congregation is supportive of District. Obviously there are some challenges with what has transpired.
96. I don't know that it is not.
97. We are in the "hinterland" and are seemingly in the shadows of attention.

98. Under the current leadership the relationship between my congregation and district seems to be improving. However, the relationship was severely damaged by the CEF crisis and the trust the congregation had in district has not been fully repaired and it may take many years to rebuild that trust as long as there are no further issues. I would have given a disagree or strongly disagree if district had not worked hard in the last few months.
99. We have lost members due to mismanagement
100. I think that trust needs to be gained again by the District to the congregations.
101. There isn't really much of a relationship.
102. Where and when was there discussion and meetings with the member congregations? "Town hall" meetings would have been welcomed. Hope you plan to have further discussions.?

103. With the collapse of the CEF this has made a damper in the relationship;
104. Again, there has been little relationship. When our congregation went into vacancy, there was NO real assistance given by the circuit counselor or district president. I serve on our congregation's board of elders and the only assistance given to arrange for a vacancy was a list of pastors (mostly retired) who might agree to preach here and there. Eventually there was good leadership in helping us arrange for an Intentional Interim Ministry, but even here the leadership was not very personal, i.e., the District President and Circuit Counselor didn't really work with the congregation. District Presidents and Circuit Counselors need to VISIT the congregations, not so much to speak (e.g., preach) but to listen, observe, and assist the pastor or the congregational leadership in case of vacancy or problem/crisis in pastoral leadership.
105. My congregation is a mission department supported congregation and while there is tension due to threat of closure, I personally am not opposed to that for the sake of the greater church.
106. I have no idea. What constitutes a healthy relationship? I was going to put "no opinion" at first, but perhaps my statement shows we don't have a healthy relationship.
107. we feel that our president knows us and supports us but also allows us some autonomy is being able to serve the Lord in our community.
108. Don't know
109. District is very cooperative and helpful whenever we ask anything.
110. Update and simplify constitutions.
111. All trust and respect is broken and cannot be repaired until District REPENTS -- something which they are unwilling to do.
112. Not sure, it appears to be. I have not heard of any problems.
113. The congregation I serve is declining. We are in maintenance ministry. And we have had many problems. But we have a good relationship with our District president.
114. Lack of trust. Resentment.
115. It is healthy in that my congregation sends its substantial mission offerings and the district leaves it alone to do it's own thing. It is healthy in that there is no conflict, but that's only because the District turns a willful blind eye to the congregation’s abuses. Of course, what worldly eyes see as healthy, faith sees as an abomination.
116. I have not heard of any problems, but then why would I?
117. because of the CEF disaster
118. I sense in our congregation either skepticism/distrust or indifference.
119. Does not exist! No common language!

120. The ABC district has serious credibility problems. I am not speaking on behalf of my congregation but as a concerned member.
121. I have not heard otherwise
122. I'm not sure. This is not something that is actively communicated to me.
123. As far as I know, it is. We don't have very much contact with "District" and we don't seem to have any conflicts regarding doctrine or practice.
124. My congregation, though impacted slightly by the CEF crisis, continues to support District through mission offerings. We are located far from Edmonton, so there is some unfamiliarity, but good will for the most part.
125. Don't know anything about district so can't answer
126. I know this because my pastor tells me it is. How would I know?
127. Formerly yes, but in the present circumstances my congregation's relationship is not healthy.
128. I think it is.
129. I am unaware about the relationship between my congregation and my district.
130. There really is no relationship.
131. I do not know how they interact.
132. I think the restructuring of the ABC District / handling of DIF funds is going quite smoothly----my congregation is handling it well.
133. I used to think that because our church was one of the oldest in western Canada that they were inclined to run their own show based on American influence.
134. The future of the ABC District is undetermined at this time; how can the relationship be healthy. It exists and is functioning in a limited capacity.
135. Except regarding the CEF crisis
136. Except in regards to the CEF crisis.
137. I think there is a moderate level of concern, but it doesn't dominate most conversation.
138. I have lost trust in our District office due to the CEF issue. It taints all their other efforts, unfortunately.
139. Considering the circumstances, I am very pleased with how the District is functioning within its downsized sphere of responsibility, and outside of the things it has little control over, such as the CCAA proceedings.
140. Other than in name -- and the sending of a yearly $ amount -- their is no concern or care from the congregation --- and in part, that is because it is not heard about, its activities not stated, and the congregation and its members NOT considered by themselves to be a part of a larger body with which they are to be working and serving together.
141. The pastor doesn't always communicate well, when it comes to building the health between congregation and District.
142. if things are running smoothly within a congregation (Pastor & congregation) then the relationship is good. If things are not running smoothly, the district does not always support the congregation! Voters meetings are not held, congregational support is not evident, however the district does nothing!!
143. Our district and our Synod simply disregards the issues of contemporary worship and don't do anything to prepare our graduates of our Seminaries to work with congregations in helping to grow their flocks with anything that is not in the Hymnal. Did Christ create our Hymnals; absolutely not. Take a look at Palm's - we don't even use the information provided here to consider creative worship, and I truly believe our Lord would be very disappointed in much of our staunch approach.

144. I was only recently accepted as a member at my new congregation, and while I think I would agree, I haven't been involved enough to know.
145. This would imply we have a relationship. Relationships require regular communication. We don't have this. There is a recognition of each, but little beyond that.
146. Don't hear much from them
147. But, it would be nice to have a visit from our District President!
148. Not aware of any problems.
149. My congregation has healthy respect for District, but little knowledge of what they do.
150. Part of the problem is the negative attitude of some people in the congregation.
151. There is confusion and ignorance as to what the role the district is. There is no connection or sense of the larger family of 'true' confessional Lutherans.
152. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
153. I don't know how to define "healthy." Does it mean "no conflict"? abundant mission support? It is what it is.
154. Not aware of any concerns or problems
155. I don't know - I don't experience "a relationship" as a Congregant. At our church, we have appreciated the District's involvement when we were calling our last 2 Pastors; I know our Pastors and church workers have appreciated the gatherings of local and whole-district staff.
156. we the members have no relationship - the pastor does, the leaders and elders do, but not the rest of us.
157. It has been very rocky her in ABC district but our churches can and will be strong again with a few changes to make us stronger.
158. There is a lot of ill-feeling with the current CEF fiasco in ABC
159. Between pastor not I to know.
160. What relationship? What does "healthy" mean? The District is unhealthy since it has incompetent leadership.
161. My congregation thinks it is fine, though what interaction we have is extremely limited.
162. The CEF/DIL has strained things but thankfully we have mature grace filled people and so were the people serving in various District roles. Nothing we can't overcome with forgiveness and God's help.
163. No faith in the District now. Must earn back trust.
164. see above notes. Again, District is invisible
165. I believe the relationship at the Spiritual level is healthy. However, the situation with Church Extension, has damaged this relationship. Trust in our leaders, and especially our Directors has been eroded. I would be very surprised if any of our members could ever be convinced to invest with any Church Extension fund ever again.
166. we are a very small congregation and struggle with funds and leadership (being spread thin). Is that healthy?
167. This is a ridiculous question since I as a lay person in my congregation am not in a position to answer it. You should ask my Pastor this question.
168. There are strains. Trust issues exist especially with respect to calling pastors.
169. I think we know they are there but only call when we are in trouble (vacant).
170. District has attempted to protect the pastors who are deeply involved in a multi-million dollar Ponzi scheme. There is no financial accountability, even after the loss of tens of millions of dollars of trusting church members. There has been no disciplinary action against

the Board or staff members who orchestrated the fraud. District and pastors seem to exist in an alternate reality divorced from the most basic understanding of honest business ethics.

171. Non-existent
172. Although language can present obstacles and distance, I believe our congregation could benefit by a deeper understanding of why we benefit by being a part of the larger body of Christ beyond our local congregation.
173. In truth, I see little or no active relationship. 80 percent of the people in the pew have no idea what a synod or district is nor do they care!
174. ABC District needs a house cleaning and remove all people from positions that were in district over the time period that the CEF and DIL disaster happened. There needs to be some at least "pause " discipline to those involved in the CEF fiasco until civil authority either clears them of wrong doing or charges them. Pastors have been on temporary leave and not able to " pastor " for things that are much smaller and definitely not as far reaching in hurting so many and their faith and life savings. No discipline to these people especially ABC past district president makes the church a mockery. Much the same as the Roman Catholic Churches delay in dealing with the priests who sexually assaulted children.
175. It is at the moment but certainly has not been in the past. The District can be very unhelpful and totally lack understanding of a congregation if things aren't going well especially when it comes to clergy. The clergy will be totally supported as long as their doctrine is as the Synod wants it to be. Whether that clergy is destroying a congregation is irrelevant.
176. It is "healthy" only as far as the financial contributions going from the congregation to the district.
177. I participate in the Quest series - the presenters are awesome - they provide good information and are always very approachable, expressing interest in our congregation The pastors who come when our Pastor is away have been excellent and very interested in our congregation. From these experiences I would say we get along well. LWML groups get along well and share resources readily - we participate in each others' rallies.
178. this perception could have something to do with the 'ill-feelings' that are still brewing as a result of the CEF scenario. Apart from that, I don't believe it to be healthy since I don't see any direct collaboration or communication in either direction.
179. I am grateful for my district and what it offers but my congregation takes no advantage of anything it has to offer.
180. Issues in the past still affect the congregation I serve. The District, according to some laypeople, did not even inquire about the welfare of the congregation during a major upheaval and split in the congregation over a decade ago. I was not here at the time but I am working to try to restore the relationship between the two, even as I have been working to mend the fences and rebuild bridges in the community of believers.
181. Damaged at one point because the District sided with the wrong party in a dispute which they later admitted to but slowly being mended over the last decade.
182. My congregation has been deeply hurt by the CEF crisis. I know that they no longer contribute to District. The pain is palpable. Only God's redeeming power can heal the rift. But this will take time. Eliminating the District will not eliminate the pain or the distrust. Centralizing is not the answer.
183. I am not sure
184. I'd qualify my agreement by stating that we (I included) suffer from a horrible apathy and readiness to let things drift.

185. I believe so, but again, this is my poorly informed opinion or "feeling."
186. We are in the process of calling a pastor but have not received any or little direction from our district, our pastor has come out of retirement to help us move forward.
187. I hope so
188. Yes, because that has been the way it has been set up since formation of LCC.
189. Never have I perceived such outright anger. The people of my parish feel betrayed and lied to. The fact that they continue to come to worship is a testament to the faith they received in baptism. I am working continually to simply have them let go of some anger and thus be open to forgiveness - but be assured, they will never trust district again.
190. I am new to my current congregation and have not gotten a feel for it yet but on the surface it would appear fine between congregational workers and District workers. My last congregation the relationships were very good I would say. However, in my opinion, I would say, on average, that the regular parishioner has little relationship with the District.
191. Our congregation functions with little visible interaction with the District and other district congregations. I see no evidence of an unhealthy relationship.
192. Need
193. Our congregation supports the District with good mission offerings and makes it a very important priority.
194. Hope so, but how do we know?????
195. I believe, when the District office included missions, education and peace maker courses to its congregations we had a great relationship.
196. the interim district is still figuring itself out...but the previous district with the duties of Pres, Missionary, Education, absolutely.
197. My church has needed to be read the riot act a few times - and District hasn't stepped up to the plate.
198. The present CEF concerns in the ABC district have changed what was healthy into a troubled relationship, although I believe it will heal with time and encouragement.
199. We have great respect overall for our district leaders.
200. The leadership in our church will not support ABC district anymore, our trust has been broken and we feel violated by the past 17 yrs. ABC budget for 2016 shows 58% of the money they expect to take in this year will be eaten up in administration, this is not good stewardship and is unsustainable. ABC needs to disappear
201. We have very little to do with our District
202. Agree, although the value of the relationship is not clear.
203. How do you loan money to Prince of Peace to build a facility in Vallyview, then when that facility is 100% sold....no trace of any loan payment made? ABC District slid into an operation focused primarily on Real Estate speculation. The District showed up at the last convention with no financial statement for district, and very little if any information on actual mission work. Disgusting. The mood in my congregation is worse than mine. We will forgive as Christians should, but for years to come we will not trust those individuals. One word says it all ACCOUNTABILITY.
204. There needs to be more communication and liaison between District leaders and Congregation Pastors.
205. By and large most members ignore the District - not a good situation
206. We feel our congregation sees little value in district. We have no understanding of what it does.

207. Even though the District is in a state of flux I believe the relationship is healthy. Fortunately, I personally have a strong relationship with District officials. Other congregations may not be as fortunate. The challenge is to find a way for all congregations to have access to the District within their means to do so.
208. I believe the relationship is healthy, but I don't know enough to comment.
209. I have not heard of any issues.
210. The District needs to function like a Diocese, and the District President like an Archbishop, the Circuit Counsellor like a Bishop.
211. There is no conflict between our congregation and district. What do you mean? What would good health mean or what would it
212. look like??
213. Our four-point parish was overlooked when similar combining of parishes was being considered. Our District went to ABC District for a working example. Our congregation now supports the services of another Lutheran Church body to provide spiritual support to hospitalized members of our congregation.
214. ABC district is sick and needs a major overhaul!
215. As far as I am aware it is!
216. I know of no particular issues, however other than receiving communications for annually budgeting, there is no communication that I know of.
217. serious distrust and pain
218. serious distrust and pain

219. It seems to me that we tend to ignore each other which is not a picture of a healthy relationship
220. NO.
221. But we still more coordination to work together.
222. As our congregation had a large sum of money invested in the ABC District CEF, I can't say that we have a healthy relationship.
223. I have NO idea what the district relationship is with our congregation
224. Very little support from district in the past when there were any issues in our congregation. An issue would maybe be acknowledged as existing, but nothing would be done about it. So we stopped asking.
225. It is healthy in as much as it exists... again, not a major component of congregational life.
226. We have very strong and engaged pastors.
227. Our congregation is centrally effected and has had an effect on the ABC district CEF situation. There is much uncertainty here as there is elsewhere in the district. There seems to be a tangible void in congregational/district relations at the current point in time.
228. not sure there is a relationship between us.
229. District has acted in very poor faith plus bordering on unethical
230. I believe our congregation and the district have a good relationship but there may be room for improvement
231. except for the CEF situation
232. Not really. When we needed guidance from the District leadership most they were not there at all. Our problems were swept under the rug and ignored.
233. There is no sense of "district" after the CEF fiasco

234. By the grace of God and through His forgiveness, the relationship between our congregation and the District is healthy. In those situations, where it is not healthy Lutheran principles of Law and Gospel and the grace of God is not being adhered to.
235. Tension and Distrust we have lost respect for our district.
236. Little to no involvement.
237. The relationship between my congregation and district (and synod) is strained at best. There is a great deal of mistrust in the current structure and management of the district/synod. Although the relationship is not broken, I would not describe the current relationship as "healthy."
238. Sometimes, my small town congregation feels like the "redneck stepchild" in an urban circuit.
239. as an emeritus pastor, I can't speak for my congregation. But I'm not aware of any general unhappiness or concerns.
240. My congregation is able to respond to District in more positive ways than smaller struggling congregations. District's response however has lacked clarity and been untruthful in financial matters to the point that audited reports or even ANY reports on CEFs were not given for several years.
241. The District's mismanagement and misleading and failure to lead has made for very unhealthy times and division within our congregation.
242. as an emeritus pastor, I cannot speak for the congregation.
243. This unhealthy relationship is primarily due to the crisis in our district. I cannot comment on whether our relationship was previously healthy (though I'm certain it was healthier) as I joined this particular congregation only weeks before the CEF announcements were made.
244. I strongly agree with the statement as read, but having a healthy relationship does not mean I favor keeping the district structure. I have no idea how my answer is would be interpreted. - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
245. I have a very poor opinion of many aspects of the District. I feel that there has been deception, arrogance, contempt of congregations, and self aggrandizement.
246. Very little communication
247. My district staff completely abused the trust its members placed in them. I can't imagine it being any less healthy.
248. I can hardly call it a relationship, except perhaps a broken one.
249. We all have to work on open communication.
250. The CEF situation in ABC has caused issues in the congregation.
251. Other than looking to District at a time of vacancy we don't make too much use of the District.
252. That being said I think that strongly agreeing means that we don't really need district office. They can keep their programs and with no strife requiring district president support, there is nothing district has to offer.
253. Is there, in fact, much of a working relationship?
254. I do not have enough information to comment
255. Our congregation is not as aggravated toward the ABC district as other; however, the CEF crises has certainly strained our relationship.
256. Seriously... we are in ABC!!
257. very little if any from district

258. outside of the fact that our congregation exists on a set of books, we could all go away and if no complaint was made no one would know we left.
259. I think so
260. somewhat
261. What relationship?
262. My district is ABC. Trust has been broken.
263. I have only seen the District President at a few call meetings and forum meetings. He is the only representative of LCC that I have ever met, no other member of the board.
264. Our church has decided to give monies to LCC and to the various missions as required-not to the district because of distrust of present district officials
265. We always strive to meet our District goals.
266. No it is not. Congregational problems exist, they are either covered up, not reported and not dealt with. Very little hands on supervision is seen for pastors when there should be.
267. Our pastor runs his own show and is not united in any way with neighboring LCC pastors and congregations.
268. CEF difficulties have strained this relationship. It appears to me that we have a strong independent spirit which I don't agree with. It leans too much towards pride, rebellion and unforgiveness.
269. There is a lack of trust.
270. I am not sure - don't really know or hear that much about it
271. There is a lack of trust in ABC district due to the loss of money for many people.
272. Congregations have had their trust shaken and parishioners have lost faith, and in some instances their life savings. How does this make a good relationship?
273. I sometimes hear negative comments directed at the District but am not sure how much substance there is to them.
274. relationship between District comes only in small drips. most parishioners do not under stand synod structure.
275. I Have no idea. can laypeople answer this as informed voters? this question is for pastors I think.
276. I really don't know enough to answer that.
277. There is virtually no relationship to be satisfied with.
278. My congregations have had struggles with district in the past, but the leadership understands the role that district plays.
279. It's not a bad relationship, but I don't there is a high level of confidence nor expectation in the district.
280. Our pastor is on the board of the district.
281. We can call them, but they don't have the resources to help so what's the point? We need to grow the church. We need to get youth and young families back to church if we hope to survive. Without more resources contact with the district is of little value.
282. The leadership of our congregation has no relationship problems with the individuals in district leadership. There may be cynical pessimism and lack of confidence, but not a strained relationship.
283. We don't have enough members to be a viable congregation.
284. Don't hear much from the District
285. They're not even sure what the district does.

286. Some congregations receive little to no support from the District and that certain issues could have been taken care of earlier on and avoided pain to the Pastor and his family.
287. We had a neighboring church with big problems between the retiring pastor and the new one. That was, in many people's opinion, handled very poorly by the church, and the church higher-ups. There was no resolution, and there was a split in the congregation. Use definitive scripture to settle matters, listen to both sides and be objective, and forget the emotional side of things. Yes, or no, who is in the wrong, according to God's Word? Who needs to repent and seek forgiveness? When no sound judgments are made, we are left to choosing sides and interpreting the matter without all the facts. We need wise men who are very well versed and studied in God's Holy Word.
288. We receive very little help from our district.
289. Ever since the CEF fiscal the relationship between congregations and District is strained, it has improved a little bit since a year ago. The main reason, District did a very poor job of explaining what happen and how the problem was going to be fixed. A lot of the time the Pastor at the congregation level was left to explain what happen and how everything was going to be fixed. That was a tough position to put the Pastors in, they became LIGHTING RODS for everybody. Pastors aren't financial advisers. There is some improvement in relationship, but there is still a long way to go. In the future the District Presidents and District personnel should be out and about more so congregational members know who they are.
290. Our congregation is about to close and the only help from the District was we were told " to pray “.
291. We continue to support the District and try to regularly have servants of the District visit us and share with us what is happening across our District and Synod.
292. Too much power at the top.
293. I have enjoyed the outreach and having the idea of something that close to us. "healthy"? I think we do better where I am at more so than other Districts....but that is my perception.
294. don't know
295. We need more interaction from district members to have a better impact on the decisions being made. Whether that means more frequent visits, or better lines of communication established.
296. This is a reflection of the current situation in the A-BC District with regard to the CEF issue. At present the relationship between our parish and the District is extremely unhealthy. If that question was asked prior to the CEF issues I believe the answer would have been affirmative.
297. I hope it will get better again!
298. Almost non existent.
299. For most of the members of my congregation, the district and synod is "far away" and has little impact on them.
300. I love both and am proud of both. BUT, the demographic challenges before us and the subsequent financial challenges which will follow are huge. We need to act.
301. Many people have been HURT by the mismanagement of funds!
302. The ABC district CEF collapse and aftermath showed a gross failure in the relationship. We are still wondering who knew what and when they knew it.
303. How would we know? We didn't know ABC district would fail.
304. It was that until the insolvency.

305. The CEF situation has caused people to leave our church, and also many people have doubts about the district's handling of the monies. Also, I know of schools that are affected by the loss of money through CEF, and because people in our congregation have family throughout BC and AB, they are affected.
306. Because of lack of personal contact on the part of both the District to the pastors and/or individuals this is a difficult question to answer
307. Not sure there is a close relationship.
308. A-BC district has caused major financial problems for many congregations.
309. Do not know
310. shouldn't the congregations receive information?
311. I think it could be healthier if the district could be incorporated with the synod.
312. Just wish we would see them more.
313. Not sure how our relationship stands.....

314. Only up to a point! It is healthy but hurting terribly and sad and disappointing. Especially now after hearing about congregations forced to sell their facilities, and the loss of Concordia college as a church college, and the many depositors hurt by the lack of financial integrity of the District.
315. Healthy, as far as I know.
316. Not with us.
317. I believe the relationship is a positive one but since our District office relocated to Winnipeg it seems to have required less frequent reference to District office
318. We do not and should no longer have a ABC district office. they are bankrupt in more ways than financial
319. There is a general "feeling" of trust and interdependence but the CEF crisis has had some effect on the relationship.
320. Because of the CEF problem we are having in ABC District, there is more overall skepticism as how the District decides to fund/invest in churches and their congregations. We have temporarily suspended our contributions to the District until and audited report is done to the financial statements. (Voted on Jan. 31/16)
321. Our congregation has ALWAYS had a healthy relationship with my District. Our pastors & church leaders appreciate all that the District has done for us & they have always been there for us.
322. Don't really see much of an obvious relationship. Just assume it is ok.
323. I don't think anyone in our congregation could articulate what the district does. The only exposure they have is at call meetings... and pastoral tenure here is long.
324. Flow of information outside of Kitchener area is non existent, it is as if the remainder of the province does not exist.
325. At this time with the CEF crisis I don't think it is healthy but things are being worked out so it should be OK.
326. Even before all of this, District just wanted money and didn't really do anything for us. I won't give any money to the church until something big changes in ABC District. I refuse to support something so clearly wrong.
327. For the most part
328. We don't have a relationship so I cannot comment on whether it's healthy or not.
329. We could do better.

330. This is more of a comment on my congregation though. They are small, old and not interested in District save for the pastor and his family.
331. The congregation falls under the East District. Not much support happens than that fact as they don't have the financial resources to do much more.
332. I think it is.
333. The congregation's pastor is the key. Some are aloof/don't care/doing their own ministry, ignoring the District's needs/plans/future.
334. Lack of trust in DP even with election; he was there all along while things went down hill.
335. District is irrelevant.
336. more use of circuit meetings and congregation circuit liaison could improve the flow of information to congregations. This could be more cost effective than printing national papers.
337. There is no relationship. We are left on our own.
338. My Pastor is an ABC District man. He would do anything for them but not his congregation. He is blinded by his faith to the ABC District.
339. Poor supervision by district of loan re-payments
340. Brought about primarily by the Church Extension Fund Fiasco.
341. While we appreciate the DP and staff ... we know the District is broken and cannot be relied on for much support.
342. Only because I keep myself connected.
343. I believe it was until the CEF/DIL fiasco. Much confidence and trust has been lost because of this. Lack of clear communication and proper disclosure of (all) the facts have also hurt this relationship. The seeming lack of control, direction, assistance, and involvement by Synod is also hurting that relationship.
344. We pretend the district doesn't exist... They did the same to us for the longest time.
345. It's ambivalent. If District went away, we'd barely notice. We'd find resources elsewhere and we'd still work with other congregations in our region closely as needed.
346. Do not hear about district at all in congregation
347. Not aware of any strong feelings against District or from District against congregation.
348. We don't have significant interaction to encourage and empower us, and we are not actively doing our part to support the District besides providing funds.
349. My congregation has always had strong ties to, and a good relationship with, District Office.
350. I wonder what the relationship is. We pay our mortgage and send as much mission offering as we can to district, but there is no relationship in terms of dialogue or suggestions in either direction. I have a
351. feeling that suggestions in either direction might be resented.
352. Our congregation tends to operate around district, not with it. District causes more frustration than it is worth.

19. I have confidence in the performance of my District's current Board of Directors.

1. Our District Board of Directors has fine people but as a group they suffer a lack of administrative clarity. Our District President is good at pastoral skills but lacking in administrative skills and an ability to project a clear vision.
2. Board is brand new last year.

3. My first thought is "they won't be able to help".
4. I do not know who is currently serving on my District's Board of Directors. I don't think there are any movers & shakers or progressive thinkers on there though.
5. I don't know them - I have confidence in God - that He will lead the right people to do the right things.
6. These individuals walked through an extremely heavy door. I believe the Board should have been a completely new slate though.
7. Agree, but I do not really know what this entails.
8. The people who have offered to serve on the district board of directors after the CEF bankruptcy are very brave and have to this point done a good job in their difficult positions. I believe they are working for the betterment of congregations and members. There have been some hiccups and the most important thing they can do is maintain clear communication and in financial decisions, follow the directive of the majority of depositors. I believe they have been successful in rebuilding some of the trust that was lost.
9. There needs to be better transparency. When millions are being lost and we didn't even know what was being invested in its not right. We should be supplied with financials on a quarterly basis.
10. I think the Vice Presidents are all very godly men who have a great heart for ministry and people. I know they prayerfully seek the Lord's guidance in their roles.
11. Our newly elected Board of Directors seems to be doing an excellent job in an extremely difficult crisis.
12. A lack of knowledge about what the BoD is doing makes it hard to respond - PS - is this a fair question given what is happening in the ABC District?
13. Don't know what they do
14. because of CEF crisis
15. I don't even really know who they are. I see their names on the District website, but that's all they are to me - names.
16. Not if they are responsible for the failure of the church extension fund.
17. If you go with ONE Head office...no districts.... wouldn’t a full review of present board be advisable?
18. They seem to have good intentions, adequate skills, good continuity and an appropriate attitude.
19. How would I know anything about their performance?
20. They are in a very difficult position right now with very few volunteers coming forward.
21. Need revised terms of reference. (constitution)
22. I am not sure what they do, everything seems to be getting done.
23. I hardly know my District's Board of Directors but I trust them. I am sure people in the A-BC District trusted their Board of Directors but now they are selling assets and there is a shortfall of funds in the Church Extension Fund. We are sinful people. What do we do when financial errors are made? We need to be very careful in managing the funds that people place in the offering plates. Some of them may be sacrificial givers.
24. Not sure
25. We have major District money problems because of the Board. I think our present situation is in flux while there's an attempt to restructure.

26. I don't know them so I can't say. And yet, I shouldn't have to know them personally or trust them. The Board of directors shouldn't be empowered to make judgment calls. They should have a defined job to do and do it with as little discretion or wiggle room as possible.
27. I was comfortable with the past board, the present board has not been in very long
28. I have confidence in God being faithful. Our governing structures and members are as fallible as human reason. LCC seems to have a healthy attitude about this. I believe that the people who serve in such capacity do, by in large, serve because they love their God, are passionate about serving Him, and His church, and furthering His Kingdom here on earth.
29. Outreach is not being effectively addressed so the Board of Directors is ultimately responsible.
30. After what we have been through, confidence is gone.
31. CEF fiasco - enough said.
32. Very new. A new board was just installed last fall. Don't know enough about them.
33. I have enough familiarity with who the people are serving on the District Board of Directors that I can say I have sufficient confidence in their performance.
34. I am a member of a Board of Directors for my District. I am very grateful to God for the people elected by our convention. We take our responsibility seriously, and we are working to guide our District through the challenges presented by CEF.
35. Have no idea who they are
36. I don't know anything about them and I know little of what they do.
37. Yes. The members of the Board of Directors of the ABC District are facing a daunting task with pressures and influences from different factions within the District and the Synod. Considering the threats of lawsuits against past members of the Board (by Christians, even pastors, no less), it is amazing people were found to serve on the present board. They need our prayers.
38. Who are the current Board of Directors? What do they do? No one has visited us in such a capacity.
39. Possibly, but I don't know who is on the board of directors. It is a small district.
40. Yes, but as I remarked under question #15 we need to restructure
41. I commend the current Board members for their bravery in taking on these positions under such tremendous crisis and personal risk. In the short time they have been in operation as the Board they appear to have performed very well. Having been a participant in the Nomination Committee it is my opinion that the Board needs a stronger representation of business experience. Pastors hold the majority of board positions and are not trained or necessarily experienced in business practice, like it or not there is a business component to running the District / Synod.
42. I don't think that the problems of the past are the problem of the current board of directors and think that no one meant any malice by what happened in the district. I have faith in the current board of directors for the district insofar as they operate prayerfully and follow Gods leading in the changes that are made.
43. They pretty much have to work within the system.
44. They are kind and wise people and they had the courage to let their names stand when others did not.
45. Trust has been broken.
46. Just barely -- we need the best qualified people -- not people elected because of "one from each circuit" consideration where at times "square pegs are elected for round holes" because

of this almost quota system. RE-ESTABLISH a "Nomination committee" that will search out the best qualified individuals and have a real good reason for putting their name forth. Don't have it just to be because someone was nominated.

47. However, I wish they would communicate more in the areas where congregations can be put to work.
48. They are encouraged to "stay the course".
49. Given that in the last few years they have had resignations and major concerns with regards to youth, education, evangelism (totally defunded), and missions . . . due to some "interesting" perspectives, I have little hope they will accomplish anything useful.
50. Don't hear much from them either - not lay people anyway
51. I do not know them well enough.
52. Unsure. They have a difficult task ahead of them in the ABC District. I pray for them.
53. Our district's (Central) Board of Directors currently looks at the "big picture" and doesn't get caught up in the minutia of everyday governance matters.
54. change, remember!!!!!!!
55. They have only been at it for a year but I feel confident that they are doing the best they can with these difficult circumstances.
56. need to be more transparent with information
57. This has only recently been changed, so that an honest appraisal or overview is premature.
58. No knowledge to know.
59. It appears the Board of Directors is only interested in keeping the status quo of its ineffective leadership.
60. Absolutely. Why wouldn't I?!
61. Have you read the report about the handling of CEF by our District's Board of Directors????
62. I am sure the members of the board are honourable people. However, because they are far removed from my situation geographically and linguistically, it is difficult for me to form any opinion concerning their efficacy.
63. BoD has changed recently
64. I don't know them well enough to say.
65. Yes, they are grass root people.
66. No confidence whatsoever. Over the past 20 years they have been dishonest and incompetent.
67. A challenge in one of the congregations in our district led to frustration and an exodus of members from that congregation. Unfortunately, there was unresolved dissatisfaction on many sides such that tainted the performance of the Board of Directors but also the integrity of the Body of Christ. I know our leaders are human beings too that need divine wisdom to guide them in their positions of authority.
68. They are governed by fear, are against changes in policy and outlook, lack vision, and show an inability to deal properly with conflict and the ever changing needs of the district. The current interest is to govern conservatively in the hopes of maintaining a "heritage".
69. I have confidence in the current board - but I also had confidence in the last board. Only later did I find out that they were trying to manage the financial affairs without the advice and direction of a fully competent business and financial administrator
70. Too early to tell about the current Board of Directors. Very disappointed by the previous BOD, which demonstrated lack of accountability and humility, insufficient oversight of

CEF/DIL, undisclosed conflicts of interest, insufficient skills to manage the finances of the district, among other concerns.

71. I believe these individuals to all be very capable, educated, faithful and caring people who have been voted in by their peers for a reason.
72. Are they separate from the Board of Directors that were involved with the CEF? If not, then I disagree
73. District president needs to be commended for his hard work and dedication.
74. Our DP is good but I disagree with the decisions and direction of our Board of Directors
75. They are new. But able. They are at the receiving end of Synod's political maneuverings and have had their existence and legality called into question. They are faithful servants and should have the full support of the District and Synod. But they don't. I fear for their faith. Blogs, forums, all speak of what they do not know and these find people, who let their name stand during a time of trial, are vulnerable.
76. I hope the A-BC District's current board does a much better job of managing the district's affairs than the previous boards have done. They have a huge task ahead of them.
77. Well, have you lost saving?
78. I do not have confidence in the ABC President. I do not believe that he is willing to let go of his agenda and simply serve his district in the manner they need him to serve. I do not believe he has learned much at all from the CEF debacle and is so far removed from the people in the parish as to be rendered almost completely ineffective.
79. But not it's president!
80. I trust they are making the best decisions that they can with the information at hand and the gifts/talents God has given them.
81. They have lots of potential, but must be encouraged to take a strong stance where a strong stance is needed.
82. They do what they can with the resources they have. Outreach initiatives puzzle them as much as it does the rest of us.
83. They are a nebulous body of ladies and gentlemen and the confidence that I have; is perhaps just hope.
84. I've heard some good things about the current BoD - beyond that I don't know what they do.
85. Our current ABC district board has a few people who I consider friends, so I'm very happy with the current board.
86. It is important that both district and synod leaders are focused on the work that God calls us to do - we need to be careful that we don't try to undertake work that is best left to others rather than to the church.
87. However, it needs to be said, other than staying financially solvent, I am not aware of what they do on a regular basis. Recognize however that things can change overnight as was seen in the ABC situation. Then the questions arise... We trusted the directors... were they really competent to govern.
88. I do not know who they are
89. Doesn't mater anymore
90. But the Board could also be a centralized Board. I have enough confidence in God that He will provide the right structure, once we put the process in motion.
91. Don't understand how they allowed the CEF to go bankrupt!
92. Many new faces, but some carried over. I will have confidence when I see proof in actions.
93. I believe they have all of our interests at heart. Time will tell how everything plays out.

94. -although I know who most of the people of my District's current BOD are, I'm not sure that most laypeople do; congregations need to pray more for the work of the BOD of each District
95. I lack knowledge to comment effectively. There is no clear way to see how members get feedback in order to hold the District accountable.
96. I am neutral on this point not because of any specific concerns about most workings of our district. Rather I think that more could have been done at the district level to more professionally deal with CEF's. I believe there is a strong 'duty of care' that should be present in all dealings with this sort of fund. I'm not that such care is in place since we are not holding ourselves to the standards that are firmly in place for mainstream funds. A strong BOD would at least recognize that a gap exists.
97. I am new to the LCC and am not familiar with them.
98. They are not prepared to make the changes necessary to save our church body!
99. As a lay delegate attending the District Convention limited information to answer this question.
100. I know of no particular issues, however other than receiving communications for annually budgeting, there is no communication that I know of.
101. at this point we don't have much confidence in anybody
102. at this point we don't have much confidence in anybody
103. Boards of Directors use up too much of their time managing the business affairs of the church, using clergy inappropriately.
104. Clergy have no business in managing the business aspects of the church (see Acts Ch 6 - waiting on tables) and need to give all their attention to prayer and the ministry of the word.
105. Hope that the new board has learned from the past mistakes. It also needs to communicate better.
106. I don't really hear much about what is going on at the District level.
107. As with previous Boards, the current one doesn't appear to be interested in restoring relationships. Communication to the member churches appears non-existent.
108. Nope. Not at all. There are still people from the CEF fiasco era involved and until they are gone there is no hope of meaningful change. Our district president is completely clueless regarding how we the people feel about this. He needs to leave.
109. Since the CEF restructuring in ABC district I am not familiar enough with the current structure/BOD to comment on this.
110. We have a totally new board so it is difficult to say, however, they need to prove themselves before I can make a real informed decision on this question. For now, I am very suspect if any change is forthcoming.
111. We need to clean house
112. It's too early to tell
113. For the last 4 years we finally have a BoD that is competent and does not just rubber stamp what the DP wants or did. Real work and progress has been made and hopefully continues to be made under this BoD until Synod's restructuring is done.
114. I have confidence in the performance the District's current Board of Directors. We prayed at the convention that the Holy Spirit would lead the process and provide for us and I now trust that God has provided. In instances where any abuse of power or authority may be/have been a factor I pray that God would reveal such weaknesses and provide correction, grace and renewed health.

115. Don't know. Our board has not been in office very long.
116. Our current board of directors is a trustworthy group. Their focus is on the good of the greater church.
117. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
118. I feel that the current board is so busy dealing with trying to protect themselves from the CEF fallout that we don't get much attention from them for anything else.
119. I have great hope that our current BOD will work toward positive things for our district. I have not kept up on things that they are doing or decisions that have been made, so I currently have no way of knowing if they are meeting my hopes.
120. I strongly agree with the statement as read, but having a healthy relationship does not mean I favor keeping the district structure. I have no idea how my answer is would be interpreted. - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
121. They are a brand new board, so the jury is still out on that one.
122. I don't think that any of the board should be serving who were serving during the financial mismanagement.
123. However, I think that we can govern with one national BD with the districts Pres., Bishops, overseer--- and be on that national BD as member or advisers
124. The staff historically as overshadowed and undercut volunteer boards by using them as rubber stamps.
125. my knowledge of this is limited
126. At this stage the board would have to prove itself before I could comment further.
127. See earlier comments re:" high church " practices. There are too many clergy reps on the board who espouse these practices.
128. I don't know them very well.
129. It is still early times, too soon to make my opinion.
130. I think that this new board has a strong sense of responsibility and what commitment and skill level is needed to carry out the work of the district. The fact that they allowed their names to stand and be elected tells us their hearts are in the right place. Still the skill level is difficult to gauge as we do not where our district is headed once CEF is dealt with. I pray for them all as they do their work.
131. Unsure. There is very little info communicated as to what the District BOD decides, or does.
132. I do not know the responsibilities of the board so I can not comment
133. We have no idea what the district or synod is going to look like in a few years and the people elected are being thrown into a situation that is exceedingly complicated, I'm really not too sure what to expect or really what can be done by them.
134. These are the people we have prayerfully elected. I may not agree with all their decisions, but I have confidence that our Lord is at work through those whom the church has duly elected.
135. Don't know a lot about what happens at district level
136. Too soon to tell. But we need to get rid of Districts anyway.
137. we have very little faith in the current board of directors
138. It feels like an uncertain time. I pray that God will continue to lead and guide those people to be in place to make wise decisions for the benefit of the church, in the context of feeding our own members and reaching out to others.
139. Somewhat
140. Very new. A new board was just installed last fall. Don't know enough about them.

141. Too soon to tell.
142. Have no faith in the current Board of Directors
143. Granted, it's so far from "business as usual" in ABC that I'm not sure anyone elected according to our current system could be expected to perform well.
144. Have little faith in the current Board of Directors
145. The current Board of Directors are only names to me as I have no idea of they are capable of doing.
146. I don't know my District's current BOD or their level of performance-whether positive or negative. Not sure where to find this information.
147. Most of my congregation does not know of the current Board of Directors other than the District President whom they do not trust.
148. They are a nebulous body of ladies and gentlemen and the confidence that I have is perhaps just hope. Note: East District not ABC; totally a different attitude there as there is no confidence in that leadership including IPL.
149. I don't know them personally and unless you are on the Board, as a common parishioner, have no idea how they are handling matters.
150. They do little at uniting and/or disciplining pastors who do not want to walk together in circuits or in synod.
151. The Board has been preoccupied with the crisis. Too early to tell if any real operational change will take place.
152. I believe God calls people to these positions and they follow to the best of their abilities
153. Not if they control the Church Extension.
154. Work needs to be done to ensure trust from all again.
155. The past Boards say over last10 years have deceived the District in many ways. I am not sure confidence is an issue as the function itself is not required or trust worthy
156. We haven't seen them do anything yet - they are brand new.
157. Don't really know who they are, how often they meet, what they discuss, etc. Are the minutes of the meetings of the District Board readily available to lay persons?
158. Not entirely sure what they do.
159. Given past performance there is not an abundance of confidence. Again it seems to me that a position on the board comes because you are a name someone is able to recognize. Skill does not always seem to be considered. The same names are often just switching job titles so new ideas do not come forward and improvement is stifled.
160. I never hear anything about or from the District Board so can't really say. I couldn't really tell you who is on that Board.
161. I have no idea. Can lay people answer this? I have no idea how the board of directors is chosen, or what it does in practice, etc. I wish I knew more....
162. I simply don't know. Enough to really answer that.
163. I only disagree if they had anything to do with Church Extension. Other wise I think they were ok
164. But the Directors also need a better business ground specially if they are to be involved with Church extension
165. Such Boards are elected at conventions by delegates who have little idea as to who the nominees are. Such votes usually return those with "name recognition" to offices. Skill and expertise have little to do with such elections.
166. I am not familiar enough with the board to comment.

167. I don't know what they've done for the last five months... and in this time of crisis we can't afford to have months go by with no action. We as Lutherans are great at talking, reading, and planning and slow to the doing. That is a
168. problem.
169. Not sure at this time. Time will tell.
170. I don't know what they've been doing since their election, so I have no idea. The lack of action at this time that requires strong and decisive leadership to rebuild trust erodes my confidence.
171. Very little communication regarding their work or plans.
172. What do they do?
173. Just because one man is part of the district Board for many years does not make him suitable for leadership of that District.
174. See above.
175. There seems to little vision. We seem more concerned about money than outreach.
176. I hear of conflict between the Board and our District President from time to time. In part, it reflects the pressure of our situation in Central District where District level staffing is at a minimum compared to other Districts. As a result, there appears to be a lot of pressure placed on our DP to get him to 'fix' perceived problems rather than recognizing that we are all in this together and that we need to find ways to activate a more organic sense of responsibility and participation among our clergy and congregations to support the mutual work which the Lord has assigned to us.
177. don’t know anything about them
178. I have no idea who is on the Board of Directors.
179. Restructuring would help.
180. all good people
181. A new Board so it's hard to tell. The average congregational member doesn’t have a clue who they are. After they have been elected a profile of each member should be sent each congregation in the District.
182. To be frank, sinner that I am, there are some clergy members of our Board of Directors whom I see as somewhat politically manipulative. However, I do not question their love for the Lord and their desire to see the Gospel go out. I simply pray for them that they would adopt some different means in which they try to accomplish this and for me that God would forgive me if I have erred in this assessment. I am thankful for each and every member of our BoD and appreciate the time (and blood, sweat and tears) that is involved in their work.
183. It's too soon to know as they have just been elected.
184. My ABC District Board is very new as they are stuck with historical baggage to work through. An unfair question
185. Don't know the board of directors, how can I have confidence in them.
186. Huge respect for our District President and his efforts...the others I don't know about at all
187. I am not close enough to the subject
188. For the most part
189. I have confidence in the elected board but I have seen tradition and doing things always the same way gets in the way of forward progress for the church as a whole.
190. ....and past boards.
191. Not yet!
192. It's too early to tell.

193. I am proud of them and are confident of their abilities. BUT, the demographic challenges before us and the subsequent financial challenges which will follow are huge. We need to act.
194. We never have had much support from our ABC district. We have given them $26,000 every year and what have they done with it has been a never clearly revealed to us. I have been a member of LCC and LCMS for over 40 years and haven't been informed very much of what they have done with our money. Missions is what we were told. I didn't think missions included wages for a bunch of people sitting in an office dictating to us.
195. The new ABC District Board hasn't ben around long enough to earn a rating
196. Most congregational members do not know what district or synod BOD's do or who they are.
197. Feel totally let down and betrayed.
198. I feel bad for them having come to their positions at a very difficult time, dealing with issues they had no part in making.
199. What a ridiculous question given the past events.
200. I do not have enough information on the who or the what of the Board so can't comment
201. Not certain who is on the board.
202. They are a nebulous body of ladies and gentlemen and the confidence that I have is perhaps just hope.
203. I do not know what they do.
204. don't know who they are
205. The current board of directors are doing their jobs okay, but I think their performance would be even better if they cooperated and merged together with the synod.
206. While I have confidence in them, I question whether we need three district boards plus synod board. We're over-governed.
207. My only concern is the length of time some of them have served. There should be limits to years of service.
208. I have no idea who they are or what they do.
209. I am confident in their abilities, but change is needed; I am uncertain whether or not the current Board is open to change.
210. Not sure
211. Have any wrongs been righted? I have never been so disappointed as in the way the CEF and DIL depositors have been kept in the dark and manipulated by our District and the Courts. I just hate to see the amount of monies being spent on lawyers, court costs, accountants to correct the very wrong actions of District officers and staff.
212. I guess I agree, though I don't really know who they are.
213. I believe this to be the case but it is based on very little specific evidence since Board meetings now occur in Winnipeg vs. Regina. I have not heard of or been made aware of any dysfunction among board members
214. We do not and should no longer have a ABC district office. they are bankrupt in more ways than financial. They have proven to be incompetent at least and dishonest and guilty as the court proceeding are proving
215. I am sure they do a credible job. See an earlier comment about our ability to afford multiple boards and districts. Maybe we should unite more. One voice, one direction one application.
216. Most of us do not even know how these people are. We very seldom hear from them. They need to be more visible.

217. No movement to restore trust to those who were affected by recent financial losses. Likely to see many churches close in near future if financial trust is not restored.
218. Have no idea what they are doing, as this information is not reported to pastors or congregations.
219. I trust they do what they can with the resources they are afforded.
220. Don't know the individuals
221. I think that the re-structuring we've seen because of CEF was harmful to many of the former hard-working pastors, especially.
222. Where God is placed first and we ask him to take our eyes off of ourselves so that He might truly lead our way I am confident.
223. I am pleased that most of the BOD members are new. One of our district board of directors lives in one town but drives over 150 miles to attend a certain church near Edmonton, even though there is an LCC church in her town. Why would I have any confidence in her???
224. Please note that I do not know most of them and therefore they are a nebulous group that I hope will take care of the affairs of the District.
225. From last year to now, there was 100% turnover in who is sitting on our board. I believe that hinders the potential efficacy of a volunteer board.
226. They have been working hard to make necessary changes and be the best leaders they can be.
227. No idea about what they do or how involved they are
228. We have many dedicated and qualified people who have worked tirelessly and often anonymously, to help our District run as smoothly and efficiently as possible.
229. We have had such a change in our district the past year that to answer that question is premature
230. They are irrelevant.
231. They are too new in their positions in order to have a qualified opinion.
232. The problems within ABC District evolved over decades and reveal deep, endemic problems.
233. They have only been in place for 6 months so it is not possible to give a response. I feel the previous Board of Directors gave a very poor performance.
234. I have confidence that God will use these people to help us transition to a healthier and leaner Church government structure.
235. Since I'm now in the East District, I agree. Had I still been in ABC, I would not.
236. They do the best with what they have.
237. That confidence was lost as noted above
238. They are doing the best they can, but the lack of resources and staffing in our particular District make it difficult for them to be effective.
239. I don't get enough information to make an intelligent decision.
240. Very little. Granted, I'm in ABC, but we're in over our heads right now. Even once the CEF issues is resolved, what do we do?
241. That's a ridiculous question. By what metric would you make such a decision. (ABC notably excluded)
242. No complaints about their performance thus far.
243. My sense is lawyers are looked to for guidance far too much at District Board of Directors meetings. I think lawyers should only be consulted when needed and not have a perpetual seat on our Board of Directors. I think there's too much emphasis on political correctness

(e.g. conflict of interest policies) rather than trusting directors as Christians to make proper decisions.

244. I don't really know what they are doing.
245. This is a very effective board in terms of being aware of and acting on issues.
246. Too many followers in the past, too long on the Board, and too inbred, not reflecting the under 45 age demographic of our church
247. ~ we are blessed in the East District to have had strong leadership for the most part for many years

20. I have confidence in the performance of Synod's current Board of Directors

1. Ecclesiastical agree with President Bugbee, but change is a good thing to build on.
2. Did not force ABC district to provide financial info on a timely basis.
3. They were elected properly; my opinion is moot point.
4. I'm not in a position to give an opinion at this time.
5. I believe that they are well positioned to be in a 30,000 ft. level of policy governance.
6. There are a group of at least 25 people in our church who would like a clear explanation from Synod and only a select few are in the loop.
7. We desperately need to revise the criteria by which people are nominated. It is ludicrous that people with zero experience in business, for example, make financial decisions. The same is true for decisions about missions, higher education, theology-- you name it. Well-meaning but incompetent volunteer board members have done enormous damage to many of our institutions (most recently, Concordia University!).
8. Don't know who the board members are.
9. We pray so.
10. Rarely hear directly from them so hard to see their performance.
11. If Synod's board of directors had been performing adequately, we would not be in anywhere near the level of trouble that we currently are.
12. There needs to be public Financial Accountability
13. What does the word "performance" mean in this context?
14. Generally, I do, but I am disappointed about Concordia University in Edmonton and it seems like the Synod could have done something more over the course of time to prevent this. I don't know to what extent the Board of Directors has influence over this.
15. I have confidence in their abilities but not in the structure they are currently working within.
16. I have confidence the abilities of the members of Synod's Board of Directors but I'm not confident in the structure they currently have to work within.
17. Personally I don't even know who the members are.
18. I do not know them or what they do, but I hope they are doing right by us.
19. I have confidence in all these members and pray that they receive the guidance they need to do what needs to be done in their roles.
20. How exactly am I to know or care about something so far removed from me? The Synod made the decision long ago to bar women from all synodical matters. Thus, we don't think about things like this.... ever. We focus our energies on tangible things we can accomplish

within our own congregation to make a positive difference and leave lofty discussions on relative effectiveness and performance to church officers.

21. Don't know who there are:((
22. My faith in the board of directors of the synod is low because: -the sale of Concordia college with no input from anyone…this was wrong -the attempt to use any recovered funds from the church extension fund (that should go to the poor people who had all of their savings in there) to cover shortfalls in the pension fund…this is wrong, stop doing it. -the attempt to use the crisis in ABC district, that has resulted in the collapse of the church extension fund, as an opportunity for the synod to concentrate power and influence for itself.
23. Please see my comments to Question 19. Equally applicable to this Question 20.
24. Frankly, as a layperson, I don't know who the members of the Synod's BoD are, or how their decisions, plans and actions specifically affect my congregation.
25. The only question without an opportunity to comment (paper copies)
26. I am not sure I can say since I am not aware of their performance. This kind of information is not made available with regard to their performance.
27. I expect they are doing their best given the changing demographics of our synod (declining membership and fewer mission dollars to work with). However, I am concerned that there seems to be less opportunity for involvement of the layperson, and fear that our synod is moving more toward a pastor-governed church body.
28. I cannot say I have confidence in the performance of the Synod's current Board of Directors because I do not have familiarity with who the people are.
29. I don't even know who sits on synod's board.
30. no
31. It's difficult to have confidence in something that doesn't seem to move forward in outreach.
32. I am thankful for their willingness to serve. I have confidence in some of those who hold office and am generally content with the work they have produced.
33. Unknown
34. I am not informed enough re the current Synod's Board's level of skills, experience and what their performance has been.
35. They have been abusing power by trying to force power they do not have over ABC District.
36. The current boards at the synodical levels appear to be assuming more power than they should actually have, based on Walther's theses and the necessary power structure (people with the most, district, and least of all, synod)
37. Do not know enough about board's function or present members in order to comment.
38. Have no knowledge who is on the Board of Directors
39. increased transparency would be an improvement
40. How did the ABC situation develop without Synod knowing?
41. I have no experience at this level.
42. So far, lots of talk but not action to rectify this mess we are in. Lots of warning too. Titles and listening don't create results.
43. I don't really know them or their skill sets. I have met oh r President on a few occasions and have the utmost respect and confidence in him.

44. I don't know who they are but I'm sure their heart is in the right place. Do you think they have the skill sets to effectively manage as a Board of Directors? You are or should be much closer than I am as a lay person.
45. From the reaction from Synod to the ABC CEF disaster, I believe that a similar type of person or group needs to be asked to come and give an outside opinion and view of the CEF situation. This is something that has built up over a long period of time and it is unlikely that there are any people who can be truly unbiased who are currently involved.
46. I give them my loyalty.
47. Should they not have been aware of the church extension funds being doled out beyond the capability of the recipients' ability to repay?
48. On items that I have tried to follow, resolutions are always postponed and nothing concrete seems to be put out.
49. As above, I don't know much about the Board of Directors, how they are chosen, etc. the present members, how exactly the Board functions, etc.
50. Synods B of D should have had oversight on District -Synod and District directors are yes men to the elected Pastors who want to be CEO's
51. after CEF don't know
52. Agree but have very little firsthand knowledge.
53. Sorry, I do not know who is serving on that Board either.
54. I do not know enough about this Board to have an opinion.
55. From my perspective the Synod board of directors has not been very active or at least haven’t communicated their activity well. Thus it is difficult to gauge my confidence in their performance. Synod manages important services and we do hear about the good work that auxiliaries and LSOs have been doing. There has been troubling news about Synod overstepping their bounds in terms of the control of these organisations. This is troubling, especially without direction from convention (to my knowledge). With further issues like these arising the confidence in Synod BoD could easily drop.
56. I do not know who are the members of Synod's BOD. Having said that I trust the Lord guiding the process of the elections, and so trust they are competent.
57. I don't really see what the Synod Board of Directors is doing. What has it done to support higher education at Concordia? Why has the main focus on the "two seminaries" problem been to suggest that "cost containment" is the real issue? Is it too much for our Synod to call, say ten full-time theologians (five at each seminary), or even more, in order to serve our church as theologians? In other words, even with small student bodies, theological education ("training of church workers") is really the most important reason we have a Synod and a Synod Board of Directors.
58. Don't hear much on what they are doing
59. Never tell us what they do
60. I would say my comments for 19 above would be echoed for this statement.
61. Same comment as applies to the District BOD.
62. I don't really see the Synod's operations much. Nor do I have a clear idea of LCC's contribution to many of the eight services listed: - calling a minister is primarily a District function, with only liaison at LCC level - circuit forums and planning appears to be done at the District level - judging by the motions submitted and discussed, the Synod conventions are for to great a part, a waste of time. How many times do we have to have motions on same sex relationships? How many of the motions are boiler plate motions with no

practical implications or follow on activities leading to anything? - I could go on and on through the list

63. Do not receive sufficient information to make any informed judgement about the Board's performance.
64. At a time, which Synodical Leadership is critically needed to heal and restore the Church, Synodical leadership is missing. There is NO sense of URGENCY to restore TRUST, or even any demonstration that the President or Directors even know HOW to restore Trust.
65. Not sure
66. However, see comments to #11. We could use more info about what the board is doing.
67. Find there is too much east against west
68. Outreach is not being effectively addressed so the Board of Directors is ultimately responsible.
69. Don't know anything about them.
70. I'm not well enough versed in their performance to make an informed decision.
71. I think that the current performance of the Synod's Board of Directors is satisfactory, but with using volunteers there is the notion that they are experts, but it is not necessarily so.
72. I cannot say I have confidence in the performance of the Synod's current Board of Directors because I do not have familiarity with who the people are.
73. Given the fact that I was not the last Synod convention (only one delegate per circuit attends), I really don't know who serves on the present Board. However, I trust in the Lord that He guided our delegates to elect capable people.
74. I don't know anything about them and I know little of what they do.
75. No, I don't.
76. Don't know anyone on Board. - Same comments as District
77. Certainly confidence in President
78. Synod does not have the authority to impose its will on a congregation unless that congregation is in violation of the Constitution therefore I have not studied their management decisions.
79. I don't think that the problems of the past are the problem of the current board of directors and think that no one meant any malice by what happened in the district. I have faith in the current board of directors for synod insofar as they operate prayerfully and follow Gods leading in the changes that are made.
80. I am afraid that they are being too reactionary in some of the things they are doing to "help" the ABC District, and I am not completely sure whether their intervention is more to help the District and its congregations and church workers regain their footing with one another or to lead the people toward a pre-determined "post District" plan.
81. Just barely -- we need the best qualified people -- RE-ESTABLISH a "Nomination committee" that will search out the best qualified individuals and have a really good reason for putting their name forth. Let the people of the Synod know that that committee has dome its task well!! The last display of the work of a Synod Nomination committee for a Synodical Convention was absolutely terrible!!
82. Looking at the advice and actions taken with regards to Concordia University, Edmonton I think our Synod should at least look at getting some advice from different lawyers than they currently are listening to. 8th Commandment, they mean well but seem to be missing the big picture.

83. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
84. I see them in action at their meetings, and I'm confident that they are using their God-given gifts and abilities to serve their Lord and His church.
85. Certainly have confidence in our President
86. Blind faith.
87. I'm not sure... I get the feeling that the Synod feels we are dying... but we will be strong and need the time to "fix" things. The Synod needs to support us anyway they can.
88. We don't get a lot of information regarding Synodical matters.
89. Generally, there is little creativity or attempts at new directions. The status quo seems to be the goal.
90. Absolutely. Why wouldn't I?!
91. Perhaps this survey and initiation of change should have been conducted before now rather than as a reaction to a crisis. While I believe that all directors act out of a desire to what is best for the church and are faithful, my confidence is somewhat tempered by their apparent lack of interest in change.
92. Do not have enough information to give an opinion.
93. I am writing with an open mind. I am sure the members of the commission are honourable people. However, because they are far removed from my situation geographically and linguistically, it is difficult for me to form any opinion concerning their efficacy.
94. A lot of things have happened on their watch (i.e. CEF issues).
95. The Board has established an continues to administer a Pension Plan that will bankrupt the LCC and many congregations.
96. They are governed by fear, are against changes in policy and outlook, lack vision, and show an inability to deal properly with conflict and the ever changing needs of the church body. The current interest is to govern conservatively in the hopes of maintaining a "heritage".
97. Don't know enough about them - how do I find out?
98. I believe these individuals to all be very capable, educated, faithful and caring people who have been voted in by their peers for a reason.
99. Unable to comment, due to lack of knowledge
100. I have no idea who they are. Never hear from them. No newsletters, no minutes. There is an extreme disconnect here.
101. I don't know who the members of the Board of Directors are, or what their qualifications are to serve on the board, or what it is they are supposed to do.
102. I personally haven't had much "church" dealing with Synod's B of D.
103. Again, lots of potential if they are willing to take a stand and use their authority where it is required.
104. If they were involved, passively or through neglect, with the current ABC crisis, I cannot be confident in them.
105. Unable to know, but how were they involved or contributed to the CEF catastrophe???
106. That CEF happened w/out Synod catching and reporting the lack of financials it a while ago is all I need to say here.
107. I don't know who's on the board.
108. As long as this group is lead by President Bugbee!!!
109. I do not know who they are

110. Time will tell
111. Again, a competent Board can be either central or local, but if funds are not there, a local Board is not going to be sustainable.
112. Similar to District, I think Synod officials have everyone's interests at heart. The only concern I have is that since they are so far away from congregations in the west and since our needs are not necessarily the same as congregations in other Districts, other strategies and plans need to be applied to meet our needs.
113. -again, does the average layperson know who serves on the Synod's BOD?
114. As a lay delegate attending the last Synodical Convention limited information to answer this question.
115. really don't know, perhaps they are creating a disaster or doing nothing
116. really don't know, perhaps they are creating a disaster, or doing nothing
117. Don't have enough information about the Synod
118. I am not informed on their performance to date. (I have not made it a priority to update myself on the current Board of Directors)
119. Honestly, I have no idea what they do because it certainly isn't communicated to the congregations very well.
120. Again, I do not have first hand information regarding the Synod's BOD but I have attended services and read communications from Pastor Bugbee and feel assured by his well tempered messages that God is working through him and others in Synod governance to steer the course of the church body.
121. Pray the Lord has put them in these positions so trust he will have them preform according to his plan.
122. Given the mess in the west, LCC's response seems to be "let’s save the ship and let them swim on their own."
123. I have been involved in the work of a couple of task forces, but did not see the BOD move the work forward in either case in an effective way.
124. They seem unwilling or unable to act in any decisive manner. They have been elected to act and govern and seem willing to just pass the buck.
125. I have confidence in the performance the District's current Board of Directors. We prayed at the convention that the Holy Spirit would lead the process and provide for us and I now trust that God has provided. In instances where any abuse of power or authority may be/have been a factor I pray that God would reveal such weaknesses and provide correction, grace and renewed health.
126. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
127. I have no reason to question the current performance of the synodical BOD.
128. As long as we have a member (Astley) who compares the relation between Synod and Districts as that between McDonald's and Tim Hortons, there's no hope that we can walk together.
129. I have concerns that only surfaced upon encountering this survey
130. I don't know who they are.
131. have no knowledge of the Board of Directors
132. I suspect the same happens on the synodical level.
133. my knowledge of this is limited
134. The BOD has seemed to always follow its predecessors in it's thinking and decision making. Once again the proof of performance would be needed.

135. I am not sure that I have the knowledge required to have that confidence.
136. I have no idea what the LCC BOD does and what skill sets they bring. I think it is naive of us to say that we have confidence in any boards performance at this time.
137. I'm mostly unfamiliar with the performance of the Synod BOD.
138. I do not know the responsibilities of the board so I can not comment
139. I think our Synod at the national level is far healthier and better than that of our districts.
140. Not as familiar with the Synod's board.
141. Don't really know
142. These are the people we have prayerfully elected. I may not agree with all their decisions, but I have confidence that our Lord is at work through those whom the church has duly elected.
143. I have exposure and believe they are doing a good job.
144. have nothing to base a valid response to this
145. not sure who they are
146. Don't know anything about them.
147. I don't know them.
148. I hear hardly anything from the Board. I have no idea if they're performing well or not, or even how to gauge that.
149. How would I know how they are performing without a yearly review?
150. To some extent the Synod's handling of the pension issue also breeds some distrust although not to the same extent as ABC District. The distrust of ABC District has led to some distrust of Synod because the info is not forthright and timely.
151. I don't know them. I wouldn't recognize them if I met them on the street.
152. Sending Dr. Astley to B.C. was a very wise decision and I trust that with the help of God's wisdom they will make wise decisions in this restructuring programme. I am praying for God's guidance in this matter for our Board.
153. I know very little about these directors and their goals.
154. A lack of unity between seminaries and nothing is done to reform them.
155. Not sure - I am not that knowledgeable.
156. My problem again is that we are not that large a body that we need to have an overlap of services. I think many could be combined as they have the same goal. Regional differences could be controlled by having a number of representatives from each region on the board.
157. The same as above. As a woman I feel we are not heard by the Synod’s current board of directors. I have also started looking at other churches and the women's role in them. Many churches allow women to have more of a leadership roll.
158. Not really sure. Maybe an area that should be looked at and given a little attention to this in the LCC Digest
159. Don't really know who they are, how often they meet, what they discuss, etc. Are the minutes of the meetings of the District Board readily available to lay persons?
160. Not entirely sure what they do.
161. Who are they??
162. I have no idea. Can lay people answer this? I have no idea how the board of directors is chosen, or what it does in practice, etc. I wish I knew more....
163. If they were managing the church extension. If not, then then I think they were ok
164. See comment on 19 above.

165. I don't know what they are doing. We as Lutherans are great at talking, reading, and planning and slow to the doing. That is a problem.
166. Agee because they have entered into this process.
167. Again, strong leadership is needed and I don't see action.
168. Although at times lack certain skills/expertise so staff has been able to provide that void
169. Why are there two boards?
170. We are not doing outreach in Canada. Why do we not use laypeople's gift to assist here?
171. I simply don't have enough information to know.
172. My experience is limited to adequately evaluate
173. don't know anything about them
174. all good people
175. In very difficult circumstances, all evidence that I have received from the Canadian Lutheran and other communications from Synod, they are doing an admirable job. I am truly thankful for each and every one of them.
176. Don't even know the board only our Synod President who is more than respected and appreciated.
177. For the most part
178. I have confidence in the elected board but I have seen tradition and doing things always the same way gets in the way of forward progress for the church as a whole.
179. I had some problems with the way the Synod handled the recent problems in the BC/Alberta District. Did not feel that had much support from the Synod.
180. I am proud of them and are confident of their abilities. BUT, the demographic challenges before us and the subsequent financial challenges which will follow are huge. We need to act.
181. How would we know.
182. ditto
183. I trust they are doing their best under the circumstances.
184. Where was the oversight from Synod for the last three trienniums?
185. Do not know anything of what they do
186. again who are they
187. The synod`s current board of directors may be okay, but more monitoring and checking weekly needs to be done.
188. not enough knowledge
189. I have no idea who they are or what they do.
190. I am confident in their abilities, but change is needed; I am uncertain whether or not the current Board is open to change.
191. Not informed in this matter
192. They haven't resolved anything. We have so little relevant information.
193. It would have been helpful if you had listed Synod's current Board of Directors. I don't know who they are.
194. The just need to get together
195. $135,000,000 says no there is not confidence in the administration of the ABC districts and Boards. They did the administration that lost the funds. These problems were known, changes recommended by accounting firms and routinely ignored for many years by ABC board
196. Not sure.

197. Same problem. No action taken to help restore lost funds or to be upfront and honest re financial issues
198. We need more confessional pastors on the board.
199. I trust they do what they can with the resources they are afforded.
200. Don't know the individuals.
201. Where God is placed first and we ask him to take our eyes off of ourselves so that He might truly lead our way I am confident.
202. I did have confidence. I was hopeful about the interim leader and hopeful about restructuring. But 1) the interim leader has given the impression of working with the president. 2) this survey was obviously not written by professional survey writers. and 3) the restructuring committee seems to involve the usual people and lacks new thinking.
203. So far in the past year the synodical board of directors has sat on its hands while the ABC district has imploded. Why would I have confidence in them???
204. don't know them
205. don't know them
206. Please note that I do not know most of them and therefore they are an even more nebulous group [than the District BoD] that I hope will take care of the affairs of the LCC.
207. I don't know enough about the synod board to comment.
208. I really have no opinion on this. I voted for some and not for others. I believe they are doing alright.
209. No idea about what they do or how involved they are
210. Again, we have many dedicated and qualified people who have worked tirelessly and often anonymously, to help our Synod run as smoothly and efficiently as possible.
211. The flow of information from the Synod's BOD is not done on a regular way. East district started to send out by emails, highlights of their BOD meetings and decisions recently. this flow of information is helpful to church councils and congregational committees for their local decisions.
212. See note above regarding seeming lack of involvement with the CEF/DIL situation from Synod.
213. When decisions are made by a convention, they aren't always carried out by the BOD. For example, the decision to operate one Seminary in two locations with one President, on Board of Regents, seems to have been ignored.
214. It seems to me that Synod's Board of Directors is somewhat too far removed from the Districts and congregations to be as effective as our Districts' Board of Directors.
215. They're fine people as far as I know, but I know far too little about what's going on at the Board level to comment.
216. That's a ridiculous question. By what metric would you make such a decision. (ABC notably excluded)
217. I have no real knowledge about Synod's BoD. I do have 100% confidence in President Bugbee.
218. I don't know who they are.
219. I don't receive enough information to know if they are effective or not. Some of their past actions regarding our Seminaries seem to have been ignored by the Seminaries and the Board seems O.K. with that.

220. I really have no opinion, since the board is more or less invisible at my level. The district board makes its minutes available on its web-site. Perhaps the synodical board might consider the same.
221. No...

21. I have confidence in the Commission on Constitutional Matters and Structure (CCMS) in leading the process of restructuring LCC.

1. If no changes are really needed, why make changes?? What are the reasons that this commission was formed? Who wants changes to desperately and why? This should have been stated on page 1. Who decided that the LCC is in such bad condition?? It sounds to me that some folks think changes are needed badly. Tell us why!!
2. I have not heard about this process or who and how the members were selected.
3. Need only to look @ LWMLC task force to see issues are not so easily addressed or proper changes so easily found or made in any length of time one might structurally strive - only 500 years since Reformation and we still have much to learn.
4. We have a good man leading this committee.
5. Restructuring looks like it is necessary.
6. When the CCMS is working on the restructuring of LCC, info needs to be sent out to congregations. How can we as a congregation give guidance to our delegate when discussions take place at convention.
7. Because they are more familiar with the current workings of the LCC.
8. Not sure - it's outside of my expertise. I know some pastors who are not so sure.
9. Looks good so far. Keep up the good work. Be vigilant and listen.
10. Time frame for a major change is not realistic.
11. Looks good so far. Keep up the good work. Be vigilant and listen.
12. I have faith those on the commission will make God led decisions.
13. Who are these members?
14. The 2017 convention will guide them to fine tune it.
15. -not sure CCMS will be able to make the hard but necessary changes to permit the synod to continue to be viable -appreciate the desire to involve the people but I expect there will be so many opinions. Not everyone is going to be satisfied.
16. Based on this survey no, maybe they should do their job and not a non-confessional consultant.
17. Not enough information that I'll need to make an informed response.
18. No idea - I'm surely hoping so!
19. I don't know much about them, or their role, purpose, or goal. I don't know if their conclusions are merely suggestions, guidelines, or if they have the final authority in what needs to be done and what will be done, etc.
20. never picked a lay person professional, just another Pastor, and survey won’t be published with all feedback.
21. I believe that they mean well and will strive to do a good job. Sometimes old paradigms are very difficult to shake in a creative design to move forward.
22. Don't even know what this means. I am old and simple language is needed. As they stated CEF was for sophisticated investors, I am neither that or in Church matters. I know my God and how He fits into my life.

23. I am not sure who is on this Commission.
24. I would need to know more of what is meant by restructuring.
25. Restructuring has been part of their mandate since forever, but because nothing has been done until now, I'm not hopeful they have the will or capacity to do what needs to be done.
26. I'm a layman-how would I know?
27. I don't know.
28. Psalm 118 v. 8-9 re: confidence
29. We would need more information.
30. We shall all pray for success.
31. I don't know who they are and don't care. Their work won't get me through the Pearly Gates.
32. Only because they are appointed not voted in and restructuring should be possibly done by church leaders and not lay people. The definitions do not say anything about who is generally appointed and the church doesn't run like a regular business.
33. I notice that no voting members of the CCMS have any expertise in the area of church polity or ecclesiology. I would feel better if there were some theologians on the committee. I also feel that the consultant has too much power and influence in the process.
34. I think there needs to be new blood and new faces (although that's easier said than done). It seems as though the same people serve on these boards, which forces us down the path of "If it ain't broke don't fix it," when in fact the system is flawed because a large portion of the population is not being consulted, or are being consulted in the same way that has been in place forever.
35. Thank you for asking our opinions.
36. They seem to be the best we currently have and I would favor them rather than an expensive outside consultant who may not understand our constituency and the issues involved theologically.
37. I hope these 5 people will be drawing opinions from districts and congregations as the restructuring moves forward - Who are these 5 accountable to? Will districts and congregations have a vote on the new plan before it is implemented? And be able to make suggestions for change?
38. CCMS needs to connect God's Word with Church structure as the foundation of the church. Matthew 16:15-19
39. a big undertaking using precious time and resources
40. This is very hard to answer as I don't really know the members of the commission or the outcome they are trying to accomplish.
41. I will judge this when the committee produces its report.
42. I don't know if the CCMS knows what it is doing, but I trust that God is in control.
43. I really don't know the criteria required, or the direction things are heading. This survey is certainly a step in the direction of informed change. Yet, the survey seems to assume the current structure (which most of our people really don't even know about) is at the heart of the change needed. It's hard to put into words, but is there a way to stimulate valuable "out of the box" input? How does the spiritual element of our faith in Christ play into the possibilities of new direction? (We are what we are, and that's it? or is there something more, and exciting / worthwhile?)
44. Anyone who was involved with ABC district and the CEF during recent years should not be involved in restructuring.
45. I'm not sure what the mandate or process is for the restructuring.

46. I am not familiar with the mandate or the members of the CCMS.
47. I would have preferred initial restructuring proposals to come solely from a panel of dedicated lay people, with ecclesiastical and practicality review coming only after survey results in. I somewhat fear Commission may be too close to the forest to see the trees.
48. I am confident that the CCMS desires to do good for our church. However, the quality of these survey questions has me feeling rather disappointed.
49. I do not know these people or what they do.
50. I am hopeful and pray we find the solutions that are needed to insure the health of the church and that we are able to continue to preach and reach out to people with the word of God.
51. Why would I? I just heard about them this morning through this survey.
52. not sure who will make decisions - one vote policy should be in place - each member of LCC should have an on line vote on everything
53. don’t know enough about the commission
54. unsure
55. I don't like how this survey was created by a private contractor with a philosophical background of pro-top-down church organization. A bad sign is that this survey was sent out with no information regarding any bias this contractor may have had.
56. Where's the vision? What's the goal? This questionnaire appears to be focused on detail ... before we've even embraced a concept. And yet, kudos to those who recognise that WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT.
57. Who is this CCMS, what are their qualifications and/or motives. Any and ALL restructuring MUST BE BIBLE based.
58. Why did you break in 1988? Is it because you want to be the big fish in the little pond? There must be more than 1-2 people making decisions like the ABC District disaster.
59. Since I'm not aware of the whole process so it's hard to say I have confidence. This survey is a start.
60. not familiar with the situation!
61. Don't know enough about it.
62. I don't know their responsibilities or what they have accomplished or haven't.
63. I am not close enough to these board 20, 21 to respond.
64. While I believe people involved are committed to the process, it is a daunting task. My concern is that things will change very little because many of the decision makers are Pastors and they do very well theologically but this is "beyond their field of expertise" and members don't know how we will even be involved. We attend church most Sundays and we know very little of how this will carry forward after all our surveys are collected.
65. I would have preferred initial restructuring proposals to come solely from dedicated lay people, with ecclesiastical and practicality reviews coming at a much later date. I fear many on the Commission may be too close to the forest to see the trees.
66. Based in this survey alone, my confidence is lacking.
67. Hopefully some old ideas will be discarded and new solutions found in closed communion and pulpit exchange.
68. I feel God will lead them to make the right decisions.
69. If the CCMS was given this task at the last convention, then it is my duty to have confidence in the Commission.
70. I am not aware due to lack of information as to what they are doing.
71. New task force is hard to understand at this time.

72. This survey is evidence of a robust process.
73. Given the mandate of the committee, the restructure issue/process has been appropriately delegated to them. However, my past experience with process and outcome leads me to pray very fervently that the desired outcome has not already been determined, with the process only a means of giving us the impression that our input has value and impact.
74. Need to prove themselves. Earn some trust.
75. Don't have the information.
76. Since this is a constitutional matter, it makes sense that this commission leads this process.
77. As long as all suggestions are looked at not like at Conventions where many overtures are screened and not brought forward.
78. I'm not sure what to expect from the CCMS regarding the restructuring of LCC.
79. Unless the commission is made up of independent members, it will be biased and unsuccessful to deliver anything meaningful or constructive.
80. We hope & pray our confidence is justified!
81. I'm not knowledgeable enough to decide on the question.
82. My confidence is in the Holy Spirit working in and through each member involved in the present Board and process of restructuring LCC.
83. no, like who is going to re-structure, the same board who put everything into this mess?
84. L.C.C. and Districts NEED to change
85. If this survey is an indication of the work of CCMS, then we as the body of LCC are in trouble! Please keep it simple! The average lay person has had little information on what is happening at the national level. Advice: Keep your eyes fixed on Jesus.
86. We would hope so!
87. I'm glad I am not one of them It is a huge task and I wish them every success.
88. Starting with this poorly devised survey seems to be a misstep. Engaging the services of Les Stalke who is known for a certain structure undermines my confidence in the process and makes me doubt that we are open to finding the best structure rather than imposing Stalke's governance model that has been "tweaked" for our context.
89. It is a good gesture to proceed with everyone's input. To make this a bottom up effort.
90. Things seem to be in fairly good condition.
91. I am concerned because this has been dragging on for many years without any action. Also, I think the Commission should be hiring professionals to help with some of the process needed.
92. This survey proves itself to be poorly written by asking leading questions in favor of a synod who wishes to take power over congregations instead of serving them as they should.
93. It will be a wait and see.
94. BUT only if all reports and possible solutions are held up and cross-referenced with one, the Bible, and two, Walther's theses, and that all information is unanimously agreed upon by all members of the CCMS.
95. I trust that God will lead the group on an acceptable path and that they will make sound decisions. It would be a good idea to introduce any major restructuring to the congregations in a "town hall type of forum where there would be discussion and ideas would be taken back to the commission. For most of us we are unaware just how things might change. Consultation with congregations in each district would be welcomed.
96. Do not know enough about commission's function or present members in order to comment.
97. Just not sure about all this

98. leading but with required expertise added as needed
99. Hopefully the commission is being objective in all matters.
100. Given they have not listened to our District rec. that it be laity with appropriate expertise be used, as the lesson to learn from NO.
101. I don't know. A mistake was made and we look at restructuring. That does not breed confidence in my mind. Focus on fixing the problem. I don't think LCC structure is the cause of the problem. More safeguards and stringent borrowing rules for CEF is what is required in my mind. If there are more systemic issues, then they have not been adequately conveyed.
102. I appreciate the work that is being done and the genuine attempt to have everyone at least acquainted with the plan, even if they do not participate.
103. I believe that an "outsider" would be a better choice. A totally fresh perspective could be very valuable although I doubt that will be considered.
104. That is why we have them.
105. From number 15 and up to number 21, I did not answer because they are statements with which I am not familiar.
106. If this survey is any indication in leading the process, I have certain reservations.
107. I give them my loyalty.
108. I don't know, because I still am not sure why we are restructuring, other than there was a vote at convention to look into doing so. I am suspicious that this is a straw man cure. It's easier to scapegoat a constitution than it is to blame people. It is my perception that the problems within synod are not on account of faithful people being dragged down by an inefficient constitution; it is rather that a perfectly adequate constitution being dragged down by people unfaithful to it.
109. the fox managing the chicken coop
110. I have no idea or information on the process or procedure, but do pray for the HOLY SPIRIT'S guidance as we go forward.
111. As above, I don't know anything about this commission, how they are chosen, etc. the present members, how it functions, etc.
112. The CCMS people are yes men who favour "Top Down" dictatorial style of management where Pastors are CEO's and are not to be questioned
113. know nothing about CCMS nor who is on it
114. I'm not sure lay member are all aware or care.
115. I expect them to do everything all wrong.
116. I can't objectively say; don't know enough about the Commission.
117. I do not have a clue.
118. In order for the CCMS to lead the process of restructuring it first needs to lead the process of determining whether and why restructuring is needed or what its objectives are, but in my view it isn't handling this process very effectively.
119. Sadly, I do not hold much confidence in this process as change is so vehemently resisted. I pray that God can and will work through this committee, through His wisdom and discernment. This survey is a good step.
120. I am not well enough informed to comment meaningfully.
121. Rev. Ney is a trust-worthy individual. I have confidence in him. I do not know who else is on this committee.
122. I do trust that this group is very dedicated and would offer a solid plan and direction for exacting change.

123. I believe there are competent people on the CCMS and that they wish to do the best for the church in their opinion. However, it appears there are opinions that go contrary to the basic church structure set up by C. F. W. Walther. In addition, the wording and structure of this survey is very disappointing and appears to be written with considerable bias. Thus I cannot be certain of the commission's intentions. I only disagree and not stronger than that because in the end it is up to convention to agree or disagree with the findings.
124. might be time to let the pastors preach and let someone else run the business side of things
125. Nope. There is an underlying bias and strategy that will affect its directions.
126. There has to be more discussion and " face to face meetings" in the future.
127. CCMS is an appropriate body to lead the effort, as long as broad input is being sought (as in this survey--thanks for preparing it and soliciting broad participation).
128. Again, too little information on what is actually happening, who is involved in the process and how final decisions will be made. But I'm praying for you all.
129. With respect, I think this process is very questionable. I don't think I have enough information on what the problems are (despite all the articles in the Can. Lutheran) and what the possible alternatives are, and I think that the restructuring of a church body needs to be undertaken with much more input and direction than has been given so far, and under the direction of a very small group of people.
130. No information on details have been provided
131. At least the idea of a survey is a good one.
132. I do not think that this group will represent the whole of LCC in its needs and desires based on the roles of the members and their age range.
133. There has been little to no encouragement to even participate in this survey. Jesus speaks to us through his word, he understands communication, for the restructuring process to be successful, communication from the President down through the organization to the members is critical.
134. Will reserve judgement until I see the outcome from the review.
135. Christ be with you.
136. CCMS leadership and behavior demonstrates that the 'OLD BOYS' that created the problems in LCC with secretive, unilateral actions are still in charge -- nothing will change until they are gone.
137. what about input from congregations?
138. This also depends on the suppositions of the Commission members. If the pastors outnumber the lay people, that could influence the final plan. I wonder if the Commission has allowed itself enough time to make the study. Time constraints can also influence the work.
139. I believe they have Holy spirit with them
140. I don't know of their mandate
141. There are many problems with this survey that will lead to tainted information and faulty conclusions. The time line is extremely ambitious and may not lead to a good result. A major problem is clearly enunciating what is wrong with the present structure and what a new structure is meant to achieve. this should have been the first step in any restructuring. My instinct is that the impetus is financial rather than a fundamental problem with the structure itself. If that is the case, then why not come out and say so.
142. Who are they accountable to? If this questionnaire is an indication of the competency - no How will all this information be correlated?
143. God's will shall be done.

144. I appreciate you seeking input but am concerned that not enough people will brave a survey of this length. Many may be intimidated by the length or thinking they don't know enough to answer the questions.
145. The CCMS will only be effective in leading the restructuring process if it receives an abundance of feedback from all parts of LCC. An online and/or paper survey is only one tool. The CCMS needs to gather face to face input from each congregation, each school, each auxiliary, each service organization, each seminary, each board of directors, etc. in order to gather a sense of what changes are urgently needed for governing LCC going forward.
146. This remains to be seen. Are they responsible for the lack of clarity in this survey?
147. I have some reservations. At the national Church Workers Conference in Calgary, the CCMS sprung a survey upon us that was confusing, or at least not adequately explained. It had the appearance, at least to me, of being hastily prepared. An hour was given to discuss the topic and about half that time was taken up trying to understand the questions. More guidance and longer time to digest and discuss would have been much better. I have similar reservations concerning this survey. Some of the questions are vague and even contradictory. I am concerned that we may be pooling ignorance rather than knowledge. These have not instilled confidence in the CCMS. There is some concern that the CCMS is too much part of an "inner circle" of influential people within synod. Thus there will be some who feel that the deck is stacked for some forgone conclusion.
148. I am not convinced there is sufficient understanding of issues facing remote areas & small churches.
149. I'm not sure what to expect from the CCMS regarding the restructuring of LCC.
150. I realize that their work is challenging. I have prayed for them and will continue to ask God to guide them to develop a model for our church that will serve us well.
151. Faint odour of hidden agenda.
152. can't answer know nothing about it.
153. I have confidence in the people but I believe the process, in particular this survey, is deeply flawed. I spent well over an hour trying to complete the survey only to give up in frustration. I then spent over an hour asking our Synod president questions to help me understand the way our church is organized and functions. I then sat in on a three-hour session with our pastor while we went through the questions. If I were not retired, I would not have had the time to do any of this. I will have more to say on this at the end.
154. Time will tell.
155. I hope whoever these people are that they base their decisions on scripture and prayer.,
156. I'm not privy to what they are doing.
157. This survey has diminished my confidence. Aside from people's comments, I don't anticipate we'll get much useful data from it.
158. I agree with the Synodical Convention decision to explore the idea of a complete restructuring process.
159. Our prayers are with you.
160. It appears that they are prepared to at least gather the opinions of the general membership. My understanding is that there are Pastors who believe a top down authoritative hierarchy is what the people need. It remains to be seen what decisions will be forthcoming.
161. I am praying for you as you discern what the next steps should be.

162. I believe that the members of the Commission will operate on faith in our Saviour Jesus Christ, and remember mistakes of the past.
163. Did not know much about the process until asked to complete this survey.
164. Don't know CCMS well enough to know.
165. I do not believe the majority of members of the congregations as well as church workers understand enough about how the Synod and Districts function now, let alone what consequences changes may have, to properly answer the questions in this survey.
166. just make sure we have a good cross section of lay people. i.e. regular church attenders and non regular
167. I want to believe in the CCMS in leading the process of restructuring for the "Glory of God."
168. NO -- they are not leading this process -- they are being lead!! This idea of a survey (even though I have reluctantly filled it in) is simply not leadership -- for the most part nobody knows what the structure is and thereby can give "nothing" to the survey.
169. This will be true only if people can make sense out of this survey!!
170. we need change to our current "stale" structure.... old ways don't always work, we as a dying/declining congregation need to be more open to change
171. I have some very serious reservations after the Church Workers conference in Calgary. All the participants gathered and spent a significant amount of time to input their views of the future of Synod. These results were never released publicly or even to the Church Workers who attended. There were promises of sharing the results, but they never happened. Even at the last National Conventions NO results were shared and there appeared to be an intentional avoidance to providing the results. Now with Les Stalke involved, and after looking through his book on governance, I am even more concerned that IF any change is proposed that change will likely reflect a governance model with more administration and more costly to run. We need a major change to reduce the administration and costs.
172. This survey shows that the CCMS has some "interesting" perspectives on church polity which seem to differ from our historic understanding. Clearer questions or explanations would be useful. More on this later in the survey. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." is true for much of our polity. We need to streamline and make us more efficient, not make major changes in the way we do things.
173. I do not know enough of the composition of the CCMS
174. Can't tell - Don't know. Don't hear anything from them
175. I would really like to agree with this, but I am concerned that they won't have the will to make hard decisions and make a total break with the former structure (if that is what is required).
176. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
177. Just don't know enough about this. I don't know if the Commission is open to consider any adjustments in Christian practice (e.g. role of women, Communing of Christians who are non- members and children, Pastor participation in community, shared Christian ministry in community. This would need to be done with prayer and Biblical guidance and eyes open to some review and interpretation of Scripture (as has been done in the past with such issues as women voting and holding office, women offering pastoral ministry in the mission field, etc.).
178. how should I know - who had the input into who is working on this - and for that matter what kind of feed-back do we get from this?

179. Again don't throw the baby out with the bath water and keep the power with the congregations like Martin Luther taught us!
180. Bill Ney should not be involved with this committee
181. If I didn't have confidence, then my time would be wasted in responding to this survey.
182. Expectant of good result through God's leadership and pray.
183. The questionnaire is severely lacking. Many of the statements are misleading or misguided in their focus and direction. Some statements do not provide sufficient information to make a properly informed decision. Some statements are only evaluative that provide minimal clarification to the subject.
184. I am actually quite nervous about the consultant chosen to help guide the CCMS through this process. I worry that the individual's own bias toward a certain framework will have an undue influence on this process, to the detriment of synod.
185. Yes! Not an easy task but we can do it supporting each other and assuming the best about each other in the process.
186. The Commission is a good start, but any change should involve a first step to constitute an implementation process that is broader, more transparent and better communicated.
187. This equality is an important check and balance for the Synod.
188. I would like to see the commission's complete mandate prior to commenting
189. They put this survey together and I don't feel that is very clear. Perhaps there should have been a separate survey for church workers and pastors. Trying to complete this survey was like going to the doctor and having him explain thing in medical terms and then having to ask him to say it in English. Lay people are intimidated by this survey and by how it is asking things that most of us have very little knowledge of. It makes me feel that the CCMS really cannot relate to the lay members of LCC. How can they restructure LCC if they don't understand the people?
190. Not qualified to comment on this.
191. Like almost everything in the LCC, I believe this Board was appointed by the bureaucracy. If elected at a convention, 50% of the votes are from Pastors, so I am not expecting the proposing of any changes, since their first obligation will be to protect the Pastors position in the church.
192. -Again, the average person taking this survey would not have a working knowledge about the CCMS. If you truly want the opinion of the average person, I suggest you restructure this survey.
193. I will prayerfully support their work as this is a very important task that will affect the proclamation of the Gospel in LCC for generations to come.
194. This very survey was extremely difficult to maneuver. We have the same faces on the same boards making the same decisions that should have been made a decade ago. I see fear, not hope.
195. It is completely unclear to me why this issue about restructuring has come up.
196. There is a strong bias throughout this question to a top down administration with the synod being the bishop and strong direction to congregations
197. I don't know anything about this commission/committee or what their objectives are regarding the purpose, process or logistics behind the restructuring. I cannot claim confidence in something I know nothing about.
198. I pray that they are!
199. have to see if they walk the talk

200. Has any information been distributed to congregation?
201. This is a daunting task. I pray that they are guided by the Holy Spirit to present to us a better operating structure than we have now.
202. Unable to comment due to lack of knowledge
203. No, can't say I have any confidence here. No real reason, other than it comes from Synod, and I have no confidence in Synod right now.
204. I'm not comfortable with the involvement of Rev. Dr. Les Stahlke in the process as I have read his books on governance and find them unhelpful. I also dislike finding out about private focus groups conducted without transparency by invitation only. Had I been invited to such a meeting and discovered this lack of transparency I would have declined the invitation. The optics on this is very poor and it eroded my personal confidence in the Commissions leading of this process.
205. As long as you understand the future in the church is in the youth...and more non traditional worship and lively events are what's needed :) Praise God
206. I do not who they are
207. I don't know the personnel well enough to comment, and hope/recommend that the members of this commission study the NT, especially First Timothy, asking how what Paul authoritatively lays down (1 Tim 3:15, "must", not "should") can take concrete shape in our polity, which it does not do right now.
208. Our Synod doesn't seem to do well at this sort of thing. This survey is an example of that. There is no perfect structure, and studying this to no end won't find one, either. Asking members of congregations who have no idea about districts, synods, CCMS, CTCR, and all the rest is silly. Just create a simple structure that gets out of the way of local congregations so that they and their pastors are free to be God's people in their particular time and place.
209. "could-a" "should-a" been done when we became LCC.
210. I perceive most of the people on this board to be part of the "old boys network" and as "company men" have no real understanding that changes must occur. Same tired faces, same tired ideas.
211. There are many on the board who are perceived as part of the "Old Boys network"
212. They have people on the committee and a consultant who are very familiar with what objectives need to be addressed in a restructuring process.
213. I hope and pray that the Commission is looking at all possibilities and will bring in a plan with significant and meaningful change rather than cosmetics.
214. God has promised His Word will not return void and I trust that God will give wisdom and knowledge to them so that His will, will be done.
215. This survey is difficult for the average layman to give opinions on.
216. Lets just say I am praying that they will remember who they are truly serving and that Christ shines through all things and decisions.
217. Let's just saying I am praying mightily for each and everyone of them, that God will lead them and us so that His name is proclaimed in every area of the Church.
218. The chair of CCMS is linked with the fiasco in ABC, the questions that this survey poses may be irrelevant [http://www.solagratia.ca/2016/02/03/the-restructuring-survey-oh-wow/], many will be demanding change in structure as if that will fix the problem whereas the problem actually lies with a few “leadership” in ABC (over many years) and those in LCC that refuse to discharge their responsibilities. Hiring a pastor who did very little pastoring in

his career but lots of flying; to give direction, produce this survey. Yah, not a lot of confidence.

219. Sola Gratia posted an analysis of this survey as reviewed by two industry professionals, and the report came back was that this survey would return no useful, actionable information. Expecting a full revamping of Synod's structure by the 2017 convention is also un-realistic.
220. Again, I personally know some of the people involved, so that helps my trust level.
221. We appear to know that things must change dramatically. We have been content in previous efforts to retool old ways of doing things. We must look to a structure that will be economical and effective for our ministry efforts.
222. Don't understand how the commission members were appointed. There didn't seem to be any consultation with the congregations in any way. The "old boys" club continues.
223. I believe some good ideas have already been floated. This is a good idea (survey) to make people feel like they are having some input and getting them ready for change.
224. I hope the group that leads the process represents a wide spectre of church members, including women.
225. I don't know who they are. I do hope the group includes lay persons, including women.
226. Time will tell
227. Don't know if they are independent, so have no idea. If there are players from District and Synod with no strong independent oversight, then any restructure will be a compromise on many different levels.
228. Not unless they are going to operate as they are in the 21st century.
229. I do not have confidence that it will be scripturally driven or that scriptural principles will be considered first and foremost.
230. I would feel better if we were getting periodic reports, and if we saw a timeline that ensured congregations would have time to review and discuss recommendations before they are discussed and voted on at any District or Synod convention.
231. I am glad this is occurring.
232. -as a first step in the process, this survey seems flawed with some poorly crafted questions and other questions which have nothing to do with the actual process of restructuring
233. I don't know...have no knowledge of how it really works....it just seems very complicated when you want to do something at a voter's meeting and have to go through a lot of constitutional red tape to do something very simple.
234. The need has been recognized, the first steps are being taken. I choose to be confident. I pray that my current level of confidence will stay as events unfold.
235. What type of restructuring is needed, and has there been an issue?
236. I doubt that they will do the unpopular, but necessary thing.
237. Who are the other options?
238. It is one of the areas that I know who is involved and have received communication on - even this opportunity for feedback which is GREATLY appreciated.
239. I pray they will be good
240. I pray that they will be good
241. We'll se how they handle this survey and the restructuring, but it seems they are more devoted to maintaining the status quo and no offending the traditionalists amongst us. Popular opinion is not required to do what is good and right for the ministry God has given us.
242. This is like having the fox watch over the chicken coop.

243. Don't have enough information to have an informed opinion.
244. Just by how this survey is structured and the introductory information shows a lot of thought went into it, giving me confidence in their leadership.
245. Hopefully the Commission will have a dialogue with the member churches and will request feedback throughout the process.
246. I don't know much about it.
247. I can only remain cautiously optimistic
248. This should have been undertaken by a neutral third party that would have asked questions that weren't biased and actually provided some ideas for moving forward.
249. no idea what they are doing. Not much valuable information being shared with the congregations.
250. Bugbee is a wonderful, smart man and if he's got anything to do with this, he's the guy.
251. I do not have enough information to base such a decision upon but as mentioned in question 21 I have confidence in Synodical leadership and therefore trust also in CCMS.
252. Don't know who or what that involves
253. I have concerns.
254. besides what was outlined at the beginning of this survey this is the first I have heard about this process.
255. I don't think it is their fault, but the timeline is too quick. Many laypeople probably don't know the theological reasoning behind some of these survey questions. A time of study before the survey would have been helpful
256. They may come up with and excellent restructuring plan, but are powerless to do anything other than present and recommend.
257. I do not have confidence in the CCMS in leading the process of restructuring. However, I pray for a miracle.
258. Seems like it might be the same leaders doing the same thing.
259. The CCMS is not taking into account enough of the advice of the greater church. The questions of this survey are not nearly specific enough and the commission is looking in the wrong places for ideas for restructuring.
260. However, I think this survey is slanted towards a specific desired outcome: the elimination of districts. E.g. questions in the next section speak about "conventions", but in reality assume only synodical conventions. While the abolition of districts may be the eventual outcome of this exercise, I don't believe the mandate from the districts to consider restructuring the synod included an expressed desire to abolish districts.
261. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
262. But they will need lots of input
263. It seems to me that you keep using the same people and expecting different results. You refuse to consult and use outside professionals to do a job, like making a survey, that you clearly are not equipped to do
264. They are faced with a gargantuan task and I am confident that they will do the very best they can to provide us with what we have asked of them.
265. Absolutely not - based on what I have seen so far. Particularly poor quality of this survey and the general understanding of what I have read that the commission thinks that in church matters you can change practices without the influence of doctrine. The church has never been a bottom up organisation from the beginning. Rather it has always been from the Head

down. We do not function as trees, but rather as members of one body, branches of one vine and that is where we need to begin and end.

266. Not sure.
267. I would not wish for any ABC representatives who had anything to do with the financial mismanagement to be on the board. I also think that ABC members who actively promoted the Prince of Peace school to be on the Board.
268. have no knowledge of members in the Commission
269. Not too sure, as it is PART of the structure it wishes to change.
270. Clearly a step in the right direction
271. Hopefully the Commission will be very open-minded, reactive and constructive as it deliberates and moves forward with recommendations based on this survey and with future-mindedness based on good ecclesiastical knowledge.
272. With the help of God I think a more cost efficient structure could be achieved.
273. I hope the leaders know what they are doing.
274. I believe that the CCMS members will perform to the best of their abilities. I have to have confidence - otherwise this is all just a big waste of time - I believe CCMS is working hard and will do a good job.
275. Who are they? Experienced?? I have to assume that the Holy Spirit is directing their decision making process.... hence my answer.
276. As stated above - I don't see the value of pooling opinions. I'd rather respond to specific recommendations along with cogent rationale explaining the benefits.
277. I have no confidence in this group. Have the same people working on this who have done nothing to address top heavy structure from the inception of LCC seems ridiculous to expect that they will come up with something new and useful.
278. I am hopeful that this can be achieved.
279. right people in the right places.
280. I may be cynical about this but we have been trying to change things for a while and nothing has happened. Many of those people who were working on this for years are still on the restructuring committee so I'm really not sure how this is going to help.
281. I don't know what the mandate of the committee is and what their experience is with restructuring to be able to comment on their abilities to do this.
282. Don't really know at this point
283. And I pray for them as they proceed in this endeavour.
284. Same Old Boys running the show.
285. how can we have confidence if we don't have faith and lack trust
286. Unless an in-depth open review is made, the needs of the small congregation taken into account as being different than a large urban congregation the small rural congregation will continue to falter.
287. Dubious,,,we all trusted others and look what happened...hope that trust is well placed
288. This will be my comment for questions 19; 20 & 21. The only reason I have indicated that I disagree is that I don't think any of these bodies is agreed enough (I believe there are individuals on those bodies that may be but I don't believe they will persuade the entire body) to suggest the kinds of radical changes that will be necessary; furthermore, even if those radical changes was suggested I don't know that I trust the convention to pass them.
289. I don't know them.

290. not knowing who these people are, and not sensing an openness and willingness to address the disaster of the CEF in a forthright manner, I do not trust any current authorities to do the right thing. Change must come from the grassroots, not from the powers that be.
291. I appreciate the effort in this survey and in the current project, but the CCMS hasn't inspired confidence in the past number of years, including their "late start" in this area in the 2011-2014 triennium which led to a report that said, basically, we'll let the next group do it. I don't have confidence that all options for restructuring are actually "on the table".
292. I hope 3-6 months before the convention in October/2017, models will be presented so that they can be analyzed somewhat before and that hasty decisions are not be made at a convention. Models presented that much before will spur good debate.
293. There are so many terms/questions that are confusing to the average person. Is the CCMS actually going to get accurate opinions from the Synod members? Or would the surveys have been better completed by the councils of the individual congregations?
294. The chair of CCMS is linked with the fiasco in ABC, the questions that this survey poses may be irrelevant [http://www.solagratia.ca/2016/02/03/the-restructuring-survey-oh-wow/], many will be demanding change in structure as if that will fix the problem whereas the problem actually lies with a few "leadership" in ABC (over many years) and those in LCC that refuse to discharge their responsibilities. Hiring a pastor who did very little pastoring in his career but lots of flying; to give direction, produce this survey. Yah, not a lot of confidence.
295. I don't believe they really want to change anything or really listen to the people.
296. Who is on that committee? Names? I suppose I could do a little investigation and find out who is on that committee.... but why should I have to do that? Why were their names, qualifications, and pictures not included in the instructions to this survey? I realize that might be expecting a little too much. But, perhaps that is a reflection of my lack of confidence at this point.
297. As the Lord instructs us to show respect for those in authority I endeavour to do that, and putting the best construction on what has happened in the ABC District, pray that there has been the opportunity to learn from those mistakes and that we go forward stronger than ever in our faith and commitment.
298. I have not been informed as to the procedures and content.
299. ...as long as they act for the good of God's Church: reasoned proactive improvements and not hasty reactive changes.
300. On what grounds does the average layman have to form an opinion?
301. I am thankful that there is a move to look at LCC and make plans for its future journey.
302. My concern here is the group leading are internal and have all worked together on previous commissions, task forces, and committees. I am wondering where the independent objectivity will come from when it comes to making recommendations
303. More information would have needed to be provided by them on a regular basis in order to instill confidence in their leadership and decisions.
304. Again, is there no new blood in LCC? The restructuring committee is headed by Commission.
305. I pray you do not disappoint. That it comes quickly
306. A 5-person committee appears adequate with fair representation.
307. When I look at them, I see that none of them have a lot of experience in these matters, except maybe two. some are educated, but again not with expertise. I do not like that the consultant

was chosen among two choices, and that there were not more choices. I believe that the consultant (even if well intended) has a particular model that he will push forth which is not necessarily appropriate for our synod. Why are there not seminary presidents or CTCR members on this commission? There are theological implications on structure redesign and polity, for sure.

308. Is there enough in-put! Is there enough open-ness?
309. who?
310. This Commission is led and "populated" by the same people who have been in leadership positions that have resulted in the need for this survey. There are no new thinkers or "original idea generators" on it. It does not inspire much hope.
311. My concern is that the CCMS will not be willing to go as far as is necessary to make something that is sustainable. Please, do not be afraid to do something drastic if it will be helpful for the health of the whole synod.
312. The questions of this survey lead me to believe that the CCMS doesn't get the true need for our church to rebuild from the ground up. We don't need a little renovation... we need to start from scratch and rebuild - starting with clear vision and mission.
313. Once again time will tell.
314. How Broad is their mandate? How many people sit on this commission? Is their representation from across LCC? I've never heard of this commission or the scope of their mandate.
315. The questions asked in this survey, unfortunately, do not instill confidence. Frankly, the questions miss the point. Our struggles as a church body go far deeper than the structure. I am being more and more convicted that many of our churches are lukewarm, willing to maintain status quo, using the Lutheran formula for ministry (regardless of whether it is impacting people with God's Word) because it's easy. This process needs to start with why has gathered us together as a church body in Canada in 2016. Once we confirm our reason for being, only then should we explore a structure to support that.
316. With the repetition of questions, I am starting to wonder. Where are the deeper issues? So far this hasn't had any substance.
317. Would love to see them have the courage to make the necessary changes to the Districts and Synod.
318. I am concerned that CCMS will not have enough clear direction from the surveys in order to produce a meaningful 'overhaul' of our structure. In particular, I am concerned with the fact that Les Stahlke has been brought on board. I love the man, but his work in restructuring has tended to focus away from the organic nature of organizational behaviour towards heavily weighted administrative structures. We need to streamline our personnel who were present when previous mistakes were made. Where are the fresh perspectives and the new ideas that are needed to proved us with a future that does not make the mistakes of the past.
319. From what I've heard so far there is nothing to suggest I shouldn't have confidence in the
320. structure so that it can be more flexibly responsive to the pastoral and evangelistic needs of our Canadian setting rather than create a structure which 'defines' the Church. Only Word & Sacrament can do that.
321. I believe the CCMS intent is real and sincere in what they are doing - I do not know if it can effectively lead the process
322. I do hope that this survey can be more widely spread. I think the more people you can include, the better the picture you will get on how to proceed.

323. all good people
324. A lot of people don't know who's on the Commission, hard to make a good judgement call on the question.
325. I very much appreciate the collaborative approach they have taken in dealing with this necessary matter of adiaphora.
326. Concerns with the make-up of the group and weighting of clergy. Concerns that we are going to end up with a bureaucracy of departments.
327. I have no idea of who is on this CCMS - prayers that they are lead to make the best decisions for the LCC
328. Our examination of future structure should begin here with a sub committee
329. I have no idea what needs to be restructured?
330. Do they have an axe to grind in this matter?
331. This is moving forward and is progress in the right direction. That being said, lay persons need to continually be able to provide input before final decisions are to be made.
332. I do not believe a survey is going to be overly helpful - it will essentially be a pooling of ignorance. In fact, I have had several of our members ask for help with the survey because they do not sufficiently understand the present structure and the majority of the questions assume a very high level of understanding of the present structure and the way we function.
333. Dismal to date
334. While I appreciate their efforts thus far, I am concerned that the more important matters as outlined in the Objectives of our synod's constitution need to be front and center.
335. I particularly like the 8 Services proposed, in contrast to the current auxiliaries and service organizations which do not interest me.
336. I understand that the restructuring is being arranged by the same people who have been involved in the hierarchy and problems all along. I think that we need fresh perspectives and fresh people... Perhaps even professionals from outside our synod.
337. I am proud of them and are confident of their abilities. BUT, the demographic challenges before us and the subsequent financial challenges which will follow are huge. We need to act.
338. I would like assurance that the CCMS members are properly qualified.
339. I am not familiar with CCMS. What are their qualifications for this job?
340. The fact that we are completing this survey is hopeful. But I do have reservations as to how the results will be interpreted and how they will be presented.
341. It seems that those there have been part of many things for a very long time with is both positive and negative.
342. For the same reasons as above - I don't really know who these people are but I think they need professional advice/counseling to do this, if it is implemented. I think there needs to be professional input from "people" (like Les Stahlke etc.)
343. Can we not learn from others?
344. At this time, I have no reason believe they are not providing the necessary leadership.
345. I would hope that the members of the commission will take into consideration the opinion of the people of the congregations.
346. The questions that this survey poses may be irrelevant [http://www.solagratia.ca/2016/02/03/the-restructuring-survey-oh-wow/], many will be demanding change in structure as if that will fix the problem whereas the problem actually lies with a few “leadership” in ABC (over many years) and those in LCC that refuse to

discharge their responsibilities. Hiring a pastor who did very little pastoring in his career but lots of flying; to give direction. Yah, not a lot of confidence.

347. Don’t know
348. what??
349. I believe they can lead this process with regular reports to lay people within the congregations as to what they are doing, and getting their feed back on a regular basis.
350. no information
351. I certainly pray the process is led by God
352. Until other issues are resolved, I say NO. I sincerely hope they are doing what they can to resolve a very challenging situation.
353. Actually, I'm a little worried about it.
354. The Commission has a daunting task ahead in terms of developing a potential new structure. I like the approach that they are taking to this work and pray for their continued success.
355. Very unclear. There were no proactive initiatives. there was no oversite. there was no prevention. They only became known and active with the court situation currently
356. Yes, if it was struck by Synod and has the leadership from pastors and lay to develop a strong, effective, united "look and feel" for all the LCC churches. It should clearly define what being a Lutheran meant and free from today's distractions that arise from society's so-called politically correct interpretations. They for the most part are not biblical. We don't need to be part of the sea of unbelief but rather a clear alternative in the group of people who still believe in the bible and what it stands for.
357. If the plan is to get rid of our Districts, I don't have confidence in the CCMS.
358. Hands off! local Churches need to do this.
359. I admit not knowing the track records of the CCMS members. I trust they do what they can with the time they are afforded.
360. Just one more layer of structure for individual members to discover.
361. Where God is placed first and we ask him to take our eyes off of ourselves so that He might truly lead our way I am confident.
362. The same people are involved as always have been. We need new people who aren't part of the system. This is what has taken my hope of change away. We are likely leaving the church after many generations.
363. This is hard to say as I have little knowledge of the qualifications and experience of these 5 individuals. If, within the group, there is a strong understanding about corporate strategy, then I have high confidence.
364. No. Not with the current members on it.
365. -yes, & I thank them for their work in this very challenging undertaking.
366. not sure how confident
367. not strong confidence
368. As a member of our congregation, I have been provided with no information leading to any knowledge of this Commission.
369. I do have concerns about engaging Les Stahlke. I disagree with the governance model that was suggested to the Central District. His governance model may work well in the civil/business side, but it doesn't work well in body of Christ. It is something I am cautious about.
370. With all due respect to the current members of the CCMS, I believe this monumental process should be led by a committee consisting of our brightest and most learned theologians and

churchmen. Although the current members of the CCMS are very gifted and educated members of Synod, are they that well versed in matters of polity, particularly the traditional structures of Lutheran bodies around the world, that they would be the most qualified members of our Church to lead this process?

371. I am grateful for this occasion to weigh in on this matter. I was disappointed to hear that Les Stahlke was engaged as consultant for the this restructuring endeavour. I want the commission to evaluate a number of potentially suitable models and I am concerned that Les Stahlke's presence is telegraphing the direction we are taking before we have even started the process.
372. They seem to be approaching this restructuring with an open mind and heart, and with much prayer and consideration to what everyone wants.
373. I am trusting the Lord will guide and the leadership will have the strength to make bold and difficult changes necessary. However, I am sure many members will support those recommendations that result in little to no change.
374. They haven't proven to me one way or the other. This survey is great.
375. Unless something is risked for the sake of the Gospel this will be another venture to be filed away like the post WWII survey (1946, Merklinger); JCILR (1976, Threinen/Schade); LCC CCMS (1990, Liske). Surveys don't build consensus, they expose differences.
376. I question the legitimacy of having a board consisting of people who were largely involved in the ABC CEF debacle be involved in a synodical restructuring. I have no confidence in their ability, expertise or competency to do such a project. I believe that despite the data being collected in this survey is from around the synod as a whole, the CCMS board will ultimately edit and compile said data in accordance with their own views and desires. It's a flawed mechanism as are convention floor committees that have exactly the same power. I don't trust any of these boards to do what they are being entrusted to do.
377. I have confidence in Les Stahlke.
378. We are prayerfully hoping that after what has happened in our district that they will be able to do a major restructuring that will help the entire LCC body.
379. I think the people are qualified but it is too early to have an opinion. The final outcome will determine their effectiveness.
380. I am hopeful, though I do have some anxieties that it will be the status quo come the 2017 convention.
381. This has been talked about for years and years and nothing done. Does not build any confidence anything will be done now!
382. I seem to remember restructuring being up for happening just after I graduated in 1994. It was voted for but never happened. Will it this time?
383. For the previous three questions, I do not have enough knowledge to form an opinion. I do appreciate that our congregation thrives in a fairly autonomous way, within the framework of pastoral guidance and the amount of support (i.e. education, pensions, benefits for church workers) that is provided by the LCC.
384. We'll see.
385. Full of too many people who had to much to do with creation of LCC in the first place. They're going to be reluctant to change what they created.
386. We don't know much about the other members of the CCMS and their qualifications to lead. We've not seen much from them in the past few years that inspires confidence (e.g. the

"push" on structure at the 2014 convention, the weak attempt at getting input at the 2013 Pastors & Deacons conference).

387. Slight change needed Board members should get out to bulletins with message. For instance, news update and at least link to district and synods website
388. If the metric is this survey, and the fact even though the Synod Hand Book 2.103c FUNCTIONS state they are to be a resource to the District and have yet to contact their respective BOD's before publishing this survey then I can safely say I have little confidence at the moment. This is to important to get wrong. It was the three districts... with Central District leading the way why have you not talked with the BOD. Sane thought would suggest you would go their first!
389. I have much more confidence than I would have knowing that Rev. Les Stahlke, a man with credentials has been hired as consultant and designed this survey.
390. I'm not really familiar with the organization or who is on it.
391. I hope the CCMS actively comes up with their own solution to restructuring first before looking at the survey results to give them second thought.
392. They have already had two cracks at it with zero results (1988, 2004). I think a more broadly based proposal is needed. This survey is a good start, but it remains to be seen what is done with it.
393. I have learned to be disappointed. I hope to be surprised. My life experience has shown me that people born between the mid40s and mid50s have matured into self-deluded leaders, confident in their abilities and judgement, when the results should really lead to tremendous self-doubt. I celebrate every retirement. Some members of the CCMS have probably already confidently written off my opinion, simply as a result of reading the last paragraph. I pray that they are full of humility and self-doubt in all of the right places.
394. Same old gang that has been around for far too long. How many are reflective of the under 50 group in our church. Too heavily focused on keeping Ontario in LCC
395. ~ this survey if an indication is very good.

Section 3: Restructuring the Relationship of Congregations, Pastors and Deacons in Convention

22. The number of pastoral delegates and the number of lay delegates to synodical Conventions should be equal in number, as it is now.

1. I believe it is essential that those who govern and guide our denomination be firmly grounded in the confessions of said denominations. Regular Sunday attendance is great but if they are not familiar with the writings that distinguish us from other church bodies, how can they guide the church in that direction?
2. I don't understand how it stands now.
3. I don't know how it stands now.
4. Pastors change - lay delegates don't - they continue in same congregation. But many lay not well informed. Hopefully pastors are aware of big picture.
5. I think the number of lay delegates should relate to the size of the congregation, but that of conventions might be prohibitive.
6. The voting lay delegates are part of the voting Assembly of a church. The Voting Assembly runs the church. Pastors job is to keep them in line spiritually.
7. No more than 3 delegates from a congregation.
8. Lay delegates do not have the theological knowledge of Pastors, there should be less.
9. There needs to be a balance of needs and perspectives.
10. too much pastoral power
11. Fewer lay delegates would be better. It has been clear from the past that many of them are unqualified to lead in this way.
12. Each congregation requires a voice.
13. Yes, if by pastoral delegates we are talking about pastor who are currently actively serving a congregation.
14. If we had more experts that weren't pastors we would have not been in this mess. In the old country, there was 1 pastor and many elders. That was it.!!!
15. It's important to have a balance between leaders of the church and the members of the church family.
16. Perhaps. The bigger issue is that deacons are not represented. They must be. To make that happen, I'm very willing to lose this historic balance between clergy and lay votes.
17. Needs to stay the same. I'm not convinced of the value that our church governments places on lay input.
18. I agree with Walther's emphasis on involvement of informed lay people. Pastors ought not have undue power in the functioning of the church without the benefit of some check and balance.
19. This present procedure seems to work why change?
20. This is preferable, but may not always be possible.
21. It keeps people informed and is much more social and nice.
22. It's a time for smoozing.

23. I don't think we will get an appropriate cross-section of lay delegates at conventions because of the format. If a lay delegate is not retired they have to take time off to go spend 3 days in meetings. It's a very unappealing prospect.
24. In a sinful world balance is needed
25. It might make sense to have lay delegates be more representative of the size of the congregations they are a part of.
26. Laypersons need to be present at these conventions
27. I believe that the number is equal in theory only, and this is not actually realised in practice.
28. Pastor attendance should be sufficient - always need to keep cost considerations related to attendance in mind. Lay person does not always have in-depth knowledge - just someone who is available.
29. An equal no. of opinions given is good so one does not get more input that the other.
30. I believe this works well in my eyes.
31. If a congregation is small and can only afford to send one person, that person should be their pastor. If they can send an unlimited number of people, then obviously the number of lay people will outnumber the one pastor they send.
32. should be an on line vote - one member one vote. the pastors have established and maintained an "old boys" empire
33. pastoral delegates should outnumber lay delegates 2 to 1
34. This is in keeping with our doctrine (based on Walther's Thesis) which states that by divine right, laymen have the right of judgement, equal with that of the ministry of preaching.
35. But I feel strongly that we are top-heavy with Pastoral decision-making. I'd like to see every Pastor in Synod welcome to attend Convention and to speak ... but Pastors should not have the right to vote. Pastors should be the Servants of our Congregations and of our Church, not the Masters and Rulers.
36. The number of responsible lay people should far out number pastors. Each congregation has only one pastor but many lay people, and the temptation to act like "the big boys club" is no less than in the private sector.
37. This, to me, is a "minor structural refinement," as discussed in a previous question. Or would it strongly affect the Convention's work and decision-making? The implications should be laid out.
38. We need more delegates from the congregations and fewer pastors. Again change is scary and it often is easier to go with the status quo.
39. Pastor is more than sufficient - always keep costs related to attendance in mind. Quite often, lay person does not have in-depth knowledge - just is someone who is available.
40. It never really is equal at a convention.
41. It's a healthy balance.
42. Although pastors have been given special gifts of authority within Christ's church, we are one Body with many members who are equal in God's eyes.
43. Unless there is a valid reason for the inequality, such as one or the other has a last minute incident that prevents them going.
44. 1 pastor and 1 lay
45. I believe we need structure changes so it is not clear if convention delegation is the way to go?
46. I think that each congregation should be able to send a lay delegate. This presupposes that the Districts are dissolved.

47. Whenever this is possible the numbers should be close to equal.
48. 1 congregation (1 Pastor and 1 Lay person) voting process should be cared out an as consensus not as a majority rules. For as we know then as in Government the Canada is driven by the east.
49. This is the simplest way to maintain a balance between lay and clergy representation at convention. One side should ideally keep the other side in check.
50. the conventions and process is flawed and impractical. It systematically shuts out the small and rural congregations that cannot send representation. Synod being so out of touch, is oblivious to the general apathy.
51. I am concerned that some of the smaller congregations may not be able to send equal numbers of pastoral and lay personnel.
52. There is good reason that this division of powers has been utilized in our history. That said, we strive for an equal representation but do not force an exact equality because there are sometimes people who are unable to attend and delegates who fail to attend.
53. no I think you need more lay people involved
54. I think the pastoral delegates have been called, are educated and should be the majority. In our experience, it seems that some lay people feel they "know better" than the pastor what is good for the church. Although I feel communication should be open, I believe the pastor should be the decision maker and the rest we give to God.
55. Fewer willing or have wisdom.
56. The majority of our membership is made up of lay people.
57. This protects everyone.
58. Delegates should submit a report to the congregation to make them knowledgeable.
59. Not sure about this. I don't think it would hurt to have more lay delegates than pastors--especially if we can get lay delegates with the right experience and skills in business, governance and finance to be at the Convention for the business matters.
60. But is this always possible, or that important What if someone becomes sick
61. This is good practice in conforming with Scripturally based Waltherian theology.
62. I feel there should be more lay delegates than pastoral. Many lay delegates go along with what their Pastor wants. This is not constructive for the future of the church. in most cases our members who leave or stop attending is because of disagreements with the Pastor. It is usually not doctrinal but over power of the congregation.
63. We must maintain our representative democracy.
64. makes sense to have more clergy than laity in deciding church polity and practice.
65. Why is this required?
66. see above # re: delegates, (can't go back on this survey to re read my area of response. Failure of the survey. sorry.
67. I am unsure if this is best or not.
68. I am not sure of the rationale for this and do not have an opinion.
69. There should be more encouragement for all congregations to have at least a lay delegate if not a pastoral delegate in attendance.
70. I'd feel more comfortable with Pastors having more say
71. If we stop thinking in worldly terms of 'each group getting their say' we might start to act more as church.
72. I have no idea who attends.
73. I think that there should be more lay delegates.

74. I am not knowledgeable.
75. It would be good to have two lay delegates as well as the pastor. But I realize that individuals time is limited and it may not be possible to have two lay delegates.
76. Conventions should be ALL lay delegates with some clergy advisors
77. larger congregations should have more lay delegates
78. I think that the Pastors should outnumber the laity.
79. Why are Pastors looking for flow of authority not flow of transparent accountability Pastors have too much authority, too many lay delegates simply vote the way the Pastor does
80. I believe that there should be more input by the average lay delegate. Two lay to one pastor.
81. This doesn't need to change. Don't change it!
82. It's important to maintain the clergy/laity balance at conventions as much as possible.
83. I represented our congregation one time at a synodical convention and it felt like we were there just to rubber stamp motions that were presented by the Synod. There is so much work to be done at those conventions, that it's nearly impossible to get motions modified.
84. It is important to have well informed delegates. Lay delegates give an important voice that pastors can not truly represent. I do not know understand the effects that changing the numbers would have on the process. What I have observed is that our Synodical conventions are ineffective.
85. I think this will provide the best opportunity for balanced input and discussion.
86. We do not want the pastors "lording" it over the laity just because they supposedly "know" more.
87. I would say that it does not have to be equal numbers. Saying that, I would be leaning towards one third pastoral and two thirds lay delegates and yet continue to have a balanced perspective.
88. I would not see a problem with there being less lay delegates than pastoral delegates to synodical Conventions. I think lay involvement is important and necessary, but do not see the necessity for having equal numbers.
89. This is absolutely necessary. Both pastoral and lay delegates bring different strengths to convention. Pastors are not experts or knowledgeable in all areas and thus the lay delegates can bring advice and insight from other perspectives. Additionally, the church is the community of believers, lay and pastoral. Already on a percentage base pastors are more strongly represented. I believe this is acceptable as they can at times have a more in depth knowledge of specific church issues.
90. Can't ground that this is an accurate assessment.
91. This is absolutely essential (subject to minor variance due to extenuating circumstance, i.e. pastoral vacancy). The conventions represent not interest groups (church workers, racial groups, etc.) but the CHURCH. Normally in history the church was represented by Bishops (pastors), but for good reasons our heritage has said that in addition to one pastor each congregation should also send one layman to represent the congregation (or group of congregations).
92. Never hear anything about it in our congregation - no reports from conventions, etc.
93. Does it presently work.... too many too few.
94. The challenge with the system as it is now is that the lay delegate is, in effect, joined to their Pastor. I am not sure that many lay delegates feel comfortable disagreeing with their Pastor at a convention. I am not aware if all votes are by ballot and confidential, nor how closely "supervised" lay delegates may be.

95. Conventions should be done using modern technological media such as tele conferencing. This would reduce costs substantially for Churches on limited budgets.
96. Are they equal in number now, or "allowed" to be so?
97. The laity should have more representation.
98. More Elders and fewer Pastors should be present at Conventions.
99. Important to have balance of professional and lay, but may not the be all and end all.
100. My experience as a lay delegate to a district or national convention always made me feel inferior to the pastoral delegates. They have an understanding of such documents as the Book of Concord where as the lay person is ill equipped in doctrinal matters. I always felt the pastors moved the proceedings in the direction they wished to see it go.
101. need more lay delegates
102. I am comfortable with the status quo; however, if it had to be unequal, I would want pastors to outnumber laypeople (and not the other way around).
103. Lay people shouldn't have the ability to veto doctrine. They should be heard, but not a voting majority. They should be solidly outnumbered by pastoral delegates.
104. This practice reflects our theology that the church is constituted of both clergy and congregations. Our current practice, while not sacrosanct, is good, right, and salutary.
105. I feel the number of delegates could be more
106. I think that this balance has served us well.
107. It should be equal - don't know what it is now
108. There should be more lay delegates based on the voting membership of the congregations. Congregations with more than one pastor should have more pastoral delegates also--each pastor should be a delegate--much like Parliament (lay delegates) and Senate (pastors and deacons).
109. Whatever works
110. If one delegate is to represent each pastor, unless a delegate may represent more than one pastor, the number should be the same.
111. This is the polity we have chosen. It is not biblical. It has little historical precedence. It leads to many people think that the church is a democracy. Nevertheless, we have the freedom to use such polity.
112. There are more lay delegates than pastoral.
113. Pastors, that are for the most part not trained in business matters, probably shouldn't be making business decisions. Pastors can help as advisors only when needed, and should handle Pastoral, liturgical and spiritual matters. These 3 are enough on their plate.
114. I do not know the arguments pro and con.
115. Walther spoke of a balance of power in his thesis on Kirche und Amt and that is the official doctrine of our church. We cannot change this balance without challenging the doctrine upon which it is based.
116. This would continue to build a strong trust between the two.
117. Probably; but they all need to develop a much broader understanding to the Bible's directives to grow Christ's Church.
118. This question is simple -- do you wan the clergy to run the church or not! Our current polity which largely unique in Christendom has been working well for over 150 years. "It ain't broke!"
119. More lay delegates than pastors

120. I am more concerned with the capability of the pastors and delegates than I am the balance of members and pastors. I don't think someone should be there just because we need to maintain the numbers.
121. More lay delegates
122. The above concept is a part of our history. It looks good on paper. But it has not also been effective in communicating the needs of the Church.
123. If we still feel the need to vote on things, that is necessary. Some things should never come to a vote! Doctrinal issues are not to be voted upon and yet issues that touch on doctrine keep coming to the floor at district and synod conventions and waylay a lot of time. Our doctrine is fairly straight forward if we would just take the time to read the Bible and understand what the Book of Concord says.
124. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
125. we should have more lay delegates as this would more represent a congregation
126. "As it is now," at the Vancouver convention, 99 voting delegates were listed which means the voting was not equal, probably due to last minute emergencies, sickness, or inability of alternates to attend at the last minute.
127. A balance is needed as it then gives no power to either Pastoral or Lay.
128. Congregations should send more than one lay delegate. Still have the same number of Pastoral delegates - add to the overall number of delegates.
129. Maybe 25% pastoral, 75% lay
130. This equality is an important check and balance for the Synod.
131. The membership of LCC has two classes of members, i.e. corporate = congregations and individual = pastors and deacons. This imbalance in representation makes LCC undemocratic in its structure and governance. The imbalance is enhanced when we consider the undue influence by pastors based on the amount of speaking time at a convention. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged.
132. I believe it is wise to hold this balance, but would be open to hearing reasons for different methods.
133. That's a human arrangement that the LCMS struck upon. It has a certain logic, though the example of the Church prior to the modern era is synods of bishops gathering to decide theological matters. Non-ministerial/theological issues can (maybe SHOULD) be decided by laypeople with appropriate wisdom and expertise, while ministry/theology issues could (maybe should) be decided by pastors.
134. And what about Deacons? The don't seem to be pastoral or lay yet we have a place for deacons in the church, yes? I'd be happy if lay people would have more say actually. Pastors complicate things and some of us have this idea that we are some how the "end all be all" and need to be authoritative just because we went to seminary and by the grace of God are called to shepherd congregations. Synod is a man made thing... why are we so worried about the balance of power. We need all the gifts of the church to be the church in order to reach the lost and proclaim good news.
135. I agree, although I believe there may be some benefit to having a 2 lay to 1 pastoral relationship. Members, not Pastors should be the decision makers.

136. the convention should have 1.5 - 2.0x more lay delegates than pastors
137. We need different perspective.
138. Only fair, a combination, of Pastors and Lay people is important.
139. The current system is ridiculous and is not scriptural. Pastors should receive no more than 10% of votes at conventions and should not be guaranteed anymore than 10% of positions on Boards and committees. I have been unable to find any part of the Bible or Book of Concord that gives the pastors special treatment in making church decisions. Look no further than the CEF crisis at the District level and the pension plan liability at the LCC level.
140. two to one in favor of lay delegates.
141. That is fair.
142. more people should be involved
143. I have never been part of any convention so I cannot comment on whether these existing numbers are effective or not, or whether a change would be beneficial or detrimental.
144. There should be more lay delegates so more churches can stay informed and be represented
145. A balance should be maintained to keep not only the impression but reality that church matters are decided not only by the clergy nor only by the laity. One of the challenges I see for our church is that we often have a lower theologically educated laity than we once had in the past. This can lead to difficulties.
146. ...but there should be a stipulation that the lay delegate may not reside in the same household as the pastoral delegate.
147. There should be more lay delegates. Their numbers should be determined by the size of the congregation. Too many clergy. The concept of one circuit, one lay delegate is outdated. And most certainly not democratic.
148. Each congregation should be allowed to send both one lay and one pastoral delegate to Synod Conventions. When only a few delegates from each circuit attend the convention, congregations who are not represented by a delegate don't get first-hand information about what went on and are left out of the loop.
149. I do not know
150. I see no good reason to change a century and a half-old practice at this stage. But we don't need to treat 50/50 as an absolute; there may be good reason to have a few more ordained than lay delegates on some occasions.
151. So if we are a congregation who does not have a pastor, does that mean that we can not send a lay delegate?
152. Doesn't matter.
153. I think the committee should establish two lines of authority: Pastors and Lay Delegates. The number of lay delegates should be based on congregational membership of those who actively attend "church." e.g. one per hundred. As for the pastors...one vote per parish.
154. Pastoral delegates should be more than lay delegates. As a church body, everything relates to doctrine and our direction should be guided through doctrinal eyes, especially by those who are fully trained and equipped to provide that specific type of guidance. Pastors must be trusted more.
155. I think both the clergy and lay need to be evenly balanced.
156. for voting purposes
157. equal representation makes sense
158. This results in too often the clergy running the church. Pastors meet often and are organized. Lay Delegates often are not well informed of matters being dealt with at the convention.

Pastors should have a large influence in doctrinal and pastoral issues but the lay representatives from congregations should have the larger say in matters of administration, finance and church organization.

159. Pastors & delegates should be well represented at conventions.
160. Conventions are expensive, and until the Synod is back in the black there should not be any pastoral delegates and lay delegates from the ABC District going.
161. If there are two pastors at one church, only one pastor is allowed to vote. I would prefer they both receive a vote.
162. I believe all pastors should have a vote. In of a dual-pastor parish, only one pastor gets to vote. I do not agree with this.
163. More lay
164. should be more lay delegates
165. Most Pastors are focused on teaching and Preaching. Congregations can send lay people who educated, skilled and experienced in financial and Business Operations. The two groups compliment and balance each other.
166. I don't know what the number should be but I think we need to adjust numbers to be more effective in our current financial and operational time of need.
167. There should not be any lay delegates. Laity should not vote, especially on matters of doctrine.
168. There should be no voting lay delegates, especially on matters of doctrine.
169. 2 to 1 lay to pastoral
170. fewer and fewer laypeople understand what it means to be Lutheran - or believe that our theology is that significantly different than others. Therefore, it is a necessity that pastors have enough of a voice to guide the church body.
171. it would be good if these people are knowledgeable and wise
172. it would seem to be good providing these people are knowledgeable and wise
173. As noted above, only congregations should have membership in the synod and therefore only lay persons would be delegates to convention. See how LLL and LWML are constituted and managed.
174. All conventions need to be conducted by lay people with an appropriate number of clergy advisors.
175. This balance is important because, given how our society leads people away from the church, more laymen making the decisions could lead to errors in practice that, hopefully, would be checked by equal pastoral representation. I don't want us to become the United Church of Canada!
176. delegate eligibility defined through a 1:1 ration of pastoral to lay is preferable to #23 (below)
177. I'm not sure how this has affected voting in the past.
178. more lay delegates need their voices heard
179. I have known too many pastors too convinced of their own infallibility to believe that the power in the church should be distributed in this way.
180. I like how Walther set things up. We are built from the bottom up. Congregations are important. I do NOT want a church built from the top down. That is TOO papist for me. I would leave the Lutheran church immediately if that ever happens!
181. It is important to have balance between the voice of clergy and the voice of lay delegates to prevent the tipping of the pendulum to far towards the model of clergy dominated denominations like the Roman Catholic Church. As stated in scripture, we are all of one

body, each with different roles, none more important than the other. The voice of clergy is clearly important, but so is the voice of other parts of the body of Christ.

182. There should be more lay delegates
183. I think each congregation pastor should be a delegate AS WELL AS LAY PEOPLE BASED ON THE NUMBER SO MANY DELATES PER NUMBER OF MEMBERS IN THE CONGREGATION
184. I agree BUT, it is the lay folks who make up the church. Pastors' opinions are one person's point of view and should not be given extra weight
185. Both members or Synod need to be in this together and not pitted against each other. We, Pastors and lay people in our congregations, are in this together.
186. If the synod remains composed of congregations and church workers, then the number of pastoral delegates and lay delegates should remain equal.
187. Since there are more lay people than ministers, that should be replicated at conventions.
188. Pastors get to vote according to their conscience. Congregations in their diversity are not fairly represented by one delegate. Consider that most lay delegates go because they are suggested by their Pastor and there is a great deal of apathy in anyone going. You are not getting a varied input of ideas.
189. I think that the equal number of clergy and lay delegates provides important balance in our church and to allow one group or the other more representation would mean that we lose that important balance.
190. Absolutely. This not only reflects our membership (pastors and parishes being the 2 entities that make up our synod, but it also is a built in system of check and balance.
191. When one pastor serves 2 congregations, each congregation should be able to have a delegate.
192. Everyone should be given a fair chance.
193. As I have never attended a synodical convention I am unaware of the overall influence each type of delegate has. Do lay delegates tend to defer to pastoral delegates?
194. I have never been to a convention
195. Pastors tend to influence the vote of the delegate so congregations need more say.
196. I do think that the church needs to address other church workers getting a vote or at least indicate if they get a church worker vote or lay vote. I don't think the issue is the number of delegates as it is the capability of both pastors and lay people to make informed decisions.
197. I have no strong opinion on this matter
198. I think what needs to be encouraged is the reporting back to the congregations post convention. My experience is that this has lacked severely following each convention.
199. fewer pastors and more Lay people
200. does not appear to have equal representation at this time. more lay delegates are needed.
201. I cannot even agree in my own mind. On one hand I think lay-people should have more because it is their church. But on the other hand most of the lay-people in my congregation don't know or care very much about the district and the synod so the pastors need to be equally represented because they are on only ones that may truly understand the broader picture.
202. Should be 1 pastor and 2 lay
203. More lay delegates should attend.

204. That audited financial statements were absent for several years, and the CEF was clearly in trouble for several years, but this info never came out - except possibly at a convention - proves that the current system is inappropriate.
205. It does not appear to be equal representation at this time
206. There does not appear to have been equal representation from our perspective
207. I agree, though this is a question best asked/answered only after significant issues relating to Church & Ministry are discussed, because those issues directly inform this question of equal representation. With the Waltherian understanding that forms the basis of our history, this would be a "Strongly Agree". But as a synod, we're not in agreement that we are in fact Waltherian.
208. When delegates attend meetings they have little knowledge of who or what they are voting on and usually follow the lead of the pastor. I believe there should be more information on candidates so that congregations can better advise the delegates on how they should vote.
209. That's if we still need this type of structure?? These conventions--same or different??
210. This question makes me wonder if the proposed restructuring of synod is a real minefield. Please remember the history of our church body and origins of our church polity. Pastors are members of Synod. Congregations are members of Synod. The pastor has an equal vote with the congregation. Our church polity is different than the church polity of, for example, Baptist or Pentecostal churches for a REASON. We are not strictly "congregational" in the fullest sense of that word. We have a theology of the divine call which differs from other church bodies.
211. it is hard, even in' larger' congregations, to find one lay delegate willing to give up their time to attend conventions and report back to their fellow members. It would seem to be logical to base the number of lay delegates on the number of members, but this is hard to calculate between congregations, and hard to achieve. Perhaps, the current system is best for now.
212. The only problem I have is the way selection of delegates is made locally. There never seems to be an opportunity for a woman to go.
213. I think what is important is finding effective delegates that represent all constituents if this is how it is done okay. A revisit of this as we are revamping may be a good thing to do
214. today's lay person is on the whole, better educated and more aware. The decisions made at convention often have a greater effect on them. We should tap that expertise and recognize their worth.
215. Representation by population should be adopted. Criterion such as 1 delegate per 100 communing members.
216. There needs to be proportionate as to the number of lay persons to registered clergy (Active in the ministry).
217. There are many more lay people than pastors so not sure why it should be equal.
218. Perhaps weighted to the Lay delegation would be better.
219. I think this works well.
220. The length of conventions makes it difficult for a lay person to commit.
221. I think pastors should have more vote since they are more informed and our shepherds.
222. An increased portion of Lay Delegates might be able to diminish the fact that Lay Delegates generally vote "as their Pastor tells them to." In today's Church, Lay Delegates are often more intelligent and better educated than the Pastors who serve them. Such people should have a greater voice.

223. I think we have a higher representation of pastoral delegates. Our church should be representative of all members. Administrators should be people who have knowledge in that field. I have met very few pastors who have had a good knowledge of financial or administrative matters.
224. Maybe... but this is not the core issue at all.
225. Sure, but again, this isn't the core issue.
226. Every pastor should go regardless of team ministry or serving institutions and each church should be able to send along delegates if they desire to.
227. It is a tradition that has worked for us. But it should be open to change if needed.
228. I do not oppose this structure, but greater attention needs to be paid to developing the leadership and oversight role of the clergy within the shaping and direction of our Church - especially when it comes to doctrinal matters as well as practical issues that have doctrinal implications.
229. It seems more Lutheran to have more lay delegates
230. Equal numbers insure a variety of views.
231. There should be more lay delegates than pastors.
232. I am torn. I hesitate to change something that is solidly ground in a real historical concern resulting from the abuses carried out by Bishop Stefan that resulted in the Missouri Synod forming with the polity it has. I also recall one of my seminary professors noting that it was the faithful lay delegates at synod conventions who kept us firmly on the Scriptures during the Seminex era. My heart wants to retain our current. However, my head recognizes that there has been much change in LCMS and LCC with the addition of deacons and deaconesses as members of synod, as well as the addition of varied organizations that have taken pastors out of the congregation.
233. Since the lay delegates don't have a vote, it is not relevant.
234. Is there a problem with the existing numbers?
235. 1:1 ratio is fine.
236. "To the ministry of the Word, according to divine right, belongs also the duty to judge doctrine, but laymen also possess this right. Therefore, in the ecclesiastical courts and councils they are accorded both a seat and vote together with clergy." Thesis X Dr. C. F. W. Walther - Kirche und Amt
237. It seems to me that there should be a greater proportion of lay delegates.
238. there should be some way to give extra votes based on membership or financial commitments to the synod.
239. I believe that the pastors should be leading the church, so I don't believe it is essential that for every voting pastor there needs to be a voting layman.
240. Lay delegates only. Change constitution so only congregations are members of synod.
241. This is necessary to keep the proper balance between clergy and laity. If anything, it makes for a strong lay representation as some congregations are vacant.
242. Pastoral delegates should be a minimum of 50%, a ratio not watered down by deacons sitting in clergy spots.
243. I would say so but I think there needs to be careful choices made - not to just send "Jane Smith" without having the lay delegates equipped to make wise choices of decisions made at the conventions.
244. This gets the members of the church more involved in the church.

245. This formula was established in a crisis in 1846 in the LCMS and has stood the test of time. While I am open to other possibilities, it is important to maintain control in the hands of the congregations, not the pastors or deacons as such. With each congregation being represented by a pastor and a lay delegate (District conventions), a level playing field has been maintained.
246. Pastoral delegates and lay delegates should have equal voice and be working together in serving God`s church here on earth.
247. Pastoral and Diaconal Vs Lay delegates.
248. I've never been to a Convention, I'm not really sure what the dynamic is or what the issue is with the number of delegates.
249. I am not convinced that our convention structure lends itself to good decision making for the work of LCC. I believe there is importance to provide information and education to lay leaders at the conventions. I think that pastors have a natural sway in the current overture/resolution process through floor committees on doctrinal and theological matters and that is good but lay delegates need to have greater influence on strategic business decision making through conventions/large meetings
250. It accomplishes nothing. this is just stating and holding the party line with no allowance for explanation or concern
251. Pastors should know what their congregation is all about, go to the conventions with that knowledge and work for meaningful change. They know more about their job and what it takes to make it work. It looks good to be inclusive but does it add. Do our seminary teachers take part and then impart that to pastors and deacons as they teach? I believe that growing and vital congregations get that way from the man in the front every Sunday!
252. While we have a lot of Pastoral delegates attend the synodical Conventions, the representation by lay delegates often does not match the Pastoral delegates. As often the lay delegates are not coming, for whatever reason.
253. This issue was voted on at the last Synodical Convention June 2014. See Resolution 14.3.15a Declined Overture 3.05 to change voting delegate numbers.
254. Every congregation should be represented by its pastor and one lay person. Currently we only have representatives from circuits, not congregations.
255. I think that there should be 2 lay to 1 pastoral
256. More lay delegates are needed. Right now the clergy has the most power.
257. The equal no. of votes assists us as a Synod to walk together as a Church of both lay and clergy. Neither pushing from top down or from bottom up. I feel it is a great statement of who we are as God's Church.
258. Why can't each member in each church have a vote? Then elections would truly reflect the desire of the people. Right now the pastors vote and the lay delegate is usually a retired guy in the congregation who gets along with the pastor.
259. should be lay led
260. pastoral delegates should be majority and lay delegates are not thoroughly educated and cause incorrect direction
261. It's harmonizes with our theological understanding of the Office of the Public Ministry and of priesthood of the baptized.
262. This should only change IF a congregation has more than 500 ACTIVE members. In which case, 1 lay delegate for every 500 active members in a congregation may be appropriate. (i.e., 750 members would allow a congregation to have 2 lay delegates).

263. The equal number of delegates would provide the necessary checks-and-balances.
264. I believe it is the best way. To change the balance either way would only create suspicion. After all, it is in our LCMS DNA.
265. It doesn't matter. As a church we are not divided between pastoral and lay delegates.
266. It is important to be balanced and have both sides represented equally.
267. even though this raises costs, I believe it is necessary.
268. In an ideal setting?
269. I believe it should be 2 to 1 lay delegates to pastoral delegates. I know this would increase the size of the convention which is concerning, but.... registration fees could be adjusted to cover additional cost.
270. That more delegates could improve the climate/understanding/effectiveness of the life of congregations & synod perhaps is not a possibility due to the high costs.
271. Should change pastors to Church workers and include Rostered teachers/deacons; then it would be equal.
272. It doesn't matter. Ban conventions all together. They are an extreme waste of time and money and accomplish nothing.
273. I believe having equal representation provides the necessary checks and balances.
274. After these synod conventions, more information needs to be given to the congregations in each circuit.
275. I think there should be more lay people. This can lead to changes. I did worry about keeping to the inerrancy of the Bible, but if you look at what happened with the Anglican and United churches, it was the Pastors that took their denominations to become liberalized.
276. While it is important to have trained theologians attend, we have many devoted and skilled lay members who can substantially contribute to the process.
277. When issues of doctrine are considered then pastoral delegates should because of their training have more of a say in the matter but in all other matters i.e.; finance, then lay delegates should have a stronger voice.
278. I have never been to a Convention, so am not sure how this works or how the number of delegates is determined.
279. This should never be a lay-dominated or a clergy-dominated church.
280. Overall, yes. We're Waltherian; issues of theology and practice are discussed by both clergy and laity. The congregation is the basic unit of our Synod, and we meet together to make decisions.
281. Should be one pastoral and two lay delegates from each congregation.
282. Do we even need conventions?
283. We are too heavily weighted on pastoral delegates. Lay people possess the skills needed in management and decision making - pastors seem to hold the church to "same-old-same-old" molds.
284. A change in either direction could possibly give either pastors or lay delegates too much authority.
285. This balanced has worded well for us and LCMS for many years.
286. Yes, keep this historic balance. On theological issues it is critical to have equal pastoral vote as pastors are well-versed in both Scripture and our Lutheran Confessions.
287. Although the number of voting delegates may be equally divided, the number of advisory delegates (who may speak and lobby) is heavily weighted in favour of pastors.

288. There are more members in the congregation than there are pastors so there should be a proportional representation from the congregation. Some pastors may think they have 100X the power of their members but Luther's definition of the priesthood of all believers would refute that.
289. The floor committees have had far too much direction in directing the decisions of synod.
290. ~ having attended numerous District, two Synodical, and an LWML-C convention having the possibility of strong Scriptural influence is what has allowed us the blessings we in LC-C have thus far. ~ if it skews toward laity we could see the ultimate demise of LC-C!

23. The number of pastoral delegates and the number of lay delegates to synodical Conventions may be unequal in number.

1. It would be better to have a few more pastors than lay people
2. It is important to maintain clergy-lay balance.
3. Every congregation must have a delegate and a pastor. Vacant must choose to have delegate too.
4. Some study needs to be done on this. How informed, inspired!! How unequal??
5. Each congregation should have a delegate
6. There should be a lay delegate from each parish-congregation may very in each parish.
7. Why are you asking this again? see 22 Lay delegates do not have the theological knowledge of Pastors, there should be less.
8. I'm concerned about what might happen if delegates promote something that's sinful or contrary to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions, and it is accepted by majority vote? Are there safeguards in place to prevent it from becoming our official position?
9. need more professional lay persons
10. Agree if that means that retired pastors, associate pastors, deacons etc. can serve as delegates in place of the "lay delegate." Strongly Disagree if the idea is that the number of lay delegates would exceed the number of theologically trained delegates.
11. I feel that the Pastor's should have more say. I feel that a lot of the lay delegates are not even aware of the actual doctrines found in the LCC
12. As above: This balance made excellent sense when we only had the 2 groups to consider (pastors and laypeople). Since deacons came along, the whole matter has needed serious re-jigging.
13. As long as pastors are not outnumbered. The main problem with lay voters in convention is that many are oblivious to the Lutheran Confessions and vote on theological issues without proper theological understanding.
14. Having an unequal number is one thing, but too many lay versus pastoral could be extremely problematic with regard to matters of doctrine considering the pressures of our modern world and the directions in which it continues to move.
15. Why?
16. It gives a better scope to be represented well.
17. more lay delegates.
18. Lay delegates stay within congregations - pastors move on... don't think "pastor heavy" is good within congregation.
19. 50/50
20. In a sinful world balance is needed

21. Provided for congregational vacancies that may cause an imbalance.
22. I don't know.
23. I have been a lay delegate to one District convention. The real issue is that our conventions don't ever get around to addressing the important doctrinal issues because everyone is afraid to expose our disunity even though that would be a necessary first step to resolving the problem. A second major problem is that I've seen many lay people (and pastors, sad to say) who do not have the requisite knowledge, the theological conviction, nor the wisdom to make effective delegates. Walther would toss these people right out the door. We need a better way to assess and select highly-qualified people to act as decision makers at conventions. Ideally we could trust pastors and congregations to select lay delegates, but we can't right now. I'm wondering if a consistorial governance model wouldn't actually meet our synod's needs better at this time in our history. Everyone just can't have a say anymore. We need to become more nimble so that our synod can be put back on the right course.
24. The seminaries and other bodies responsible for training and ecclesiastical supervision should ensure that pastors have the necessary qualifications to vote on matters that need to be decided at conventions. However, the only qualification necessary for a lay delegate are that he/she be a member in good standing of an LC-C congregation. This is not a high enough standard. It widely known and lamented that the majority of the members of LC-C do not attend Bible study regularly, do not do home devotions regularly, and do not read Scripture regularly. Furthermore, it is not an exaggeration to say that most members of LC-C congregations do not even know the Small Catechism, let alone the Lutheran Confessions. Being a lay delegate should certainly require a good working knowledge of Scripture, the Book of Concord, and the LC-C constitution. Perhaps a certain basic examination for potential lay delegates would be a good idea!
25. I believe that this is the case currently.
26. I feel that each congregation should be represented by a lay delegate. If a pastor serves more than one congregation, he attends, but each congregation should have a lay delegate to represent them at the convention.
27. I am open to considering changes in this regard.
28. More lay delegates than pastoral delegates would be preferable.
29. I believe the current way works well.
30. each member of a congregation should have a vote
31. pastoral delegates should outnumber lay delegates 2 to 1
32. This would allow for the power balance to shift to that of the pastors. This would be in direct violation of our doctrine which clearly states that laypeople have the same right of judgment.
33. Please see my Comments for Question 22. Equally applicable here.
34. The greater number should be duly elected lay delegates who wish to see God's will done and all to God's glory.
35. I haven't been involved in any District or synodical conventions so I'm not familiar with what happens or with what decisions are made.
36. Again, the practical implications of these changes should be laid out somewhere. Without further info, too many of us this is just a theoretical sort of exercise -- some change vs. no change.
37. should be even, no.
38. As per my comments above. Perhaps there could be a pre convention gathering of delegates in each area to better understand the business at hand and be better prepared.

39. But this is not license to get too creative.
40. Although having an equal number of lay delegates may be seen as a good thing, I think it would be very difficult and therefore impractical to actually get an equal number.
41. I cannot think of a reason for unequal representation but perhaps there could be a good reason.
42. As much as some pastors would like to have full control of our church body, they join with us laity as joint members and heirs in the body of Christ.
43. Why must it always be equal - is there fear about being unequal
44. This question and the one previous (#22) are the SAME!
45. Perhaps more congregation delegates who take their responsibilities seriously would give more accountability.
46. I don't understand the question.
47. I think that each congregation should be able to send a lay delegate. This presupposes that the Districts are dissolved.
48. absolutely not.
49. There should always be more lay delegates, at least doubled to the number of pastoral delegates to any convention.
50. I believe a balance in numbers is fundamental.
51. There is good reason that this division of powers has been utilized in our history. That said, we strive for an equal representation but do not force an exact equality because there are sometimes people who are unable to attend and delegates who fail to attend.
52. I am OK with lay delegates outnumbering pastoral delegates, but not vice versa.
53. same question as about just re-worded
54. What is purpose other than, voting?
55. More laymen and WOMEN.
56. Pastoral delegates have a unique insight but may also have a conflict of interest in some of the issues presented.
57. If this means more pastors, makes sense to have more clergy than laity in deciding church polity and practice.
58. this is vague - I am not sure if you mean more lay delegates or more clergy delegates
59. I prefer a balance.
60. # are not the issue see above #.
61. Uncertain as to what is best.
62. I am really not sure why you ask two opposing questions back to back....
63. I am not knowledgeable.
64. But not an absolute. One clergy and one lay per congregation is good. The issue of multi point parishes and permanent vacancies is an issue.
65. No clergy delegates, only elected advisors
66. So long as it is the Pastors who outnumber the lay delegates. I am having trouble just filling out this survey, it is the pastors who know more about how the church does or should function.
67. With there being more lay delegates than Pastor delegates
68. This doesn't need to change. Don't change it!
69. This may be the reality, although I feel an equal number is most desirable.

70. When I think of some of the initiatives (primarily CEF - ABC District) that were embraced it would cause me to determine that perhaps there should have been less pastoral and more lay involvement.
71. particularly if the church is large.
72. If there is a good reason for the difference, I see no problem with that.
73. I would have no problem with that if it is decided
74. Delegates do not need to Travel to conventions and stay in hotel rooms if modern technological devices are used.
75. In the case of inattendance, a delegate should be there
76. If unable to send both.
77. More Elders and fewer Pastors should be present at Conventions.
78. If unable to send both.
79. The word "may" is somewhat ambiguous. I assume you mean "It's OK if...."
80. although minor shifts one way or the other would be fine.
81. If unequal, lay delegates should outnumber pastoral delegates.
82. as long as number of lay delegates is not less than pastoral
83. My belief is that we need to move away from a dependence on pastors to run everything for us in order to be successful in spreading the Gospel. We certainly should not move to have a greater percentage of pastors.
84. Clergy (and deacons) could theoretically outnumber laypeople, and I would be fine with that.
85. See above. There should be more pastors than lay delegates.
86. While I agree, please note answer to the preceding question. I note that any disagree answer could reflect an opinion either favours clergy or lay representatives, two entirely opposite ideas.
87. If unequal, then there should be more lay delegates.
88. Some congregations may share a pastor, but each congregation gets to have a delegate.
89. As long as laymen are not in the minority.
90. At present, I can't think of a reason for relinquishing the balance between pastoral and lay delegates.
91. Probability of having equal lay to pastors at a Convention would seem unlikely so inequality must be permitted.
92. Don't know what it is now
93. "Should be unequal in number"
94. Whatever works
95. It depends on who agrees or disagrees.
96. I don't think it matters if there's (inadvertently) a slight inequality.
97. Depends on which you have more of.
98. It is important to have a church represented @ conference but it is important to have a pastor voted on clergy based inferences.
99. This creates more input for Pastoral than lay.
100. How will the abuse of power be managed? How well do Pastors manage business dealings?
101. If unequal, there should be more laity than pastoral delegates.
102. The clergy should not outnumber the laity.
103. The governing body of LCC should be made of professionals and only those who are knowledgeable in LCC affairs. this would limit the numbers of voters to the best possible to make decisions, and they should solicit opinions from all LCC members interested in

commenting. Convention costs are high and time consuming. Conventions could be much smaller and limited to a few knowledgeable decision makers. The time used for 'organizing ' could be better spent sharing the Word of God.

104. There must be a balance of power if congregations are to be respected with their authority in convention and pastors are respected with their authority as called men.
105. Strongly disagree if it is predetermined to be that way. OF course it happens when some elected delegates don't come (or the alternative also does not come) and/or pastors get called back to their congregation for something of importance -- so from time to time it is a reality already. However, it should not be planned to be that way.
106. Too many decisions would end up being one-sided.
107. Definitely not more pastors than lay delegates.
108. The only way I could see this go is for more pastors to vote -- this was promoted about 15 years ago or so -- it died at convention. Take a look at clergy run churches and see what a mess they are in! CFW Walter wrote: the power to advise one another, that we have only the power of the Word, and of convincing. According to our constitution we have no right to formulate decrees, to pass laws and regulations, and to make a judicial decision, to which our congregations would have to submit un-conditionally in any matter involving the imposing of something upon them. Our constitution by no means makes us a consistory, by no means a supreme court of our congregations. According to our constitution we are not above our congregations, but in them and at their side. . .. WALTHER'S 1848 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS
109. Keep the balance
110. We need creative ways to meet the needs of Christ's Gospel and His Church.
111. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
112. should have more lay delegates
113. I believe it is a goal for which to aim, as in many conventions more pastors come to the microphone to express their opinion and possibly sway the delegates' thinking.
114. Keep the balance
115. As stated above the balance should be equal.
116. This equality is an important check and balance for the Synod.
117. The membership of LCC has two classes of members, i.e. corporate = congregations and individual = pastors and deacons. This imbalance in representation makes LCC undemocratic in its structure and governance. The imbalance is enhanced when we consider the undue influence by pastors based on the amount of speaking time at a convention. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged.
118. Doesn't really matter to me. This is all "form"... if we really knew why we function as synod then we could begin to reform the synod.
119. The balance between pastoral and lay delegates should remain equal to balance.
120. I assume this can happen if a Pastor serves more than one congregation.
121. We need different perspectives to be heard and valued. Why are you asking the same question in a different way?
122. This would lead to anarchy if someone wanted radical changes.

123. At least 90% lay, since they are the ones that are paying for the whole structure.
124. Either a clergy heavy or lay heavy convention could cause division and dissention.
125. It is sometimes not so easy to find lay people willing to participate.
126. I have never been part of any convention so I cannot comment on whether the existing numbers are effective or not, or whether a change would be beneficial or detrimental.
127. if anything the delegate numbers should outweigh the pastors by at least 4 to 1.
128. This answer seems contradictory to question 22. However, with a structural change where every congregation is represented and every pastor present then there will be an imbalance of laity to clergy because of multiple point parishes - in that event then maybe only one lay person per parish rather than per congregation would be in order.
129. There should not be more pastoral delegates than lay but as there are fewer congregations with full time pastors, there may be a situation with more lay delegates. It should be stipulated that a lay delegate cannot be the spouse or a child from the same congregation as a pastoral delegate (otherwise, you may as well give the pastor two votes).
130. ...as there become fewer churches with full time pastors this may be necessary
131. But only if there are more lay delegates than clergy.
132. Two lay delegates to one pastoral delegate.
133. My agreeing to 22 and 23 indicates that I have not thought these issues through to the end. In Acts 15 the Apostles and Presbyters (Pastors) took the doctrinal decision, but in the presence of the "Brethren," and we don't know the number of the Brethren.
134. Should be.
135. I would have no objection to the numbers being unequal, provided the change is explained.
136. To be fair in to be 50-50.
137. I would like to see the Districts dissolve and thus bring an end to their conventions. The synod convention then could and perhaps should include a representative from each congregation. The conventions should only take place every four years. Between conventions the synod board of directors would govern with the trust placed in their offices.
138. If you have a dual pastor parish, perhaps one lay person and 2 pastors would vote.
139. Don't see how that would make any sense or be an advantage, unless we want to be run like the Vatican?
140. I think we need more lay people.
141. I think it is appropriate for there to be balance between lay and pastoral delegates. The pastoral delegates bring their professional theological training to the table. The lay delegates bring the wishes of their congregations to the table. Neither of these points of view should overwhelm the other.
142. Equal representation is better.
143. There should only be pastoral delegates and lay observers.
144. Again, there should be no lay delegates voting. They should be invited to go to Conventions, especially the "elders," but their voting roll, if any should only be on business concerns.
145. They should be determined by need of district.
146. In a multiple point parish each congregation should be able to send a lay delegate.
147. The number of lay delegates should be based on the size of the congregation.
148. Lay persons shall be the delegates and a limited number of clergy can be elected as advisors.
149. What is the impact of an unequal number?
150. this may occur as a result of 'inability to attend' but it should not be the basis for delegate selection

151. On certain matters, the lay and pastoral delegate may have a difference of opinion, so it may be advantageous to have unequal numbers.
152. I believe the lay people should have a greater voice, since the programming of the synod is paid for by the people.
153. Unequal in number presuming the laity have the larger number. If the worry is that the laity will rise up and impose false doctrine on the priest caste, then perhaps the pastorate should spend more time teaching and preaching the laity, and less time attending to the business affairs of the synod.
154. The wording for these questions is horrible.
155. I think it is imperative that the decisions are made without favor one way or the other. Lay people cannot make the decisions of the church without the strong theological influence of pastors.
156. Each congregation should have a lay delegate even though the Pastor serves more than one congregation.
157. As much as is possible.
158. We have many Pastoral areas within our Synod that have very little voice and no voting rights.
159. Strange introduction of new material in this check question... Should it be that the structure changes so that church workers no longer have a full membership in the synod I would have concern as it is generally the church workers who have more training and knowledge in the Scriptures, Confessions and their application. Without a vote from church workers in the process it is likely that the synod would rapidly drift from the Scriptural and confessional moorings.
160. except for minor variations.
161. Another poorly worded question. Does this mean you should have more lay than pastor delegates or vise versa?
162. In theory, the numbers are currently equal, but in practice this is seldom precisely the case. Slight variations are not a problem, but they should be approximate.
163. Changing the word in the above question "should" to "may" for this question not only ruins its value as a check question, but also greatly skews the results. In charity, it is hoped that this was unintentional manipulation and thus voids the results. - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
164. Because of the theological nature of so many resolutions, I think there should be slightly more pastoral delegates than lay.
165. SOME pastors are dictators, power hungry and controlling
166. This doesn't seem fair.
167. I could see pros and cons for such a scenario. Too many lay delegates may lead to decisions contrary to church doctrine. Too many pastoral delegates may lead to decisions that do not reflect the true needs of the laity.
168. Ours should not seen as a clergy dominated church.
169. I have no strong opinion on this matter
170. more lay people need to be delegates at conventions for better congregational representation
171. There is a cost factor involved and as long as there is not a huge imbalance, then it should be fine.
172. Our pastor hates attending however his skill set is not in this area (and therefore little feedback is received.)

173. Agree that the delegates and pastoral rep. should be as is - authority not to lie in one group.
174. Should be 1 pastor and 2 lay
175. More lay people need to be delegates at conventions for better congregational representation
176. There needs to be more lay delegates from a congregation to attend conventions for better representation
177. I can see one possibility where it could be unequal based on the specific issue/resolution. But that would be tricky and may not be feasible. On questions of theology and practice it might be tempting to have clergy carry more weight, but because we're Waltherian laity should have a say in those resolutions/decisions too. But there may be also issues where clergy shouldn't have a say, or should be weighted less. But a weighted system could be seriously unwieldy.
178. Should be same or equal representation for each congregation.
179. Some congregation cannot find a lay delegate, and some selected delegates do not attend. So, the numbers may not match the plans.
180. If our findings are this is a more effective way of representing the constituents
181. Yes, in that there could be more lay delegates than pastoral as there are more lay members of LCC than pastoral.
182. Each congregation needs representation, especially in dual- or tri-parish situations.
183. Lay could exceed Pastor but not the other way around.
184. more pastor votes
185. Should be a lot more lay delegates.
186. Maybe... but this is not the core issue at all.
187. Maybe, but again, this isn't the core issue.
188. Is there a good reason for this?
189. With the inequality being on the side of the pastors.
190. Lay delegates should not out number clergy delegates.
191. if the imbalance means more lay delegates
192. I’m not terrible worried about the balance
193. should be equal numbers
194. I don't know. Frankly, I wish we wouldn't worry so much about numbers and rely more on the guidance of the Holy Spirit through His Word and through the direction of the one whom He calls through the convention, to serve as our synodical president. Sadly, I am not Solomon, and have no solution.
195. with pastors having the lion's share
196. Does it matter?
197. having an influx may only be allowed if more lay delegates attend and not pastoral.
198. N E V E R
199. Why?
200. The members of the congregations should have a greater voice than they do now. With the exception of theological matters, we should be able to do a vote per person in each congregation on many topics... Including leadership and money matters.
201. Lay delegates only
202. To receive a reasonable response to this question we need to know the ratio between lay and pastor.
203. Ideally they should be equal.

204. Should the number of pastoral delegates outnumber the number of lay delegates it would not be a problem as long as there is a lay presence and voice.
205. I think 50% of each is appropriate. Question of women vs men???
206. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
207. Each congregation needs to be represented by its Pastor and a Lay person for the interests of the pastors and lay people to be equally met.
208. It is unfortunate that many lay delegates are chosen by their availability to attend the convention.
209. Quite often we have decisions regarding ecclesial matters being made by those who are ill informed. Often with Lay delegates, it is the ones with the most time on their hands, who can afford to attend rather than those who may be best equipped to make these decisions.
210. We have several congregations who are not served by a pastor. Many of these are small congregations whose lay voices are often disproportionately heard through decision-making. We should consider introducing some aspects of "representation by population"
211. It accomplishes nothing. this is just stating and holding the party line with no allowance for explanation or concern
212. This issue was voted on at the last Synodical Convention June 2014. See Resolution 14.3.15a Declined Overture 3.05 to change voting delegate numbers.
213. A balance of lay/clergy input is necessary.
214. It would be better not to put so much weight and focus on voting and therefore on numbers. Consensus by all would be preferable.
215. Each church could have a few delegates - or the whole board of the church could vote - or the whole congregation would vote. There have to be better ways in this day and age of getting input from everyone. Even a survey like this gets more input than district conventions.
216. YOU just asked this. Who put this survey together? LCC survey for dummies....
217. Agreed, so long as the number of lay delegates is higher than the number of pastoral delegates. I believe that Pastor's may often have too much say in the way congregations operate. The primary mission of LCC should be to promote the spreading of the gospel in our communities, not just within the doors of our church buildings. Unless Pastor's support outreach and actively train workers, the outreach either will not happen or will be ineffective.
218. Lay delegates from my experience seem to be uninformed about the overtures and resolutions, therefore it would not be wise to have more lay delegates than pastoral.
219. See comments above. 50/50 between pastors and lay people is the least controversial way to move forward.
220. I would not support a move that allowed for a wide margin of difference in the ratio of pastoral to lay delegates.
221. I would be concerned with unequal representation on either side.
222. This is a reality in rural areas
223. It doesn't matter. Ban conventions all together. They are an extreme waste of time and money and accomplish nothing.
224. So what?
225. I'm not certain what this statement is getting at. There may be an unequal number simply because there are not enough lay delegates who would attend, or vice versa. I'm not saying that would be what we should aspire to.

226. Lay delegates are often pushed into this service ("Well, someone has to go."); and so they may not be interested in the proceedings. Perhaps (to reduce costs and streamline conventions) congregations "may" send a lay delegate ... that way very important issues can receive the full attention of the church whole, while "regular conventions" can be reduced in size to clergy and those who are truly interested.
227. The reality is that it is never unequal in number, due to absences as well as pastoral vacancies.
228. Due to multiple parish arrangements, the number may be unequal. That should not, however, change the principle for which we strive of equal representation.
229. Should be a balance, we keep each other out of trouble.
230. Just so long as the preponderance is with the laity and not the clergy.
231. More lay participation
232. Don't understand the question. I assume each congregation at all District and Synodical conventions currently have exactly two votes (one for pastor and one for lay delegate). If so, I agree this is how it should be in the future as well.
233. The pastoral-lay balance in voting delegates is very helpful. It is a good equilibrium.
234. The laity should be the majority.
235. there should be two lay delegates for each congregation
236. More lay, less clergy

24. Pastors not serving congregations, e.g. retired pastors, chaplains, etc. should have a vote at synodical Conventions.

1. It is important to maintain clergy-lay balance.
2. Maybe have a certain number of retired pastors per district. We are losing a lot of wisdom from their years in the ministry.
3. Retired Pastors and chaplains may have good input.
4. They are part of the vehicle (church) they have info that could be useful. They have passion. Most retired pastors still serve. They see a part of "the work" others don't.
5. Many are very active in their congregations, others serve vacancies etc. Currently vacant congregations lack representation on the pastoral level.
6. As we (all persons) retire and age we do not always keep with the times and attitudes can be antiquated. Most people lose a little something as they age: patience, memory, ability to reason etc.
7. Those with a call should be voting.
8. they have wisdom and specific experiences related to their service.
9. as it is human nature (after retirement) not to "keep up with the times"
10. Would depend on topic/subject.
11. I don't know enough about theology to be able to answer this.
12. Unless there is good reason for them not to have a vote (e.g. mental illness that is beyond treatment; drug abuse, sexual immorality, or other things that would remove a pastor from serving as pastor; beliefs contrary to Scripture and Lutheran Confessions; etc.), I think they should be allowed to have a vote at synodical Conventions.
13. only if they form total pastors group of less than 50%
14. As a non-voting member, I would like a vote; however, I also know that I have a VOICE, which at times is just as important.

15. There is great wisdom to be shared from our retired pastors and alternate perspectives offered by chaplains, etc. are critical to ensure we have an informed and broad perspective.
16. They would have experience and knowledge that should be helpful
17. Bad question. All of them? -- probably not. Some of them, e.g. those elected by their circuits as representatives? Sure.
18. This would be more difficult if #22 prevails, equal numbers of pastors and lay delegates.
19. Perhaps this should not be the same answer across the board. Chaplains, professors, ordained teachers should get votes, but emeritus pastors should not.
20. Retired pastors: no Chaplains: yes
21. So many are now involved with long term vacancies and so-called part-time calls of one sort or another, the issue of serving congregations becomes one of specific definitions, or at least particular guidelines.
22. Keep lay and pastoral equal!!
23. Only active pastors and active chaplains should have a vote.
24. Too many cooks!
25. Only if they represent a congregation.
26. Why not?? They are more informed that the average layperson. If not a vote at least be heard.
27. Then we should all have a vote.
28. Any pastor with an active Call at the Synodical, District or Congregational level should have a vote at synodical Conventions (this would include, chaplains, seminary professors, missionaries, District Presidents, etc.). On the other hand, this would not include retired pastors or pastors without a Call, who would not normally hold an active call unless service as a vacancy pastor, or similar.
29. A vote no. But a voice yes... some have lived experience.
30. While I disagree with this there could be a place for a retired pastor in a congregation to serve as a pastoral delegate.
31. Who would they represent?
32. I answered "Agree" only because actively serving chaplains should have a vote at synodical conventions, BUT retired pastors SHOULD NOT have that vote. They should resign themselves to the fact that its time for others to rise to the occasion. Unless, of course, they are still serving our church as interim pastors in congregations that are vacant.
33. only as members of an LCC congregation delegate.
34. another cost factor to get them to conventions.
35. It would be injurious to ourselves if we didn't have learned and seasoned people have a say in the goings-on of our church.
36. That might depend on what the vote is on. Perhaps in some cases this would be useful.
37. Absolutely; all ordained pastors should be full voting members of synod.
38. This answer simply follows logically my responses to 22 & 23 - presuming that the goal of balance between lay and pastoral involvement in our synod's polity is important. I certainly understand the postulation that pastor emeriti, deacons and deaconesses, teachers, or others have valid input -- which I understand is yet permitted by rights to speak in convention, etc. Is it a concern that their vested interest and participation is lagging, that it should change?
39. I believe that pastors currently not serving congregations voting creates a majority bloc of pastors. This defeats the purpose of having an equal number of pastors and lay members.
40. Retired pastors should not have a vote. Called chaplains should have a vote.

41. It is important to keep a balance between
42. They are retired, may not be current on present church needs/trends. Past experience useful but not necessarily relevant. Probably should be employed more in an advisory role.
43. Not sure about this one. At least, I think these subsets -- retired clergy, chaplains, seminary faculty, ordained district officials -- should be evaluated for this separately. I'm inclined to think that retired clergy should not have a vote, but that actively serving ordained clergy could vote.
44. I wasn't aware they didn't have a vote. I believe the learned experience and wisdom a retired pastor has is very beneficial in moving forward.
45. Active pastors are more relevant to the times.
46. I am uncertain on this one. If they are not involved, then I am unsure of why they would need a personal vote.
47. The clergy who do not serving the congregations are part of the LCC and should have a vote.
48. Why should an army or hospital chaplain not have a vote? I assume they have all been through the same educational background as pastors serving congregations. And since they serve different people every day who are under much higher amounts of stress than the standard parishioner in a congregation, they will have ideas and insight into how to serve God's suffering people than pastors won't.
49. IF each member of a congregation has a vote - then retired pastors should have a vote as well BUT if retired pastors get a vote and pastors get a vote and one lay delegate per congregation get a vote - that would only serve to perpetuate the "old boy club"
50. experience is vital
51. Pastors not serving congregations are no longer pastors. As per Walther’s Thesis, the holy ministry is conferred by God through the congregation as holder of all church power, or of the keys, and by its call, as prescribed by God. The ordination of those called, with the laying on of hands is not by divine institution but is an apostolic church ordinance and merely a public solemn confirmation of the call. As such, when a pastor is retired or has no call from a congregation, they are no longer a pastor. Therefore, as they are technically not pastors (as they have no congregational call to serve), they don't have the right to vote as a pastor. Trying to argue otherwise is doctrinally inaccurate and would shift the power to judge and make decisions away from the congregations.
52. Why? just because they once served? I am not sure why this would make sense
53. Wisdom from elders
54. Retired pastors often have a better of the BIG PICTURE and how/what changes have happened and what needs to happen to make LCC a more equitable, God pleasing and Bible based church.
55. University chaplains in the ELCIC were ones who started the Gay Lesbian disgrace. They become Saol Alinsky type power lobbyists.
56. As a lay delegate only.
57. Obviously I would agree if they had been selected as lay delegates from their congregation
58. These people all will be much more equipped to attend and should be able to be a delegate from their respective congregations if chosen, thereby having a vote as any delegate. They should not have a vote "just because" they are retired Pastors, chaplains, etc.
59. They are retired, may not be current on present church needs/trends. Past experience is useful but not necessarily relevant.

60. A good, but difficult question. There is a lot of wisdom among our retired pastors, and professors, but how is it best to represent and utilize this group.
61. Allow a portion of "Other" (10% as example) come to convention and vote. Question, however, how to balance with lay delegates.
62. They have much to offer in experience. Don't know how that would work and still keep pastoral and lay delegates equal - unless they and deacons are just considered another category.
63. Retired pastors are always being asked to serve congregations, but those pastors are denied a vote at conventions and are expected to pay their own way. This is unfair considering the years that these retired pastors have served and now living on senior's fixed income are expected to pay their own way is a real kick in the face. Is this the thanks the retired pastors are given?
64. Perhaps if an issue directly affects them, they could vote on it.
65. They could vote as a lay delegate?
66. This would create a great imbalance in the voting power at conventions. At some point, it could create a situation where the retired pastors could form the majority of delegates and have full control of our Synod, even though they are not actively serving congregations.
67. Because a pastor/chaplain is retired does not mean that opportunities for input a convention should cease. Many seniors still have much wisdom to share based on experience.
68. They may have valuable input due to past years of experience.
69. question note relevant if there is a structure change.
70. They are still a part of Synod; they should still have a vote.
71. Pastors/retired pastors/ chaplains should all have the right to attend conventions and to address the issues at the conventions.
72. NO they retired for a reason.
73. as something?? may not be Pastoral. May not be lay. but perhaps create another category for those in this and the other stated situation in this section of the survey
74. "Pastors" not serving congregations must NOT have a vote unless appointed to be a lay delegate.
75. They're not serving, then they don't have vote. They should have voice.
76. We respect their office and role in our church and therefore give them voice at conventions.
77. There should be some voting representation from such clergy, though probably not every pastor in this category having a vote.
78. But, should have right to attend and address convention assembly as non-voting participants.
79. Should be classified as lay delegate only
80. why? I can see they are important but if a Pastor is not serving a congregation I would ask why…. unless he was working as a board member, but that brings us back to the same issues, too many ministers working as board members and out of touch with congregations and their needs
81. Commitment is also becoming a retired pastor and comes with experience...of course.
82. Age provides wisdom.
83. Their wisdom and experience are important
84. Their retirement ends their vote.
85. They are out of active service to a congregation and may not be up to date with recent information.
86. They should only have a vote if they are the congregation's delegate.

87. Their opinion is important
88. A pastor can never retire and will always hold an unintended influence over people. There is no such thing as a retired pastor. Chaplains also should be more focused on serving the people than having a vote of their own at synodical conventions. If they are not serving the people by having a direct call from them they should not have a vote.
89. A pastor is only a pastor with a call. However, if a retired pastor goes as a lay delegate, he is taking away the vote from the people of that congregation. The pastor has not always been there, and he has a different view point than a lay person. To allow pastors to have the vote in replacing a lay delegate, the representative democracy is dead. He should be allowed to attend and advise, but NOT vote.
90. They still are church workers in the field representing LCC and being cared for by LCC, makes sense they would have a vote.
91. active in non-parish but not retired
92. As long as they are in good standing why not.
93. Would this vote give a bias to one group?
94. If they have a way.
95. They should be allowed to serve as their home congregations lay delegate if the congregation so chooses.
96. Depends upon the above being solved. Too much power in the Pastoral house.
97. I am not sure in this instance. Are they a represented group with a voice? Are they still considered to be workers within synod? If they are a part of synod who are working with us and walking with us, should they not also be allowed to have voice and vote? Or would it be best to have (a) delegate(s) from these groups within synod?
98. I believe the experience of these people who have served in the past could be valuable.
99. Does adding votes broaden the depth of discussion and solutions found, or does it become difficult to get things done. Not sure what the quorum rules are.
100. It would seem that all members of Synod should get a vote.
101. I am not knowledgeable.
102. These pastors served our congregations for years and some in many different positions and areas. Their knowledge for our church is vast and just because they are retired their input is still invaluable to our church and they should definitely have a vote at synodical conventions.
103. I agree with retired Pastor's not having a vote, but I believe active Pastor's i.e. chaplain's etc. should have a vote.
104. only if representing a congregation
105. what are the pros and cons?
106. base it on congregations.
107. I believe pastors on candidate status should have a voice and a vote.
108. could be advisors
109. they should be elected as lay delegates
110. This is the first I have learned that they do not have a vote but considering how many retired pastors are still serving and helping out in congregations and how chaplains are under the supervision of LCC, it only makes sense to me that they would have a vote.
111. might have more wisdom to offer
112. When a Pastor serves as a "temporary" in a Congregation, that Congregation should be allowed to authorise his voting at a synodical convention.

113. Only if they are representing a congregation as a lay delegate.
114. They should have voice on the floor to express their opinions but not able to vote. Advisory
115. Unless they are a delegate from a congregation.
116. Maybe, but not if it unbalances the balance of clergy/laity per questions 22 & 23.
117. If they are not in the loop, it may be difficult to make informed choices, especially retired pastors.
118. This could be a positive, allowing us to gain wisdom and insight from these pastors, but I am unclear on the practical effects of this change.
119. I believe pastors in this position should have a voice but no vote.
120. Most of them are still heavily involved in the churches - why not use their experience?
121. I think they should have the ability to have a vote but I do not believe they should be randomly allowed to attend as a voting delegate. Retired pastors, chaplains, etc. should be given a set number of voting seats which should be filled through a vote of their membership. This could be done regionally. The number of seats they have should be small in number (perhaps 10).
122. I believe they should have a voice because they will have a lot of wisdom but if they are not currently shepherding a congregation then they should not have a vote.
123. I have seen retired Pastors living in the days of the past when congregations were larger, and not really understanding how the times and demographics have changed, meaning some things need to be done differently in the church.
124. Such pastors could represent a congregation's ministry in the place of the congregation's pastor (e.g., in a vacancy). But the principle should hold that each congregation (or group of congregations) sends one ordained pastor and one layman to a convention.
125. A pastor's call comes from God through the Church - pastors without a call should not have a vote.
126. Should have lay vote number
127. They are members of a congregation who has a vote.
128. Its also their church
129. Why would they get a vote? Do we really want to make the organization totally resistant to change?
130. Only if a mechanism is found to balance these additional votes by votes by lay people.
131. Chaplains yes, retired pastors no.
132. Okay if present as lay delegate.
133. They should be allowed to lead with their experience and have their views listened to.
134. But only if temporarily serving a congregation during vacancy.
135. Retired Pastors and Chaplains should be represented
136. Okay if present as lay delegate.
137. It might make them feel like a part of the Synod. Might also recognize their contribution to Synod.
138. If lay person or a pastor is not represented, possibly.
139. Retired pastors can serve as the "corporate history" and should be encouraged to stay involved.
140. This would destroy the parity between lay and pastors.
141. It would be fine provided the balance (pastoral / lay) is mainly kept in tact.
142. There should be some sort of allowance made for this

143. depends on the issue. I would lean towards "agree", as our retired pastors and chaplains have unique experiences and wisdom that really should be drawn upon and implemented.
144. I think they should be allowed to speak but not vote.
145. If they are not serving, they should be part of their current congregation. If too much of the vote is held by retirees, we will end up living in the past and shrinking further as a church.
146. I have no problem with active pastors (e.g. chaplains) having a vote, but retired pastors should only vote if they are lay delegates from congregations. It would be too easy for them to have too much influence on a decision that they are not really responsible to execute.
147. I would have agreed if the question had asked if it "could" rather than "should."
148. Not if it gives pastors more votes than lay.
149. This would naturally result in an imbalance in favour of pastoral delegates.
150. Yes, but the problem is this creates imbalance with lay delegates which is of concern when issues that are more materialistic than spiritual are being addressed. So maybe some conditions put on qualifying voters depending on the nature of the motion.
151. No - Once they are retired they should not be allowed to vote on anything
152. I disagree only because it would upset the balance of lay to clergy.
153. A retired pastor or deacon is a lay member of a congregation and consequently no more eligible to be a voting delegate than any other member.
154. Tell me why they should. If they aren't active I wouldn't see why they might.
155. As long as they are still members of a church that belong to our synod.
156. Yes, as their knowledge / wisdom is important even if not serving a specific congregation.
157. I have no objection to a retired Pastor being a lay delegate if chosen to do so by his congregation.
158. As stated above
159. not sure how equal this would be
160. Retired pastors who remain educated on current events and engaged in the issues of the church should be welcome.
161. There should be some representation from this group, but I wouldn't allow every retired pastor to have a vote, for example. Called and installed clergy in other synodical entities (e.g., seminaries) should be eligible to at least have representative votes.
162. Provided they are a member of a congregation that has asked them to be their lay delegate to the convention.
163. The authority of a pastor comes from his call from a congregation. No congregation, no authority.
164. If they are a member of the congregation and the congregation votes to have them represent them as a lay member.
165. ONLY if they are serving a congregation as Vacancy Pastor for an extended time and are elected by that circuit.
166. Too many retirees would have a problem being open-minded to positive changes.
167. As a lay delegate!
168. The right to speak is powerful. As CFW Walther said (see above) And all ye are brethren," that is, in My church you are all equal, all subject to Me and no one the lord and commander of the other. In another passage He says to the disciples: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." . . . The holy

apostles grant only one power to those who serve the church as rulers, namely, the power of the Word. . .. Accordingly, there can be no doubt, venerable brethren in office and respected delegates that we are not renouncing any right belonging to us if we as servants of the church and as members of an ecclesiastical synod claim no other power than the power of the Word; for in the church where Christ alone rules there dare and can be no other power to which all must submit. To be sure, there are matters which must be arranged in the church; but all such matters are not to be arranged by any power above the congregation, but the congregations, that is, pastors and hearers, arranges them, free of every compulsion, as it is necessary and appears salutary. What, then, are men doing who claim a power in the church beside the power of the Word? They are robbing the church of Christ of the liberty which He has purchased with a price, with His divine blood, and are degrading this free Jerusalem, in which there are only kings, priests, and prophets, this kingdom of God, this heavenly kingdom of truth to an organization under strict police rule in which everybody is compelled to be obedient to every human ordinance. . . . . How could we lust for a power which Christ has denied us, which no apostle has claimed, and which would deprive our congregations of the character of a true church and of the true apostolic form? WALTHER'S 1848 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

169. This should be conditional upon the nature of ending the service.
170. With all due respect this would sway the vote to keep the status quo and if we're looking for change it wont happen.
171. They have the experience and wisdom from years in the ministry to make good decisions.
172. But experienced retired pastors should have voice to lend wisdom to the conversation.
173. The Church needs their voice and vote.
174. When issues facing the synod or district impinge on the current happenings at the congregational level, those with no 'dog in the hunt' so to speak should not have the ability to waylay the issues at hand. We have a few retirees with very strong opinions that are not always helpful to the discussions at hand.
175. Proportionately Danger of not giving them a vote is possibly losing out on the wisdom of their years of experience - though just because they are older doesn't guarantee they are wiser.
176. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
177. I agree only if the synod is willing/able to pay for their attendance. I don't believe that this will ever be the case as congregations are currently struggling to pay convention assessments for both district and synod.
178. In the old ELCC the pastors in campus ministry with their voting power brought in the decadence which reached fruition in the ELCIC's nauseating approval of gay and lesbian pastors, missionaries and bishops.
179. This would allow the pastoral side an advantage in deciding matters at conventions and the grass roots, the lay less of a say in convention matters.
180. Only those appointed by the congregations should have a vote.
181. They have experience and should be able to help guide.
182. Vacancy Pastors should not have a vote
183. In fact, these people should not have their expenses paid to attend such conventions
184. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC).

Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged.

185. But only as an elected lay person from their congregation.
186. If we change our polity to decide issues of ministry on the basis of clergy only votes, then yes. Or if we maintain a clergy/laity equal division of votes and retired clergy are required in order to maintain the balance, then yes. Otherwise, no.
187. Retired pastors - no. Active pastor - yes.
188. Pastoral delegates would be more and the balance would not be maintained.
189. Only retired pastors serving a vacancy for say 6 months or more should be allowed to vote.
190. They should not even be at synodical conventions.
191. This question is overreaching is lumping together "retired pastors, chaplains, etc.". First, what is meant by "etc."? Second, I believe there to be a difference in an actively serving chaplain, and a retired pastor-namely that one is actively serving and the other is not. There is an important difference there that should carry weight as to whether they should vote or not.
192. Pastor votes should not outnumber lay votes.
193. They can attend and speak if concerned.
194. Congregations are the church, not the pastors.
195. -If they are there as laity representative. Otherwise, they should continue in the advisory role
196. Only if they are voted delegates and will speak for who elects them.
197. I believe active chaplains should, if they are in hospital or care facility, but not necessarily, military, as they are too far removed from the reality of our church body. Retired pastors should be advisory only, as they had their time in active service. They might have insight and advice, and can give such as deems appropriate.
198. all pastors, retired or not, should have a vote
199. They could have a vote if serving a vacancy.
200. Retired pastors that are serving a vacancy should be able to vote.
201. Depending on the situation
202. Retired pastors and chaplains etc. have good information to share - congregations and pastors need to seek out their expertise - there should be opportunities for delegates and pastor to discuss issues with this groups before the discussions and votes at the convention
203. If on roster, may go as pastoral delegate. If not on roster, may go as lay delegate.
204. Agree with reservations: Pastors who have received a call to the military, educational institution, etc. should have a vote.
205. I believe that the advisory role they now have is sufficient. That opinion may change when I am among the retired. :)
206. When there are too many aged Pastors making decisions I don't feel that bodes well for future changes.
207. ...but not one vote each > a representative vote (similar to a congregational delegate)
208. unless he has been voted in as the pastoral delegate of the circuit.
209. ...not one vote each but a representative vote similar to congregations
210. Retired pastors or chaplains serving an official call/or commission should be eligible. In the case of a retired pastor who serves a congregation where they were essentially experiencing a vacancy should that congregation extend him a divine call and he were to take it then he should be eligible to serve as a voting delegate at a synodical convention. Including chaplains that serve institutions that do not qualify to be congregations in Lutheran Church

Canada would require additional thought as to how to balance the delegates so that there is still an equal number of lay and clergy delegates. Otherwise pastors not actively serving a call should be excluded.

211. They should be allowed to voice their opinions, but not have a vote.
212. I would be cautiously open to this--vacancy pastors who have no parish of their own should surely get a vote (?).
213. They should be members of a LCC congregation and be considered a lay person. Then if a congregation wants to select that individual as their lay delegate so be it.
214. So long as they are still members in good standing.
215. Would not be fair for lay delegates. Not even.
216. They would then have more voice (delegates) than the lay.
217. A voice often more important than a vote
218. advisory, but no vote
219. Depends on their involvement & dedication as a retired pastor, chaplains...
220. Only if they have delegate status.
221. there is generally wisdom in the older community.
222. Perhaps LCC needs a conversation on the doctrine of the call prior to this question.
223. They should be represented at the convention - the manner of that representation is another question.
224. I can see some pros and cons, and don't know enough to be sure.
225. There should be representation for these workers, including a vote, but that should be based on a formula (e.g. 1 vote for every 25 retirees)
226. Experience counts for something.
227. No, Voters should be representing a congregation or mission that is officially part of LCC.
228. There knowledge and experience is valuable.
229. -why ever not? -chaplains are called, active, serving pastors -retired pastors have a wealth of experience and knowledge
230. And women
231. Could be advisory
232. They have valuable insight. However, they should keep up-to-date in all areas in order to have insight into all matters at hand.
233. While these people may have idea and opinions that will benefit the church they have served already and in that time have given their votes. It is time for the new generation to vote.
234. To be able to draw from their vast experience/knowledge.
235. Retired pastors, chaplains and other church workers can be elected as advisors.
236. Pastors are ordained Servants of the Word, whether they are called by a congregation or not. Their ordination places them above the laity.
237. perhaps - as long as the current ratio is maintained
238. Pastors not serving congregations should not have a vote at conventions. Only retired pastors may be elected to be advisors to the delegates at the conventions.
239. Is this a need that has been missing in the past?
240. If not serving, they are lay persons and as such could attend in that capacity.
241. I think it is fine if they are elected as lay delegates.
242. Pastors whether serving a congregation or not have wisdom and a stake in the church. They have dedicated their lives to the service of the LCC and have every right to share their thoughts and vote in matters relating to choices of the synod.

243. unless the congregation they are members of vote them to represent them as lay delegates
244. Only as a lay delegate if so elected
245. They may have some good suggestions based on their past experiences.
246. As members of Synod they should have a say and a vote in some way. If balance is to be kept, then extra lay people from the District in which they reside should be allowed to vote.
247. Those not serving congregations, or perhaps serving part-time as worker priests, or perhaps those in missionary capacities should have some input to conventions and also some form of membership in the synod. (Auxiliary?) However, as to equal representation, it might be better to consider other forms of input.
248. Why not?
249. Advisory roles are more than appropriate for these pastors.
250. This should be the case for pastors serving congregations as vacancy or interim pastors.
251. No, they do bring wisdom to synodical conventions that help give direction and guidance for the church as a whole, but should not be given the right to vote because they are not actively involved in ministry and likely do not have a full understanding of how issues will influence the local congregation
252. The only exception to this would be an advisory pastor who might vote as a pastoral delegate on behalf of a congregation who does not otherwise have a pastoral delegate to attend on their behalf. This would allow that congregation to still have full representation.
253. absolutely - but as duly elected LAY delegates, which is technically what they are, whatever else we may call them. However, the question seems to imply that they should be able to vote by virtue of their office as clergy - which I strongly disagree with, so once again - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
254. I am not sure to whom the etc. refers in the above statement. I think chaplains should have a vote.
255. Some of these folks, especially retired pastors, have a wealth of experience and knowledge that should be allowed to influence key decisions at Conventions.
256. Who else would have more experience then those who have served.
257. Only if they are currently aware of what is going on.
258. Only if they are serving as the pastoral delegate for a congregation/circuit, etc.
259. I think that the benefits of this need to be explored. I am not sure that just because they have Rev. in front of their name means they can make an informed vote. It is amazing how quickly pastors lose touch with where churches are at. As for chaplains, they are working with other organizations and therefore do not need a vote in LCC decisions.
260. It seems that advisory clergy having voice is fair and adequate.
261. only if they are taking the place of the pastor or lay person
262. They should advise but not vote
263. this is one of the reasons the church cannot move ahead. Do you believe that a retired worker from any other work force is able to input a work place that he or she no longer belongs to? One might take exception to the term worker but that is how most church workers see their position
264. Retired pastors should have a vote as any other member (delegate) if they are elected to attend synodical conventions. Currently serving missionaries and chaplains should have a vote. If a retired pastor is filling a vacancy, then that congregation should be represented at convention by that pastor.

265. If an agenda item or topic is relevant to retirees (or they can lend their experience and knowledge to subject.) 2) Chaplains should be required to attend (they are "called" to their congregation. -the armed forces; service other societal needs, etc.)
266. We are top-heavy with retired pastors - they (clergy) could then control the church.
267. Again, this goes back to Church & Ministry issues: are pastors not serving congregations actually holders of the pastoral office if they don't have a congregational call? We have to answer that question first before asking questions about convention voting.
268. If this would happen, some congregations may have more votes than others. Also, are pastors that don't serve a congregation as up to date with issues, information and current needs of a congregation as a serving pastor is?
269. That would put all into an imbalance.
270. Only as congregational delegates.
271. After years of faithful service, or after a retirement for medical conditions, why should we reward our older members by removing their franchise. They have a unique perspective and a long-term understanding of the church and change.
272. Pastors who are retired and have far removed themselves from LCC may be out of touch on current issues, therefore I would see them having a vote as unproductive
273. If you are not serving a congregation, then you really do not have an active pulse on current issues facing your people.
274. they'd likely know better what's needed
275. If there are issues on the floor which this group has expertise and could add valuable insight for the discussion at hand, they should be given a spot as an advisor??
276. Only those actively serving a Call.
277. Chaplains for sure but not sure about retired pastors. Their experience may have value but in some cases they may already be too far removed from the day to day.
278. providing a balance or weighted to lay professional is maintained
279. the retirees bring lots of experience and so do chaplains. why not give them a vote?
280. This should be explored in connection with the ratio of clergy to Lay delegates.
281. Can come as lay delegates
282. Maybe... but this is not the core issue at all.
283. This makes the voting unbalanced.
284. Maybe, but this is not the core issue
285. Don't want to create an "old Boys Club"
286. yes, they in their experience might have insights that we do not.
287. Is there a good reason for this?
288. They are no longer on active payroll.
289. As long as they have not been found guilty of heresy of some sort.
290. Provided that they are present for the convention.
291. They have experience we need.
292. their training and experience are not theirs alone those belong to the Church and the Church has the right to access them through official Synodical Conventions
293. Must be in good standing, no suspended etc.
294. We should always include everyone who has expertise regardless of whether they are currently serving in a congregation.
295. if they are in good standing, why not
296. advisory only

297. Agree as long as there are more lay delegates than pastors
298. I have concerns that pastors who are not serving as spiritual overseers in other occupations -- i.e. CEOs of insurance companies, administrators with no explicit spiritual or teaching responsibilities in educational institutions or social agencies, pastors on candidate status showing no desire to return to active duty when calls are forthcoming -- should not have a say and quite frankly, should not be on the roster of synod. Pastors emeriti and chaplains should have a vote and a voice.
299. Why?
300. These men are servants of the Lord now and as long as they are able should serve at conventions as voting delegates
301. They can bring more practical experience to the conventions.
302. only as a lay person; unless another position is created i.e. consultant
303. I suppose as a lay delegate they should
304. Under the Canada Not for Profit Corporations Act they do if it directly affects them i.e. pension or benefits
305. They may be out of touch?
306. Pastors are ordained for life and should be given a voice at synodical conventions.
307. why not use as advisory instead?!
308. All members of congregations should have an equal vote
309. They should be advisory.
310. That seems fair to me.
311. The experience and contributions of these people I think would be helpful.
312. This may also affect the ratio question above.
313. The church is made up of congregations, so active pastors should vote.
314. They should not all be given a vote simply because they aren't serving congregations, but there should be representation for those pastors not serving congregations. Particularly because these men are often the ones who have the most experience in synodical matters.
315. Only if they are pastors in good standing. If they left the church because of problems they caused, and they have strayed from the Word, they should not be voting.
316. I think it's the "in the trenches" pastors who should have the vote but I also know the pastors come "out of retirement" sometimes to fill pulpits, especially when in transition between pastors
317. They still have their knowledge and experience that is valued.
318. Perhaps LCC needs a conversation on the doctrine of the call prior to this question.
319. maybe have a 3rd category just for these people, include deacons? then the number of lay delegates should be raised to equal pastors and this category
320. valuable for their experience, they know what it is like at the church level, not just upper levels
321. It is not wise to have any group of church workers voting as such. Congregational representation is what should be maintained in the interest of good order.
322. They are members of LCC churches, so they should be able to vote at conventions.
323. Do these people currently have a vote?
324. These emeritus pastors often can have a positive influence.
325. Balanced by a lay person vote
326. We no doubt need all the experience and wisdom that these persons could bring to any discussion.

327. Of course. They still remember their business and can make meaningful discussion.
328. I agree in principle that pastors not serving congregations should not "be put out to pasture" by reason of their retirement or non-congregational call. However, I believe that clergy should not dominate convention debate or decisions by reason of their ordination.
329. Too many clergy, not enough individuals/
330. I do think that we need to honor the retired pastors. If they are well enough to attend conventions, perhaps they should vote.
331. As a group yes.
332. I think every member should have a say.
333. There is great wisdom and experience that should assist the entire body.
334. only if representing their congregation
335. Yes, but transportation and accommodation expenses should be borne by that pastor.
336. Although I believe they should have a voice, I'm not sure how we would be able to keep the balance between lay and clergy if their vote was added.
337. I have to admit I am on the fence about this one.
338. If they pay their way, they should have the to speak or instill words of wisdom but not holding a call as the Pastor in a local congregation should be the minimum requirement to attend as delegate and have a vote.
339. YES. If they do not have a congregation but are still willing to serve in many diverse capacities, I think we would be doing a great disservice to our Synod and Districts not to take advantage of their expertise and years of experience, in the decision making process.
340. I believe that there is a 'gap' in leadership and that the pastors currently serving congregations need to step up to be more effective leaders instead of us just relying on somebody else to do it.
341. pastors already have too much power.
342. Retired Pastors should be stripped of their titles and ability to perform any kind of duties or responsibilities within LCC. They are lay people upon retirement and ought to be treated as such. Further more, they should be banned from attending conventions unless conventions are banned altogether as I indicated above. Then it does not matter. :)
343. Let us use all that knowledge and wisdom!
344. As a retired pastor I am less than a lay person and an active pastor. I have no vote because I'm retired. Our lay people are not denied a vote because they are retired. The people who are not able to vote at conventions are retired pastors - how is that right or God pleasing?
345. Retired individuals should be put out to pasture. They are too stagnant to really contribute to change that the Synod needs.
346. I lean towards one pastoral and one lay vote per congregation.
347. There past experience in the case of retired can be valuable. They should be required to pay their way.
348. While this would be nice, who foots the bill? Perhaps as a voting lay delegate.
349. At a convention where a certain number of pastors are elected from each circuit (as is currently the case with a synodical convention), any pastor should be eligible for election by the circuit also.
350. Only in matters of doctrine.
351. We are losing their wisdom
352. I think we need to take advantage of the knowledge and wisdom of the elderly.
353. This would upset the equal representation.

354. This question groups too many people together who shouldn't be grouped together.
355. The basic unit of our Synod is the congregation. Those not serving them, while important to us all, should not be able to vote without additional lay representation. If we want to increase lay representation proportional to these additional potential clergy votes. We also need to clarify our theology of the call of Office of the Public Ministry: are pastors not serving congregations to be properly considered called pastors? Or are they not?
356. Not retired but possibly chaplains.
357. They care as much as employed Pastors.
358. If retirees are part of the equal clergy/laity mix - fine but don't load the odds in favour of clergy.
359. Retired pastors: no vote. Special cases (for example, pastors teaching at seminaries, working for LAMP, etc.): pastor should have a vote. All pastors including retired pastors should have the right to speak at conventions.
360. They should be welcomed as members, with voice, but not vote.
361. Professors, chaplains and "retired" pastors actively serving a congregation (i.e. as in a vacancy pastor) should have a vote, however these need to be balanced with additional lay representation.
362. I strongly agree that retired pastors, chaplains, etc. should not have a vote at synodical conventions if they are not actively serving a pastor, the military, etc. But I strongly believe those who are actively serving should get a vote as long as the 50:50 lay-pastoral balance is maintained. I strongly believe that serving seminary professors should get a vote at synodical conventions and the laity could get an extra vote (from the big congregations or elsewhere) to keep the 50:50 balance. The seminary profs have a deep understanding of Scripture and the Confessions and that should be welcomed into our voting structure. I really hope our actively serving seminary profs will get a vote in the new structure.
363. If these gentlemen warrant a vote, how about retired district and synodical board chairs, or business managers?
364. The retired senior pastors etc. often shed their experience with all who ask.
365. ~ exception as #26

25. Deacons should have a vote at synodical Conventions.

1. Only if the congregation has passed on their thoughts to how they should vote.
2. They will add to the picture - brings out needs, opportunities etc.
3. There aren't that many, but it could be a healthy change.
4. *Only as a lay delegate. See #27
5. Never any contact with deacons
6. Should have a broad knowledge of the larger picture.
7. Deacons play a vital role in educating parishioners and prospects - therefore should have a vote in how it is to be done.
8. I don't know enough about theology to be able to answer this.
9. Unless there is good reason for them not to have a vote (e.g. mental illness that is beyond treatment; drug abuse, sexual immorality, or other things that would remove a deacon from serving as deacon; beliefs contrary to Scripture and Lutheran Confessions; etc.), I think they should be allowed to have a vote at synodical Conventions.

10. As "lay" voters!! It is inappropriate to lump them in together with pastors simply because they are paid workers. Theologically they are laity.
11. they do as lay delegates so that is not an issue as I know.
12. This could be done for some deacons.
13. Great ideas and important viewpoints come from all staff members.
14. Not everyone who is a deacon is well versed on what they are to be voting on. I have had the experience where a lay person was to be a delegate, meaning voting on behalf of the congregation but once at the convention voted as he wanted without asking what the congregation would have liked
15. Absolutely. This is one of the synod's biggest pieces of "unfinished business," dating back to the adoption of the diaconate many years ago and already identified at that time as an item needing urgent attention.
16. I guess they could vote as lay delegates.
17. Only if critical doctrine changes are voted on.
18. This one is a bit of a struggle for me. I tend to lean toward "Agree" but I understand the difficulties that could bring.
19. Don't know what effect it might have. How many deacons are there? Where are they?
20. Why or why not?? It may also depend on subjects or topics at the time.
21. They should be allowed to be lay delegates - because that is what they are.
22. The deacons are a group of highly educated individuals who do not have the opportunity to vote on items that directly involve or affect them.
23. Deacons, as serving church workers and as church members should have the same opportunities to vote as either of those groups.
24. Only if they are serving a congregation
25. only as members of an LCC congregation delegate.
26. I don't know what a deacon is from Scripture, as a distinct office.
27. Deacons are lay people. They could serve as lay delegates.
28. Only as lay delegates.
29. I agree only as the lay delegate for their church.
30. Do not know.
31. I believe this could be dangerous in properly representing the church body. I am unsure at this time if this would be a hindrance or a benefit. I need more information before I could say yes or no to this.
32. If the voting line must be drawn, draw it here.
33. we need all input
34. They are merely members of the congregation and have the ability to vote if elected as the congregational representative. There is no doctrinal basis for allowing them a separate vote. Again, this would shift the power to judge and make decisions away from the congregations.
35. Again, deacons and pastors MUST NOT out number lay delegates.
36. They are, hopefully, very involved in congregational and District matters so they shouldn't be excluded from synodical Conventions.
37. Obviously I would agree if they had been selected as a lay delegate from their congregation
38. Once again - as previous comment. If going as a delegate for their respective congregation.
39. Agree if they are being sent as that church's representative
40. Need balance between lay and ministerial representations and voting.
41. How would that work if we have a balance of lay and clergy?

42. Same as for! 24 -! Re: Balance with lay numbers.
43. Perhaps if an issue directly affects them, they could vote on it.
44. Again, this would skew the balance and decrease the value of lay delegate involvement in convention business.
45. Attend meetings and present their thoughts.
46. They are a part of Synod; they should have a vote.
47. Some congregations do not have a deacon thus those would not be represented equally.
48. Especially those on candidate status, let them at least have a lay vote, or something.
49. Only if currently serving a congregation.
50. Yes, if they take the place of a lay delegate. Our church body does not recognize commissioned deacons to have the same status as ordained clergy, and understandably so, therefore they should be regarded as lay persons even though they are professional church workers. If a congregation chooses to send a deacon to serve as a lay delegate, that is fine.
51. I believe Deacons are usually selected as non pastoral attendee (see 27)
52. Again, we respect their office and role in our church and therefore give them voice at conventions.
53. Classified as lay delegate only
54. Why not are they not important?
55. Why wouldn't they have a vote?
56. Their opinion should be given to Pastor (vote is the question)
57. They are employees of the congregations that vote.
58. if a congregation elects them as their lay delegate they should be able to vote on behalf of that congregation
59. As long as the deacon does not replace a lay person's vote, yes.
60. Have had NO experience with any Deacons
61. They should be allowed to serve as their home congregations lay delegate if the congregation so chooses
62. I am not sure if it is still currently the structure, and I could be mistaken, but I thought at one point our deacons had no way to vote in synod as they are not pastors nor laity. To have a group of active participants within the synod who have no voice in synod seems to be the opposite of "walking together."
63. If congregations are willing to send them and they themselves are willing to attend there is an evident interest and perhaps they should be allowed to vote.
64. Does adding votes broaden the depth of discussion and solutions found, or does it become difficult to get things done. Not sure what the quorum rules are.
65. After they have served the church for say 5 years they should be able to vote as well. They would know and understand the congregational level very well.
66. Deacon/DPS is not a divinely established church office. They have no separate standing in the eyes of God and therefore should not have any separate standing in the eyes of the church. They are laypersons, as is evidenced by the fact that the position is open to women. Deacons, as described in the pastoral epistles, are those who are called into the office of the holy ministry. While the whole idea of having a synod and voting delegates is adiaphora to begin with, the reason pastors and laypeople have separate representation is because the creation and distinction between pastor and congregation is by divine command. Deacons, insofar as it describes those who are trained in the DPS or DCE program, are created by

human authority and are simply laymen with training who are fully employed in the church. So no, Deacons per se should not be a separate voting category at synodical conventions.

67. could be advisors
68. As full time church workers, it makes sense to me they would have a vote.
69. "Deacon" is a misnomer (I Timothy 2:12) which could properly have been applied to a different category of personnel than our Congregations presently have. When Pastors were expected to be able to be the Congregation parish school teacher and to lead the Congregation's music, including the choirs, it was good to relieve them in these duties when possible. Such half-trained clergy are things of the past! Our church workers, other than Pastors, are lay-persons to be highly treasured and appreciated, but treated as laymen in the Congregation.
70. Not sure
71. Deacons should have a voice and vote at conventions, but not one for each congregation. Perhaps two or three for each district.
72. I would like to see their vote count as lay or deacon
73. Yes!
74. Unless they are the delegate from a congregation
75. Maybe should be given some enhanced standing but not at the expense of disturbing the clergy/laity balance per questions 22 & 23.
76. Why don't they? They would have important insights into the life of congregations that neither pastors nor lay delegates would have. They need more than a voice, and should have a voice with some authority (i.e. a vote).
77. not sure.....haven't thought through implications on this
78. 2 votes per congregation.
79. In their professional capacity I do not see the necessity
80. So long as the balance of lay delegates = Pastors and Deacons
81. I would lean towards no on this question, but am not very informed on the matter.
82. In the same line as retired pastors, deacons should have a limited number of seats at convention filled by a vote. These seats should be comparable in number to advisory pastors. I would also think it acceptable if deacons were able to run as lay delegates, then a separate number of seats for them would not be required.
83. Again, there could be an exception: A congregation could elect a person who is a Deacon as their lay delegate (probably this is not currently allowed). But I strongly disagree that Deacons should have a vote as Deacons. A convention is a gathering of pastors and representatives of congregations, not a gathering of various interest groups or vocational groups (much less racial groups, etc.)
84. Deacons with a call should have a vote.
85. Do not have adequate information to answer.
86. Active or lay vote count
87. They have more informed knowledge than most Lay members. They are actually involved in their home congregations.
88. They are members of voting congregations.
89. Last I checked, they don't pay the bills for proposals.
90. Okay if present as lay delegate.
91. But only if serving a congregation without a pastor.
92. Okay if present as lay delegate.

93. If a lay person is not represented or as a proxy?
94. They should not all get a vote, however, they should be allowed to be a delegate and hence have a vote.
95. But balance would be important and Deacons could be considered Laity.
96. Again, there should be some sort of allowance made for this
97. Again, depends on the issue being voted upon.
98. As long as they are actively serving at the time.
99. They are trained ecclesiastical workers.
100. While the Office of the Holy Ministry and congregations of the elect are divinely mandated, the diaconal office is by human mandate. It is not necessary that deacons vote at conventions, in my opinion, but conventions also are not divinely mandated, but are humanly instituted for the sake of good order. That being the case, I am not opposed to the diaconate having delegate voting rights.
101. Only if this vote is part of the pastoral pool of votes, which should not exceed lay votes.
102. I think that this would be good, but we would need some form approach to maintain balance. What is important to me is that there be sufficient opportunity for each of the groups to have a part in the conventions.
103. Yes, but with similar concerns to 24) above.
104. Who are deacons - what is their job description
105. They could, but only as a lay delegate if no other lay delegate was available.
106. Why is a pastor a delegate? I would think because he is the called servant of the congregation. Deacons are also called servants and therefore should be delegates.
107. If they are nominated like other delegates
108. As long as they are members of a church in our synod.
109. Deacons, as a separate category? Or as the lay delegate for a congregation? I believe deacons (as they're currently defined in LCC) shouldn't be considered a category of their own at Conventions.
110. They can be elected, nominated as a delegate in order to vote
111. As laymen, yes. As clergy, no. As some sort of other, third-class group, no.
112. They are not to replace the Pastor as they don't have the grounding of thorough education on the bible.
113. They should be eligible to be the representative of their congregation either as the Church worker or layperson. This still needs to be clarified. The need to hold a vote should not be necessary, but a voice should certainly be given.
114. Only if Synod changes its policy to allow them to serve as a lay delegate.
115. I would say with no less authority than a lay delegate.
116. Provided the Deacon has been asked by his or her congregation to act as their lay delegate.
117. Deacons are not ordained clergy. They should be included as lay people, though, and have the right to vote as a lay delegate if elected to that position, which they should also have the right to.
118. If they are asked by their congregation to be their lay delegate.
119. NO -- they serve a role in the church -- but are not pastors and are not laymen -- they are represented by elected pastors and laymen from their congregation or circuit.
120. Congregations with schools would have a much larger number of votes and could lead to an unhealthy balance.

121. I would say yes, but then they would probably be counted as the clergy, who would make up half of a convention's delegates. I would prefer pastors make up that half exclusively. Which would then mean that deacons would have to be grouped with the laity, so laypeople would then have fewer than half of the delegates, which I don't like. So at the end of the day, I'm not agreeing. However, in principle, I see nothing wrong with it. A strict laity-pastor 50/50 split probably isn't as important as I think it is.
122. They should not have their own vote. They are represented by their pastor and congregational/circuit rep.
123. With the DPS program currently non-existing this may be a mute point in the not to distant future. However, if the congregation has confidence in them (deacons) I see no reason they couldn't have a vote as their lay delegate. That would certainly be far better that having the pastor's wife as the lay delegate.
124. Should have a vote only as a LAY delegate.
125. YES - YES - YES
126. Speaking o.k. - No vote
127. Representative vote rather than each Deacon having a vote.
128. The Church needs their voice and vote.
129. Deacons are not pastors. Deacons are part of the laity and can be called upon by the congregation to represent them should they so desire. There is no other distinction in the Church apart from Pastor and Lay.
130. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
131. Speaking permitted - no vote
132. The balance between lay and clergy delegates is one of the few checks and balances we have.
133. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged.
134. But only as an elected lay person from their congregation.
135. No, not unless we maintain a polity of lay/clergy balance and there are not enough clergy or retired clergy to maintain that balance. I see deacons as ex officio just as a pastor is on most church councils. Their input can be uniquely valuable but they are not holders of the Office of Ministry and therefore ought to be treated as laity. Eligible for voting rights in the same manner as laity.
136. Why wouldn't they?
137. Deacons are paid church workers and the balance would not be maintained.
138. It is ridiculous that we have not sorted out and better supported our Deacons. This is evident in the fact that they cannot vote. Laity rightly have a vote, but deacons (who are well educated and actively serving laity) cannot?
139. They are a part of the daily church life and they have their own unique perspectives different from those of the pastor and lay people.
140. They should attend and be able to speak.
141. Because its 2016.
142. As lay delegates.
143. Do they not already? If they are active workers, of course.

144. Deacons, as they are not pastors, but a churchly-created office, should be treated as lay for the purposes of choosing delegates from congregations and so should be able to vote in the lay delegate category when elected from the congregations in which they serve.
145. If the deacon is serving/has a calling within Lutheran Church Canada
146. Only as a lay delegate for their congregation
147. these individuals are as concerned for the welfare of LCC congregations as pastors and should therefore have a vote in the proceedings - because of the nature of their relationship with a congregation they could offer a unique and vital perspective that could otherwise be missed.
148. If and only if representing congregation
149. I understand the frustration that deacons have in not having a voice. I do not know how that would be accommodated.
150. Only as a lay delegate
151. only if they have been voted to be a lay delegate by the circuit.
152. But only as a delegate of a congregation. Speaking of which. Circuits that have deacons should really be allowed to send a deacon as a voting representative as a deacon. Just like a pastor gets to go to represent his congregation/circuit.
153. Members of the Deaconate should be eligible to serve as a circuit lay delegate as they are to clergy. They could put their name forward, or let their name stand like any other potential lay person.
154. They should be allowed to voice their opinions, but not have a vote.
155. I have no strong views on this matter. Two comments. First, we restored the Diaconate two decades ago, but we don't seem to have developed any deep theological understanding of this office--there's some work to do here! Secondly, there don't seem to be that many Deacons, whether for good or ill, and I'm not sure how significant a corporate entity they are in LCC. ...Another issue, if I may: let's please make a proper distinction between Deacons (male) and Deaconesses (female)!
156. Deacons aren't currently members of synod, are they?
157. Yes, if they are serving in a parish where an active pastor is not serving that congregation. And as a retired teacher, I feel that parish teachers and principals select a teacher or the principal to represent their school.
158. unless a new classification can be determined. LCC has insisted in using the unfortunate term "called" to describe them which has only muddied the waters at to what exactly they are. They are not called workers; they are trained lay people who are "rostered"
159. Not unless there is some category that reflects their status. While it is recognized that they are not "lay," neither are they Clergy. There needs to be more study to determine the true nature of the term "called" that is unfortunately used to describe such workers.
160. Deacons are laity.
161. I would disagree if this meant that the number of votes by lay delegates were less than the number of votes held by pastors, deacons, etc.
162. I have no knowledge of what impact this might have.
163. Perhaps 1 elected delegate as a group?
164. microphone privileges, no vote. You already have a pastoral delegate and lay delegate. This upsets the equal representation for both sides of that.
165. If they are chosen by their congregation as a delegate.
166. Only if elected as a congregational delegate.

167. They should be represented at the convention - the manner of that representation is another question.
168. Currently serving deacons, at least.
169. Again, on the basis of representation for the diaconate - equal votes would mean that professional church workers would be in greater influence than the laity; even a proportionate vote will do that, if equal pastoral votes are allowed.
170. Not clear on how this could be good or bad. Likely a wash for votes since the bulk is through current adequate representation.
171. they are usually your layman representative
172. Only if their congregation appoints or elects them to represent them.
173. They bring a much needed perspective to our programs and spiritual environment.
174. -as a lay delegate
175. Should be a point for discussion
176. I don't think they should have an automatic vote but if they do have a vote then it should be balanced by a lay delegate.
177. Only Clergy should be able to vote. (This is the practice of the ancient Church and of the ancient ecumenical Synods).
178. Assuming deacons are theologically trained.
179. As long as there is a balance of church workers and lay persons.
180. They are represented by the pastoral and lay delegates of that circuit.
181. No person who is employed in a professional capacity by the church (being paid a salary to serve in the church) should have a vote at conventions
182. I realize it is semantics, but a Deacon or Deaconess, indicates an education higher then laity. I am a teacher. I graduated from Concordia, River Forest, IL. I am not a deaconess, I am a teacher, who was under contract to several Lutheran schools in the United States. I am laity. I was not called by a congregation. If Deacons and Deaconesses in the LCC are called by congregations, then no, they are not laity.
183. No professional church workers should have a vote at conventions
184. Is this a need that has been missing in the past?
185. If the pastors get a vote by virtue of being a pastor, then deacons should be treated similarly. AS it stands now they have no vote, either as lay delegate (since they are not lay people) but apparently aren't as worthy as the pastors.
186. Yes, for the same reasons mentioned in question 24.
187. They may have some experiences that may offer good suggestions.
188. They too are mostly voiceless and voteless.
189. Not on a one-person-one-vote basis. A congregation with a school could have ten votes. It might work to have deacons be given one vote for every ten or 20 deacons in a district.
190. Deacons are servants of the church. They help care for the needs of the congregation. They are not a called minister of the church and should not be seen as such.
191. Not individually. Otherwise a congregation with a large school, could have 8 or 10 votes, due to its teachers. Deacons might have one voting delegate for every 10 or 20 deacons in a district, for example.
192. I feel that deacons should be able to vote as the "pastoral" delegate for a congregation. This might function similarly to those congregations with multiple pastors: only one is allowed to vote per cycle. This would allow deacons to vote at times, but not upset the important balance between our professional workers and our lay people.

193. absolutely - but as duly elected LAY delegates, which is technically what they are, whatever else we may call them. however, the question seems to imply that they should be able to vote by virtue of their office as clergy - which I strongly disagree with, so once again - with obvious strong opinions, I cannot answer this question.
194. As a delegate like everyone
195. Its time to get rid of the nonsensical title of "deacon". Congregations and schools hire whoever they wish, regardless of training, or a "call" process. Call them what they are: teachers, lay church workers, whatever. "Deacon" is meaningless.
196. I think deacons should serve as lay delegates, not in addition to lay delegates.
197. Only if their congregation does not have a pastoral delegate.
198. They play an important role.
199. It is their church too.
200. Too many deacons may be able to influence the outcome of votes on spiritual matters...as they have a lot less seminary training as pastors.
201. The interests of deacons need to be taken into account but I'm not sure how to do it so as not outweigh the vote of the laity.
202. The church needs to decide if they find deacons important or second class citizens.
203. Speaking privileges would seem adequate.
204. only if they are taking the place of the pastor or lay person.
205. On what grounds would we want to not let them vote, they might have helpful insights since they too work in the church.
206. Again there is a cost factor that has to be considered. However, if the church is going to have a recognized position as deacon as a church worker, then their voice (collectively) should be heard through voting. Likely a representative number of votes, based on the number of deacons in Synod, should suffice. It should not be tied to specific congregations because some do not have schools or other deacon positions and those that do could have a number of them and so care would need to be taken that an imbalance of voting numbers is given to such congregations.
207. Again if the agenda item is relevant they should participate (also context Q.23 ans)
208. It's deplorable that their voices have been excluded by way of being excluded from voting. If they're neither clergy nor laity (which seems to be the case), then it's disrespectful to not include them in voting.
209. Not all churches have deacons, so again some congregations could have more votes than others. Also, deacons are more educated in theology than the average lay person, so there may be a more educated advantage to the vote compared to a vote from the pastor and a lay person versus a pastor and a deacon.
210. If deacons do have a vote, it should be offset by a lay delegate.
211. Necessary? Benefit? No need?
212. They should not have a vote just because they are a Deacon. They can, however, be selected as a voting delegate by the congregation members, or if they are serving a congregation with no current pastor.
213. That is why there are lay delegates. Not all churches have deacons.
214. would it hurt?
215. Maybe they should look at the deacons as a group and have one potential delegate from the 3 regions of Canada or one per circuit
216. These are valued Church workers, give them a voice and vote.

217. if chaplains get a vote so should deacons, but this assumes pastors get more votes.
218. Can come as lay delegates
219. Maybe... but this is not the core issue at all.
220. Only if the numbers remain balanced.
221. Maybe, but this is not the core issue.
222. Is there a good reason for this?
223. Then you get a top heavy pastoral influence without any equivalency on the part of congregations. If congregational believers are not going to have any influence in decisions, why bother going.
224. Male deacons only.
225. While it would not make sense for every deacon to have a vote at a Synodical convention (every pastor and congregation do not get a vote) it would be good for some mechanism to be established so, say, and percentage of deacons equal to the percentage of pastor who vote be allowed to vote. (If 10% of pastors in Synod are chosen as voting members, the number of deacon delegates would equal 10% on all deacons. They could be nominated and elected electronically, and would be a "non-geographic circuit" much like the English District in the LCMS.
226. Deacons need to be given a greater voice within the functioning of our Church. At the same time, there should be more emphasis placed on continuing education for both our pastoral and diaconal workers in order to develop a greater sense of common purpose and collegiality between them.
227. Why not? They are church workers.
228. if they are in good standing, why not
229. advisory only
230. Here again I struggle. Congregations and pastors are biblically mandated. Deacons are allowed but are essentially a creation of man. I lean towards them not having a vote, except, in all fairness, as members of synod, if they are serving a congregation or entity of synod in the capacity of deacon, they should have a voice. Retired deacons (deacon emeriti?) should also have a voice and vote, however not deacons who are candidate status and showing no desire to return to active duty when calls are forthcoming.
231. on certain items
232. They are part of church leadership and should be able to voice the concerns in which the area they work i.e. worship leaders. This doesn't mean they must have a delegated seat at synodical conventions however.
233. As long as the number of pastors/deacons balances with the number of lay delegates. Not sure how to answer this question as some congregations do not have deacons.
234. I disagree because Deacons are part of the laity. They have representation in the vote of the laity.
235. Not necessarily. In the East District, the majority of the rostered "deacons" are candidates and although they may be faithful workers in their parish should each have a vote at convention, a voice perhaps.
236. All members of congregations should have an equal vote
237. Yes, as a lay delegate if their congregation elects them.
238. This would increase the numbers of people attending a convention. We need to keep the cost of conventions down.
239. That seems fair to me.

240. They fall under the authority of their pastors, who can vote with them in mind.
241. As long as it does not change the minimum 50% pastoral delegate ratio.
242. Yeah, there's the people "in the trenches" too.
243. I am not sure what the Deacons role is currently.
244. That would upset the balance of Pastors and Lay.
245. This would upset the balance and deny the flow of authority from the pastoral office to the office of deacon. If deacons were given a vote (apart from representing a congregation) then a serious conflict of interest could occur and the balance between the pastors and lay representatives compromised.
246. Deacons are also members of the LCC so they should be able to vote.
247. Yes, but as a layperson. See Question 27.
248. But not in place of a lay or clergy delegate. they would be in addition to the half/half split.
249. Unless going as a lay rep
250. Do these people currently have a vote?
251. Professional church workers should be allowed to speak and "be heard" by their votes.
252. Balanced by a lay person vote
253. Deacons are the same status as pastors, and therefore votes are unfair as deacons become the lay representatives. The positions are biased. The vote results are known before they are asked.
254. See #24 and are front-line workers.
255. This issue was voted on at the last Synod Convention June 2014. Resolution 14.3.14b To Study & Provide for Diaconal Voting at Synod & District Conventions. Adopted. Currently they are Advisory with a voice.
256. Only if they are representing a lay person, but not a vote which would replace a pastoral vote!!!
257. Deacons fall under pastoral supervision. Their pastors will have the church's best interest in mind when they cast their lot.
258. As above.
259. More than just as a group if they are serving in a congregation. Just do not know how to do that and retain equality of representation?
260. only if representing their congregation
261. The deaconate is a humanly ordained office, auxiliary to the Office of the Public Ministry
262. If chosen as a lay delegate
263. Yes, as lay delegates.
264. Deacons should have a vote, but It should be a lay vote.
265. If they are the representative elected by a circuit, then it shouldn't matter if they are a deacon.
266. Each congregation should identify a Pastor and one lay delegate to attend and be able to vote. Otherwise, they should be treated similar to retired Pastors. Either their congregation pays their way or they themselves pay their way and can speak to any issue but don't have a vote.
267. YES, they are an important part of what we are trying to accomplish, so their input is very valuable.
268. I am VERY concerned about the way that we treat deacons in the synod. I think this matter requires much attention.

269. Yes, but as a church worker. Congregations could decide which church worker to send depending on issues, e.g. pastor or principal or teacher or deacon.
270. They should be eligible to vote as lay representatives.
271. Although I greatly value the work of our Deacons, I believe they should be designated as laypersons. I don't believe there should be a third category created, bringing unbalance to our conventions, nor do I believe the Deacons should be lumped together with our pastors. A congregation should be able to appoint their deacon as their lay representative.
272. The way I understand it, Pastors and Deacons are members of Synod, just as congregations are members of Synod. Congregations are entitled to have a vote, therefore shouldn't Pastors and Deacons likewise have a vote?
273. For every deacon vote there could be an additional lay delegate to keep lay and professional votes equal.
274. Again one lay and one pastoral vote per congregation.
275. But perhaps as a (layperson or deacon) vote for their congregation.
276. In substitution for a lay delegate.
277. Are deacons "called" as pastors are? If not, no. If called.... I'm not sure.
278. It would be a welcome change, if some way could be found to avoid destroying the historic balance between lay and clergy voting strength at conventions.
279. This would create a third class from an auxiliary office and would drastically change the concept of equal representation.
280. We are currently unduly limiting the voice of our Diaconate. By placing them in a category that is neither lay or clergy, there's not only un-clarity with regards to the theology that practice espouses, we're missing their voices as members of Synod.
281. but I don't have enough knowledge about this topic to give an informed opinion.
282. Since deacons currently cannot vote as either "pastor" or "laity" at convention, they can be considered a neutral addition to the convention that would not upset the balance of clergy and laity.
283. Deacons are neutral, they are considered neither pastors nor laity in our current structure. This is good and since they are considered neutral all actively serving deacons should get a vote at synod as giving them the vote will not break the 50:50 lay-clergy balance. Our deacons work very hard and have intimate knowledge of service in the church and that should be valued by giving them a vote at convention.
284. The status of deacons is very uncertain in our church. They are not pastors, but they are definitely not laymen either. The only reason this has not become a major issue is because there are so few of them.
285. Our diaconal program and understanding needs work
286. ~ exception as #26

26. An advisory Pastor should be able to represent a congregation or a circuit as a voting lay delegate

1. Pastors, even retired, have a far different perspective than lay people, and should not be representing congregations.
2. Pastors should be attending and voting. Congregation lay delegate also should be with Pastor and active.
3. No: make use of our lay people. Wonderful resource if trained, used, encouraged.

4. Do not let lay people get lazy and let ordained do the work, lay people to be active.
5. Might depend on the person and his thoughts.
6. Yes, as he is more likely to know of the difficulties of the congregation he is advising.
7. Because he is more likely to be informed as to the positives and problems in the local congregation.
8. Who are they representing - congregations or themselves?
9. Yes, they have the theological understanding that lay delegates do not.
10. Maybe this can be worked out. This is not a critical thing to me.
11. I don't know what an advisory Pastor is.
12. Again that advisory Pastor may not be aware of what that congregation wants or would like to vote on
13. One is either a pastor or not.
14. Lay delegates need to maintain the responsibility to vote and should not be delegated to an advisory Pastor.
15. No way!!
16. I don't see why such a pastor would be chosen.
17. There may be a conflict of interest, possibly?
18. Again- pastors are or should be more knowledgeable than a lay person - but most have personal knowledge of the congregation.
19. Who is an advisory Pastor? Vacancy?
20. S/B up to congregation or circuit.
21. What does this statement mean?
22. What is an advisory pastor?
23. Only if taking the place of a lay delegate.
24. I don't know what an advisory pastor is, as distinct from a regular pastor.
25. What is an advisory pastor? Pastors are members of synod and should represent themselves as pastoral delegates.
26. The question is not clear. What constitutes an "advisory pastor"?
27. This can upset the voting representation between clergy and the laity.
28. What is an "advisory Pastor"?
29. They should have their own vote.
30. I am sure there is knowledge to contribute.
31. If the congregation wishes that person to be their delegate, I actually do not see an issue with this. They would be their lay delegate and represent their stand.
32. An advisory pastor should be able to represent a circuit as a voting clergy.
33. we need all input
34. If they are a called, currently serving pastor then no they can't act as the lay delegate. If they are not called (retired, not serving, chaplain, etc.), they can be voted to act as the lay delegate.
35. advisory/vacancy pastor?
36. Yes, if the pastor represents the congregation's Bible based values to the Synod.
37. I don't think a pastor, advisory or not, can ever really be considered a lay delegate.
38. Agree with the congregation’s approval and in accordance with the congregations wishes.
39. What does "advisory" mean
40. Only if they are a voting member of the congregation they would be representing and have been elected by their voting assembly in the same manner as a lay delegate.

41. In my retirement years there were numerous times that I served a vacant parish during a convention as called vacancy pastor but could not vote on behalf of that parish. (To clarify--I was no longer a voting pastor as I was retired from the home congregation--thereby voting as vacancy pastor would not constitute a double vote.
42. The lay members of the whole church need to take more responsibility for decision making.
43. They are not lay they are still pastors.
44. only if representing in lue of that Lay delegate
45. same as above
46. He should only represent a congregation to which he has been called, including vacancies.
47. He is clergy, not lay.
48. We want to encourage lay participation and such an action would undermine the goal of lay representation.
49. Only if the congregation so deems the Pastor to represent them
50. Again, why not?
51. Only if known to congregation.
52. A voting lay delegate should be able to express his/her opinion as a lay person
53. They are employees of the congregations that vote.
54. He will have his own view that may conflict with the people's of the congregation. Therefore, the vote should fall strictly to lay people.
55. if the deacons are granted the same
56. Once again, pastor is a pastor. To give him the lay vote is to take the power away from the people. The pastors serve the people, not the other way around.
57. please define "advisory pastor"
58. They should be allowed to serve as their home congregations lay delegate if the congregation so chooses
59. No, need the laity to be more involved, given the governance of the LCC and District have stepped into the business world.
60. I think I need to have "advisory Pastor" defined for me, however I do think laity should represent and vote for laity.
61. What exactly is an "advisory Pastor" I personally have never heard this term before.
62. If that is the congregations wish, yes.
63. A pastor is not a lay person!
64. Perhaps this individual could be one of the two delegates to convention I mentioned above.
65. only if there is no congregation lay delegate available to go
66. Ordained therefore clergy.
67. An advisory Pastor, if he should have a vote at convention, it should be as a Pastoral Delegate.
68. I agree in that, as expressed before, I think it makes sense for pastors to outnumber laity in terms of votes...but I am a little uncertain on this question in that I don't know what the present rules are. And if advisory means vacancy pastor, I don't see why a pastor would not do well to represent his congregation or circuit as he would be well suited to give voice to that group which is the point of the delegate in the first place.
69. This is just another way to get another Pastors vote
70. Especially if there's no else willing to go to a convention
71. The lay people need to have a voice in the church and should be encouraged to exercise their responsibility by attending, speaking and voting at conventions.

72. they are clergy. you can't take the lay vote away from lay
73. Assuming by "advisory Pastor" you mean "advisory delegate at conventions", such Pastors already have influence at conventions by having a voice. Congregations should be able to field at least one good lay delegate.
74. Whomever is the best to represent a congregation should do so. How are we vetting through delegate selection?
75. Again, I am not very informed on this matter, but it does not seem to make sense to me. If this was happening because there was an insufficient number of lay delegates attending, then I would suggest changing the policy so that this is not necessary, i.e. making it so that there does not have to be the same number of lay delegates as pastoral delegates at synodical conventions.
76. Advisory pastors should not take a lay seat as they do not represent the lay vote.
77. I don't know what an advisory pastor is.
78. Not sure who an advisory Pastor is.
79. This would be OK as long as the congregation is electing their representative. For example, although I am an ordained pastor and serve my congregation at times as an ordained pastor (e.g., guest preaching, teaching), I really function just as any other layman in the congregation, and if they wanted to send me (along with our called pastor) to the convention that could be fine.
80. Active or lay vote count
81. We already have more than enough clergy votes. Maybe a solution would be to grant multiple voting rights to certain clergy, e.g., Synodical and District Presidents and their staff, something like a special College of Cardinals.
82. Again this loses the balance between pastoral and lay delegates.
83. Do not understand the concept of advisory pastor
84. If he is a vacancy pastor NOT an additional pastor.
85. What's an advisory pastor?
86. This would destroy the parity between lay and pastors.
87. If the congregation has confidence in the person does it matter?
88. Not sure what you mean here. I think it is up to the congregation to choose their representative. If the rep happens to be a pastor who is a member of that congregation, that should be their choice.
89. Pastors are not laypeople and should not take lay-delegates' places at convention.
90. Congregations without a called pastor are currently disenfranchised for their pastoral vote. Since the Church consists of both laity and clergy, the congregation could be allowed to designate a pastoral delegate who is on the LCC roster to act as their delegate.
91. Maybe?
92. Yes, but only for a congregation with its approval and with similar concerns to 24) above. Should not represent a circuit.
93. Who is an advisory Pastor? Why does a congregation have one? Need more info to answer this question
94. But only if there is no lay delegate available.
95. Why should he?
96. Just because of their designation? I'm not clear.
97. I think they should be having separate duties.
98. I don't know what an advisory pastor is.

99. A pastor is not a layman. This is a very basic fact.
100. This would need to be decided upon by the board of Elders.
101. Same comments as question # 24
102. Why as a lay person? He's still ordained.
103. No as above
104. If the Pastor has his own congregation and is only in an advisory role does he not already have a vote? Could it not represent a conflict of interest or an abuse of power in a critical or adversarial position?
105. If he is the only one for the congregation
106. They should have that right as a CRM just like a Deacon should as a lay person with special training, but still really a lay person.
107. If they are members of the congregation and asked to be their lay delegate.
108. NO -- they are pastors -- not a layman
109. An advisory pastor is often not well informed as to the needs of Synod/District/Congregation.
110. Laypeople need to be involved, and if let off the hook to go, we never will. Only in extraordinary circumstances should that be acceptable.
111. Only so long as they are not acting as a pastor in the aforementioned congregation.
112. I do not understand the role of the Advisory Pastor
113. He would need to be well informed of the needs of that congregation or district.
114. Not a lay person
115. Pastors and deacons have very different perspectives on church in comparison to lay people, and both of those voices should be present in our conventions.
116. Not if they are eligible and seeking a Call to a parish or other recognized ministry.
117. Pastors are pastors... if a congregation has more than one pastor, they should agree between them who will have that responsibility for that convention. Again, all this depends on if we NEED the right of vote. When something is contentious, perhaps we need more dialogue on that issue rather than a splitting vote!!! (What does Scripture and BOC and Church history/Fathers have to say on this issue?)
118. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
119. "If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck...."
120. Once again the lay then loses a vote as Pastors could tend to vote in their mind as a Pastor and not as a lay representing the congregation
121. ...thus changing the title to "voting delegate"
122. The balance between lay and clergy delegates is one of the few checks and balances we have.
123. What does represent mean? Only voice and non-voting. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged.
124. Don't understand the question.
125. Again pastoral delegates would outnumber the lay delegates.
126. Voting lay delegates should come from within the ranks of the congregation and should not be an advisory Pastor, Deacon etc.

127. Why?
128. Pastors like all employees are primarily concerned with reducing their workload and increasing their compensation. They have a direct conflict of interest with the laypeople who have to support the church with financial gifts.
129. As a nominated pastor delegate. Pastors are Pastors. Lay and staff are lay.
130. If elected by the congregation.
131. What is an advisory Pastor?
132. But should not have two votes?
133. I don't understand what this question is saying - what is an "advisory Pastor"? I have never head this expression before
134. If by the name of advisory Pastor it is meant to include interim Pastor, then my answer would change to agree
135. Advisory Pastors are still on the clergy roster as Emeriti they cannot be lay delegates by that very fact.
136. He is not lay!
137. The input of the laity is important!!! (think about the Reformation)
138. Who came up with this idea? Pastors have too much "authority" and "supervision" already.
139. This may create unexpected conflicts of interest and undermine their credibility as an advisor, also this would create confusion. Could a vacant congregation have a lay person represent their congregation as a clergy delegate? There is enough confusion surrounding article XIV of the AC without adding to it with this sort of exception.
140. What is an advisory Pastor?
141. Ordained men should not represent lay folk, and vice versa.
142. An advisory Pastor is not a Lay person.
143. I have no knowledge of what impact this might have
144. An advisory Pastor is not a lay person.
145. Clergy are not laymen - they don't have the same views.
146. This should be the congregation individual choice, per vote.
147. I don't know
148. Churches should be able to send people to represent them, and if they don't have a pastor then someone should be able to stand in that person's place at Convention.
149. If he is a Pastor, then he is not a Lay person.
150. If no other representative is available.
151. As long as they understand that they are acting as a lay delegate and that may mean thinking a bit differently than as a pastoral delegate
152. No. He should be given a vote as a clergyman. He isn't laity.
153. There should be no voting lay delegates. An advisory pastor should have a vote.
154. An advisory pastor is still a pastor, whereas a lay delegate could bring insight from the laity's point of view to the convention
155. Once a pastor, always a pastor, it would only confuse the situation.
156. A Pastor is an ordained servant of the Word; this places him on a plain above a layman. He will always be an ordained servant whether he has a call or not.
157. I think we have seen with Pastor Krispin's situation, you can't and really shouldn't separate clergy from their call and rely on them to be lay voters. It's not a really bad idea, but I think it's important that the laity make the effort to be involved.

158. An advisory Pastor should only be allowed to represent one congregation vote if an adviser for several congregations
159. Only if there is no lay delegate available.
160. Huh? What on earth is an advisory pastor? I have never heard this term before.
161. What is an "advisory Pastor"?
162. Each congregation gets one vote. The Pastor that represents that congregation gets one vote. No congregation and no Pastor get more than one vote.
163. Any Pastor on the roster (active or retired) should have a representative voice and vote in synodical decisions.
164. Not if he's taking the place of a lay person
165. Only is elected by the congregation
166. All personnel should be heard if they have something worthwhile to suggest
167. No, the Pastor is not a layperson.
168. He is a pastor, not a layman
169. He is not a layman. Therefore, cannot be a lay delegate.
170. I don't know what an Advisory Pastor is.
171. An advisory pastor is not a lay person and should not be able to vote as such.
172. Finally, a straightforward question
173. who is an advisory Pastor?
174. It should always be a lay delegate
175. If all pastors have a vote, see item #24 above, they would already be voting and each congregation or circuit should have a congregational member voting.
176. Only if he does not have a vote as a delegate for his own congregation.
177. Only if the advisory Pastor is active in a congregation.
178. Not sure what exactly an advisory Pastor is in comparison to a 'regular' Pastor.
179. Why? Does this mean that the congregation pastor is not able to attend and he is a substitute or?
180. No, they are not a lay person.
181. Yes, if there is no pastor in office to act in that capacity.
182. I have no strong opinion on this matter
183. We need more lay participation in the working of the church, not less.
184. If the advisory Pastor is already serving a congregation, then he would have vote. If he is a retired pastor that is fulfilling this role, then I would think that it would be an imbalance to give a congregation or circuit an extra vote in this way.
185. Same answer as #24 - Church & Ministry issues - if an advisory "pastor" is to be regarded as holding the pastoral office and therefore a called clergyman, then no, he shouldn't be able to be a lay delegate. If he's not actually a pastor because he doesn't have a congregational call, then he's a layman.
186. Again, this could mean that some congregations could have more votes than others and also advisory pastors may not be as well informed about a congregation as far as current issues or needs as a serving pastor.
187. Same answer as #24 - Church & Ministry issues - if an advisory "pastor" is to be regarded as holding the pastoral office and therefore a called clergyman, then no, he shouldn't be able to be a lay delegate. If he's not actually a pastor because he doesn't have a congregational call, then he's a layman.

188. The important issue throughout is that there never is an imbalance-pastoral to lay delegate. If there is an advisory pastor allowed to represent, a lay delegate must be noted.
189. All congregations should provide a representative.
190. This is a difficult question--if we are not going to change things, I guess it doesn't make a difference, one way or another.
191. What is the definition of "an advisory Pastor"? If you have two pastors, then one is selected to go. Retired pastors are a special delegation (besides, pastor cannot ever retire). Everyone else is not a Pastor and is treated a member of the congregation.
192. A pastor is a pastor - he should not be considered a lay delegate.
193. May not be familiar with the issues. If the person is appointed from the circuit level, no problem
194. We need lay delegates
195. I think I agree, but need more information or example to really answer this. A lot of the questions on this survey make me ask <" why are they asking the question?" I am not sure what the issues are, so it is hard to respond. I wish the survey overall, had more information on why the question is being asked or explanation for context.
196. Maybe... but this is not the core issue at all. Under the current model, this would be a good change.
197. Makes voting unbalanced.
198. Under the current structure, this would be a good change (giving them at least a chance to be a voting delegate if their congregation chooses them to represent congregational interests), but this is not the core issue!
199. Should not have two votes
200. Oxymoron?
201. Each congregation should have their vote represented by their delegate, not necessarily another Pastor, advisory or not.
202. A rose by any other name smells just as sweet
203. if they are in good standing. why not
204. A pastor is a pastor. Although he is part of the people of God, the laity, he has been set aside for a divine office. He no longer has the privilege of serving as laity.
205. only if they have served for a certain number of Sunday's in a year (a number which is yet to be determined).
206. would this be similar to question #24?
207. This question is a very good example of assuming a lot of knowledge of how our Synod works and will only lead to confusion. I had to read it three times to understand the point.
208. By definition a pastor cannot be a layman.
209. All members of the congregation should have an equal vote
210. I don't understand the term "Advisory Pastor"
211. They cannot, as their focus would be different than a layman.
212. This confuses the matter unnecessarily.
213. I don't understand this question - more specifically, what's an "advisory pastor?"
214. He is a member of a congregation and sits in a pew like the rest of us I think he should be able to represent the congregation he is a member of. He probably knows the congregation better than most people.
215. Perhaps LCC needs a conversation on the doctrine of the call prior to this question.

216. not sure what and advisory Pastor is. Does he assist congregations with vacancies? if so then he should/could be a pastoral delegate. we need lay delegates to be laymen and not get infiltrated with other church workers to insure a balance and have a layman’s voice heard
217. If an advisory pastor is the congregation's choice for its pastoral representative, especially if it does not currently have an active pastor, or if their pastor is incapacitated, then they should have the right to have an advisory pastor as their voting delegate in order that they may have two votes in Convention and not just one (lay).
218. An advisory Pastor is a Pastor, so he should not be under the category of a voting lay delegate.
219. When a lay delegate is not available perhaps
220. God's people should be able to have their voices heard.
221. Once again all experienced and knowledgeable minds could add to any discussion.
222. Advisory Pastors are the same status as pastors, and therefore votes are unfair as they become the lay representatives. The positions are biased. The vote results are known before they are asked.
223. A pastor is not laity.
224. If they are a pastor, they wouldn't be a lay delegate.
225. As long as lay and clergy #'s are kept in balance maybe that could work but that might make things unclear???
226. All of these questions reflect a bias that the entire current voting system with delegates should be maintained. A professional survey writer should have been used.
227. I would agree, but only if decisions are based on knowledge and collaboration of the thinking and wishes of the congregation, which must be prepared in advance of any vote.
228. What is an 'advisory' pastor? Part of the conflict within LCC is our understanding of the office of the ministry which includes the title 'vacancy pastor' and 'vacant non-calling congregations.'
229. This question is an oxymoron.
230. If they are not the acting pastor and there is no lay person wishing to represent, then it would be better than forfeiting the congregations vote.
231. If a congregation does not have a regular Pastor, an advisory Pastor would be a good alternative to have the concerns of those congregations addressed.
232. A retired pastor might be the best delegate, but it would be up to the congregation to elect.
233. They're pastors not laypersons.
234. Why lay?
235. I believe that would create an oxymoron.
236. Only if he represents the wishes of their congregation and not his own.
237. I feel the costs of these conventions must be controlled and therefore those attending must limited.
238. Once retired, a pastor is no longer leading a flock ... but they are a "revered" member of the priesthood of all believers.
239. Should each congregation send a pastor to a convention (as is currently the case with a district convention), any pastor should be allowed to be a substitute for a pastor serving a congregation.
240. Only in cases where a lay delegate is not available and/or designated.
241. A pastor is a pastor and not a layperson.

242. A pastor who has retired or is on candidate status isn't a pastor. He's eligible for a call, but, as we echo Luther and Pieper, when he's not serving a congregation, either by retiring or by some other means, "he steps back into the common crowd, commits his office to someone else, and is now again no more than every common Christian." Unless you mean an advisory such as a seminary professor, etc. If we were to clarify our understanding of the call and Office of the Public Ministry to say that advisory pastors are not serving as called pastors, then they should be eligible. If we continue to maintain that they are in fact called to their particular post, then they're still defined as clergy and as such should not be able to be a lay delegate.
243. He is not a layman.
244. Pastors, employed or not are not Lay. Lay people employed or not are not Pastors.
245. Yes, if (for example) the congregation is vacant or the existing pastor can't attend due to illness or other. I assume "circuits" don't currently have a vote (other than the votes the congregations within the circuit have). This should continue.
246. Advisory pastors should not get a vote if they are retired. However, I strongly believe that serving seminary professors should get a vote at synodical conventions and the laity could get an extra vote (from the big congregations or elsewhere) to keep the 50:50 balance. The seminary profs have a deep understanding of Scripture and the Confessions and that should be welcomed into our voting structure. I really hope our actively serving seminary profs will get a vote in the new structure.
247. So long as he speaks for the congregation and not for his colleague/co-worker.
248. ~ sometimes especially in smaller congregation timing and life may not allow one of the laity to attend. To not allow a congregation a vote especially because of their size is not right. ~ I know of at least one congregation where this occurred. ~ the first business order at convention is to acknowledge these exceptions and approve them.

27. A Deacon should be able to represent a congregation or a circuit as a voting lay delegate.

1. Deacon should vote as a deacon, still need delegate as well.
2. Why not?
3. Should have three categories: 1. Pastor 2. Lay 3. Deacon All deacons should be urged to attend conventions.
4. Yes, they have the theological understanding that lay delegates do not.
5. thought they did. but again lay delegates are to be equal or greater than spiritual leaders given our poor history on governance. And financial. Use the old world model, it worked, less power to pastors who have lots to start with and turn to Lutheran model, vs. Roman Catholic model
6. A Deacon should be a voting member as staff, not as a lay delegate.
7. As long as a congregational meeting takes place before the convention so that the Deacon knows how the congregation would like to vote
8. Absolutely not. Deacons are not laypeople. Neither of course are they clergy. They are a "third thing," and must be brought into our polity on that basis.
9. Lay delegates need to maintain the responsibility to vote and should not be delegated to a Deacon.
10. Deacons, as members of Synod, should be able to vote, but in their own right.

11. Let the "Lay Delegates" be their own voters... not some proxy
12. Don't see why not.
13. Again, possibly a conflict of interest?
14. Don't know any deacons personally
15. I don't think that the deacon should be taking the place of a lay delegate. The position of the lay delegate, in my understanding, is to provide an alternate opinion to those who are involved in the daily ministry of the congregation. I think we could potentially lose an entire subset of knowledgeable people if we have only those involved in the ministerial as those who vote at a convention.
16. If they're not clergy, they should be able to vote as laity. If they are clergy, they should be able to vote as clergy. It has to be one or the other.
17. S/B up to congregation or circuit.
18. In place of a lay person?
19. Only if taking the place of a lay delegate.
20. The problem is I don't think most people understand what happens at a convention so these questions are difficult to answer.
21. I agree, at the congregation's discretion.
22. Deacon must know and reflect the needs/wants/direction of the congregation in voting.
23. Yes, as they are lay people.
24. Once again if the congregation wishes that person to be their delegate I actually do not see an issue with this. They would be their lay delegate and represent their stand.
25. we need all input
26. They are a lay member of the congregation. They did not answer the pastoral call so they are the same as a lay person and so can act as the lay delegate.
27. Yes, as long as there is not a conflict of interest and he represents his congregations SCRIPTURE based values.
28. Lay delegates should be lay persons. Deacons are spiritual servants working within congregations; they are in a different role.
29. Agree - with my exact comments as for and advisory Pastor.
30. Deacon must know and reflect the needs/wants of the congregation.
31. If deacons are not permitted to hold voting membership in the congregation in which they serve, then they should not be permitted to serve as a lay delegate for that congregation or circuit.
32. But not as a third or fourth vote from that congregation.
33. Agree. A Deacon should be able to represent a congregation where serving.
34. They are not lay they are still deacons.
35. only if representing in lue of that Lay delegate
36. Currently, once a deacon; forever voiceless...
37. A serving Deacon should have their own vote. A non-serving Deacon should be allowed to represent their own congregation as a voting lay delegate.
38. Yes, if they take the place of a lay delegate. Our church body in line with the Lutheran Confessions does not recognize commissioned deacons to have the same status as ordained clergy, and understandably so, therefore they should be regarded as lay persons even though they are professional church workers. If a congregation chooses to send a deacon to serve as a lay delegate, that is fine.

39. We want to encourage lay participation and such an action would undermine the goal of lay representation.
40. Again only if the congregation deems so
41. They are employees of the congregations that vote.
42. Not well enough informed as to the whole picture.
43. They are part of the clergy factor.
44. No. The power CANNOT be taken away from the lay people.
45. or as a clergy delegate
46. If the congregation chooses them as a delegate, then yes.
47. They should be allowed to serve as their home congregations lay delegate if the congregation so chooses
48. Does the Deacon have any other voice? If not, I think a Deacon could represent laity. It is a fine balance, though.
49. What is the definition of lay delegate? What is the definition of a deacon? Is the answer clear already? Why then, is it being asked?
50. A Deacon should be elected by the congregation where he is serving just as a lay delegate is elected by the congregation.
51. A Deacon is not an ordained pastor. Thus they are a lay person. However, they are more than an ordinary lay person. They are a type of hybrid.
52. Perhaps this individual could be one of the two delegates to convention I mentioned above.
53. I think it should be someone that is not paid by the congregation that represents them.
54. Sort of lay. (not ordained, but commissioned)
55. A DPS is a layperson.
56. Deacons are employees of the congregation and could not serve responsibly as such.
57. Still a member of congregation.
58. what/who is a deacon?
59. A deacon is a class of clergy and should not substituted for a lay person. I would feel more comfortable with a deacon taking the pastor's place.
60. Assuming deacons are advisory delegates at conventions, they already have adequate standing. Congregations should continue to be required to field proper lay delegates, i.e. delegates not in any form of professional church work.
61. I think maybe yes..... but haven't entirely thought through this one
62. If the pastor can not make it.
63. If deacons do not have their own set of voting seats, then I think it is appropriate to allow them to represent their congregation as a lay vote.
64. As long as the congregation is electing this person, and it is understood clearly that the Deacon thus represents the congregation (not Deacons), this would be fine.
65. In principle, I believe a deacon should be able to represent a congregation as a lay delegate; however, I fear that in some congregations, the lay people might turn to the deacon as a "convenient" person to send, thus making it easy on themselves.
66. Voted by membership
67. Similar response as to #26.
68. If chosen
69. I consider Deacons as a ministerial delegate.
70. But not as substitute for a lay member.
71. Only as proxy or if no lay person

72. Again, if the congregation has confidence in the person does it matter?
73. I can't say this would be right for every situation. Generally, I wouldn't see a huge problem with this, unless a "conflict of interest" issue arose in voting.
74. Not sure of meaning again. I think the congregation should be able to choose, but this question doesn't tell me if deacons currently have a vote due to their role as deacons.
75. We should have a new category of voting deacons. We should divide the lay delegation voting number in half and let it be half deacon delegates and half lay delegates, so that the total number of lay plus deacon votes will total 50% of the total votes, and the pastoral votes will make up the other 50%.
76. If deacons are permitted to serve as congregational lay delegates, then they should not be permitted to have voting diaconal delegates at a convention as per question 25.
77. If that Deacon is a member of the congregation, he/she could represent a congregation, but it would be better to have a voting lay delegate as well as the Deacon who could also have a vote.
78. This could be another way of including Deacons, though I would rather see there be a more definite opportunity for their participation. One reason people become alienated is that they have no opportunity to participate.
79. Yes, but with similar constraints as in 26) above. Should not represent a circuit.
80. No. Should be a Pastor and a lay person.
81. But only if there is no lay delegate available.
82. A deacon is a called servant of a congregation and as such, not a lay member. He should be a voting delegate in his capacity as deacon.
83. These questions (25, 26, + 27) are all redundant. If it as appointment/nomination or whatever. Are they just presenting themselves?
84. If member of a church in our synod.
85. I think they may need to represent a congregation in different ways or areas.
86. Yes, they serve the church.
87. if a congregation chooses to do so
88. Why not a separate category for deacons? just say - deacons can vote
89. No as above a Deacon is on the Roster
90. NO -- they are not a layman
91. A deacon is responsible for only one area of the congregational work, whereas the pastor is the chief spiritual supervisor or CEO.
92. As the lay delegate!
93. As long as the deacon's been properly selected, I have no problem with that.
94. To much responsibility for the average deacon.
95. They are professionals and should have a representative place for participation on all levels. This can help raise the awareness of their work.
96. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
97. Such representation may place the deacon in a conflict of interest.
98. What does represent mean? Only voice and non-voting. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged.

99. I have serious concerns regarding the vague and undefined office of deacon in our church body. Are they pastors? No. Should they replace pastors on the various Boards/Committees/etc.? No. Should they be able to vote as laypersons of the church? Yes!
100. I don't think a deacon is a lay delegate.
101. Deacons are paid church workers and not lay members.
102. Deacons should have a vote in addition to lay members. It is hard to know how to include Deacons.
103. Some times this is necessary as no one is available for conventions.
104. Deacons are paid staff.
105. I'm not sure of the implications between # 25 and #27.
106. Agree only if there is no lay person available
107. He or she is a church worker. If there is a pastor as well, one of them must decide who is voting. Can't have it both ways.
108. A Deacon is trained, paid staff and is not a lay person.
109. One consideration, though, it that there may be matters up for a vote for which the deacon would have to declare a conflict of interest and recuse him/herself from the process. The same should apply for pastors.
110. They should be able to represent a circuit as a church worker - create a new representative category for "Deacons and church workers" in addition to "Pastor" and "Layperson". This may encourage the development and intrinsic value of these types of positions within an overall circuit.
111. Deacons currently exist in no-man’s land. They don’t have a vote at Conventions (not even a representative vote from their group), and they can’t be elected as a lay delegate. Except for their voice, they are non-existent! Of course, this must change so that they can represent their congregation as a lay delegate. The same should be true for advisory pastors.
112. While not clergy, deacons are professional church workers and not lay people.
113. Yes, if Deacons do not receive a vote (# 25 above)
114. It would be better to give them a vote but barring that this would be acceptable.
115. A deacon of a congregation should automatically have a vote. Circuit representation if we keep our current model, congregational if we have each congregation involved in having delegates.
116. Members of the Deaconate should be eligible to serve as a congregational lay delegate as they are to clergy. They could put their name forward, or let their name stand like any other potential lay person.
117. I'm open to thinking of Deacons and Deaconesses as minor clergy, but this does not seem to be the explicit majority view. If the Diaconate were a flourishing institution among us, it should have its own representation.
118. see comments on question 25
119. Deacons are laity and as such must have and equal voice as laity.
120. I have no knowledge of what impact this might have
121. Also - Clergy are not laymen - they don't have the same views.
122. Churches should be able to send people to represent them, and if they don't have a pastor then someone should be able to stand in that person's place at Convention.
123. Provided representation for that congregation or circuit is so ambivalent that it is absent.
124. A Deacon is not a lay person.

125. Only if they have been selected by a vote at a congregation voters meeting and not by appointment by a Pastor or council.
126. Same comment as Q26
127. Agree but there shouldn't be laity voting.
128. Only if no Pastor is available.
129. A deacon, again, has placed himself above a lay delegate. I realize this is semantics but moving from teacher to deacon in terminology places these people into servant of Christ and they remain so, with or without call.
130. For the same reasons as given in Question 26.
131. only if he brings what congregation agrees to
132. If there is not a lay person available, then a deacon may attend.
133. They should have the same voting rights and privileges as the pastors.
134. Any rostered worker should have a representative voice and vote in synodical decisions.
135. If the regular pastor is not able to attend I would think that a deacon should be able to attend with the pastor having input,
136. They are not truly lay people nor are they pastors.
137. That is, if they represent the needs and wishes of the congregation
138. If not voting otherwise as a deacon.
139. No, if they are able to vote, as per Question 25. Yes, if they are not able to vote as a deacon.
140. A deacon is not a lay person and should not be able to vote as such.
141. As a delegate
142. So-called "deacons" are lay people. However, as employees of congregations, it may not be wise to have them serve in such a role.
143. Perhaps a deacon should have the same privilege to vote as a pastor.
144. If the congregation appoints him as a delegate.
145. It is their church too.
146. Not ideal but if the congregation approves it OK. Same goes for having pastors' wives serving as lay delegates. Seems like they might tip the scale in favour of the clergy.
147. Yes, if there is no other representation possible.
148. Maybe if we were to do this we would actually come to some understanding as to whether or not deacons have a call or not, if they do not, then this would make sense to me.
149. Not sure of the wording of that. If a person is elected as a lay delegate and they happen to be a deacon, then of course they would have a vote. However, I would be cautious of giving those congregations that employ several deacons and increased voice through vote at conventions. A representative number of deacon voters should suffice to have their voice heard without providing an apparent imbalance and unfairness to other congregations.
150. Too many chiefs- not enough Indians.
151. Either a person is a member of the clergy or a person is not. We've created this weird "in-between" position of Deacon, and thus created confusion about their role. If we're not going to provide for a Diaconal vote in some other manner, then yes, they should be able to serve as voting lay delegates.
152. Very similar question as # 25, so I have the same opinion. Don't know the original reason that deacons are not allowed to vote, but would like to know the original reason.
153. Either a person is a member of the clergy or a person is not. We've created this weird "in-between" position of Deacon, and thus created confusion about their role. If we're not going

to provide for a Diaconal vote in some other manner, then yes, they should be able to serve as voting lay delegates.

154. They should not have a vote just because they are a Deacon. They can, however, be selected as a voting delegate by the congregation members, or if they are serving a congregation with no current pastor.
155. It should be mandatory that Deacons represent their congregations as a non voting delegate in addition to a lay person being sent by the congregation as a voting delegate.
156. A deacon may not have the same perspective as a lay delegate.
157. If appointed as a lay delegate at the circuit level, no problem
158. Let them vote as a professional Church worker.
159. They are not truly "lay".
160. Maybe... but this is not the core issue at all. Under the current model, this would be a good change.
161. Again should not unbalance the vote of lay and clergy.
162. Under the current structure, this would be a good change (giving them at least a chance to be a voting delegate if their congregation chooses them to represent congregational interests), but this is not the core issue!
163. Only if that deacon has been voted as that congregation's delegate and the Pastor is unable to attend.
164. Especially if there is no lay delegate available to attend.
165. I do not know enough about the role of the Deacon.
166. if they are in good standing, why not
167. As one who serves closely as an assistant to the pastor, although a deacon is also still part of the laity, he or she has been somewhat set apart from the laity. To some extent he or she is neither fish nor fowl. Deacons should either have a vote or no vote and not come in as either lay or clergy.
168. only if they have served for a certain number of Sunday's in a year (a number which is yet to be determined).
169. That is the only category that makes any theological sense for a Deacon.
170. All members of a congregation should have an equal vote
171. This should be for pastors only.
172. They should only vote by virtue of their professional purpose
173. Deacons are church workers not lay persons. They should be able to vote as a church worker.
174. If this is the congregation's choice for its "lay" representative, then they should have the right to so choose.
175. A Deacon would be under a different category than a lay person, so should not be a voting lay delegate
176. When a lay delegate is not available perhaps
177. This set of questions is nearly impossible to answer conscientiously. I'm a lay person who has never been to a convention. From all the questions, it seems like the issue of who gets to vote is a problem, but I don't know enough about it to voice an intelligent opinion.
178. If the congregation has confidence in that person, yes.
179. In various areas of the country we seem to be hurting for people to be available and ready as well as interested in making their contributions as to the running/organization of church business.

180. Deacons are the same status as pastors, and therefore votes are unfair as deacons become the lay representatives. The positions are biased. The vote results are known before they are asked.
181. Deacons are NOT lay members so why would they be voting lay delegates. Deacons are Advisory with a voice.
182. That is the only way they can, as they are not clergy!!!
183. Deacons fall under pastoral supervision. Their pastors will have the church's best interest in mind when they cast their lot.
184. Somehow that works a bit more for me than the above but I'd still like to see more lay delegates that are not in full time ministry as the cong. rep. so that things in congs do not become top down leadership. Leadership but not top down.
185. RETIRED DEACON SHOULD BE ABLE TO REPRESENT THEIR CONGREGATION BUT ONLY AS A LAY PERSON
186. If there is no one else.
187. Our church congregation has no Deacon.
188. Again, if there is no lay person wishing to represent then it would be better than forfeiting the congregations vote.
189. If a congregation does not have a regular Pastor, an advisory Deacon would be a good alternative to have the concerns of those congregations addressed.
190. Would undercut lay representation even more; as it is a number of pastor's wives have attended as lay delegates.
191. I certainly feel that the Deacon's opinions are not valued. We are trained, professional church workers, we have signed the Constitution of Lutheran Church Canada, and yet we are not recognized as people. We are neither Pastors nor lay people. Please do not misunderstand. I am not saying that congregations with more than one church worker (Pastor or Deacon) should have more than one vote. Rather, I am stating that Deacons should not be excluded from voting simply because they are Deacons.
192. In substitution for a lay delegate.
193. If the pastor is not able to do this, it should transfer down the line to the next "trained and involved" party.
194. We should not try to repave our lay representation with professional church workers.
195. If Deacons aren't
196. Deacons are members of synod and should be subject to the same rules as clergy. Therefore, if a pastor is a voting delegate, the synodical delegate for that congregation is the pastor and the deacon should not have a vote. Same thing with roles reversed.
197. although they would attend convention in their capacity as a member of a congregation, and not in their capacity as a deacon.
198. If the congregation has no Pastor
199. Deacons are not laypeople. But they are not pastors either. They are neither and should be considered neutral and as such be given a separate vote by virtue of their office in the church. This won't affect the 50:50 balance.
200. They are staff and should be treated as such.

28. Some circuits may need to be restructured geographically.

1. Without map and/or boundary?

2. Maybe, if for example one area has 200 congregations and the adjoining area only 50.
3. If that is what is decided, I will support it, but there are some very isolated churches that already have a hard time with making it to Winkels, I don't see how this could be improved.
4. Just remember when geographical areas become too large you lose the personal touch. Distances too great to travel. Contacts lost.
5. For sure! I'm not sure we need them!?
6. possibly
7. This should be allowed with consultation.
8. There are pros and cons to this idea. Weigh benefits very carefully. Perspectives, attitudes, desires and lifestyle in differing communities can both help or hinder. Active membership #s also impact planning and thinking.
9. Consideration for country and city differences / perspectives many vary. Perhaps even small active memberships should play a part in determining boundaries. Just a thought.
10. Congregations in far North and far South are bound to be very different in their cultural needs.
11. Whatever benefits the expansion of the Kingdom - with consideration of costs and travel.
12. Not enough member congregations in the circuit
13. How would I know that?
14. Restructured by geography and population.
15. Absolutely - and by number of members/population.
16. why?
17. The use of a pastor to be a circuit counsels is unacceptable and wrong. The burden placed as an unpaid servant on behalf of the president is inappropriate. The burden on that congregation of the circuit counsellor is unfair. Circuits are a US concept and do not work in Canada. Create regional groupings of congregations with paid resource people to pull those congregations together in ministry. Canadian churches need to see themselves as part of a large multi campus ministry with satellite worship locations. Isn't is disgraceful that congregations in cities are so territorial and suspicious of their fellow congregations?
18. not sure and why you need this. again no explanation of this to help to answer it. what is the agenda?
19. The key word is "may." I think this should be seriously looked at.
20. Maybe they are fine, but a review is necessary.
21. If needed- use common sense on use of time for circuit functions.
22. It seems to have worked so far.
23. like Moncton, Ottawa Valley and Northern Ontario.
24. One way to deal with this would be to go with a deanery model or similar with a regional parish.
25. this should be done if the need is apparent.
26. Some circuits large - others small - with many miles between. Some made up with few congregations.
27. This is already happening and is ongoing.
28. What does this mean?
29. should not have to make more
30. Not familiar with enough circuits across Canada.
31. This ties into our need for efficiency. Everything to strengthen our church and increase its ability to respond in a timely manner is a good thing.

32. This seems to be an ongoing item that is addressed.
33. Circuits are the most natural first-level hierarchical unit in synod. They should remain relatively localized.
34. Why have circuits anymore. We have far fewer members and congregants than we did when they were initially created. The current format should be updated or completely overhauled.
35. B.C. is very rural in nature - some Pastors now driving 3/4 hours to attend circuit meetings.
36. I think those decisions can be left to those people in those circuits.
37. Yes, we are a huge country with many miles between.
38. I agree with this only if there is a good reason to. If geographically there is a need to better serve by restructuring, then it should happen.
39. I'm assuming it's been many years since the lines were drawn? Considering that my own hometown grew from 55,000 to 70,000 in the last four years alone, I'm guessing populations may be far out of whack within current circuits by now.
40. not sure why we have circuits at all - one more layer
41. I think the circuits are ok as they are.
42. it is possible. and probably likely
43. i.e. Ottawa circuit- Timmins, ON to Newfoundland. Or at least co-circuit counselors.
44. For what reason??
45. I suppose if necessary
46. If it benefits the circuits - sure.
47. I am not in a position to answer this as I do not know. This could be a question going forward to the congregations following the compilation of the survey results.
48. B.C. is very large, congregations spread out - some Pastors driving 3/4 hours to attend Circuit Meetings.
49. Agree, but what would the restructured regions look like? What criteria would be used to restructure?
50. Regina - South Saskatchewan, South Alberta (Lethbridge Circuit) and Calgary, Vancouver-Fraser Valley.
51. -losing some of the smaller churches may mean some will need to be combined.
52. I am not aware of any specific need in this way, but perhaps if problems have presented themselves, it would be a good idea.
53. Possible reasons may be due to the number of congregations in an area or distance between congregations in a circuit. Also, if the restructuring means that the tasks of circuits change then the size of circuits may be adjusted to suit the new objectives.
54. But how with the geography of Canada?
55. I expect that some circuits have experienced changes in the number of congregations, pastors, and members over the years.
56. Not enough information
57. Where the circuit has a concern, that may be brought forward at to the District Synod
58. geography for our circuit seems appropriate - could see there are possible concerns elsewhere.
59. It is possible that some circuits cover too large of an area and need to be restructured. Our circuit I believe is fine.
60. I thought this is how they are already set up.
61. As long as voting is by consensus
62. I think some circuits are just going to be hard to restructure period!

63. for what purpose? First synod, then district should be restructured. Then address the need for support and guidance to our pastors. Circuit structures are not the problem, only because everything is left to the circuit. There should be pastoral (i.e. bishop) representation from district to the circuits
64. I do not have enough knowledge of circuit geography to make an evaluation.
65. I am not sure. Perhaps some cover too great an area. I believe that the circuit that our congregation is part of is fine.
66. If we were to maintain the current definition of circuit, this would likely have to happen. That said, perhaps it would be best to consider geographical distance in the definition of a circuit.
67. Yes, church dynamics are changing and churches are closing not growing so I would think geographical restructuring is in the future
68. Quite probably in my opinion but only if it improves a result
69. Once again duplication of services. All serve God - common and only reason.
70. Some?
71. Red River Circuit is fine.
72. not too familiar but realize needs change.
73. Don't have enough information
74. Churches have come and gone and therefore geographic restructuring in the interest of better collaboration and communication of churches is warranted.
75. Depends on the area covered
76. I see no issue with the current circuit lines, however, an individual from another congregation may see things differently.
77. depending on what purpose a 'circuit' is to serve. Is this even a necessary concept under current circumstances?
78. Have no knowledge of other circuits
79. Likely as populations decline in rural areas some circuits may lose their voice.
80. Not the issue, its using the bylaws and constitution and taking action to enforce consequence not redefining boundaries with same issues.
81. The district we are currently in is huge which makes it hard for the pastors to get together, and it makes it difficult, if not impossible for us to have any place in the district.
82. If it improves the functionality
83. 25 to 28 - not knowledgeable
84. Don't have enough information to make a decision regarding this statement.
85. what is the criteria
86. Perhaps, but I am not aware of any present need or rationale for doing so.
87. The distance between congregations always says the same. The congregations in large cities like Edmonton and Calgary should be in their own circuit. Their ministry is different than the more rural congregations
88. That might depend on the convenience of the present structure.
89. It would seem, with churches being merged (e.g. dual and triple parish) new roads being built, etc. that it would make sense to at least re-assess the structure of our present circuits.
90. Canada still has same geography
91. Change a circuit only at the request of the circuit.
92. Do we need three Districts with a number of circuits as well

93. Some circuits are too big geographically to be able to function as normal circuits (e.g. Ottawa Circuit). Restructuring them geographically won't solve this problem, except by having more and smaller circuits, which would lead to other problems. May have to rework what some circuits do, or what their mandate is, to deal with geographic realities.
94. I'm not informed enough to make a logical choice on this one.
95. If services at district office level are reduced, our grass roots approach may need be different within the circuits to interact with one another.
96. Don't know have a clue why
97. If this is necessary, I have no objection.
98. I cannot create an opinion on this matter as I have not taken part in circuit events for the most part.
99. If it makes sense.
100. I don't know the current situation.
101. Circuits should be able to request restructuring if they feel they could function better with a change in alignment.
102. Why?
103. I am open to this idea, but I'm not sure of all the implications of this.
104. With the large size of the districts, there will always be problems no matter how you slice the pie
105. Perhaps...but the goal should be to be able to bring people together more easily and not the opposite. If circuits become too big, it makes it impossible for some pastors to attend circuit meetings.
106. Always good to look at the geography on a regularly scheduled basis to ensure it still makes sense. What I see happening is that the Lutheran church closest to us is actually over the border into the next circuit. That means that we really have no contact with one of our closest neighbors. There are no announcements about their activities. We do not invite each other to our activities, we don't really share anything. They could be Baptists for all we know. The circuit structure can divide as easily as it unites.
107. And perhaps linked with low cost video meetings to reduce the call on resources
108. But Canada is a very big country with a number of small congregations.
109. This question is ambiguous. Does this mean if restructuring occurs or under the current setup? No particular need right now. In future it would depend on whether or how restructuring occurs.
110. if we keep circuits, then re-alignments might be necessary. However, they might not be geographical alone. We may wish to consider travel time including air travel. For instance, some Maritime work can get to Hamilton or Toronto faster by plane then to other destinations apart from air travel.
111. There are some areas of concern particularly in rural areas
112. geography for a country matters not so much for a church
113. all circuits need to be restructured
114. I don't have enough info. Avoiding duplication is beneficial, but pastors draw much needed support from the circuit. If the circuit is too large or too small that support will not be there.
115. For some the geographical distance is far too big and does create challenges for clergy and lay people to carry out the affairs of the circuit safely, especially during the winter months, when daylight hours are limited.

116. I can't speak to individual circuits, but we should certainly do what makes the most sense. If there are congregations that are close together but located in two different districts, that should probably be fixed.
117. Possibly. This has certainly been done in the past in my experience. The congregation at Grand Cache in Alberta was moved from the Stony Plain Circuit to the Peace River Circuit when transportation accessibility changed. The Edmonton circuits were also realigned some years ago. This seems self evident. There is no reason that circuit boundaries be set in stone. Functional circuits should be retained.
118. We should be willing to consider this.
119. Decreasing individual congregation sizes = more amalgamation (dissolved, dual & tri - parishes) = possible circuit re-alignment.
120. don't know how they are structured now.
121. I would never have known how to answer this if I had not attended the presentation put on by my pastor.
122. With the change in demographics, restructuring may be necessary from time to time.
123. If possible. Geography doesn't work with our declining congregations.
124. Don't see why not, if deemed beneficial.
125. Our circuit is very large. Circuit needs to be considered - however travel needs to be considered in the deciding of size/locations.
126. Sure, but it doesn't matter much, I don't see that circuits are very important.
127. Many congregations are in decline or have closed down. Circuits should be rearranged to reflect that.
128. This should be an on-going consideration do to any changes in that particular area
129. Some of our Circuits stretch right across an entire province, making it impossible for congregations to meet regularly.
130. Perhaps.
131. I'm not currently aware of the current map of circuits in the LCC, but there's nothing wrong with periodically recasting them as situations change.
132. Some are too large to effectively meet together with any regular frequency.
133. Do we need circuits as such?
134. It's a fact that some congregations are struggling and have to face the reality of their situation.
135. Definitely
136. This is a useless question. Why worry about the geography of circuits if you have no clue whether you are even going to keep circuits in their current fashion. It seems like the CCMS already has a decision made as to what the new structure will be, and this survey is just paying lip service to synod-wide input. I hope that's not the case.
137. Sure, as the need is be for proper order.
138. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
139. The Central District has had to ratify such restructuring at their last two conventions.
140. The members of each circuit should determine this for their own circuit.
141. That should be decided by those involved.
142. Not sure of any concerns now to need change.
143. Many of our circuits, like all our districts, are too large. There is a maximum number beyond which congregations and pastors cannot provide one another with the caring, knowledgeable

support circuits should provide. I suggest that number is seven. If another congregation is established, the circuit should be split into two circuits.
144. This statement is nonsense and misleading. Currently Circuits are structured geographically.
145. A mix of urban and rural congregations may not work well.
146. see above notes. They need to be more present in the lives of the congregations.
147. This should be ongoing, especially if we keep in mind what is happening to Lutheran congregations with regard to membership and the availability of Pastors.
148. Circuits should be disbanded
149. Demographics are always changing. Membership is shifting.
150. Many churches are having to close or have part time pastors therefore we likely need to restructure
151. Based on membership(population) numbers
152. May be necessary as numbers and sizes of congregation change.
153. I don't know what the existing circuit geographical boundaries are so I cannot comment.
154. Quebec east
155. Many of our circuits in the Central District are huge already. I do not think any change to be made to enlarge any of our circuits would be wise. At that same time there are too few pastors in some areas that would allow for any smaller circuits that already exist in the Central District.
156. It's important to consider the geography very carefully in order to avoid making a circuit so large that congregational visits by the Counsellor/Visitor would become impossible to accomplish. Very large circuits may also make ecclesiastical supervision in the area or calls for vacant congregations a hardship. Super Circuits could also create unintended inequality within the board of circuit counsellors.
157. maybe
158. I don't know enough about all the circuits to be able to answer this.
159. I do not know what the benefits of this restructuring would be.
160. Due to shifting population demographics
161. Also, discussions on churches merging should be presented more frequently.
162. It's ok here.
163. If there are still circuits in the new structure in the form they are in today. Some changes need to happen at the circuit level as well.
164. One circuit for Manitoba and combine some other circuits in Canada. Overall less circuits.
165. No knowledge about this to make an informed opinion!
166. I don't know
167. I don't know.
168. How often do I have to repeat myself; As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. This should also include changing circuits as required. LCC should always be open to change and at the same time we do not have to change just for change sake.
169. Does it make sense to have geographic districts? See the LCMS "English District"
170. Do what is necessary (if anything) after careful study and prayer.
171. I don't see any value in local geographic circuitry. There are apparently some communications and cooperation at the bureaucratic level, but I never see the people of local congregations having anything to do with each other.
172. Once we eliminate districts, some circuits may need to be re structured.

173. Work with zones - Vancouver Island - meet in Nanaimo; British Columbia Mainland - meet in Vancouver, Prince George, Kamloops; Alberta-meet in Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary; Saskatchewan-meet in Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Regina; Manitoba-meet in Winnipeg, Brandon, Steinbach; Ontario-meet in Thunder Bay, Toronto, Ottawa; Quebec need to understand the impact of doing that and it fits with the right structure
174. Divide into zones.... Vancouver Island-meet in Nanaimo; Mainland BC-meet in Vancouver, Prince George, Kamloops; Alberta and Maritimes-meet where ever West Jet flies....
175. Would
176. -meet in Edmonton, Red Deer or Calgary; Saskatchewan-meet in Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Regina; Manitoba-Winnipeg, Brandon, Steinbach; Ontario-Thunder Bay, Toronto, Ottawa...follow West Jet for flights to various locations...
177. surely provision for such adjustments already exists
178. There may be need for change, but that would be up to each circuit.
179. What is the purpose of the circuit? Why do we have them? That will guide whether geographic restructuring is required. Is it to provide delegates to convention? Why do we have convention? Go back to the actual purpose of these entities and events and that will guide the answers to these questions.
180. Please be careful with this. There are some circuits that are very happy with the status quo. They get along with all members of their group.
181. This depends on the individual circumstances and needs of the area. I think every situation would need to considered individually.
182. depending on what is practical for travel.
183. If a review is conduct end and if it appears that the circuits should be changed or restructured geographically differently so that operations can be conducted more efficiently, yes make the changes accordingly.
184. Restructuring our circuits should happen as we restructure Synod.
185. We do this all the time -- of course it should be an option. It is more likely a reality.
186. The circuits and the CCMS should be open to this possibility.
187. Happens all the time
188. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
189. Of course. This is an o-going process, and circuit alignments change from time to time.
190. If there is reason to change the circuit structure/geography, then I think it should be done. We should not cling to the previous pattern for sake of tradition.
191. do they? maybe - as in the word "may" above. I have no idea but hey, why not? "should" they? - still no idea
192. Do we need circuits?
193. There is a large area District in our remote part of Ontario. Weather makes a huge impact on travel here.
194. Some circuits are smaller than others.
195. If they NEED to be restructured why would that be a problem. If the reason for restructuring is other than NEED then that would make it questionable - wouldn't it?
196. I am unsure of the circuits boundaries and the reason for this statement. Is it because pastors are too far apart from fellow clergy for support or is it a matter of the # of delegates per circuit. This question is too vague.
197. This is already occurring in some regions.
198. do not know the structure now to be able to comment

199. Our country is massive with most parts of it sparsely populated, we need to figure out how best to serve people through taking into account the geography of our land.
200. if there is an identified need for this to be done, then absolutely. If it is restructuring geographically just for a change, then no. There are many relationships that have been established over the years within circuits by pastors, deacons and congregations.
201. If it is cost saving it may be required
202. I feel that the circuits are structured in a functional manner at this time
203. I do not know enough about the current geographic situations of all circuits. I would assume that this issue should be looked at and evaluated by those involved in order to see if such changes would be beneficial.
204. The entire East GTA is long overdue -harvest is ripe - as Billy Graham said the Lutherans are nice -sleeping in their pews.
205. not enough information as to why this might be necessary
206. not sure why
207. Distance can be a strong factor.
208. This all depends on what we're going to try to accomplish together, and how.
209. There have been many changes in size to some congregations and also some church closures so this would be a good time to look at geographical changes also.
210. If Districts remain, they should be equal in population.
211. Have no idea, outside of our circuit, I don't know the situation in other circuits, or what they look like or need. I believe our circuit works well.
212. I'm sure this is true. Just don't do it very often because the change can be disruptive and expensive.
213. No one wants to drive three or more hours to a circuit meeting.
214. If we move toward the circuit system in our Church rather than District we may need to consider populations a little more closely.
215. But this survey is about Synod restructuring.
216. I believe the circuits could be discontinued. Use Synod and District model.
217. Circuits may need to be discontinued. This could be a layer of governance removed.
218. I believe circuit counsellors should play more role of district president would. more like a bishop at local level. They should also have more authority in addressing congregations' issues when the pastor is being bullied over doctrinal or practice matters.
219. There will never be a perfect system for circuits, this is the challenge geography in Canada, but we need to be open to considering how the current system can be improved.
220. Maybe, if it makes sense.
221. Maybe... if it makes sense.
222. Should be based on membership numbers. Although this will result in some large areas.
223. The shift in population should be reflected.
224. I am not sure that this should be a direct concern of the CCMS within the restructuring process. This is a matter of the grass-roots level which can be adjusted over time. Let's look at the national structure (get rid of our current Districts).
225. e.g. East District's Ottawa Circuit which includes much of Eastern Canada: part of Ontario and 5 entire provinces
226. Synod needs to be restructured geographically.
227. as more congregations become "dual" or Triple parishes, it will become a requirement
228. Does not really matter.

229. Don't have enough information on current "borders"
230. But only with conversation of the parties involved.
231. Is there a problem that needs fixing, or is this a make work project?
232. Elaborate on terms that are unfamiliar (I do know what a circuit is but many lay persons will not). Circuits should reduce the travel time and restructuring the geographically could alleviate this.
233. Ha! Can you mix up BC with Ontario? I know it is foolish from me----
234. Some circuits are so gigantic that they become nearly impossible to deal with
235. If it seems like a good idea, yes.
236. I.E. Saskatchewan, Manitoba and other rural areas of our country
237. BUT with so many miles between parishes, this really is not practical
238. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. This should also include changing circuits as required. LCC should always be open to change and at the same time we do not have to change just for change sake.
239. does that really matter? Shouldn't we be focusing on the Word?
240. I don't know enough about circuit forums since I joined the LCC in 2010
241. is this not done at a district level as needed?
242. Tis the people not the land base that causes problems and concerns
243. If restructuring means combining if it makes sense.
244. Not sure.
245. Cariboo and Ottawa circuits are good examples.
246. I'm not sure on this one, but I think that each circuit should have an equal number of "Lutherans".
247. One circuit in ABC District has a BC Congregation in it that I know of. This congregation is too far from most of the other congregations in this Circuit. All congregations should be within 100 kms from each other for easy access to meetings, etc.
248. LCC should always be open to change. Not for change sake but for the betterment of the Church.
249. Geographical separation today is not like it was before roads, railroads and airplanes. We need to be more concerned about "political" separation. LCC needs to be of one mind under one GOD.
250. I think it would be a good time to look at the geography of all circuits and restructure them according to membership, size, and distance
251. The ABC and Central Districts are fine. I am not sure of the issues the Eastern District may be facing.
252. As long as there is good evidence for the benefits, of course
253. For example, should Sherwood Park not be included in the Elk Island circuit?
254. Demographics change and the church needs to reflect these alterations.
255. Not in BC
256. We already did the work here in south Sask.
257. I don't know enough about this subject to offer opinion.
258. If we do away with Districts, obviously circuits (if we are going to use that designation for such a structure) will need restructuring.
259. Restructuring should be based on what best serves the needs of the people in the area.
260. although I can't make any specific recommendations in this area.

261. The Ottawa Valley circuit is a monstrosity by any measure, extending from Timmins to Newfoundland.
262. Some need restructuring due to loss of congregations
263. ~ we are to have a minimum number of congregations when it drops below that than restructuring should be a first order of business for a BoD. I have heard from family and friends in the LC-MS when this occurs problems have arisen. Federally and provincially the may is always being changed. Why should we think we are any different?

29. Circuit forums are a meaningful part of LCC.

1. What are circuit forums? If it is the same as a District Convention, then call it that!
2. That being said, it would seem that my opinion is in the minority.
3. I would hope so, we get little information.
4. For the most part they are poorly attended and the congregations do not seem to be part of them.
5. If they are attended, only every three years how much can they relay?
6. Do not know. Have never been to one.
7. Circuit forums - need to be open to all LCC members, if they wish to attend to gain knowledge of District and Synod plans.
8. Just another level - expense. Could be replaced with district planning and congregational visits as I've described.
9. We have had some, but I'm not sure how beneficial. It's hard to get lay representation as many members do not see the need to be in close contact with other congregations.
10. Absolutely. Sharing and support of each other very important.
11. Since moved to only needing to meet once every three years they no longer serve their purpose of information exchange.
12. meaningful thought sharing and support
13. Would be nice to hear results/decisions made at circuit forums.
14. Need larger turnout for these meetings.
15. Because of High Church ministers ours has been stopped.
16. A vital bond between district and congregation.

a. pastors and circuit counsellors need to provide better quality topics and make lay people aware of the theological issues that arise at the seminaries, in sister synods and the like - provide clear instruction on social issues changing in Canadian society

17. Never attended one do they have them in ABC district.
18. They could become meaningful, if lay people were to have an understanding of why they are important.
19. If the congregation is being debriefed after a forum by delegates/pastor. (our congregation - not so much)
20. could be but have not been yet.,
21. until circuit forums, even if they ever happen to be held, begin to have some meaningful purpose, they will never become anything. Give them some reason to be and then things might change. the other thing that needs to end now is circuit pastoral meetings (sometimes still called that offensive ethnic name Winkel). Without lay voice, these meetings have become opportunities for pastors to complain about their churches, or at least that is the suspicion of lay people. Laity needs an opportunity to defend itself if complaints are being made.

22. They serve an important function of keeping the laity informed and capable of voting for officers and on issues at conventions.
23. you're not listening to small groups, waste of time if not doing anything valuable with it.
24. Not currently, though the design is not all bad.
25. They could be, but in my experience they have not been presented as such to the lay people.
26. A waste of time for everyone.
27. though I loath to admit that they are not.
28. They could and should be... but too many pastors don't put nearly enough importance, or effort on them...
29. Dependent.
30. Only those who have attended would know. Communication is indeed vital. More information shared is always valuable.
31. Why? It's a free trip and meal and time for smoozing for some.
32. Depends how informed and knowledgeable the reps are within the circuit.
33. More circuit forums would provide the opportunities for more inter-church dialogue and, hopefully, encourage education and sharing of skill and financial resources.
34. Unknown
35. There are generally poorly attended with minimal business-usually just to appoint convention delegates.
36. It is difficult to get lay people to attend in some circuits e.g. distance, time of year.
37. Pastors should have a time to get together to share and refuel.
38. They need to be more strongly and regularly structured for LAY training in congregational activities. How many successful businesses today survive using untrained, inexperienced laity with little or no previous training or experience for the position they are elected to fill? And this is not the job of the Pastor!!
39. I believe there is value in circuit forums. However, from what I see their value is not being utilized in a useful way.
40. I've attended and even presented at circuit forum meetings. They are small enough to be effective, potentially. But they would need far greater decision-making authority. A bishop should be put in charge of each circuit. All bishops should be full-time pastors of one of the congregations in the circuit. This way we can eliminate all the useless full-time bureaucracy (DPs, mission executives, etc.).
41. Without them, even less contact with t people of other congregations in circuit would occur. Nevertheless, if another vehicle or setting that would attract us as Christians in common purpose or mission might draw together besides meeting around a legislated agenda, it would be great to have such motivated interest and purpose drive these, rather than mere obligation to meet, as it seems so many feel it is.
42. I imagine they provide a means for airing concerns and bolstering one another's faith in trying times.
43. Circuit forums that I've attended have been poorly organized, very poorly publicized and, consequently, very poorly attended.
44. Do they even happen anymore?
45. I know little about them, but I would think meetings would be helpful.
46. Meetings on all levels are always needed. There are issues that need to be discussed that can help to find solutions or help to bring on track things happening locally and across the country. Removing meetings from all levels would find us more distant and fractured rather

than more aware and involved. The issue is not the meetings but that the conclusions from them are enacted and acted upon. Some of our problems have been with the actions or I should say inactivity from the meetings.

47. However, it has to be utilized effectively.
48. They are, if people can attend them. I freely admit our circuit is so big that I don't attend any event happening at a congregation other that my own. I have an unbeliever for a husband and am pregnant with my second child. I'm afraid competing priorities take precedence.
49. Circuit forums are currently dominated by Clergy ... and our Clergy, at least locally, do not work well together. They each do their own thing. Doesn't appear to be any evidence of team-work, of many-hands-make-light-work, of encouraging interactions amongst Congregations. When it comes to "United, we stand; Divided, we fall", they don't walk the talk.
50. Need improvement
51. I do not know; we have no information to our congregation
52. They should be, we've never known or heard about any forums open to lay people
53. Should be but aren't
54. They have not been well done in any circuit I have been a part of.
55. Need to know what they are about.
56. I am assuming you are referring to Winkels
57. We really have had little involvement in a forum but anything to connect and help members to better understand the workings of LCC would be very beneficial.
58. They can be, but are they? We need more of them.
59. We only meet to elect delegates to Synod Convention.
60. Could become meaningful but requires change in ethos as well as format... The draw for more than business needs to be there. Need to build/encourage synodical family!
61. Been to some - great discussion and ideas but rarely any follow through.
62. Knowing what other delegates in the circuit think can be useful when forming opinions or actions.
63. As congregations grow smaller and perhaps more isolated, there will be even greater need and importance of meeting as a circuit to receive/share information and discuss current issues. The opportunity to support one another and fellowship with one another is appreciated.
64. The problem is that some circuits have not had a "meaningful" forum in years and only got together when it was necessary to elect convention delegates. In my current circuit the congregations largely "do their own thing" without particular regard to the interests or well-being of sister parishes. The same might be said of some pastors who--for whatever reason--prefer to be "loners".
65. Apparently our circuit has not been holding forums for some time.
66. The problem has been that Circuits have not held Circuit Forums. Each congregation has acted like "an island" and not part of a larger family.
67. it gives each congregation opportunity to discuss how to further the mission of the church in their specific area.
68. As long as decisions are not railroaded
69. don't hear about them congregationally, and not encouraged to attend
70. I have never heard of or been invited to one (circuit forum) in our circuit.
71. yes, because they are self supporting in the void and lack for any other support

72. Minimize travelling, time and cost. As long as communication lines are open, honest and accurate, lighten workload and hopefully conflicts are resolved promptly
73. If the forums are taking place, they can be beneficial. Geographical considerations can make this a challenge.
74. I think so each circuit can learn from each other but there again.... communication
75. On some level, yes they are but they are also too large a group and it would be great if there was a way to change that to improve communication and information from everyone.
76. No communications.
77. Circuit forums are a good place to share information, also for fellowship.
78. Who attends, who benefits?
79. Mutual support for pastors is necessary.
80. However, they are poorly attended and there needs to be more encouragement in having our lay people attend these forums to better understand what is happening in our circuits, District and Synod. Perhaps we need to offer more food!! That always brings people out!! All kidding aside, there needs to be better communication regarding these forums and the important role they can play.
81. I think they could be and used to be years ago, but in our experience they have not been happening for many years. Under a new synod structure, I would like to see these resurrected and organized by someone designated under the new structure to make sure this happens.
82. They are critical in helping to serve the congregations effectively and to better the ministry of the Church.
83. When they were used properly, they were meaningful. Circuit forums should be reinstituted and supported.
84. I think some have been useful.
85. I agree the Pastors should meet, but have no idea what actually goes on.
86. If this is for Pastors, then this is important that they all attend and add value for each other.
87. Peoples voices need to be heard at a wider level than congregation only. Not advertised that well.
88. Not given ABC District example of what has happened.
89. I have heard less and less about circuit forums in recent years. Are we using them and/or do they currently fill the purpose we have given them?
90. As a lay person I have no idea.
91. They should be, they would be an expression of more local concerns / viewpoints
92. In some places they function well. In others they do not function at all.
93. I think pastors meeting together to discuss problems, concerns, etc. freely is beneficial.
94. Keeps churches abreast of the needs each other has.
95. Yes, a good method on communicating. In our circuit they don't seem to be held much anymore. Can't remember the last time I heard about one happening and I am the treasurer of our congregation. A suggestion could be to have 2/3 circuits have their forms together and maybe break off into groups for items that may only concern one circuit.
96. But they can be poorly attended
97. Pastors need to be accountable to one another. The less a Pastor is a lone wolf within the synod the better. Synod should strive for unity and uniformity in doctrine and practice and circuit forums ought to be geared at fostering this. Attendance should be taken each forum and reviewed annually by the district president who will follow up and inquire if and why a

pastor is reclusive toward his brothers. "Pay careful attention to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to care for the church of God, which he obtained with his own blood. I know that after my departure fierce wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves will arise men speaking twisted things, to draw away the disciples after them" (Acts 20:21).

98. Not the way they are now with lay people not interested because clergy dominate and it is so hard for us lay people to speak up and differ with a pastor or other church " professional."
99. It could be a way of improving Interchurch relations.
100. should meet every 4 months with at least 3 lay delegates from each congregation. The lay delegates should have differing opinions
101. need to know how they work in order to assess
102. ...though it would be nice if they were.
103. Not always attended
104. Some forums may be meaningful but not within the circuit I belong.
105. Ask a Pastor
106. Circuits need to be encouraged to meet regularly. The practice seems to have fallen into disuse, but should be revived.
107. They could be if guest presenters could be brought in and draw the lay to attend
108. Circuit forums were a good idea but in most circuits there aren't enough interested and dedicated people to carry them out as originally planned.
109. This Circuit has not had a forum for a number of years. They could be very useful in building relationships between congregations and for planning as a circuit instead of as individual congregations.
110. They could be, but they have not been. It is a good concept, but in practice it is left to exhausted pastors to plan and execute. Do congregations participate in what we are currently doing?
111. I am unsure as to their effectiveness?
112. They should be but I am not adequately enough informed to know whether, indeed, they are.
113. Circuit forums are a waste of time
114. They can be but sometimes they seem to re-hash the same stuff -- little progress is made.
115. Are usually a great resource.
116. Just a shame some pastors ignore them completely
117. My only real involvement with the circuit is having other circuit pastors officiating Advent and Lenten midweek services. This is nice, but I suspect this question has more in mind than only this. Speaking as a layman and a new member, I do not know what the benefit of being organized in circuits is. I wonder if it is an outdated mode of organization?
118. They should, but in our circuit there seems to be no interest on the part of lay persons - except for special needs.
119. I think it is valuable for geographically and geo-politically similar congregations should have the opportunity to meet and discuss issues relevant to them. It also provides an opportunity to mingle and support churches in the region.
120. If you mean winkles, then yes.
121. Currently, they do not seem to be utilized very much. I think they have potential, but am not sure how to resurrect them and have the people support circuit forums.

122. They could and should be; I don't see that this possibility is being utilized, for example, in Edmonton where due to the CEF crisis several congregations are in big trouble and could benefit from a cooperative effort.
123. I have never attended a circuit forum but I think they could be a meaningful part of LCC.
124. don't know what they do
125. Never hear of results from them how can we have an opinion
126. Circuit forums do present valuable information BUT are poorly attended by congregations and there is no encouragement for members to attend
127. I suppose they are, but since I am a layperson, and almost never here about what happens at these forums, I really have no idea if they are meaningful or not.
128. No knowledge
129. I understand that Circuit forums can be very beneficial to the pastors. Should there be a similar structure for Congregational Chairs?
130. These too can be done with no travel and hotel costs.
131. It seems to depend entirely upon the circuit membership, both clergy and lay.
132. Today circuits must be able to operate without the travel requirements. E meeting are much more relevant and practical
133. I see no evidence of useful outcome form the circuit structure other than fellowship for pastors which they can organize themselves. Circuit should engage a board cross section of laity with the pastors in making shared decision about ministry integration within the area served by a circuit.
134. Unknown...
135. Maybe for the dedicated members of a congregation, the forums are important. For most members it isn't a high priority.
136. Circuit forums COULD be a meaningful part of LCC if church leadership listened
137. They would not be missed.
138. They don't exist for laypeople. Do you mean the Winkels? If no, I agree. Laypeople have little or no input circuit wise.
139. It doesn’t agree with forced need to do something because it is process only have opportunity if need
140. Only if they are well advertised
141. Distances create financial problems for getting together, unless by technology.
142. They COULD be meaningful if they did what the bylaws say they are meant to do. However, their effectiveness has faltered due to the lack of support by the clergy in general. They have lost most of their effectiveness because the CCMS & convention watered them down by only requiring a meeting every 3 years.
143. Circuit Forums used to be very useful and much more frequent occurrences. Certainly they were a chance for spiritual growth, info sharing and a wonderful opportunity to meet other people from other churches. Now I think they are held just to elect delegates.
144. However, the last two circuit forums I attended in the past six months were really academic exercises and a review of "Lutheranism" and didn't really accomplish the reason for calling such a forum. We have a number of congregations struggling to survive but the issue is not being discussed.
145. Some people like them but most members of our congregation ignore them. I don't find them compelling.

146. more is accomplished at circuit forum level. Discussions more open, frank and all sides get their input heard to whatever the issue at hand is
147. Not sure if you are referring to pastors' meetings or?
148. I think they become another level of meeting - we need fewer meetings and more activity on behalf of our faith.
149. They could be a meaningful part of LCC; but they need bolstering, as in their current state they seem to do very little. If circuits (better termed "dioceses") had stronger local ecclesiastical leadership (in the form of a local "bishop") then I could imagine these forums providing much to the spiritual life and pastoral care of LCC members.
150. I have not participated in one.
151. Of course I can only address my own experience. My current circuit Winkels contribute meaningfully to my life and ministry. My previous circuit, not so much. My first circuit was definitely a blessing to me. Concerning Circuit forums, they have not been held regularly as mandated by the handbook in any of the circuits I have experienced. When held, for the purpose of selecting convention delegates, they are generally poorly attended. I suspect that most congregation members do not identify as part of a circuit. They have little comprehension of this part of our synodical structure. Of course the same could be said of the District.
152. What are they? Never seen one.
153. Circuit forums have never really worked well (in my perspective).
154. At present, I have never been in a circuit that has regular forums. The ones we have had have been excellent. In many circuits there is a general disinclination to travel and a sense of being busy enough locally. A further obstacle to travel is the aging of our members. This is unfortunate to my mind, because forums build relationships between congregations and allow for spiritual growth through study. I think that a revival is needed here.
155. What are they. Who can go to them. What are their objectives.
156. The theory as described in the 2014 Handbook makes sense, but I have no experience.
157. I would hope they are; otherwise why are they being held.
158. I've never participated in one.
159. In theory they could be.
160. Even though they are not consistently being held at this time, they are an important component for sharing of information between congregations and reflecting on the mission needs of the circuit they represent.
161. How meaningful if meeting every 3 years - just to elect delegates
162. Circuit Forums tend to be not held. Poorly attended. This is evident by at last convention changing Forums from 6 Months to 1 every 3 years.
163. Are the forums effective if they meet only every three years?
164. They would be if only more of the lay people realized that they have genuine authority to make decisions in the Church at large. One reason ABC District is in the trouble it is in is because the authority of the congregations wasn't properly respected on either side.
165. If only meeting once every three years, what is the consistentency and quality of work done?
166. I might have agreed IF they were a real working entity that dealt with items which make them of some relevance
167. Too many circuits simply are not meeting as circuit forums because it is so inconvenient.
168. The reason I disagree is that can become another form of "Group Think" which does nothing to resolve church issues. Look this up if you don't understand the concept.

169. Probably, but I've never been to one so can't say.
170. They used to be very useful, though now it is incredibly difficult to get people interested in attending.
171. Low attendance no mandate for what should be done.
172. Forums have become more of a duty than a uniting factor in our Circuit, but this has not been the case in all Circuits to which I have belonged.
173. They could be, but I have yet to be a part of a meaningful one.
174. How meaningful if only to meet every 3 years to elect delegates
175. They are rarely effectively held, even though they are mandated. Depending on the leadership of the Circuit Counsellor.
176. They can be with sharing of information among congregations and with an education component to the circuit forums.
177. Forums is the only avenue that the congregations have to be included in the workings of the district and synod. Congregations are about doing the work God has included for them as a congregation to do; forums extend that boundary to the district work and the synodical workings... they need to still operate and function for the good of the Church.
178. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
179. This used to be the case, but not anymore. Circuit Forums, historically and currently, brought together representatives from circuit congregations designated by the congregation. They would conduct the business of the circuit, and choose delegates to the synodical convention. Other than the latter, there is little formal business still conducted at a circuit level. I would strongly be in favour of retaining the Circuit Convocation, a gathering of any and all clergy and laity from the circuit for worship, education and fellowship.
180. Sadly, in the circuit to which I belong, there hasn't been \ forum for ten years.
181. How meaningful if they only meet every 3 years to elect delegates.
182. At the last Conventions Circuit forums were changed to 3 years from 6 months Spring and Fall. LCC needs to be more involved both at the District level and at the National level to help out with Circuit Forums rather than leaving it up to each circuit to decide what to do to hold one.
183. I have been to three and have not found them meaningful. I don't know their purpose.
184. They can be useful if they contain data pertaining to the circuit and not just a periodic get-together
185. In the past I have found them less than interesting, so didn't think it was good use of valuable time.
186. Circuit forums may be useful for some congregations, but since they are conducted in a foreign language they have no impact upon my congregation.
187. Circuit forums are meaningful when they are well planned and held regularly. Similarly, Circuit Convocations can enhance the work of the congregations.
188. they may be used very well and do a lot of good, but often are very hard to organize and to bring laity to attend because people are so busy.
189. Yes, but they have fallen out of disuse. Maybe we need to teach on the purpose of these gatherings.
190. Monthly circuit meetings are important, yes.
191. However, they are rarely held and they are poorly attended. They used to be every 6 months and now every 3rd year as decided at the District conventions.

192. However, they are not regularly planned and promoted and thus are poorly attended.
193. Input and opinions expressed by others helps understanding and clears conflicts.
194. Again, no sense of circuits. I am assuming that they are primarily supportive of Pastors and staff.
195. Great way to keep lay members informed and involved
196. I am not in a position to answer this question. The ? should be asked of those who are involved in Circuit Forums.
197. There has not been a "circuit forum" in my district. Unless by "circuit forum" you mean winkel?
198. I don't know what circuit forums are.
199. They may have run their course.
200. Did not know that they existed.
201. They should be in order to strengthen and encourage congregations for fellowship and leadership. Unfortunately, they have become just another meeting to try and have people serve another position. It takes a lot of vision, inspiration and teamwork to try shepherd and equip members of the Body of Christ which sometimes act more often as ornery or wayward sheep.
202. Long tedious meetings where issues are tabled and discussed tediously waste time and resources and are so disconnected from the reality of parish life and synod as a whole.
203. more forums should be happening
204. Circuit forums should occur more often then once in 3 years.
205. I think circuit forums serve a valuable purpose in bringing God's people together to worship, to pray and to share/make plans about their mission and ministry. Unfortunately, many pastors fail to see the value of circuit forums and therefore do not make it a priority, attend and contribute collegiately.
206. This aspect of our current structure is greatly underutilized. Much can be done to revitalize these forums so that congregational members and clergy can benefit from these opportunities to worship, pray, discuss strategies and share burdens. This needs to start with changing the attitudes of many pastors so they see the value of their circuit forum and make it a priority.
207. If Districts were removed, they would take the place of District conventions.
208. Not much communicated to local parishes about Circuit work/efforts
209. I have not attended one but have heard they were useful in the past.
210. What is a Circuit forum?
211. Could be!
212. Could be.
213. They have in the past been good for the church. Now it is a challenge to encourage people to attend them. Most often it is local people who attend rather than long distance members (even though they drive just as far or farther for other functions). If circuit were any larger than they already are then even fewer would attend.
214. Very little is accomplished at circuit forums other than delegate elections.
215. They can be but I don't think they often are
216. only when they are done according to the constitution.
217. They could be but I'm not sure that they are at present.
218. These are, for the most part, a joke when it comes to the average member of the LCC. It is time to re-energize and reform our circuits. Most circuits that I know of meet only once every three years to elect delegates for the National Convention.

219. However, this should not be taken as licence to remove them, circuits would benefit from a reform of circuit forums and encouragement to hold them in their circuits. Perhaps a "Free Conference" model would be beneficial.
220. I don't know what is meant by a circuit forum. Obviously our circuit doesn't offer them.
221. At the moment in our circuit they are not a meaningful part of circuit life. But I have no idea about the rest of the circuits. So can't answer this.
222. when they are useful or relevant - but having them simply because the handbook requires them is pointless and a waste of time
223. When they are needed and relevant. Simply having them because the handbook requires it is a pointless exercise
224. These should be left to each circuit to determine their frequency.
225. The theory was good--
226. They need to be used and defined with a specific purpose for each circuit. The BOD needs to explain why they need to happen.... each circuit should report to the BOD. It should not happen for the sake of meeting. But whatever each circuit deems needed for its situations.
227. Good to meet with area churches.
228. I hope so.
229. Not as currently constituted.
230. Don't know about them or how they operate!
231. Forums can and have been meaningful to the few that attend, many do not.
232. I'm not sure my circuit had any in recent memory, until the CEF thing.
233. I have not seen any examples of anything meaningful coming out of a forum.
234. I don't know what they do
235. I do not know.
236. I know that circuit forums are a joke as pastors are not even required to attend the forums. This seems ridiculous.
237. They bring a much needed and respected value to our District and to LCC.
238. Not sure exactly what they do.
239. Circuit forums should continue, but their structure & purpose need revision & renewing.
240. They are for some circuits but not for most in my experience.
241. They could and should be, but the laity tend to not get involved beyond the 4 walls of their church and a lot of times within the walls, so the forums are not well attended.
242. as far as we know
243. as far as we know
244. In practice, Circuit forums have become clergy dominated and lay person intimidated. Circuit Forums should consist of lay persons only with a clergy advisor.
245. I have never been able to figure out their purpose other then they fill in the 3-year cycle.... Synod Convention, District Convention, Circuit Forum....two of these have to be eliminated.... District and Circuit
246. Circuit Forums are not meaningful in that they are over run by clergy and many lay persons are fearful of speaking up. Circuit Forums need to be for lay persons only with a clergy advisor (likely the Circuit Counselor)
247. Each circuit is a unique blend of people and geography. The relationships that are built in those groups are necessary for growth.
248. I went to a forum once since I was elected to be a lay delegate to convention. It was ridiculous, it was a bunch of pastors moaning about a proposed change at the convention.

We spent 2 hours wordsmithing a response to the proposed change. There are millions of lost in the world. I would far rather we spend our time thinking about how to reach them. If the forum had that format, I could get behind it. A bunch of old white pastors worrying about how things aren't the same as they used to be - forget it. Waste of time.

249. They could be a meaningful part of LCC if they focused on actual affairs in the circuit, and fostering co-operation between congregations. As a mere means of communicating things from synod and district, they are not very meaningful.
250. As long as cost-containment measures are in place and the modest venues, meals and accommodations are respected.
251. Circuit forums and winkles provide a mechanism for congregations and their leaders to support one another and continue to retain filial relations. Without these mechanisms congregations become isolated islands and drift away from the feeling of connectedness to the larger church body.
252. These are rarely carried out as envisioned by the handbook.
253. Not really, we treat them as mandatory and do what we can to make them happen and then they fail to materialize and so we use other circuit events in their place.
254. Forums and convocations are rarely used to anyone's benefit. However, that speaks more to the lack of healthy relationships within the circuit than to the useful purpose of forums and convocations.
255. Serves needs of community but really doesn't happen.
256. I have not found them to be meaningful or useful.
257. The opportunity is meaningful even if every specific instance is not.
258. I believe they are meaningful to the Pastors who see benefit from having a circuit counselor. Pastors in our area meet and get to share their joys and sorrows in ministry. Why don't circuit forums include delegates? There is no place for lay people to have a broader connection with other churches in their area which is what walking together should be.
259. I think circuit forums CAN be valuable, though depending on how they are organized and what purpose they ultimately fill they can be a waste of time.
260. While they could be, the reality is that even getting folks out for electing synodical reps every 3 years is problematic. we have had to link it a circuit LWML event to even get a moderate turn out. so for electing representative voters they are essential, but otherwise .... - bottom line: I don't know how to answer this question.
261. I think they are needed, but I don't think they are very meaningful now. Perhaps if the district structures are eliminated then the circuits would become more important and vital.
262. Depends on the circuit.
263. Meaningful if pastor participates
264. Perhaps for pastors, but certainly not for lay people.
265. Our forums are very poorly attended.
266. They can only be meaningful if information and recommendations are then heard by Synod. They can be meaningful when used as teaching and training forums for congregations.
267. If they are held.
268. No guidelines were produced - hence failure They need more material to function
269. This is one way of sharing information.
270. I don't think I have known of any circuit forums taking place in my circuit.
271. Communication between the congregations promotes supporting/assisting/collaborating with one another. The circuit forum provides the contact regularly.

272. I have no way of knowing. Lay people do not get any information/communication of the benefits or not to their pastors or the benefit to LCC.
273. These should be promoted and encouraged in order to keep the laity better informed and involved in the workings of the church.
274. What is a circuit forum?
275. These seem to be irrelevant, maybe that needs to change and we should come together more often and as we should.
276. I am only speaking for my circuit, not all circuits, as I am aware if others have them. They are done so rarely in my circuit that it would be impossible for them to be meaningful. Lack of participation by both lay and church workers show that they are not an effective way of communicating.
277. I think they are few and far between, have never attended one
278. not clear on what this refers to
279. The need for church workers to important to those workers who have a need or are interested in learning or sharing but to make a trip to just be there is a waste, which often is the case.
280. What do the circuit forum members think, are they useful meetings or not?
281. Communication is important however it is done!
282. I think they are for some circuits and not for others. From my general knowledge I would say they are not meaningful for many of our circuits.
283. Give guidance in operations.
284. What are they? Never seen one.
285. Only speaking from my experience, the theory and the desire to meet are good, but the forums themselves have not been well attended. They haven't been meaningful in my experience.
286. Yes, but there should also be a report given to each congregations either by print or spoken, so that all members have the most current information.
287. They are one of the ways helpful communication between LCC and congregations remains open.
288. Not as currently constituted.
289. The monthly meetings of pastors in a circuit is excellent, but why are we spending money on a circuit forum? What is the true purpose and outcome?
290. I agree.... now, if we can only find a way to get our congregation's lay people to more invested in the Circuit Forums.
291. not sure what the circuit forums are
292. You need a chance to share ideas, encourage one another, and renew friendships within a circuit. However, keep it simple and economical and not too often.
293. This should be part of the goal of better flow of information and understanding between congregations and District and Synod.
294. There has been very little interest in forums. Especially in circuits where people have to drive for a minimum of 2 hours to meet in a central location.
295. Providing they meet regularly and put into action what they agree on.
296. As long as they are productive
297. If there is a lack of unity among pastors in the circuit, then little will happen. I have seen this a lot.
298. Have not heard anything of these forums. If there are Circuit forums, we are not being told about them.

299. This provides the opportunity for specific individual needs to be met and/or come forward.
300. Never get a chance to see this in our area.
301. The future of the LCC should be around Synod and Circuits. Time and attention needs to go around making the circuits very viable and a more grass roots way of communicating two ways with the Synod.
302. These are not practical in rural/remote areas.
303. These smooth the way for conventions by electing circuit delegates.
304. I don't really know what they are or what they do.
305. Too small with struggling to fill vacancies.
306. I don't know if lay people even know what these are or that they happen, or what happens there.
307. meaningful for who? church workers or laity or overall congregational...
308. Any opportunity to engage other local congregations and members has excellent potential to strengthen everyone involved.
309. I have never attending one. Until I started attending Winkels as a pastor I didn't ever know one was happening. The majority of lay people in our synod know nothing about them.
310. They seem compliance events that don't build the kingdom.
311. No.
312. Often not much accomplished or at least communicated to members.
313. Very few people attend anymore and they should be eliminated. In many cases they are only done to say we did them.
314. Depends on whether they are given meaningful things to do. Otherwise a waste of time if just nominating delegates. That can be done by other, more efficient means.
315. If they are function.
316. They ought to be a meaningful part but I am not aware of one that is.
317. I know that some areas struggle to maintain the forums. These remain important ways that the local congregations can work together. More effort needs to be put into fostering a stronger sense of mission and collegiality between congregations. The forums can be used as meaningful ways to let this happen.
318. Where geographical proximity permits easy attendance - probably
319. they can be
320. On occasion they are, but frankly, most of the time, most of the business gets decided at the circuit winkel by the pastors and I have never heard a peep of complaint from a layperson regarding this.
321. Am a member of the Lutheran Church since '74 and have never attended a forum.
322. not enough knowledge on the matter, but forums always have some value
323. If they are attended.
324. But, "they should be."
325. Never heard of a circuit forum.
326. They should/could be but they are not presently.
327. East District - some are working well while others do not function well other than the monthly pastoral conferences
328. The only time a circuit forum meets is to select delegates for a synodical convention. There is potential that Circuit forums could be a meaningful part of LCC, but forums are rarely offered.
329. If properly organized. Attendance of pastors at Winkles should be mandated.

330. In some circuits they function well, but in many circuits they do not.
331. Many Circuits don't have yearly mandatory meetings or if they do it is a 'make-work-project' which yields minimal benefits.
332. Circuit forums are easily attended in large urban areas. In outlying rural areas, the travel distances make the forums very poorly attended.
333. Too few lay people are willing to attend.
334. They could be. They need review in what their purpose and goals are. I would suggest that at present, they are not making as meaningful an impact as they were intended to make.
335. Other than in the current fiasco, I can't recall that circuit forums have been conducted in our area - again because of huge distances (and fewer and fewer individuals)
336. Forums can be meaningful to the few that attend, many do not.
337. at least in the ones I have attended they seem to just have a few lay people and most pastors and the information may not always get back to the congregation
338. I have found them to be useless other than for the choosing of Synodical delegates to a Convention.
339. But likely under-used.
340. These are not well promoted (in advance). Circuit joint worship services are promoted.
341. Even if all that they do is provide a venue for Pastors to interact and support each other, they are worthwhile.
342. Never been part of one.
343. These are under-utilized means of engaging and inform in the church at large of important work and opportunities in service
344. Appears that this is a role out of LCC policy and a selection of board members, so does it really require a 2-day expensive gathering or would there be a more effective approach? It appears that ABC really did find ways the economize when needed this last convention
345. To date I have not been aware of the function of such "forums".
346. If they were restructured geographically, then yes they are meaningful.
347. They are meaningful when they are meaningful.
348. Not having attended a circuit forum I have no comment,
349. They could and should be but I believe in many areas they are not!
350. The people have no involvement in these.
351. What Circuit forums?
352. not sure how meaningful but should not eliminate circuits
353. They could be more meaningful if they had some more importance and if the laity would invest in them
354. They are meaningful in theory, but not in practice. They OUGHT to be meaningful, but in reality they are not, because very few people attend them.
355. Yes, please!
356. They are a great way to enhance communication and relationships with other Lutherans and to share what is going on at the upper levels of governance that individual congregations aren't always privy to.
357. It is just another layer requiring lay person to sit on yet another committee with more meetings which purpose is to create overtures and pass on information. Completely unnecessary and poor use of people's time especially with the technology we have today.
358. This is an opportunity for churches to grow together, support one another, and learn from one another.

359. According to current practice, they are not. I believe there is a need for and potential for gathering and unity in some way, though.
360. If forums are actually used; perhaps drop circuit conferences or merge the two.
361. Likewise, with conventions, these are an expensive waste of time and money, accomplishing nothing.
362. Not relevant to our congregation.
363. I wish there were more of them, to bring us closer together.
364. There is no real change or democratic principals in place to make them meaningful.
365. Only if outside speakers excellent in their field are scheduled with a minimum of business.
366. I have served in three different circuits. In each circuit the forums were either burdensome or not observed
367. They can be, but rarely are (more just for electing delegates from Circuits).
368. Participation has been too low.
369. Haven't been to one in a very long time.
370. All voices need to be heard. This is best done in smaller groups.
371. Circuit forums could and should be a venue for pastoral fellowship, mutually supportive prayer and encouragement...much more than they are now. Excessively academic circuit forums are not what our church workers need.
372. They could be meaningful but I don't think they have accomplished much up to now.
373. They are largely ignored and ineffective.
374. Ideally, yes, but they've been irrelevant for a long time.
375. For many attendees this is a "day off" and as a result these forums are not effective. They take time away from pastors/lay members which could be devoted better to visitations, bible study, outreach, youth.
376. But the theme and thrust of the forum should be provided by the LCC so all of our circuits can do meaningful discussion on a common topic. Don't leave it to the Circuit to develop its own programs. Our "one" church needs us to be discussing the same topics!
377. although it is my understanding that too many pastors choose to not take part in circuit level meetings on a regular basis
378. I think the last synodical convention legislated this question when it enacted that forums need only meet to elect convention delegates.
379. The ones I have been exposed to have been poorly attended.
380. The circuit should be a place where congregations receive encouragement from one another. Sometimes instead of supporting one another through concerns they become competitive boast-fests.
381. They have no power and no real purpose at present
382. ¬ I have heard of Circuits where they haven’t used them to the best of their ability, however I know of one that attempts each Spring and Fall to have a meaningful presentation often with a guest presenter. Further they even offer it via the internet to other congregations that due to distance may not otherwise be able to attend.

30. If the District Conventions are discontinued, each congregation/parish should send a pastoral and lay delegate to synodical Conventions.

1. Every congregation should have a vote, even in dual or triple parish. To keep lay-clergy balance, some advisory pastoral delegates could be designated voting i.e. some retired, some from seminaries, etc.
2. Only if they are really going to work and actually plan and learn.
3. This would become prohibitive for small congregations otherwise.
4. Every Pastor should go, but lay people do not have theological understanding. 3 pastors to 1 lay
5. Way too expensive for a country this size.
6. Even a 2 or 3 Parish church's each congregation should have a lay-delegate.
7. True, but is that something that LC-C should pursue? I don't know.
8. only if the total of delegates is less than 50 % pastors
9. Can each church afford this? doubt it, although this CEF matter will eliminate small churches.
10. This may be unwieldy ... but may be most representative.
11. Perhaps? A funding model would have to be proposed and figures weighed before I could say whether I favour this or not. In theory, however, I think this is an excellent idea. I would really like to see its adoption, if it's feasible.
12. Agree 100%
13. not sure
14. Or at the least, each send one or the other.
15. Would depend on structure of districts. Districts unequal in number of members and/or geography and size, especially if the discrepancies were large, could greatly complicate the fairness or influence in voting on certain issues.
16. Both Lay and Pastoral delegates must be far better prepared before they go. At present, it is far too much like a paid holiday.
17. Too many people too much cost, no perceived benefit. Maybe two clergy and two lay from each circuit.
18. Communication is important! The more information the better informed.
19. I guess if there are no districts then no conventions would happen - not necessarily agreeing districts are not necessary.
20. How else will congregations be informed.
21. The cost may be prohibitive, even without district conventions.
22. Agree - but the drawback would be the cost to the congregation to send them as Canada is a very large country
23. This may not seem equitable especially considering congregation/parish sizes vary significantly. I'm not sure that one vote from a congregation with 10 people should be considered the same as a vote from a congregation with 200 people.
24. The synod conventions would become too unwieldy if each congregation sent two delegates. We cannot make decisions in groups of 600 people. Perhaps each circuit, as the smallest local governance unit above the congregation, could send the local bishop, a few pastors, and a few lay delegates, in proportion to the circuit's communicant membership. My worry with this type of model is that corrupt bishops or corrupt congregations (depending on who does the selection) could hand-pick their goons, and then the final state of synod would be worse

than the first. The best solution: the selection of pastors and lay delegates should be taken by lot from a pre-qualified pool of eligible and willing candidates.

25. Are conventions even necessary? Pastors should certainly meet together in many different forums, including the occasional national assembly. But is it productive and cost-effective to have pastors and lay people meet together in person for national conventions?
26. (I muse some thoughts) On what periodic basis - every 5 or 6 years? It's a large undertaking -- would it work every other convention (presuming 3 years)? (aha- but would charges of misrepresentation or concerns result questioning varying degrees of authority depending on who attended, pitting smaller conventions vs. larger conventions, differently constituted?) hmm.
27. I agree in principle, but this may be difficult for some congregations.
28. Either a pastoral or lay delegate from a congregation should be sufficient.
29. Pastor attendance is sufficient - keep costs in mind
30. Ideally, this would be the case. But it may be cost prohibitive, and may be unworkable in reality.
31. However, I feel District Conventions are needed.
32. Have to have some input.
33. I would hope that this would be funded from the Synod if this happened because this would be a hardship for some parishes. I would hope though that meetings at the district level, whatever those would be, would continue in some form. I still hold that the meetings from local to area to country wide are useful to make sure we tackle problems from as many ways as possible.
34. This sounds like a great idea if you're looking to save money. After all, if the previous statement about ensuring the districts have the same goals as the synod holds true, you can abolish district conventions and pour time and money into making the synodical convention apply to everyone in the synod.
35. voting on line eliminates the need to have someone else represent my voice - NEVER have I been asked how I would like a vote to go
36. Why are you suggesting that the district conventions should be discontinued? This question is poorly phrased. I do not think district convention should be discontinued. Also, currently every circuit sends delegates, not congregations. If this happened, I don't want every congregation to have a say because regionally, congregations are not evenly distributed and therefore the east would have a larger influence. You have not clearly stated this could be an issue. Districts assure that one region does not have the power to dictate direction for all regions based on population.
37. We've got large Congregations and we've got small Congregations. We've got self-supported Congregations and we've got "Mission" Congregations. Doesn't seem right that each Congregation is equal in the decision-making process. And I'll repeat a Comment made earlier, that Pastors and others on the Synodical Roster should not have the right to vote. They should be Servants, not Masters.
38. Again, more lay delegates.
39. Conventions would be too big and expensive.
40. But of course each congregation/parish should be represented at synodical conventions. I don't know if the one pastoral/one lay delegate formula is the right one.
41. If able

42. Why would District conventions be discontinued?? They serve very different agendas to the best of my knowledge.
43. Sending only Pastor is sufficient.
44. Too expensive, but must ensure meaningful representation across country.
45. costs would be very large and this needs to be considered.
46. Yes, but provided cost is less than the 4 conventions.
47. Cost may be prohibitive.
48. Each congregation, even those who are served by a vacancy pastor, should be able to send their vacancy pastor and a lay delegate. Why are these congregations being punished? The congregation is expected to pay their share but their vacancy pastor is not allowed to go.
49. I do not believe district conventions should be discontinued; that would lesson information exchange and fellowship opportunities.
50. Yes, if it is logistically feasible for facilities and cost. Another option is to have only one delegate (pastoral or lay) for each congregation / parish but the total number of pastors and lay persons would be equal.
51. In see this as the ideal to maintain congregational input in the business of the synod. However, I also know that if the "numbers" (financial cost to congregations; increased size of synodical convention) make this prohibitive it would have to remain circuit delegates as now.
52. Why not more lay delegates?
53. I hope that D. Conventions are not discontinued
54. I could envision too many people and all of the whole convention taking too much time.
55. Structure and decision making would need a different approach.
56. Districts should not be discontinued.
57. I think that would be good because our congregation would not have individual representation but I'm afraid that it might be too expensive and probably the pastoral and lay delegates representing the circuits as they do now could speak for us.
58. I think Districts should be discontinued.
59. I think the Districts should be abolished or discontinued and replaced with multiple regions comprising 3 or 4 circuits.
60. We don't need more national governance, we need more local support
61. Would be too costly.
62. In principal this makes sense, however smaller congregations may not be able to support this.
63. While attendees would be larger in number, there are benefits of unity and conversation that would follow such a course of action.
64. Why? No matter where these conventions take place there is an expense and some churches simply cannot afford to send on let alone two
65. If they feel that certain information will not be given or attained and then transferred to the congregation.
66. Where financially viable.
67. District conventions should remain intact.
68. District conventions should not be discontinued.
69. Only one or the other needs to attend
70. This would not be financially possible in some cases.
71. How will those not taking part be informed about the latest information

72. I agree, however, not very practical or cost effective unless the delegate were willing to pay their own way. Albeit if there were no "District" conventions the overall cost to the church might not be that much different. The size of the convention might pose some problems. As I see it now, our Districts are very different geographically and culturally...not sure one large convention without the District convention input would enable the geographical issues to be presented and addressed. I prefer the way it is.
73. I do not think District Conventions should be discontinued in the interest of effectively serving the church.
74. Again the laymen/women should out number the clergy by 2 to 1. I don't think you need to discontinue District Conventions. They provide a good sounding board to an up coming Synodical Convention.
75. District conventions should NOT be discontinued. If it was, for some ridiculous reason, absolutely necessary, then yes, every parish should send both a pastoral and lay delegate. Otherwise, there would be no democratic representation for each congregation and there would be no point for those who cannot send delegates in being members of LCC.
76. While this makes sense in theory, seems logistically and financially challenging.
77. at least one delegate per congregation (lay or clergy)
78. All churches need a voice in the decisions that are being made.
79. I disagree with the word "send". We should use technology to attend via webcast. All presentations and voting can occur using this technology. Send if you want, but give the option for virtual attendance.
80. However, I don't think District Conventions should be discontinued.
81. Is the structure then Synod and congregations only? It is hard to give a definite opinion when I am unsure of what other structures may be in place.
82. With technology being what it is, live stream events could reduce/eliminate the cost of physical attendance.
83. If we keep the Districts, the District conventions should be one day of the Synodical convention.
84. I am not knowledgeable.
85. Don't believe that district conventions should be necessarily discontinued. But would agree with the second statement above if district conventions were discontinued.
86. Would be nice to have more representation than one, but to send every Pastor/delegate would become very expensive.
87. In the event of this, I also believe synodical conventions should be at least every 2 years or better yet, every year. If cost is an issue, it should not be handled by assessment, but individual pastors and lay delegates are responsible for their own costs, and there is no requirement to attend if cost is an issue. Even so, Synod should encourage Congregations to cover the cost of their own delegates.
88. the costs to do this would really increase and how could District business be effectively taken care of with so many people and lots of other synod work to be done too.
89. Theoretically this makes sense, but logistically and financially, it seems quite impossible.
90. could be a high expense to smaller congregations
91. Also matters to be discussed at convention should be presented to congregation before the convention and a dissenting opinion from each congregation should be allowed
92. 1 pastor to 2 lay delegates
93. Districts have never been what was intended and are, instead, liabilities.

94. I think that could be a financial hardship for some congregations, especially if the convention is quite a distance away. I think one pastoral and one lay delegate from a group of congregations would be sufficient.
95. Cannot afford this.
96. Too many people to make decisions.
97. then if district business needs to be done the districts could caucus on 1 day
98. Provided the total cost isn't prohibitive.
99. We need to stay tuned in somehow but there would be too many delegates to accommodate.
100. Is this cost effective? Proper representation is critical.
101. The cost and logistics would be too onerous
102. I believe we would continue to achieve fair representation to make decisions regarding the work of the Church. I do not think this would embrace good Stewardship principles.
103. both this and the below option would be ok
104. I think it is more important for a pastoral delegate to attend, than a lay delegate. The pastor can inform his parish / circuit about the decisions and discussions of the convention. I do not think it is necessary to require a delegate from each and every congregation/parish. Of course, if each parish could send a delegate, then that would be a good thing, but should not be required.
105. I do not agree with discontinuing District Conventions but if it were to occur then each congregation should be represented individually. Every congregation has different struggles, opinions, and skills.
106. Ideally, this may be true, but logistically I am not sure how that would work in practice as that would be a lot of people at conventions.
107. Can't ground that this is an accurate assessment.
108. Probably this would be best; possibly a group of congregations (e.g., a circuit) could suffice if having all pastors and congregational delegates serve as delegates.
109. Circuit representation only would make individual congregations too disconnected from each other and thus our national church.
110. Why would the District Convention be discontinued?
111. Numbers alone would make this impossible.
112. Not financially practical due to the large size of the country
113. To be honest, I believe it is pastoral leadership that will make the decisions. I don't think lay leadership has a lot of impact at the conventions.
114. If you get rid of District Conventions, where would people have an opportunity for input? How would they make it "their" church?
115. These should be done with minimal costs as is now the norm for businesses elsewhere including the Health Districts.
116. Perhaps a percentage of the congregations?
117. Not necessarily, use live and streaming video broadcast.
118. Absolutely.
119. You cannot afford that expense. Even the Canadian government does not do that. How often do we have trouble getting a lay delegate? Or we send the same lay delegate year after year.
120. Keep the Est District conventions
121. Or from circuit? Not sure
122. Why would District Conventions be discontinued?

123. I can see many problems arising from this that would need to be addressed Price tag, who pays? Size - would be a very large group! etc.
124. with communications the way they are today districts could be holding meetings on a weekly basis without leaving the church structure costs would be greatly reduced and the improved amount of communication would be better for everyone I know from experience annual conventions accomplish nothing
125. This would be ideal but I don't know how it would be funded.
126. It will just be an overload of delegates and an enormous cost. Issues arising at the national convention could be debated at circuit forums before a convention. The results of a convention could be delivered to congregations at a circuit forum following the convention.
127. If practical, given the number of people attending.
128. There would be too many delegates to get much meaningful work accomplished.
129. while I agree it would be highly unlikely to get more than adequate representation from all congregations
130. We need to keep up the lay input, and to retain our strength as a church run from the members up. If we don't do it this way, we risk a top down structure that will move closer to the Catholic model of a senior clergy dictating to the membership.
131. think District conventions should be discontinued. There are a LOT of conventions right now. They should be consolidated.
132. That might be ideal, but practical matters such as cost, accessibility, etc. must also be considered. Other possibilities such as alternating between a lay delegate and a pastoral delegate at every other convention might be considered.
133. Sounds as though someone's mind is made up. Is this the plan? Better re-think this!
134. The present system of circuit representation seems to me to allow us to drift apart in our relationships and common interest in the church. Cost is a concern, but given the choice, I would rather have synod conventions than district ones.
135. Expense would be a huge issue.
136. Yes, and no. Each congregation should have representation, but not one pastor and one delegate per congregation. A congregation with two or three pastors and several deacons should have more pastoral delegates that one with only one pastor. Likewise, lay delegates should be assigned according to the number of voting members.
137. I think some kind of convention is necessary for unity
138. Definitely. Each congregation should be represented.
139. All congregations should be able to be involved in decisions being made.
140. Very poor Stewardship - Plus 6-700 Delegates would require a longer convention (more speakers) and more difficult to accomplish goals.
141. The congregations would not be able to afford the assessment asked for by Synod
142. This could be too complicated and expensive to do compared to District conventions
143. Conventions would become to large and expensive.
144. This maintains fair representation.
145. The number of communicant members required from each circuit could be reduced, but it would not seem necessary for every congregation to have both. I do not believe large numbers of delegates translates into higher quality deliberation or greater satisfaction from members with the outcomes.
146. Why would District conventions be discontinued? Why are you presupposing this? Do you have a pre-determined plan?

147. I am not certain if the numbers would be too large but it would be good to have each congregation represented.
148. "If" -- NO --- because we are not a "big church" and certainly not as big or strong as very often implied. We have circuit representation -- and perhaps increasing the number of delegates in a reasonable way would suffice.
149. If we want to work together, we have to be able to meet together.
150. This is probably the only way to ensure proper input and voting in that approach, however, that can be rather costly. But given the drop in costs to have separate districts conventions, the cost could actually be less.
151. In principle, definitely. Transportation would obviously be a significant problem, but if we can avoid compromising the principle, we should.
152. One big convention every three years or so -- rather than 4 over 6 years? Not a big question.
153. A pastor and two lay delegates
154. Need a meeting sometime
155. This could be a good option, but the option below would also be fine.
156. Very poor Stewardship - Too costly plus unnecessary. A convention with 6-700 delegates would require a longer convention (more speakers) and probably be less productive.
157. But that becomes expensive.
158. Yes, but continue to have Synod Conventions every three years.
159. What about mission churches?
160. Absolutely! Every congregation, regardless of size should have representation there, equal to everyone else!
161. Would be expensive but would allow for a greater sense of participation and ownership in the Synod.
162. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
163. 2 lay delegates should be sent along with the pastor
164. You need to ask whether district conventions should be discontinued before you broach this question.
165. Very poor Stewardship- The price tag would probably exceed a million dollars.
166. Circuit congregational lay delegates do not report what happens at conventions so some of the congregational members have no inkling to what changes occur at a synodical convention. Perhaps LCC should suggest that Circuit meetings such as a Forum be held to inform the members of that Circuit what has transpired in changes at the Convention.
167. The District Conventions should not be discontinued!
168. Other wise we the parish have no direct connection to the decision makers.
169. Too much cost
170. That means a total of at least 630 voting delegates, over twice as many delegates as there are members of the Parliament of Canada. Parliament has problems accomplishing anything, working full-time. If we adopt this organisation, our pastors and lay delegates will quite likely be in Convention full-time.
171. This statement is nonsense. Has anyone provided the cost analysis? This was only realistic when LCC was formed and then the District conventions followed the Synodical convention. This statement implies that the Districts will be discontinued. Instead of discontinuance, they need to be enhanced. When congregations have a clear understanding that they will be heard,

there will be greater involvement. Decision-making must continue with those who are affected most directly.

172. This way every congregation/parish still has a voice. Though more expensive, yet we would save much by eliminating District Conventions.
173. Assessment fees for congregations to cover expenses for conventions would be prohibitive for some congregations. You would also need a much larger convention site and again costs would be prohibitive.
174. The cost to do this would be prohibitive
175. This provides an avenue for LAY PARISH representation at synodical conventions.
176. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
177. We need to have accurate representation across the board.
178. Would be great if feasible.
179. Pastors should have not more than 10% of votes at a convention. The current fiscal disaster facing the LCC is a result of the skewed voting that gives pastors control over all aspects of District and Synod business (see CEF crisis and pension plan liability).
180. Pastor and two delegates per congregation.
181. I don't think District Conventions should be discontinued. They have unique regional ministry and mission opportunities to discuss and plan and the District conventions serve the purpose of bringing people together for spiritual encouragement.
182. Our Synod is small enough that this would be the best plan of action.
183. District Conventions should not be discontinued. Do less Synodical Conventions if it is a financial burden to do both.
184. I believe it would be the most effective way for Synod to get input from the congregations. Huge challenges in terms of costs for all concerned.
185. and Deacon/church worker if available (esp. if circuit-based...see comments from question 27)
186. may not be cost effective.
187. May be costly.
188. I don't believe that District Conventions should be discontinued
189. This would ensure that every congregation/parish has a voice through its respective representatives.
190. My pastor and congregation should have a voice in our Synod but sending that many would be very costly. Perhaps

191. Ever the same number as attend now to with a method of electronic voting for the others?
192. The more people involved, the more unity there can be...cost would be an issue.
193. it's always about the cost of sending delegate
194. A formula based on size of congregations, etc.?
195. What if the congregation cannot afford to send the delegates to conventions?
196. the synodical conventions could replace the three district ones.
197. Synodical conventions could replace district conventions.
198. What about dual congregations, in this case there would be 1 Pastor, 2 Lay delegate.
199. That could prove to be very costly. Perhaps having a synod convention every four years (rather than three) then having all clergy/lay representation from each congregation attend would be a cost effective compromise. Since the costs would be deferred an additional year

every convention cycle. A synod convention every 4 years with total representation would be less costly than current format of (3 district and 1 synod convention) every 3 years.

200. Equal Clergy & Lay participation is good or necessary
201. This would be the best, but it may not be possible financially.
202. each circuit should send a Pastor and layperson
203. Would result in too many delegates. Each congregational should send their pastors, Deacons and lay rep to the conventions.
204. Are proposing that we dissolve districts? I am not convinced that structure is at fault with ABC. That said, no.
205. I think the cost of large conventions is poor stewardship of the limited resources we have. Better communication electronically and fewer meetings are a more progressive approach
206. should use of technology to reduce travel costs
207. We live in electronic age, let's get with it.
208. But it should not be mandatory, if a congregation feels they cannot afford it, they should be able to assign their vote to another congregation.
209. Ideally I agree. But within financial reason. If financial it is unfeasible then a representative structure is needed.
210. I am not familiar with the total numbers involved. This does run the risk of becoming unwieldy at some point. I do not know what that point is, but if exceeded then some form of grouped representation would be required.
211. Only Pastoral Candidates. Laity should not vote. Besides, I think the circuit should send a delegate, namely, the Circuit Counsellor.
212. They should send a pastoral delegate who votes and a lay delegate who can speak but not vote.
213. more is accomplished with smaller numbers
214. this would become too expensive for the church
215. I don't know if they "should" but they definitely should have the option of sending both pastor and a lay delegate
216. The cost factor could be lessened if the synodical conventions were held every 4 years like the political system.
217. synodical conventions are too expensive
218. synodical conventions are too expensive
219. When Districts and District conventions are eliminated, delegates should be selected in proportion to the number of members in the circuit. For example, a circuit with 1000 members could elect 10 lay voting delegates from across the circuit and 1 clergy advisor.
220. The District Conventions are a vital part of communication between churches.
221. In accordance with above comments on synod constituted with congregations only, each circuit would elect lay delegates in proportion to the total number of members in the circuit. Therefore, a circuit with 1000 members would elect 10 lay delegates and 1 clergy advisor. (This is just an example; the actual ratios would have to be worked out)
222. If District Conventions are discontinued, then each congregation needs to have a voice in the Synod
223. Good grief. Talk about a waste of money to send that many people to a meeting. Pastors once again controlling the agenda.
224. This may get too big to manage a convention effectively, but is fine in principle.
225. Well each congregation should have a say but it might be too huge and unmanageable.

226. I am Lutheran, NOT Catholic.
227. However, we should also look at cost and the use of technology. There are many ways that congregations may participate, especially during times when voting needs to take place, where congregational delegates can log in live using various technologies'.
228. As mentioned previous, I believe it is in the best interest of the church to amalgamate all 3 districts under the auspice of the synod. If this is done, congregation representation at conventions making choices for the synod as a whole becomes an imperative in order to have a balanced and complete representation of views and perspectives of those affected by the decisions.
229. Lay delegates should be based on membership numbers.
230. Agreed BUT surely these could be electronic some years and only "in person" some times
231. Why discontinue district conventions, that is the place for the chance to air any differences, have dialogue with others and see that all are on the same page.
232. Not only would it replace 3 conventions it would also allow people who may never mingle to be together and see others like them working to help move Synod forward.
233. If.... Of course -- or present themselves electronically as an alternative. However, if there is to be any regional representation or significance to our church body, perhaps it is the Synodical convention that is unnecessary. Should our church body be a Federation of Regions or a Centralized Episcopate, or a relational Synod as we now exist that allows for regional ministry and mission and differences of culture (not theology) and also shares a national work program that does things the local members cannot accomplish on their own.
234. Bear in mind that the entire LCC is smaller than some LCMS Districts.
235. Would be too large. But convention representation should be larger than at present. Perhaps around 250 or 300 voting delegates.
236. If this occurs, this is a very large financial burden on many churches.
237. I've heard that District conventions are a waste of time and money and could definitely be trimmed.
238. This allows everyone to have a say. With fewer conventions to run, the cost of this undertaking hopefully would even out.
239. The costs alone would be prohibitive.
240. some congregations are served by the same pastor
241. suggest more lay than pastors
242. Do we really need EVERY congregation to be equally represented?
243. I am not sure if would mean too many delegates at a convention (how many congregations are there?)
244. Only one delegate, with a system of alternating between a pastor and lay delegate, that maintains equal numbers at the convention.
245. Not practical to have that large a gathering Many delegates do not present a good report for leadership.
246. Congregations need a representative for feedback.
247. That would be a huge convention at great expense.
248. Cost would need to be considered. Would the savings from eliminating District conventions offset the cost of sending delegates from each congregation to the national convention - if so - then yes.
249. A bit expensive but may be required to get a better cross section.

250. This is a silly question. So a congregation of 12 people send a pastor and lay delegate along with a congregation of 1500 getting the same representation. This is not a useful question.
251. Yes, in order to keep the "walking together" aspects alive and functioning. However, would practicality and costs make this unfeasible or impossible?
252. this may make them to big to make them effective
253. That would make a good amount of sense.
254. his would make for an extremely large convention if every congregation across Canada would have pastoral and lay representation. A convention that larges makes it difficult to have a productive meeting with meaningful participation the delegates.
255. We are not that large of a church body that we should be limiting participation in the working of the synod. The more we get to know one another across this country the better our sense of unity and the better our witness to our society.
256. Districts themselves should be discontinued.
257. A pastor would not be required but they may make one of their reps a pastor.
258. That is a tough one as I do not know all of the financial impacts of such a decision. It also depends on what districts would even be if there are no conventions. I do agree that having conventions just for the sake of having them is wasteful. If there is a major restructuring that changes the roles and purpose of having districts (and even what size and number of they are) then it would have to be looked at to see if there is a purpose to district conventions.
259. The cost would be too high for our congregation.
260. To agree or disagree I'd need to accept the presumption that regions won't be structured another way that will allow for better dialogue and representation. I'd like to see a newer structure that would allow for that, so perhaps this wouldn't be needed. This question shouldn't be asked until we decide how regions should work.
261. This also means that each member should be informed with important and current information.
262. Can do the same as synodical conventions now. Each congregation/parish sending would add an extra unnecessary expense.in many ways.
263. Would result in too many delegates. Circuit representation would be preferable.
264. If they are discontinued, then yes. But it will become more difficult to find a delegate of the time/distance/expense increase (even with Church support).
265. Mandatory!
266. They should not be discontinued.
267. If the location for each convention changes each time so it would keep the travel expenses the same for each congregation over time.
268. Puts more pressure on the congregations as would cost more.
269. who's asking for this change and why?
270. Need to look at circuits. Each Parish may be unwieldy and thus ineffective
271. Local congregations need to have information and input into what is happening both at the district and federal levels.
272. This would create a "huge" convention; where to be hosted; at what cost; and limited dialogue.
273. I think pastors should have more vote
274. At least one of each. Perhaps more could be sent depending on ratios.
275. This would make conventions to large and un manageable.
276. Although costly, this would be the best possible way to foster unity within our synod.

277. Makes sense, if we still have conventions.
278. One delegate is enough.
279. Too far and too big
280. Yet I don't think District conventions should be discontinued. Where was the question to ask about that?
281. That is impractical.
282. Too costly especially for small or aging congregations
283. This would make the meeting too large and expensive to be effective.
284. Either arrangement would serve the church equally well. I don't think this is an issue to create division over.
285. as means allow, yes
286. That would too large a group and too big an expense.
287. I am convinced this would be a blessing to visible synodical unity.
288. There are other ways to accomplish the work that are less costly and just as effective.
289. Yes, for the sake of a voice - HOWEVER for the sake of costs there may have to be alternate ways of meeting virtually also to allow the smaller congregations to gather in an area through skype and still participate.
290. It is a useless exercise to vote for unknown delegates.
291. This may make the convention very difficult to manage but I am not opposed to it in principle
292. Would be nice, but cost prohibitive and would lead to "have" congregations having unfair power over the "have-nots"
293. This is going about it the wrong way. Districts should be dissolved with the synod being the governing body with VP representatives. There would be conventions for the VP areas, and synod conventions with the VP present.
294. Depends- costs of travel need to be taken into account
295. While a synod convention costing would be more, without three separate district conventions, the costing to the church at large would be less. Pity the convention manager(s) though
296. A pastoral and at least 2 lay delegates should be sent to a synodical convention
297. But lets NOT discontinue the districts. We don't want complete control of the synod to go to the poorly functioning ABC area.
298. I believe that the pastors should be leading the church, so I don't believe it is essential that for every voting pastor there needs to be a voting layman.
299. However, I believe you are making the assumption that the structure of the membership and voting is going to remain the same! I think that with technology, there is no reason that most votes could not be open to all members of every congregation.
300. These national conventions could either stay on a 3-year cycle or even be spaced out to a four or five-year cycle.
301. That would be an obvious choice, since each congregation needs to be represented. At the same time the delegates would be able to inform the congregation about what took place at the convention.
302. Too expensive. 2 Lay only per circuit.
303. HUGE expense!
304. It is extremely important that each congregation has both input possibilities and feedback from the convention.

305. Are proposing that we dissolve districts? I am not convinced that structure is at fault with ABC. That said, no.
306. Do not discontinue district conventions
307. this would make for an unwieldy convention, too many delegates.
308. There are many faults in the current situation of Circuits providing delegates based on Circuit population. However, congregations should be represented on the basis of numbers of members somehow in order for the representation to be fair in this scenario.
309. I think its important for individual congregations to elect their own delegates and send them to the conventions. That gives a wider representation of opinions and ideas.
310. It would only be a commitment once every 3 years and would be the only voice a congregation would have.
311. We need Districts.
312. Sounds expensive.
313. That may be a strain on resources of the church in some places so would need to be planned carefully. At the very least, there should be steps taken to ensure both pastoral/diaconate and lay delegates meet together at or before convention to develop understanding of issues and processes in order to streamline the decision making
314. Pastoral and deacons where they exist.
315. If the District Conventions are discontinued, I can't imagine how huge that synodical Convention would be & were would it be held? Would it be a cost savings?
316. Do NOT discontinue!
317. It would be a blessing to do this ??? every Convention but at min every two to three Conventions!!!
318. Again, this question reflects a bias that the current delegate system should even be maintained. In Synod votes as well, there is no reason that the opinion of the entire church cannot be sought for certain matters. The vote for president could be made in a way that allowed every person to have a say. Maybe the delegate system could be used for other business taken care of at conventions.
319. who said anything about discontinuing district conventions???
320. But would be a high cost especially for struggling churches.
321. pastoral not lay delegate. Pastor would represent the congregation.
322. Most congregations would not be able to afford the extra expense to send multiple people to synodical conventions
323. With the current high tech society, we should be able to set up live streaming to conventions in order that travel is not always necessary.
324. Due to cost, the convention may have to run every 4 or 5 years.
325. I believe this would be unnecessary and poor stewardship. Circuits or Regions should appoint representatives to be their voice at Convention.
326. However, to keep costs down, the synodical conventions should meet every 5 years instead of 3.
327. I would prefer it if we considered electronic means of engaging every called pastor and congregation in Synodical conventions.
328. Again this has to do with a balanced representation and keeping communication flowing freely between congregations and synod. If there are no Districts, then the only way to keep everyone involved in the church body is to have a representative from each congregation be

a part of the decision making. This will also ensure that congregations don't feel left out or forgotten and will help with relationship building for all
329. If District conventions are discontinued, where else would those voices be heard?
330. What a good idea. It can reduce costs not to have District conventions.
331. In theory that could mean 700 delegates, but only every three years.
332. Ban all conventions. They are an expensive waste of time and money and accomplish nothing. They are an ineffective way of administering business that doesn't matter at the end of the day. Ban all conventions.
333. I believe that would prove to be too costly and not good stewardship.
334. Financially speaking, I don't believe this would be wise, I believe regions or circuits should appoint representatives to be their voice at convention.
335. This would perhaps increase the cost of Synodical Conventions. This should also perhaps increase the length of the conventions so should be very carefully looked at as an effective use of available funds.
336. except that this would cause a greater strain financially.
337. Possibly but real change needed. A real democratic process is called for.
338. Sending a pastoral and lay delegate from every congregation leads to a costly convention for both LCC and the congregations.
339. "Must" send pastoral delegate, "may" send lay delegate. Quorum is reached by whomever is there.
340. Professional church workers and a lay delegate from every congregation should be there every four years and the regional conferences can be held at the beginning of a week long gathering.
341. If districts are discontinued, further study is needed to ascertain what the best way is of arranging representation at synodical conventions.
342. It depends on the new structure. If we divide the Synod into more geographical areas than three Districts, it may be sufficient to have delegates from this areas (maybe called circuits).
343. That all depends on what the actual structure is - if Districts still exist, I think they should be scaled back in scope and there would be no conventions. But maybe other regional gatherings would make more sense. This can't be fully answered until the actual structure is known.
344. By circuits
345. Delegates should be one pastoral and two lay delegates from each congregation.
346. If able to.
347. Strongly agree provided the cost is the same or lower than our current district conventions plus synodical convention.
348. This would produce a much larger convention, probably about 500, which would give some room to address the vexed question of deacon representation.

31. If the District Conventions are discontinued, pastoral and lay delegates to synodical Conventions should be elected to represent circuits as they are now.

1. I should be open to the congregation, if they choose or elect delegates.
2. May be necessary to increase numbers for better representation.
3. If there is only a synodical convention, then every congregation should have a vote.

4. not representative of numbers
5. If no district convention and not all congregations represented at Synod convention - less info getting back to congregations, fewer congregations involved.
6. Circuit reps would or wouldn't get info to congregations. Only work if strong circuits. I haven't seen many.
7. This would become prohibitive for small congregations.
8. Need all congregations Pastors and lay leaders to be active in Synod.
9. We would then need a voice from each parish.
10. Repetition. Every Pastor should go, but lay people do not have theological understanding. 3 pastors to 1 lay
11. need reps that are in each church
12. We have to create ways for more dialogue in our church. More representation. But, make sure conventions are meaningful and effective
13. no, as there is so much conflict of interest and cover-up in the ranks and neutral rep. is lost.
14. This could work.
15. In theory this is a terrible idea. Individual congregations and pastors would rarely have the opportunity to attend, fostering ignorance and hurting our fellowship as a synod. Everybody should be there, every time-- as long, of course, as this is not impossible in financial terms.
16. Each congregation needs to send pastoral and lay delegates. If we don't have district conventions, then this is imperative. I recognize that there will be an expense to congregations, but we need a louder lay voice in our organization.
17. Organizing the process for selecting synodical convention delegates via a circuit forum can be difficult and frustrating. If this ends up being the only way to get congregational involvement I fear the quality of representation may be inferior.
18. I lean toward "Agree" but, as above, depends on structure adopted.
19. May need more input for Synod if no district weighing in.
20. Whoever the Circuit leader is for the region should be the pastoral delegate and then the lay delegate for the Circuit should be voted on.
21. Again would depend on how responsible pastoral and lay delegates are.
22. Each congregation should be able to have a voice
23. each congregation should personally be present
24. Synodical Convention delegates could be elected to represent a smaller specified number of members of the circuit at synodical Conv.
25. However, keep in mind costs, which by doing this would be downloaded to congregations that may not be able to afford it. Maybe having conventions in an easily reached central location, if at all possible using facilities in LCC-C congregations for meetings as opposed to hotels.
26. Pastors should not be elected, because in some circuits the most faithful pastors are unpopular and lack the support of their brothers in the ministry. Their voices and votes at conventions cannot be suppressed. Pastoral and lay delegates could be chosen by some sort of lottery, not by a vote.
27. Alternate to full gatherings? (per Q 30.)
28. Provided the delegates volunteer for such service, yes.
29. My answer depends on how circuits are revised.
30. As they are now, but at future conventions, should be based on reorganized Circuits
31. This may be a workable compromise to #30.

32. If this happens we need to rethink totally how the parishes are represented. From this idea what we would do would be to remove more of a voice than improve things. Perhaps the fact that the circuits are voting at just one level would streamline things for the better but we possibly run into the issue of more things forgotten or falling through the cracks so to speak. We could end up with less unification and more isolation. This could turn people away rather than spreading the word. Anything we do must be for this end.
33. one member one vote
34. gain, poorly worded question as this suggests the district convention should be discontinued. If you put everything in a synod convention, I think you would need circuit representation. But again, you are making the church vulnerable to an Eastern-Canada-dominated agenda. Most of the population is in the east. How is that fair to churches in the west who have different views (for example on whether we should have a top-down or a bottom-up church).
35. Each congregation needs to elect a delegate to be fairly represented.
36. Elected representatives would limit the number of persons attending the Convention, so this would be financially wise, but representatives might not reflect the wishes of some congregations.
37. This is another "minor structural refinement" to me. A micro-issue. First we need to know whether circuits WILL be geographically restructured.
38. Again - separate purposes. We need more communication from a membership level - NOT Less
39. Might be necessary for first Synodical Convention, but once rezoned, delegates should represent their new circuit.
40. More cost effective.
41. We all need a voice at some point and level.
42. Prefer better representation of parishes - voices and votes.
43. But?
44. Not sure how well the information would get back to individual Congregation.
45. If District conventions are discontinued, then every congregation should be sending their pastor and a delegate, even if this is a vacancy pastor. Circuit representatives don't necessarily represent the way all the congregations feel on certain issues.
46. question 31 is contingent upon my comment to question 30,
47. Representation could be prorated by the number of congregations in the circuit.
48. Only if it is not possible for congregations to each send a pastoral and lay delegate.
49. Probably.
50. Every congregation should have a say in what is happening.
51. There could be opportunity at synodical conventions for districts to get together.
52. If response to "30" is not feasible this is the best possible plan.
53. There are benefits from Christians gathering together around the Word in study, as well as the business that goes on at conventions. It would be a great loss for congregations to lose that exposure. Not sure because then you always run the risk of popularity votes
54. Once again "wisdom" rules. Those who communicate, willing to serve God's purpose.
55. Each congregation should have a pastor and lay delegate.
56. Again District Conventions should remain intact.
57. If district convention is discontinued all congregations should have representation at synodical conventions.
58. If Circuits remain as they are NOW

59. more cost effective and providing the circuit forums are active and well representative of their constituents, this could work.
60. The congregation/parish has the right to send a delegate to synodical conventions
61. Still, to best serve the congregations I do not think District Conventions should not be discontinued.
62. LCC has to choose. Either two conventions where at the: first: every congregation may send two delegates second: the congregations who had their say at district level may elect representatives of each circuit. OR One convention where every congregation has two delegates. You cannot remove the representative democracy.
63. I don't know how effective this is.
64. I don't think District Conventions should be discontinued. If so each congregation should be represented at the Synod Convention.
65. With enforceable powers.
66. Once again, what structures would there be in synod? Would this best represent all of synod?
67. If you have no convention, how do you elect? How do people know who to vote for?
68. Every congregation and member should be there. It will serve to foster better communication and strengthen our unity and understanding of the work across Synod.
69. I am not knowledgeable. Depends on what those who have more information then myself would believe on this matter. But all decisions with thought processes behind them should be related to churches and circuits before final representations are done.
70. but maybe have 2 per circuit instead of the one as it is now.
1) LCC is small enough that all congregations can be represented. 2) If there are no district, then all congregations need to be represented.
71. Above I commented that each congregation should send a pastor and lay delegate. It would be best to have the least amount of layers between congregation and the top of synod.
72. BUT lay delegates only with pastoral advisors coming from circuits but representing Jesus Christ
73. Too many lay delegates are just yes men to the Pastors. lay delegates should be chosen by lay members only and dissenting opinions allowed
74. Districts have never been what was intended and are, instead, liabilities.
75. Could be less Circuits
76. Let them all vote, clergy and lay reps of congregations, they are there anyway
77. Disagree because, as is currently the case with synodical conventions the local congregations feel disconnected. As per question #29, congregations have little circuit interest or involvement.
78. Each congregation needs a voice at the convention, and a report back to the congregation from its delegate.
79. This would save a lot of travel expenses if we had circuit reps instead of one from each congregation
80. Is this enough representation?
81. This may be an area where the distribution of representation could change.
82. So long as the balance of lay delegates = Pastors and Deacons
83. If elected means by vote, I do not see this as necessary. Could delegates not just be appointed, perhaps on a rotational basis? If I am misinterpreting "elected" as voted, then I would agree that pastoral and lay delegates should be appointed to represent circuits, or

whatever organization of parishes is deemed sufficient (in the case that circuits are deemed an outdated mode of organization).

84. I believe each congregation should send a lay and pastoral delegate. However, if this was not selected as an option then at least each circuit should be represented as they are now.
85. Can't ground that this is an accurate assessment.
86. See above. If feasible it would be best to have every congregation represented.
87. These people should be elected in a Democratic fashion by the whole Congregation, not appointed by a small number of people like a Church Council.
88. Important connections are lost when not every congregation participates directly.
89. Possibly combine as circuit delegate holding proxies from congregations.
90. If the District Conventions are discontinued, every congregation should have a voice at the Synodical Convention. Unless the pastor or lay delegate is chosen from your congregation, you never hear a full report on the convention. While The Canadian Lutheran gives a summary of what happened during the convention, you don't get the details behind the decisions that were made.
91. Hopefully delegates would represent circuits they reside in. Any plans for a super Church?
92. Let them all go.
93. Each congregation must be represented individually at both District & Synodical conventions
94. I believe District Conventions are important
95. I think a decision should be made (Plan, Do), and then monitored (Check, Adjust)
96. providing circuits are structured to properly and fairly represent the overall membership of LCC. Suggest 1 pastoral and 2 lay be elected to attend
97. It's very hard for congregation members to have much input on these elections. Rarely do the members in my area know the members outside of our own congregations well enough to make an informed choice. It's more like ratifying someone already chosen - or throwing darts in the rare event there is a choice.
98. If LCC had more robust Circuits (or "Dioceses") with regular elections (for a local "bishop" or "dean"), then I would prefer this leader representing the district's clergy. These regular diocese meetings could similarly elect a lay-representative to serve the diocese over his/her term, including as a representative to the synodical convention. I would prefer the clergy in a diocese/circuit to be responsible alone for electing their own bishop. And similarly, I would want only laity to elect the lay-representative.
99. Each congregation should be represented.
100. That is a possibility. What other creative options might we consider?
101. A cross section/adequate representation is more important than the question of elected or selected
102. Not sure on this.
103. I would think that it is very difficult for the important information from the Conventions to filter down to each congregation if only a few people represent all of the congregations. Granted, it is more costly, but it probably would only be once every three years.
104. See above!!!
105. don't know how they are elected now
106. This would mitigate the expense issue.
107. Why disband districts only to replace them with circuits?

108. I don't have a better way. If you do put it out there for the ordinary church member to consider.
109. All congregations should be able to be involved in decisions being made.
110. It is important for pastors to know each other for knowledge and supports. Learning opportunities.
111. Elected by whom?
112. Agree, but to the extent that more should be sent from each circuit. An equal balance maintained
113. Maybe larger circuits in regard to number of members could be able to have more reps.
114. A more manageable number with representation from geographical zones across the country.
115. I would be strongly against the discontinuation of the Districts, let alone their conventions.
116. This totally depends on what structure would be devised
117. All congregations/parishes need to have representation, otherwise they will simply not be interested in being involved.
118. Too much authority by the limited number of delegates and pastors.
119. I disagree, because the communication is so poor that we rarely get any information at the congregational level!
120. That would work, but I would prefer a delegate from individual parishes.
121. Did you not just ask this question in a different way? Redundant question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey
122. We all need to be represented as we were in the early LCMS. WE AREN'T THAT BIG.
123. Too much already
124. This seems to be functional system.
125. Congregations are the foundational unit of our Synod.
126. Nope. Every congregation should be there.
127. I think there would need to be a greater number of representatives than currently. Without that congregations could feel further detachment from the Synod
128. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
129. With migration of members from rural to urban areas, many of our rural circuits are at a disadvantage if the current bylaws are followed.
130. We need to exercise the rights of the congregations and the church workers, this needs to happen.
131. should be more lay than pastoral
132. District conventions should NOT be discontinued.
133. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged. This statement implies that the Districts will be discontinued. Instead of discontinuance, they need to be enhanced. When congregations have a clear understanding that they will be heard, there will be greater involvement. Decision-making must continue with those who are affected most directly.
134. I feel this would silence the voices of many of our people.

135. That might be one way to deal with regional concerns, by having occasional "conventions", instead of whole Boards of Directors and conventions, where only representatives from each circuit show up and talk things out. Apart from election of officers much of what happens at District conventions is really Synod's business.
136. However, the number of pastoral and lay delegates per circuit should increase depending on the number of congregations in the circuit. There should be at least 2 or 3 of each that are elected by the circuit to attend the synodical convention.
137. Too much time and money involved so don't bother.
138. See comment to item #30. Do away with circuit representation and obtain LAY PARISH representation.
139. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
140. Unclear as to what is meant by "should be elected". All congregations should send a pastoral and lay delegate. Yes, democracy is important
141. Congregations should pick delegates from their congregations, larger congregations should get more delegates.
142. 2 to 1 (lay delegates and clergy)
143. Our Synod is small enough that all congregations should be present. If Synodical Conventions are so important then virtually all clergy and a lay delegate from each congregation should be there. If just one or two are elected to go then invariably one will not get a good cross section of people. One will get mostly those who are interested in the "political" aspects of governance.
144. need broader representation
145. Congregational representation is still important, especially since our congregations do tend to function so independently from one another. Smaller congregations could be at a disadvantage for adequate representation if the delegates were limited to circuit only.
146. Unfortunately, these statements button-holed respondents into only two options. In reality, a third option seems to make more sense to me. If the District Conventions are discontinued, then each congregation / parish should be represented at the Synodical Convention by either a pastoral or a lay delegate. That representation would alternate for each congregation at subsequent conventions. So, in 2017, congregation A would be represented by its pastor, but in 2020 it would be represented by a lay delegate. A system would be established so that each circuit would normally be represented by an equal number of pastoral and lay delegates.
147. stronger rep by Laity.
148. believe that for the unity of the church it would be best to have every congregation/parish represented and every eligible pastor present.
149. Every pastor and congregation should have a voice in our Synod but sending that many would be very costly. Perhaps the same number as attend now to with a method of electronic voting for the others? The more people involved, the more unity there can be...cost would be an issue.
150. If Question 30 comes into effect, then delegates should be elected at the congregational level.
151. How are they elected now?
152. Given our size, each serving pastor and each parish should have opportunity to take part in church wide assemblies.
153. Or the circuits which may be reallocated and boundaries redrawn.

154. f there is are synodical conventions in place of district conventions then there needs to be greater representation as there will no doubt be regional meetings occurring. This seems like a good idea, to provide fair representation, but I do not know what the disadvantages of this change would be.
155. Same reasons as my answer in 31
156. see 30 We are a small enough synod that we can meet together. We need to meet together. We need to have face time together. Walking together as synod with only representation at a synod convention is not walking together. By our own admission we say pastors and congregations are members of synod. But...we don't need all of you at a convention to talk about the work of the church.
157. district (local) conventions should continue.
158. uninformed on this issue
159. Are proposing that we dissolve districts? I am not convinced that structure is at fault with ABC. There should be some sort of mechanism that would provide some of the qualities that Districts currently provide. That said yes [perhaps smaller circuits].
160. No idea what the implications of this are.
161. Smaller parishes or congregations would be under represented.
162. Pastoral and lay delegates should represent congregations
163. I believe this is the only financially viable solution. However, in this day and age where teleconferencing and other electronic means are available, it is possible that a larger scale involvement is possible. Such a solution should be considered and ways to facilitate such large scale participation.
164. -the way the system works now, some pastors never have the opportunity to attend a Convention, while other pastors always seem to be going; every pastor within Synod should the opportunity to attend; set limits (i.e. not allowed to attend more than two conventions in a row)
165. This would not be my preferred approach but might be required based on numbers.
166. There should not be an election, but the Circuit Counsellor should be sent.
167. However, if districts change then this should also change.
168. Agree but as noted above.
169. The circuits need to go too.
170. All delegates whether they are lay or clergy are at convention to represent Jesus Christ, not a congregation or a circuit or any other entity!
171. I would do away with circuits.
172. but if District Conventions continue, then response would be #1
173. If District Conventions are discontinued, then each congregation needs to have a voice in the Synod
174. This question makes no sense.
175. At some level, a congregation needs an independent voice.
176. If the size is unmanageable....
177. Each congregation gets one vote. The Pastor representing that congregation gets one vote.
178. More representation not less.
179. Centralizing power and authority and at the same time decreasing the ability of the members of the organization to have meaningful input is a bad idea.
180. but increased representation, as per Question 30

181. I think that this could work if needed, though I think that representation from everyone would be better if we no longer have district conventions.
182. lay people are often unknown by other congregations and congregations usually never receive reports from the elected delegates if they are from another congregation
183. Circuits are not really necessary, but some other method to choose delegates may be put into place.
184. Assuming that "one" structure solves problems.
185. Only if this system is working.
186. Problem is to get delegates elected that are representative of circuit and not pushed through by a larger congregation.
187. Are these the only two options we have? Where is the CCMS out of the box thinking we need at this time.
188. Not sure.
189. It seems a fair way of providing equal representation. There has to be better communication from the convention delegates back to the congregations and church workers before and after the convention.
190. Same question as #32. Why the repetition?
191. should be from each congregation
192. delegates under this premises should accurately state their position to those who might elect them as a representative and several choices be available.
193. Should be from each congregation
194. Should be from each congregation
195. Same as #30 - To agree or disagree I'd need to accept the presumption that regions won't be structured another way that will allow for better dialogue and representation. I'd like to see a newer structure that would allow for that, so perhaps this wouldn't be needed. This question shouldn't be asked until we decide how regions should work.
196. should restructure
197. One pastor and one lay delegate from a circuit--will they really bring the concerns of ALL the congregations in that circuit to that convention?
198. If you eliminate Districts the Synodical conventions should have representatives from every congregation.
199. Worried that small churches won't be heard.
200. The best and most practical way. Looking at the composition of the circuits and adjusting that will make sure this is the way to go
201. Congregations in circuits especially in rural/remote/non-urban areas vary widely in opinion and needs.
202. Obviously each congregation wants their best representative.
203. this is related to the question previous and following. I wish I had a scenario to make an informed decision. what would the implications be if we changed it? I wish the commission had thought of that, told us, and then asked the question.
204. Circuit representation sets a degree of separation between the congregation and the church at large that simply increases the disconnect that already exists.
205. Not necessarily in equal numbers
206. Should represent each congregation.
207. I wouldn't know the people being voted on.

208. The information they receive at synodical Conventions can be printed and passed on to congregations in their circuit when they gather
209. I'm not sure how one would determine this, but only those who truly believe that God's Word is authoritative should be making decisions / wise Christian leaders.
210. This is simply an echo of question 30 phrased the other way around. Again, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. Shouldn't be made into an issue.
211. Are they not representing congregations not just circuits?
212. means may be problematic
213. District conventions should not be discontinued.
214. unless all congregations are represented
215. when you remove a level of participation and communication I feel that those congregations will feel farther away and disconnected from decisions made that affect them. I realize that this addresses costs and cuts down on persons being burnt out from volunteering all over but some congregations will be cut off also.
216. Each congregation should be represented and have voice.
217. they may not be the same, so pretty hard to do!
218. Yes, circuit reps should be elected at these synodical conventions BUT the Circuits may need to be reorganized/reconfigured.
219. I don't think there' much choice
220. Are proposing that we dissolve districts? I am not convinced that structure is at fault with ABC. There should be some sort of mechanism that would provide some of the qualities that Districts currently provide. That said yes [perhaps smaller circuits].
221. if we don't have delegates from individual congregations attending
222. I believe circuit unit is valuable and much more useful than the districts.
223. We need Districts.
224. Undecided on this one, quite complex, like all the above.
225. There should be increased efforts to ensure selection of delegates is a result of a more informed selection process in the circuits
226. There currently is no ABC district so there is no ABC representation
227. If District Conventions are discontinued, I feel that the Pastor and an elected lay delegate from each congregation should attend the Synodical Convention. I believe that would allow for a more effective sharing of information.
228. I think it would be a mistake to discontinue District Conventions.
229. Do NOT discontinue!
230. Have to take into account the geographical restructuring.
231. Again, this very question reflects bias that conventions remain the best way of making decisions and holding votes.
232. As all congregations are assessed the costs for conventions then I would suggest that representation be from all. The financial viability and comparisons of what congregations have paid should be considered.
233. who said anything about discontinuing District Conventions??? Cart before the horse question???
234. We need to eliminate the current synodical system of representation. Well known and popular pastors and lay people are elected numerous times to a synodical convention, while less known people who have the ability and skill to attend are overlooked. Each parish should send a pastor and lay person. It is the only fair way.

235. Only pastors should represent congregations.
236. I am unfamiliar with the current process. I thought that each congregation was able to send representatives. Therefore, why would circuit elections be necessary?
237. Absolutely not. Every pastor and congregational lay rep should be there. The current system of voting pastors and lay people to represent circuits is grossly unfair. Popular pastors and lay people continue to be elected multiple times,
238. I would suggest the Districts and circuits could be dissolved. These would be replaced with "Region's" that have much larger geographic areas than circuits to be determined. Elected paid positions then at Synod would then be responsible for communications and oversight of a specific number of group geographic Region's. A local Pastor is no longer burdened with the responsibility of Circuit Counsellor.
239. Individual churches each need to have a voice.
240. Ban all conventions. They are an expensive waste of time and money and accomplish nothing. They are an ineffective way of administering business that doesn't matter at the end of the day. Ban all conventions.
241. You need the opinion of the average person, not just the most well known.
242. and maybe instead of the 2 per circuit; there is 3 or 4...
243. Grass roots would be severely reduced.
244. Didn't I just answer this question in #30?
245. see question 30 above. Every congregation represented professionally and lay.
246. Are you assuming that the circuits as we now have them will remain?
247. That all depends on what the actual structure is - if Districts still exist, I think they should be scaled back in scope and there would be no conventions. But maybe other regional gatherings would make more sense. This can't be fully answered until the actual structure is known.
248. .....roughly speaking.....
249. Whatever works best.
250. If I understand this correctly: currently congregations don't send a pastor and lay delegate to synodical conventions. Rather, each circuit sends a representative. I didn't know this was the case. Certainly, each congregation should have two delegates (pastor and lay) attend some level of convention. If district conventions are eliminated, then each congregation should send two delegates to the Synod convention, since the Synodical convention will become much more important than it is now.
251. If there is no District Convention, then most likely the pastors who are popular with the laity in each circuit will continually get elected to synodical convention and many pastors may feel disenfranchised as they could possibly never get elected and have a vote at synodical convention. Better to let all pastors and congregations get a vote.
252. These "elections" are a farce. There is little to no vetting of the delegates, and at my church there was absolutely no discussion of any of the issues to be discussed at the convention.
253. The right way to go is to have each congregation represented.
254. If District conventions are discontinued each congregation should have representatives to the synodical conventions.
255. Congregations would become more and more disconnected than they have become because of the lack of leadership on the district level.

256. ~ if done every three years it MUST then one pastoral and one lay person per congregation or parish for every convention. ~ this is important both for clear information an opinion going both ways.

32. Whether or not District Conventions continue, each congregation/parish should be represented individually at synodical conventions

1. Every congregation should have a vote, even in dual or triple parish. To keep lay-clergy balance, some advisory pastoral delegates could be designated voting i.e. some retired, some from seminaries, etc.
2. No, don't need both.
3. Cost prohibitive.
4. Why not use circuit rep?
5. Why not use a circuit rep.?
6. Are there too many people attending these conventions? We need to hear more info from these.
7. They should be represented by a lay delegated from each congregation and Pastor from the circuit. (Circuit counsellor)
8. 3 pastors to 1 lay
9. Each congregation should have a delegate
10. For congregations / parishes that cannot afford the expense of sending a delegate, another option would be to provide a live video feed from the Conference to delegates who have password protected access to it. Add a moderator who receives and asks questions submitted by remote delegates, and that alone might save some money. If it's a popular option, then less delegates means less space would need to be rented, less snacks / food would need to be bought, etc. If almost all delegates opted for a video conference, then the conference could be held in a room of LC-C's office building. The main down side is that personal social interaction between delegates would be gone.
11. online or tele as they can't afford to go. and need lay rep at church level.
12. cost is the issue; proxy votes important or long distance tele votes live forums should be offered somehow.
13. Maybe.
14. Maybe? The principle I support is that all congregations should attend "some" convention, every time. If District conventions continue, there's no need for everyone to go to Synodical conventions. If District conventions cease, then by all means everyone should go to the LCC convention.
15. Yes, however some congregations will be challenged by the cost.
16. District conventions ensure every congregation is involved in the synod's activity in some way. Without district conventions, I fear many congregations might slip to the back of the decision-making bus.
17. To add that many people to a Synod convention could be cost prohibitive.
18. Maybe one pastor and one lay delegate for each five or six congregations.
19. Only those people would really know what is going on - individually. The more information the better!
20. Not sure about this one. It would be nice, but probably too expensive.
21. Cost to pay ways. The chance the rep. is not knowledgeable and does not pass on info is real.

22. The cost may be prohibitive, even without district conventions.
23. See above. Size might make a difference.
24. No, if individual congregations are all represented, we will have a minimum of 300 delegates to the synodical conventions, and this is just too many to be effective. Let's face it - synodical conventions are treated like paid vacations by too many. They are a waste of resources at current sizes.
25. Ideally
26. This seems like overkill. Each congregation should be permitted but not required to send a representative. All conventions should be restructured to allow remote participation. The travel and accommodation costs for conventions are far too high.
27. Every congregation should have equal voice in convention deliberations.
28. While this might be ideal, it might be unworkable and cost prohibitive.
29. We have to have some representation relevant to our local congregation.
30. Same as my answer for 31, I am unsure as to whether this would cause more problems than solve things. This is a big change that needs to be understood fully t make sure we are moving ahead and not back.
31. Due to lack of pastors, we have one pastor serving several outlying congregations. Each congregation should be represented by the pastor serving them. If they are currently without a pastor, then the synod may assign someone to represent them, but only if that pastor can actually visit and speak with that parish before the convention. If you assign representatives arbitrarily, they won't know how to speak to the issues concerning that particular parish. If you don't like the fact that one pastor serves multiple parishes, then your goal should be to train more pastors.
32. one member one vote
33. this is the same question. No, we don't want to become an Eastern-Canada-centric church.
34. Please see my concerns, at Questions 30, regarding all Congregations being treated as equals for decision-making purposes, when clearly, Congregations are not all equal in size and financial strength.
35. It would be too costly
36. It might be difficult to find representatives to attend both District and synodical Conventions.
37. definitely - we are "the body of Christ" and so the Bible teaches every part has a use and purpose.
38. Every congregation should have equal voice in Convention deliberations/decisions.
39. Too costly.
40. Leave it as it is now.
41. costs need to be considered.
42. It appears from Q's 30-32 that this survey directs participants to expect no District Convention! Leading question?! At national Convention provinces/district could meet for 30 min. to elect D.P.
43. If District Conventions continue - stay with status quo.
44. Yes, each congregation should be represented, even those congregations being served by a vacancy pastor. The vacancy pastor is just as important as a regular pastor.
45. question 32 is also contingent upon my comment to question 30.

46. If District conventions continue, I don't think that each congregation / parish needs to be individually represented. Also, if the strategic plans of the synod and districts align then there is less need to be individually represented at both conventions.
47. If conventions at both levels continue, I expect a good number of congregations would not be able to support the cost of sending delegates to both. If district conventions cease, I would see congregational delegates as the ideal, but am not sure if cost to congregations and increased size of synodical convention would make this a practical choice.
48. These discussions should happen at the circuit level.
49. this seems unrealistic and financially unrealistic
50. How will congregations who are struggling now be able to send delegates to synodical conventions where travel cost and lodging is expensive
51. Especially if Districts are maintained and District Conventions are held each congregation/parish should not be represented individually at synodical conventions and maybe not even if District Conventions do not continue.
52. As stated before, Districts should be discontinued.
53. too expensive to do that if both district and synodical conventions exist
54. If Districts continue to be in existence, Synodical conventions should be extended by one day on which Districts would complete their District business.
55. See comment to "30" above. This may give one area of the church more power than originally planned when setting up LCC.
56. there again, you are just twisting around the same questions
57. It's important the pastors know what is going on...
58. Where financially viable.
59. Each, every congregation must know direction of Synod.
60. One rep from each circuit only who can meet with congregations after conventions
61. This would be too unwieldy.
62. Only way to keep up to date!
63. again unmanageable, costly and likely not effective communication from each circuit
64. I do not believe District conventions should continue.
65. Each congregation/parish has the right to be represented at synodical conventions
66. Still, to best serve the congregations I do not think District Conventions should not be discontinued.
67. If you want to deal with a gazillion and five people at one convention. Go for it. There NEEDS to be the chance for each congregation to have a say at either district or synodical level. This is best done in following the necessary power structure: The people are all represented at district. The people then elect individuals to carry the news of the work they did at district level to synodical level.
68. This would depend on the results of the restructuring. Would this be prudent or not.
69. It is inefficient to do both. Since the district is the synod in its geographic area, perhaps restructuring should eliminate the existing synodical convention. Instead, since each congregation is represented at the district convention, the delegates to the district convention should elect a group of synodical delegates. Retired pastors would be eligible to serve as synodical delegates, since they would be elected by the district convention. These synodical delegates from all three districts would then meet at a smaller synodical conference to elect the synodical directors.
70. Easier to do if utilize technology reference in my answer to question 30.

71. I don't think District Conventions should be discontinued. If District is kept, then each congregation should be represented at the District convention and by circuit for the Synod convention. If District is discontinued, then each congregation should be represented at the Synod convention.
72. but see how above.
73. I'm not sure this would be best, but these scenarios are rather vague at this time.
74. With technology being what it is, live stream events could reduce/eliminate the cost of physical attendance.
75. Functional? Economical? If yes, then yes
76. Every congregation and member should be there. It will serve to foster better communication and strengthen our unity and understanding of the work across Synod.
77. I am not knowledgeable.
78. Every congregation has the right to be represented at synodical conventions.
79. disagree because of the cost of sending everyone there.
80. But if you keep two conventions the cost fact will be significant.
81. Once again, if the issue against this is cost, the cost should be covered by the attendee and attendance is not required if cost is an issue. Even so, Synod should encourage Congregations to cover the cost of their own delegates.
82. Each congregation should be involved in all the proceedings; we are the 'church.
83. Again, while theoretically this makes sense, logistically and financially, it seems quite impossible.
84. Districts have never been what was intended and are, instead, liabilities.
85. The cost would be prohibitive. Might be practical if district conventions were eliminated, as per question #30.
86. Maybe too many delegates and this may slow down proceeding at the convention.
87. This would be good representation but how would it be done? Is it cost effective to poorer congregations?
88. Some simply may not be able to afford it. Or dual parish need not send someone from each parish.
89. As stated above, I do not think this is necessary. Delegates could represent a grouping of parishes. This includes economic concerns. Travel costs, as well as time commitments, add up, and may not be beneficial for some parishes. As long as discussion and results from conventions are passed on to all parishes--as I believe they are now--then I do not see a problem with delegates representing a grouping of parishes.
90. With the existence of district conventions in place I believe the current system works and attempting to represent each congregation becomes a logistical challenge and is overly expensive. If District conventions no longer existed, then I believe every congregation should be represented.
91. Can't ground that this is an accurate assessment.
92. If cost was not a factor, individual congregation representation could really increase a sense of synod - walking together.
93. Again- numbers
94. Not financially practical
95. I gather that one of the issues would be the high cost of transportation and accommodation. Perhaps LCC should investigate using modern technology to enable the convention to be

held simultaneously in multiple locations through streaming on line, with sections of the convention led by each of the sites. Broaden the audience, without crippling costs.

96. But not necessarily physically. See 30 and 31 above. Live and streaming video would be needed for feedback.
97. A little confused what #30 and #32 are saying. Travel costs would be prohibitive if each congregation/parish was represented individually at synodical conventions.
98. Ideally, I would agree - but practically, due to financial constraints, I would disagree.
99. Only if District's are no longer utilized. Then yes, every congregation should be represented.
100. Again, as in # 30 I can see many problems arising from this that would need to be addressed
101. Again this would be ideal but is it practical?
102. That would be too great a # to have at a convention.
103. Synod and Districts are formed and made up of individual congregations and as such, they play the most important role in governance and should not feel their role is to pay for decisions made by the elite.
104. need more info on this also
105. The expense would be prohibitive for small congregations.
106. Yes, but represented fairly: the larger the congregation, the more lay delegates, the more called servants, the more pastoral and deacon representation.
107. Even if Districts remain, I think it would be good (if feasible) to have each congregation represented at Synod level.
108. Only if there is a complete amalgamation
109. Poor Stewardship - Plus how many small congregations could afford $2-4000 to send Pastor & lay delegate Would the money come from Missions???
110. As in # 32 Congregations could not afford the Assessment
111. I believe that each congregation should be represented and each pastor have a vote at Synod conventions that deal with major decisions, such as was the case at the founding convention, and such as will be the case at the convention in 2017. It would be too cumbersome, expensive and also unnecessary to have all congregations represented at "normal" conventions.
112. Not certain if this is financially feasible but a good way of keeping the channels of communication open between all of the individual members.
113. Circuit elections of delegates is sufficient --- just get delegates that truly do their job!!! --that means, study, serve, and report back to the circuit and congregations in it.
114. If they are meeting in District Conventions, then they don't need to be represented individually at Synod Conventions.
115. As a matter of principle, yes. As a matter of practicality, there's nothing wrong to continue as it is now, as long as individual parishes are represented at the District Conventions.
116. The District and Synodical conventions should take place at the same time and at the same venue. Perhaps the Districts could meet separately on the first day to take care of district matters and then gather with the other districts for the Synodical conference for the remainder of the days. This way there would be greater representation at the Synodical conference and greater time of fellowship with others from around the county.
117. Each congregation should send delegates to at least ONE major Convention every three years. Otherwise they will rarely be represented directly resulting in a Synod which is increasingly disconnected.
118. Isn't this the same in essence as 30?

119. Not only poor Stewardship - many small congregations could not afford $2-4000 to send their Pastor and Lay delegate - Mission giving would probably suffer.
120. Possibly - but how is the question
121. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
122. Very bad stewardship as mentioned in #30 -- Plus how many small congregations could afford $3-4000 to send Pastor & delegate. to convention - would the funds come from Mission contributions?? A convention with 6-700 delegates would in my opinion be very unworkable and require a considerably longer convention.
123. each circuit should be represented
124. If district conventions continue with representation from each congregation/parish, it would be too costly to do the same at synodical conventions.
125. That means a total of at least 630 voting delegates, over twice as many delegates as there are members of the Parliament of Canada. Parliament has problems accomplishing anything, working full-time. If we adopt this organisation, our pastors and lay delegates will quite likely be in Convention full-time.
126. The church (LCC) is the people of God and pastors and deacons are only a small part of the church. Representation at conventions should reflect the nature of the congregations (LCC). Clergy dominance is a hierarchal structure. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" needs to promoted and encouraged. This statement implies that the Districts will be discontinued. Instead of discontinuance, they need to be enhanced. When congregations have a clear understanding that they will be heard, there will be greater involvement. Decision-making must continue with those who are affected most directly.
127. Too expensive to do both District and Synod conventions and not really necessary considering our size.
128. A large Synod convention like that is expensive and removes the need for district conventions. There may need to be District caucuses at such conventions in order to elect local officials, but beyond that, let's just have one convention.
129. Cost would make this impractical.
130. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
131. Only if the District conventions are discontinued.
132. 1 vote and 1 voice is important.
133. -That would be a huge expense. We should be able to trust that our representatives are speaking on our behalf.
134. I'm not used to the ramifications of voice and vote that each congregation would have or not have at the district and synodical level as well as the cost involved. i.e. #30-32
135. To expensive
136. There is little uniformity of heart and mind within circuits. I feel one representing many does not serve the needs of the whole body of Christ.
137. with more delegates from each congregation
138. Would be awesome but costs will be very high - may be prohibitive
139. Only if District Conventions are discontinued, should each congregation be represented individually. If District Convention continue, then circuit representation at synod Conventions is sufficient. See comments on # 31.
140. ...but we may have to look into how they can be represented (electronically?)
141. ...too much cost

142. But, a congregation of 15 members should not have the same representation of a congregation of 150 members.
143. To costly.
144. Strongly Agree: Only if there are no district conventions. Strongly disagree if there will still be district conventions after restructuring.
145. Although I admit that costs might be prohibitive. ...
146. Total representation at both Synod and District conventions would be way too expensive, and not a wise use of the resources the Lord has provided.
147. congregations and pastors are members of Synod
148. Each congregation needs to be represented.
149. The repetitiveness of the questions is getting on my nerves. See Q30.
150. That would be too many people.... clearly they need to be represented in some manner.
151. I can see pros and cons, but a big con is the expense of each congregation sending 2 representatives to both synod and district. I'm not sure that's necessary. Given today's technology, perhaps there's a more online way to involve each parish while only physically sending 2 representatives from each circuit?
152. If there are still district conventions, the cost would be too much for us to have every congregation represented at synodical conventions.
153. Unless it is too many people??
154. use technology
155. They should be represented by the Circuit Counsellor.
156. it is difficult now to address all that is on the Convention agenda, voices would never be heard!
157. Only if district conventions are discontinued.
158. because of cost
159. disagree because of cost
160. See as noted in # 30. When Circuit Forums regain what they were originally intended to be, there all lay members could attend and have voice.
161. Although I think it's OK that the congregation is represented through the circuit, the best case scenario would be representation of each congregation, however, I think it would be difficult logistically.
162. this ought to be presented as two questions as different responses follow each one: "if District Conventions continue", then #5 "if District Conventions were to cease", then #2 (agree)
163. If District Conventions continue, then I don't think every congregation needs to be represented.
164. I do not support bringing that many people together for a meeting. Why do you keep asking the same question over and over?
165. Each congregation gets one vote. Stick with our heritage from LCMS!!!
166. As long as the balance of lay and clergy remains equal.
167. Sadly, it should be so, but as a Church body we cannot bear the cost.
168. Of course -- after all it is the congregation that is the basic unit of the Synod. Let's not forget that without the congregations the Synod would not exist except as just another para-church organization.
169. If this occurs, this is a very large financial burden on many churches.

170. If District Conventions continue, synodical conventions should be constituted as at present, except that the delegate total could be increased, to provide broader representation. But not two delegates from each congregation.
171. Or, failing that, by representation per communicant member
172. If there are district conventions, then there is no need to send everyone to the national convention. I think this is wasteful.
173. There's no need to have full congregational representation at two parallel levels of structure. This would be highly wasteful and inefficient.
174. The costs alone would be prohibitive. In a perfect world, why not? but with all the financial problems we face as a synod, with congregations continuing to struggle for survival, I'm shocked that this question would even be asked
175. They should have the opportunity to be represented
176. Only if there is no District Convention.
177. Who is going to pay for such a large gathering?
178. If the congregations are small, we can share a representative.
179. Is this realistic? Huge event. I would like to agree, but I do not think it possible.
180. Can we not think of a per capita voting ratio based on church membership other than circuits or one vote per one congregation?
181. Unsure.
182. If we go with this idea than we should just get rid of the idea of circuits altogether.
183. Same comment as #30 above: This would make for an extremely large convention if every congregation across Canada would have pastoral and lay representation. A convention that larges makes it difficult to have a productive meeting with meaningful participation the delegates.
184. I agree only if there is no District convention, if there is a District convention then things could stay the way they are.
185. Fiscal concerns are important to consider here as well as the working and walking together of our church family.
186. Districts should be abandoned entirely. We don't need them.
187. whether through actually attending or through an elected representative
188. I do not have enough of this kind of information as many others...perhaps that is why things evolved as they did...there was blind trust that people knew what they were doing
189. Probably this would be too many people to get anything accomplished, if the District Conventions continue as they are now.
190. Too expensive.
191. Same as #30 - To agree or disagree I'd need to accept the presumption that regions won't be structured another way that will allow for better dialogue and representation. I'd like to see a newer structure that would allow for that, so perhaps this wouldn't be needed. This question shouldn't be asked until we decide how regions should work.
192. Fair and equal involvement and representation.
193. Have regional interim meetings
194. I agree, but let’s take a look at expenses. These conventions must not be held in the most expensive hotels, with luxury meals, travel expenses and all the other perks paid for by the congregation. This will no longer be tolerated. There are ways to have a convention without spending thousands of dollars.

195. It is very hard to see the consequences of this plan. Without the District conventions, the national meetings will be bloated with lots of local problems and decisions which will not interest most of the people at a national convention. People will be less interested in attending. Can we use technology to support a regional meeting at lower cost?
196. I do not have enough knowledge to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
197. this depends on whether that congregation would send a rep from a different church
198. They would be through the circuits. May encourage individuals to get active at the circuit level
199. Perhaps it would be better to represent the congregations in each area according to some proportional weight, rather than each congregation individually. Each area could choose their representatives (pastors, deacons, lay persons) by a regional vote.
200. All congregations are important and should be represented.
201. Too large of a gathering - every 3 years. Is this valid in the pace of today.
202. Representation should be based on a Circuit level based on membership numbers. Approx equal across LCC
203. Impractical and not necessary.
204. Again, this asks the same question a third time. Shouldn't be an issue.
205. means may be problematic
206. It would be nice but difficult
207. there are too many too costly conventions
208. Again, I am convinced this would be a blessing to the synod. Also, it is a blessing to the congregations as each of them has an opportunity to see the synod more manifestly. Though, to disagree with the question itself, Districts should not continue, much less District Conventions.
209. There are other ways to accomplish voting at convention
210. Yes, for the sake of a voice - HOWEVER for the sake of costs there may have to be alternate ways of meeting virtually also to allow the smaller congregations to gather in an area through skype and still participate
211. Again, I don't know difficult this would be to manage logistically
212. Would be nice, but cost prohibitive.
213. I've stated my opinion in the previous 3 questions
214. Too many cooks in the kitchen can be dangerous; there should be less representatives present at synodical than district.
215. Some congregation/parish may find this very difficult financially to send representatives so not sure how to answer this.
216. Each congregation should be represented and have voice.
217. This would result in a huge cost increase & I can see very little benefit for the church at large as a couple of hands full of people would continue to control the synod with no real benefit to the individual congregations.
218. far too expensive
219. It should be one or the other.
220. Should the Districts/District conventions be retained, individual congregational representation should happen at the district level. Otherwise it should be synodical
221. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
222. Each congregation has different needs, even if they are in the same community. These needs should be represented individually.

223. Each congregation if possible should be represented. This is the way democracy works.
224. You know; this is a stinking long survey, I have been at this for more than 2 hours, [second pass as the first failed to get a done]. I think that I said no in Q30 and Q31 please review my answers.
225. Again, this would make for a large number of delegate. issues can be explored and flushed out at the circuit level, then the synodical convention could spend time on issues that are already proven to be important to the majority of circuits.
226. Only if District conventions cease.
227. It seems like you missed a question - why didn't you ask if District Conventions are a meaningful part of LCC"?
228. Not every congregation can be equally well informed on the issues. There would need to be some form of additional information provided to ensure qualified representation
229. we indicated that we do not feel district conventions are required
230. I think the synodical conventions would be huge if each congregation/parish was represented that's why it's good that District Convention offer this opportunity.
231. Should be the option of the congregation/parish
232. Do NOT discontinue!
233. Each congregation/parish should be represented individually at synodical conventions only if district conventions cease.
234. Perhaps that would make for rather lengthy discussions on topics. (I'm not sure on this one)
235. Is District Conventions remaining only need for an all in Synod Convention every 10 years.
236. But again, how this happens can vary. Maybe each congregation could have a few delegates. Or anyone on the church board could have a vote. Right now, though, only retired people or unemployed people can be delegates.
237. A cost analysis should be provided to make an informed decision but if cost is not a factor then each congregation should be represented.
238. Again, lets look to technology to make this happen with less expense.
239. Every pastor and congregational lay rep should be there. The current system of voting pastors and lay people to represent circuits is grossly unfair. Well known pastors and lay people continue to be elected multiple times, while there are faithful pastors and faithful lay people who haven't been elected to go after 20+ years of willing to serve.
240. ...if the cost can be mitigated by electronic participation.
241. If we continue to have District Conventions, then it is not necessary to have every parish represented at the Synod convention. It would be a waste of resources and finding lay delegates to attend a Synod and then a District convention in back-to-back years could be a challenge.
242. If possible? If affordable? Every congregation should have their say in one form or another.
243. Ban all conventions. They are an expensive waste of time and money and accomplish nothing. They are an ineffective way of administering business that doesn't matter at the end of the day. Ban all conventions.
244. Waste of resources.
245. Unfortunately, circuit forums no longer exist in many areas. Unless this is changed, congregations should be represented individually.
246. This is one option.
247. Not if district conventions continue.
248. Too many people make it difficult for things to be resolved or decided upon.

249. I believe you are asking the same question as no. 30
250. Only if District Conventions discontinue does this become necessary.
251. Everyone should have a voice.
252. We should not jump to this conclusion without considering various options to arrange for voting and representation.
253. Not necessarily as stated in the previous comments.
254. In this day and age of diminishing resources, it would be poor stewardship to try and provide for representation of each congregation/parish.
255. Congregations can't afford to do both. It's desirable, but completely impractical. But again, this can't be fully answered until the actual structure is known. This question presumes Districts still exist. That shouldn't be presumed at this point.
256. Why? Expense, manageability immediately come to mind
257. Would be too large.
258. should be.
259. Probably. If District Conventions cease, then certainly each congregation should be represented. If we continue to have District Conventions: I don't know if having individual congregations send reps to the Synod convention would be unworkable (too many people in attendance).
260. Unsure as to the potential ramifications at the synodical level.

Section 4: Restructuring Synodical Leadership

33. The President of the Synod should serve as both Chief Executive Officer and Ecclesiastical Supervisor, as is now the case.

1. Not knowing the full scope of responsibility currently held by my Synodical President I could not answer this question knowledgeably.
2. Two is too demanding.
3. Impossible job. Scripture says people have different gifts. One doesn't have all.
4. These would be better divided. Most people don't have the skills for both roles.
5. Have had no experience with any boards past our local board and not in Taber.
6. We don't need more employees.
7. Split the time - don't have enough time to do both - however can synod afford another layer of governing?
8. I don't know his responsibilities, ask him.
9. I can see benefits and struggles to either a yes response or a no response. It comes down to whether LC-C should continue to unite the roles of Chief Executive Officer and Ecclesiastical Supervisor, which means more responsibilities and pressures and conflicts of interest; or divide these roles, which means less responsibilities and pressures and conflicts of interest for each person, but may result in friction and disagreements between the two people holding those roles (much like the struggle that often existed between the kings of Israel / Judea and the prophets of God from the time of Saul and Samuel onward).
10. I do not see the president of the synod as having a valid role as a CEO.
11. Perhaps we need to figure out what CEO means in a church context.
12. see results so far, are very poor.
13. This leadership has served us very well over the years.
14. These two roles may be best divided.
15. That seems like a lot of responsibility and maybe that is why they are not able to govern as well as they should
16. The ABC fiasco has highlighted the difficulty this system has always struggled with, albeit to a lesser degree. Just as congregations have their own chairmen to oversee "externals" while the pastor and elders are responsible for "spiritual matters," so the Synod should separate these two roles.
17. I'm not sure. I'd like to see our organization streamlined and operate "lean & mean"; keep admin costs lower to allow more $$ support to mission
18. This is our weakness. Too much administrative time is taken up with CEO duties and this does not allow sufficient time for the president to be pastor to the pastors and congregations
19. Seems to have worked up to now.
20. This did not help in the CEF situation in the BC Alta. area.
21. It's important to have the right person though!
22. He needs to be both or else he will become a mere figure-head. He could devolve some of the responsibility of Chief Executive Officer to an assistant (as in the case of the Dean of the Mission Diocese of Finland) perhaps, but the authority should still be vested in the President of Synod.

23. I wonder if the time has come to split these two roles.
24. These are two separate roles
25. It all depends on the gift set of the person elected as president. Absolutely, they should be the Ecclesiastical Supervisor, but if they don't have strong gifts in administration, someone else could be the CEO.
26. This means that the selection of president is very important and the person needs to have the qualities to handle both.
27. No, the synod needs to be downsized until there is almost nothing to administer. We only need a bishop, and the little needed administrative support (accounting, reporting, technology) can be provided by able laymen or pastors.
28. The Church does not have CEOs. The Church has Shepherds.
29. I'd need more info re: what the contrasts / advantages or disadvantages of such a CEO / Ecclesiastical Supervisor differentiation might be. Is there thought that having an administrative CEO would allow more time and focus for the President toward Ecclesiastical supervision / activities? I think we could prayerfully consider these options, but have no anticipation of what a best leadership model for the Lord's purpose in His Church might be in this respect.
30. I'm not sure why the head of our Synod is a CEO.
31. Why is the head of our Synod a CEO?
32. he sure has a heavy work load. Does he have time to do it all?
33. I believe these are very different roles and each is likely a full time position. Proper time is required to devote to each role.
34. Yes, to CEO No to Ecclesiastical Supervisor
35. I do not know. Would that be too much power?
36. I believe this works well now and if there is no problem found now, this should not change.
37. only in this way will the synod stay on one course with one set of objectives
38. The Bible says that some are called to be Pastors. We train Pastors in theology, in Greek and Latin, etc. ... and then we elect some of them to be Chief Executive Officers. Different skill set needed. Different outlook required.
39. Not necessarily - one person may be gifted in one of these areas but not the other.
40. Yes, because President Bugbee has my complete trust. I believe he is thoroughly capable, conscientious and Godly in both roles, I pray that the Church would always elect such leaders. As a theoretical/structural issue, however, I'm unsure. I would be most interested to hear President Bugbee's views.
41. Too much work.
42. I think the highest office of the Synod should be served by one person, a Bishop, however the bishop could be served by two administrative officers.
43. This is too large a job for one person and secondly they require a skill set likely not to be expected in one person as they are so diabolically different
44. To much responsibility for 1 person.
45. If it is possible to find an individual who is gifted in both areas, I can agree with the above.
46. Doesn't this present the same potential trouble that has been experienced in the ABC district with conflict of interest when serving both positions?
47. This depends on whether the current positions cause conflict-of-interest or lack of attention to certain matters.

48. When emergency arises and energies are taxed there should be an appointed officer, perhaps the VP.
49. If we can afford two positions, it would make sense to split the administrative activity from the ecclesiastical work.
50. I believe the President needs to be cognizant of all aspects of synodical operations to ensure adherence to God's Word in principle and practice.
51. The chief executive officer should manage financial affairs for the entire synod.
52. I think they are two completely different entities.
53. I believe the roles need very different gifts and skills.
54. I'm not sure how the workload is as it is now. Perhaps there should be two positions but we need to stay as lean as is possible.
55. each geographical region should have its own Ecclesiastical Supervisor. (All districts will be discontinued)
56. These duties can be handled by 2 people if 1. the Ecclesiastical supervisor is the ultimate authority. and 2. the person chosen as CEO is well qualified and has Christian values that are the same as ours.
57. to big of job
58. This suggestion is not in line with common practice of separation of duties in normal governance. Normally there should be a CEO, CFO, CIO, etc. The officer roles have singular accountability of their office and serve to report, and are liable.
59. Depends on the spiritual gifts, education, skills and personal circumstances of the candidates who are nominated and elected as President of the Synod.
60. While pastors are not necessarily trained in the business matters, we want those holding that highest office to have that level of theological competency.
61. However, the Ecclesiastical Leader must have power to veto Administrative Leader should administrative decision have a negative bearing related to spiritual matter.
62. How does this work? Has this worked for A-BC district in the past few months? Who is really the head? We need one head for synod, and I hope it is Rev. Bugbee. A CEO can be hired to serve as right hand person, but not as head of synod. And by the way, salaries for all serving synod need to be disclosed. There should be no secrets. And if you pay a CEO huge bucks then you have to tell what they earn, or else you are ashamed of how much you are paying as you are not being good stewards of God's gifts for the church.
63. No! And you wonder why there are issues
64. Is it working now, are costs kept down this way?
65. One voice representing God's voice.
66. We have witnessed this not working.
67. The President should be focusing on ecclesiastical issues and the big picture of our Christian church here in Canada. We've got other minions who can slug through the administration stuff.
68. THE CEO should be someone with at least a Masters level education in Accounting and Business management. Pastors do NOT have the education or expertise to fulfill this role. This would ensure that we don't get into anymore Financial messes like we have now. The President should be the Ecclesiastical supervisor which is what his training and skills and calling are for.
69. I am not really qualified to respond

70. The synodical president should serve in a parish half time while serving as synodical president half time (as I believe President Bugbee does now)
71. How does a CEO best serve the congregations?
72. I do not think you can break the role of bishop into 2 parts...decisions about practical things and administration still reflect the beliefs and theology of the church. And I am not a fan of CEO type language as if we were a corporation and parishioners clients or customers rather than sheep.
73. it seems likely that those two positions require different skill sets which may or may not be embodied in one person
74. Ecclesiastical Supervisor, with a qualified lay person as CEO
75. Considering what is happening in the ABC district now requiring Pastor Astley to fill the Ecclesiastical role this should be considered to be split.
76. These are two very different skill sets. I have seen dysfunction at the district level. That said there are individuals who can be successful doing both. Others can't. We should elect those who can. But if the workload is too much for one man then we should segregate along these lines.
77. Need to split it.
78. This is not a business. This is a church. There can be supportive persons working with the head who are more specialized in one area or another, but the head should be the head of both.
79. Unfortunately, these two offices may be in conflict, so it is not a good idea to keep them as one position. In the past this may have worked, but the church has had to take on too many secular issues that may need a more secular approach.
80. Depending how the restructure is planned. I believe that there should be a dual service by the chair of the presidency just to take care of the work load and travelling.
81. I can see value either way. What is the dual workload like? Are they able to do both in a timely and exemplary fashion?
82. It would be ideal if he could just focus on the ecclesiastical, however I am not sure if that could be accomplished practically.
83. Any individual who takes on this role should be well trained and versed for the work ahead. Which I assume would be the case because of his former positions within the church. Perhaps a definite hierarchy should be in place of positions held before he takes on this role.
84. need more info
85. I strongly agree, but with the proviso that functions that require a chief executive officer ought to be streamlined in the church. We do not need to have a Lutheran bank/CEF, for instance.
86. The CEO MUST BE A qualified lay person with a separate elected ecclesiastical head of synod
87. If we should eliminate the districts, then the President might best be represented by a lay delegate and the Synod Will need a full time Pastor who is qualified to oversee ecclesiastical issues.
88. I agree in that I don’t want to divide the church's head position into a 'spiritual' advisor and 'practical' advisor as if the two could be separated. Theologically, the two are inextricably linked. And, however with the times it may be, I don't like calling the head of our church a CEO as if we were just some company....

89. Pastors should TEACH, PREACH, ADMINISTER SACREMENTS and VISIT MEMBERS Not be CEO's or counsellors for drug addiction, alcohol addiction, marriage counsellors Pastors should only counsel our relation ship to Christ A weekend course does not make a Pastor a counsellor. Counsellors take years of training our seminaries are to train Pastors not counsellors
90. as long as this is NOT excessively burdensome for the pres
91. The two go together
92. If we no longer have Districts the duties should be divided.
93. Do not know how busy he is.
94. A trained financial person should take care of administrative matters, leaving the president free to attend to ecclesiastical matters
95. Current and past LCC president's doing/did a fine job. If more ecclesiastical supervision given to DP or regional DPs that would free up LCC president for more CEO focused duties.
96. Agree as long as we can continue to attract people who are both effective ecclesiastical supervisors and good administrators, such as our current Synodical President.
97. Very different skills are needed for the two very different jobs.
98. Only if that person has all the qualifications necessary for both functions.
99. Does this work? Is it too much work for one man to do? Can we afford to pay for two people in this position? We don't want to build too many "middle management" positions either.
100. This may not be feasible due to increased workload in the event that districts, proper, are enveloped in the synod. If workload allows, then yes.
101. I'm thinking now that that might be too big of a job for one man.
102. I think that in light of possible change, this position could only be determined based on the magnitude of the changes.
103. not aware if this is working well or not.
104. As in the medical field, it has been found that hospital with a none medical CEO are significantly more efficient compared to those where the CEO is a medical professional. It would be my preference to have an administrative CEO and a separate Ecclesiastical Supervisor.
105. I do not no the answer to this. President Bugbee would obviously be best informed on this matter. Perhaps it is my military mindset, but I prefer to see one person at the top of an organization.
106. It is my opinion that pastors are better suited for ecclesiastical supervision than business supervision (CEO); however, if the position was split then the division of authority could become very difficult. I think it is in the church’s best interest to have a consistent direction in business and theological guidance. Sometimes the best business direction is completely contrary to Lutheran doctrine. I do believe that while the President should hold the CEO office they should have lay advisors strong in business skills as well as an administrative team consisting of administrative professionals that make the majority of decisions.
107. The church is not a dualism of "spiritual" and "non-spiritual" activity. If the business of the "Chief Executive Officer" is not spiritual leadership than the president is doing the wrong things.
108. Can't ground that this is an accurate assessment.
109. As has proved out by CEF crisis in Alberta this is almost an impossible task for one individual.

110. I disagree with the idea that the Synodical President is, or should be, the CEO. I think this is a worldly idea and question this as an assumption. I am only "neutral" in that I don't think the office should be split. The more we use terminology from the business world to describe the office of the ministry, the more we love the world. This saddens me.
111. I do not think that a Pastor necessarily has all the skills, gifts, and training necessary to serve as Chief Executive Officer.
112. Pastors are now trained or qualified to service as CEO's on financial and administrative matters. Conflicts of Interest arise which they attempt to perform both functions.
113. It is too much for one person, leave the president to do ecclesiastical and the CEO to handle the Administration
114. That's a very broad focus, and a greater Pastoral presence from the president would be more helpful.
115. possibly should be separate
116. However, he should be able to delegate CEO responsibilities to staff and/or VP's as appropriate.
117. Two different skills sets perhaps best served by two qualified individuals.
118. Don't know enough about this, but on the surface it makes sense to separate the two duties
119. Would it be beneficial to split up these tasks/roles? I'm not sure either way...
120. Being an excellent pastor/shepherd/servant with a heart to reach others for Christ does not automatically make one an expert administrator. The skill sets are quite different.
121. There may be a need to delegate some duties to a chief operating officer who has extensive management experience, particularly if districts are abolished.
122. The current format requires the President to divide his attention between ecclesiastical matters and matters of business--the latter of which he may not be particularly gifted in. Better to let him focus on the church, and let someone else worry about the business side of things. But this separate CEO should never be considered the Ecclesiastical Supervisor's boss.
123. It is difficult to have a passion for administrative duties and a pastor's heart that beats for the ecclesiastical needs of the church and its people. If you want a CEO than hire a CEO. A pastor is called to serve, not hired to serve!
124. Events in the ABC District have shown the folly of this practice. I would support a position of an elected Bishop to oversee ecclesiastical matters and an appointed (by the BoD) Chief Operating Officer. This person should be a member in good standing of an LCC congregation with suitable executive and supervisory experience.
125. Unrealistic to expect one person to have skills and background to be expert at both these distinctly different roles.
126. I believe there should be only one elected leader. Divided leadership is folly no matter how you divvy up the duties and responsibilities. He should, however, have a second-in-charge (2IC) either elected or appointed. The 2IC would focus on the administrative responsibilities. The terms of duty of the president (bishop) and his 2IC should be staggered so they're not both new in the job at the same time. By creating a 2IC position, the church would be giving someone experience at the Synodical level that he would otherwise not get - experience that could stand him in good stead if he were elected president (bishop).
127. Don't know how this person serves now so can't answer this
128. Chief executive officer only. Ecclesiastically supervision of doctrine and practice should not be in the hands of one person.

129. I don't know. Is it working now?
130. Certainly the elected President (Bishop) should be Ecclesiastical Supervisor.
131. Since when does the church have a CEO? All pastors have administrative duties, but this does not make them CEOs of their congregations. I do believe an ecclesiastical supervisor should also fulfil the administrative duties of his office, but we should provide him as much administrative support as necessary so that the administrative duties do not prevent him from his real work.
132. Not sure what the 2 roles entail this I have no opinion.
133. if synod is restructured the positions should be separated
134. Those 2 duties are so different in nature that no one person should be attempting to handle both. They should be separate positions.
135. I feel as is done in the ABC District is proper than 1 person trying to do both as is snow the case the President is on other world wide committees and spends time away from his office while doing both
136. I believe the President can have two CEO's reporting to him. One on spiritual matters and one for administration. Each CEO requires different skill sets and have responsibilities to the members of all congregations.
137. The president should be the Ecclesiastical Supervisor only.
138. I am not aware of the responsibilities associated with CEO, though the organization as a whole and all finances are to serve the Gospel.
139. The DP should be the ecclesiastical supervisor, but an office manager with an appropriate business background should look after the administrative and corporate functions.
140. This can be done -- IF the Synod elects capable people who can help, who can serve, and who are not just "warm bodies" or "square pegs in round holes" but are there to properly conduct, monitor and be accountable for the work of the president. Right now they should be limiting travel and working on an appropriate future path -- together serving the Lord and His people in the Synod.
141. It makes for greater continuity in carrying out the leadership needed in the Synod.
142. Two roles - should be separate.
143. Too much work, especially if we eliminate the districts!
144. This has not allowed the President of Synod as much time to act as the ecclesial head of the church. It would be nice to have the two roles separated, but not as equals, as the CEO would have to be responsible to the Ecclesiastical supervisor.
145. Both would be nice but can we afford it?
146. Impossible job
147. The President should be the leader, overseer and voice for ALL Synod
148. The president should be the Ecclesiastical Supervisor.
149. We need more focus on the Church side of affairs for the sake of the Gospel.
150. If we can free the President to be a Pastor still for all the congregations and pastors, that would be a huge blessing. The President shouldn't be left out of the business workings of the synod, because there is overlap, but if the job could be split in some way, that would be good for all!
151. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making

152. Currently, the synodical president only has ecclesiastical supervision over the district presidents. In our current structure, the district presidents exercise ecclesiastical supervision of the pastors and deacons (Handbook, 3.73).
153. Quite a few think that a president should be a chaplain and counselor to pastors. A secular counselor only has a caseload of 20-30 clients. It's an impossible dream and furthermore what pastor would want the caregiver be the one who gets him a salary/call. This caregiving function must be taken over by the circuit COUNSELOR, who should receive annual workshop style training. and the re-establishment of CONFESSORS. Every pastor needs a confessor with whom he meets semi-annually
154. I feel it's important to have the President as overseer of all Synod activities and be the voice of Synod
155. I feel that as it is now being done in the ABC District is a very good way.
156. Not sure - but I think there can be 2 roles here. It's a huge job for 1 person.
157. Lay CEO
158. I believe one role informs and enables the other.
159. A division of these duties between two persons will lead to endless argument concerning which person is responsible for a given item.
160. It can easily come into a conflict of interest.
161. There may be benefit in doing it this way, though I suspect it creates conflict of interest (the necessities of ecclesiastical oversight are often opposed to the value of institutional preservation that motivates a CEO). Also, while it is valuable to be a pastor in order to understand the Ministry from the inside it does not mean that a pastor has the proper skill set for a variety of CEO duties.
162. If things stay the way they are now.
163. I think there are likely much more gifted leaders that are non-ordained type people... To run and lead an organization made up of people is beyond many of our training and experience and know-how. We assume that just pastors have this gift of leadership? I can see why you would want a pastor among us to serve as Ecclesiastical supervisor.
164. There are advantages to having this but I suspect that sometimes administrative duties detract from Ecclesiastical duties.
165. If the finances are all moved to Synod, then a separate CEO definitely needed.
166. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
167. These roles need to be done by separate individuals. Business matters need to be run by someone with financial training and experience. Both roles are too broad and cannot be done well by one person.
168. This is a basic chain of command.
169. Pastors know nothing about administration, the CEO should be a layperson who is responsible to congregations, not pastors.
170. Yes, but he should have a second in command to help .... a CEO who reports to the President
171. Synod president or Bishop should be the church's pastor and another pastor or suitable lay person could be the CEO.
172. The wearing of " Two Hats " seems to have caused huge problems in our church and has been the excuse for getting off track as to what God intends us to do.
173. It is preferable to have the President of Synod to be the ecclesiastical supervisor and to hire a Chief Financial officer to address the corporate responsibilities.

174. I think these two roles should be separate. The chief executive officer should have strong administrative, financial and management background. I would not have a problem if this person had experience as a pastor but I believe the management experience is vital.
175. Administration should be performed by a layperson with the appropriate gifts and training. The President/Bishop should be a pastoral office.
176. The President should be the spiritual leader who uses the administrative gifts of someone in the role of CEO (not clergy).
177. CEO. Too much power for one person.
178. Please avoid Splitting this up: Splitting this into two positions will create conflict. Sin always finds a way to pit the one against the other, having two people fill these roles will only exasperate this. Currently this is an internal spiritual conflict for the President splitting it up could create a number of unforeseen spiritual issues for the synod.
179. These should be 2 separate positions, and these 2 individuals would need to work closely together.
180. He should be Bishop of the Church and chief Pastor of Shepherds and Sheep in first place, but I don't see how he can be simply exempt from "Left Hand" stuff.
181. Not sure
182. This is an unclear question. It assumes that the respondent understands the difference in the duties of the president re: CEO and Ecclesiastical supervisor. Those duties need to be outlined before this question can be addressed.
183. The job should be separated. As the current priorities in our church dictate that the President as Chief Pastor should be focused on Ecclesiastical matters (outreach being a crucial area that needs attention). Unfortunately, in the current arrangement our Presidents often get drawn into substantial business(administration) matters.
184. In matters pertaining to theology and doctrine - an ecclesiastical supervisor should have authority. In matters other than theology and doctrine a CEO but decided through BOD and votes.
185. Makes good sense.
186. The Chief Executive Officer should be someone educated and trained in matters of finance and administration. If not, the President's qualifications should specify that he not only be an ordained minister but also have a Masters degree in Administration or something comparable.
187. If, and only if, he is willing do the hard stuff [like church discipline] for the sake of the erring and the church.
188. It's becoming painfully clear that pastors are not business people and as such they need to stick to pastoring, and have competent laymen fulfill the business responsibilities.
189. Someone who's a good and wise spiritual leader doesn't necessarily have the skills and experience to be a good and wise financial leader. And it's like asking an apostle to wait on tables.
190. I stated earlier the President should be the head of the Church as the Pope is to the Catholic Church. He leads the Church and is ultimately responsible for its direction. He must build good teams to help him manage the job.
191. Should be the leader regarding Spiritual matters.
192. The two should be separate.
193. I don't think the church should have a CEO. That is a model taken from the world. I'm not sure an Ecclesiastical Supervisor is needed either. Can the Lord not work directly through

the pastors and elders He raises up in the local churches and be each church's supervisor. He has super vision - He sees and knows everything. Nothing in all creation is hidden from God's sight. Everything is uncovered and laid bare before the eyes of him to whom we must give account.

194. President must be a Pastor. Pastor's teach and Preach. We should have an Operations Manager that maintains the Synod operations and Budget. His decision making should be limited to decisions deemed within Budget. Operation and financial issues outside of budget would need Board approval. I do not like the term Chief Executive Officer as that implies decision making authority for all financial matters. This person must stay in budget and prove to our President/board that his decisions are within the bounds of good financial Stewardship while focusing on minimizing operational expenses so more funds are available for mission work and care of church workers.
195. I think having someone having full authority/responsibility is important. If the President can't be effective in both he should delegate duties for each area to a V.P.(s) but retain overall responsibility for both within his authority. I think the responsibilities of both roles are not mutually exclusive. Someone has to be in place to see that the common interests are properly maintained.
196. The President of Synod is not a CEO. There is no CEO. We are not a business or a corporation. We're a CHURCH. He's a BISHOP.
197. He should be a bishop, however, not understood in political-business terms.
198. I am still thinking about this. But, no matter what, the title of "president" needs to be replaced with the title of "Bishop".
199. I have no knowledge of how much time is taken up with administrative duties vs. ecclesiastic duties. Certainly his focus should be on Ecclesiastical duties.
200. I agree if the job/ workload would be easily manageable so that he could do a quality job in both.
201. seems to be a lot of travel to other countries, could more costs be eliminated with technology such as Skype, for sure at the district level this could be done. You don't need a President running around to congratulate somebody.
202. there seems to be a lot of travel to other countries, could some costs be eliminated with technology such as Skype. For sure at the District level this could be done. You don't need a President running around to congratulate somebody.
203. As noted above, the Office of President must be separated in two with the President being responsible for managing the business affairs of the synod and (we could call him a bishop?) a clergyman being responsible as ecclesiastical supervisor in the church and spokesman to the world on matters where faith and life intersect.
204. As I am responding after the letter of the President of Concordia University of Edmonton, there could be a conflict of interest.
205. Don't understand the impact of separating them
206. Ideally, the two should be separated.
207. There may be times when the President may not be able to fill both roles properly.
208. There is the business of the church, and the ecclesiastical supervision requirement. I do not believe one person can serve both functions.
209. I'm not sure of the amount of time that would require... we have to be sure that we don't overwork him... we need to value the work he does and allow him to do it well...

210. Kingdom of the Right and Kingdom of the Left. I believe that the President of the Synod should have Ecclesiastical Supervision of the church but that an individual with appropriate business training and experience should act as the CEO reporting to the Synodical Board of Directors who are then elected by the congregations/synod members. This provides a separation of Ecclesiastical duties which are the bedrock of our organization from "business matters". Having a CEO responsible to an elected Board of Directors provides accountability back to the congregations regarding matters of business within the organization and does not put the Ecclesiastical leader in potential conflict of interest situations.
211. Bugbee is a great leader. If the role of both is too demanding, he'd be the one to ask.
212. IT sounds like a heavy load for one person and the spiritual gifts could be in conflict within that person
213. Pastors in general are ill equipped to be managers and my understanding of scripture is that that is not their calling. The current president who clearly has an outstanding gift of preaching and teaching is wasting that gift "administrating|"
214. I can see arguments for both single and separate offices, yet our Synod President is primarily CEO and not much of an Ecclesiastical Supervisor, which is not just spiritual care, but also a supervisor or doctrine and practice within our Church. As our structure now stands the Synodical president does not have much Ecclesiastical say as we tend to the practice of every congregation and Pastor does whatever they want.
215. There will always be a balance needed of the head of any organization to be accomplished in multiple areas. However, that doesn't mean the head of any organization needs to be doing all the work. There is a reason that in Scripture the qualifications of a pastor include "be able to manage well his own household". Managing isn't the only thing a pastor does, but it is part of the overall expectations of Scripture.
216. What happened at CUE is a good argument that this should not be the case. Also, I think it burdens the pastoral office with unnecessary worldly responsibilities.
217. In general, I agree with this statement. However, this also depends on the chosen structure for synod. If the president acts as a part-time pastor, the full duty of the presidency might be too much. This is a good structure if the president can continue to dedicate all of his time to his duties.
218. Too much pressure on President.
219. I believe the Ecclesiastical care should be a distinct role.
220. If this must happen, then I'm not strictly opposed. I'm not convinced it would be the best, but it could still work.
221. I do not understand this question, nor the companion (opposite) - I do not have enough information to make an opinion as I have no idea what that would look like nor how the authority would be divided. also I object to the subtle change in wording between the two questions -
222. I believe this requires two different individuals.
223. difficult to do both jobs effectively.
224. Especially if one of the results of the restructuring is the dissolution of the districts, separation of the two roles of the President would be wise.
225. The responsibilities are so different it would be hard to find all the skills sets in a single individual. However, there does need to be a "top dog".
226. The office of the President should be adequately resourced so administrative support is available as needed but responsibility still lies with the President.

227. Possible conflict of interest would be avoided
228. The function of CEO would be better served by a well-qualified executive capable of managing the affairs of the institution, i.e. finances, organization, etc.
229. he can delegate functions
230. This position may be too much for one person.
231. I don't know how the two roles could be separated. I think one naturally informs the other, especially Ecclesiastical Supervisor to CEO.
232. I believe this depends upon the structure further down the ladder. It is a huge task to perform the duties of both jobs equally well, even more so if the districts are eliminated.
233. The 2 "hats" here are not always strong points for one individual. Separate business from religion.
234. What are we learning from the current ABC situation with the DP acting as CEO and the "Spiritual Leader"?
235. It may be more beneficial to have someone with the skill set to be CEO taking care of the business end of synod and a pastor be the ecclesiastical supervisor.
236. If this is not too much to ask of one individual.
237. depends on the new structure... if this becomes a single office that oversees all of LCC then separate if it stays as separate districts then Pres. can be both
238. We should have him as the pastor of the pastors, not trying to do both. Pick one job or the other. I think it would help clear up some matters even in my own district. Elect a CEO of _____ and a President of _____.
239. I think this could be done by two different people as Pastors are not necessarily equipped to be Chief Executive Officer's
240. Should be 2 roles with a lay person as CEO.
241. The President is elected as is the Vice President. A business manager not a pastor but a Lutheran is hired to fill the other Vice President job if it is not practical to offer names at convention.
242. if LCC want to be recognized as a corporation then operate as one. Choose a Vice President who is accountable to the President.
243. not sure what the duties of both of these positions are
244. Our Presidents have been outstanding Christians, Lutherans and men we could rely on as our leaders, both in the CEO and Ecclesiastical leadership positions. The only reason I can see for changing this would be if the presidents feel that it is an unworkable combination. You would have to ask them, past and present.
245. D.P. should be the spiritual advisor CEO should or could be a layman.
246. Perhaps a qualified CEO/manager/administrator needs to have some authority in business related matters.
247. No, no, no. A clergyman should be the spiritual leader only. To be fair, our theology always informs our practice, but if by "CEO" it's meant "one who is responsible for the business side of the Synod", then a clergyman should not be in that role.
248. Without knowing the total amount of time that is needed for each duty, it is hard to say if the President's duties should be divided.
249. No! This is what lead to the problems in the ABC District. He should definitely be the Ecclesiastical Supervisor but not the CEO. That should be a layman with professional financial experience.
250. separate responsibilities

251. No! No! No!
252. I may be a challenge wearing both hats, but perhaps the Synod could solve that problem by enlisting the help of other qualified individuals as he carries out his duties.
253. Isn't the President supported by a board to provide support for the administration duties?
254. I believe that the President should be the President of the Synod, however, a separate person should be the Ecclesiastical Supervisor. The President cannot oversee all of this supervision. The supervision currently is weak, at best.
255. They should be two separate positions.
256. They are 2 separate roles.
257. I would think that each position would require a different skill set but if it works now to the Presidents satisfaction, OK.
258. If we don't go into business, we know very little about this should work. The question here would be does the CEO have to be a Pastor or Academic? If that is the case nothing to be accomplished other that another salary
259. It is far from obvious that the most qualified person ecclesiastically will have enough business experience to be an effective CEO. Maybe these jobs should be separated.
260. These should definitely be separated. The business of the Church should be perceived and run as a business. Many of the problems this Church has experienced are due to the fact that they have ignored this tenet. There are different qualifications needed for each of these job titles, acknowledge that fact and understand that no one can be all things to all people. Let the Ecclesiastical Supervisor "be a Pastor" to the Church workers and let the CEO run the business.
261. As long as work load is manageable.
262. Although both should have the same mandate.
263. I think they are two different roles with different skill sets. As a congregational leader I see this at the congregational level as well. Many pastors I've dealt with over the years don't understand the business aspects of the congregation and should stick to the spiritual.
264. Ecclesiastical and administrative require different "spiritual gifts,' knowledge and training
265. There should be an individual who is not as Pastor but employee of the Board. (Treasurer is supposed to be filling this role currently). Responsibility but no authority.
266. I detest the language of CEO talking about church matters. we should attempt to speak biblically here. dividing those functions looks good on paper, but will result in a lay CEO who will have ultimate authority over the ruling of doctrinal matters to the ecclesiastical leader. look at history. the secular authority since the reformation, has always ended up having more power than the ecclesiastica. it is important though that our synod president has skills in business and admin, a bit, as well as doctrine and theology.
267. The "Business of the church" should be conducted by those with excellence in Best Business Practice. The Spiritual needs of the church, its workers, and its people need to be administered in a separate, and perhaps more urgent manner.
268. I have concerns about the "business" over ruling the theological side, but those who are most knowledgeable in management and finance should probably make business decisions as the CEO rather than a pastor who is trained in theology and pastoral care.
269. Maybe... there is a need for one person to be the "buck's stops here" person.
270. I believe recent events have demonstrated that the CEO should not only be a pastor but should also have some business training. Running a Synod is a difficult job made worse by

having insufficient knowledge of business realities to make sound decisions on non ecclesiastical issues.

271. Maybe. In any organization, we need someone where the buck stops. These lines get blurred (as it is being blurred in the ABC District right now... I have met with both Pastors Schaeffer and Astley and I can't clearly articulate how their roles differ. Can they?)
272. Is he overworked from such expectations? This should maybe be taken as a personal case for each individual President...does he want to serve as Ecclesiastical Supervisor and have someone else more suited to the position of Chief Executive Officer do that position. Otherwise we might not elect someone because they cannot do one part of the role well but they are the best candidate for the other position.
273. The doctrine and administration should be split.
274. Why give him so much responsibility?
275. Ultimately there is no theological distinction of the two - both are the affairs of the Father's Church on earth That incarnational reality should be reflected in the Office
276. There could be other options for this.
277. This is a huge job for one person.
278. No, only as Ecclesiastical. Should have a separate CEO with financial background
279. Depending on his time allocation. Does he have the time to do both?
280. As much as I hate the idea of the President of Synod (who I think should take on the perfectly Lutheran and historically Christian title of Bishop) being overwhelmed with administrative responsibilities, there is a certain necessity for it. I would sooner see an Chief Administrative Office who would be overseen by the Bishop/President.
281. Laypeople don't know enough to have a clear opinion. If the person can fill both positions, why not.
282. The CEO should possibly be elected from the Church population based on established competency criteria
283. He should be a pastor to the pastors not an administer.
284. These should be 2 different roles; the CEO should have a business background, and the ES should have a theological background.
285. Another question that will lead to confusion. Many people do not understand the concepts that are being dealt with in this question.
286. MUST BE. Otherwise we wold be setting up the stage for potential conflict.
287. The President should not be burdened by, or empowered to, serve as a papal figure with universal jurisdiction and responsibility.
288. I am very content with the status-quo. That said, I would be very interested in the way things are working in the ABC District where these responsibilities have been divided. If the President's role was divided in two with the result of having two salaries to pay, would we still have enough money for a national mission exec.?
289. Need to be 2 different people to ensure that duties do not conflict with one another.
290. I think the duties need to be separated.
291. These could be 2 different people, possibly, with expertise in each area, one pastoral, and the other not.
292. There would be considerable Ministry value provided to pastors and congregations should the "head pastor" of Synod have a specifically spiritual leadership role.
293. Too much for one person - our country is so expansive that time to travel alone, never mind time, that I don't see this as practical - we'd just create burnout situations

294. CEO and Ecclesiastical supervisor should have different skill sets and abilities. These roles should be separate and focused on the specific area.
295. CEO should not necessarily be ordained.
296. If, and only if, he is willing do the hard stuff [like church discipline] for the sake of the erring.
297. These duties are too much for one man to handle efficiently and carefully.
298. This depends on what happens with Extension Funds. Clearly Presidents shouldn't be in charge of multi-million-dollar investment funds. If the CEO role is only over Synod, and not investments, I'm fine with it the way it is.
299. Too much responsibility.
300. I think it would be far better if the President of the Synod's job description was that of an Ecclesial Bishop, not a CEO. I would suggest the same regarding District Presidents.
301. I am very confident in our current president to deliver this now
302. Very distinct responsibilities required by a CEO as opposed to the responsibilities of the Ecclesiastical Supervisor. This is what got the ABC in big trouble where it still remains
303. These must be separated
304. Pastors should serve as Ecclesiastical Supervisors first.
305. A knee jerk, "No."
306. Let's let Pastors do what Pastors do best, be shepherds and may we have a Spirit filled layperson with the God given gift of Admin take on the role of CEO! Guys may I say that this question and most on this page just talking Synod Pres looks suspiciously like Districts have already loped off!!! Is that your pre-conceived notion? If so, why are we even doing this survey?
307. These roles should be separated.
308. We've already seen where that has taken us. How can an ecclesiastical supervisor be responsible to a board??
309. If the president is to be an elected pastor, then he should serve as the Ecclesiastical supervisor.
310. For all practical purposes this is not the case!! In this position the person needs to move the church forward and not so concerned about administration and supervision. The President of the Synod needs to be a visionary and lead the church with contemporary eyes.
311. This would be part of the restructuring plan [if there is one]. I do not think that the example of ABC where the CEO and ES seem to attend the same meetings so we have two doing the work of a half.
312. Isn't this a question for the restructuring commission. As a lay person, I am not familiar with the inner workings of the LCC executive.
313. Depends on the final structure and the amount of work created.
314. The President should simply serve as the Ecclesiastical Supervisor/Bishop of Synod, a position he would be qualified and trained for. I believe it would be wise for the Board of Directors, consisting of an equal number of qualified clergy and laypersons, to handle the administration matters and business of Synod.
315. I think it would be wise to separate the two. Then there would be some accountability for both
316. I think there is a strong argument for a CEO to be an elected person to run the "business administration" aspect with work experience in this area--likely candidates would be experienced members of the Synod but not a trained Pastor. A Pastor's interest should not be

running a business nor do most Pastors have any experience or skills in this area. The top Pastor leader position if call "Ecclesiastical Supervisor" should be strictly for the spiritual welfare of its Pastors and members along with strong SERVANT leadership for supporting local and regional ON-GOING Sustainable Mission programs.

317. I feel this has worked fine in the past and helps streamline the process. However, if one person can not adequately fill both positions then having two positions may be required.
318. The CEO of Synod should be separate. I also believe that it should not necessarily only be a Pastor, there are many Lay People in our Synod that could serve as CEO. The Ecclesiastical Supervisor needs to be a Pastor and the "right hand person" of the CEO. This could be the case for districts as well.
319. And should be called Bishop
320. The President of Synod in our current policy and procedure is a waste of time and money. He should be a Bishop and actively serve a congregation. We do not need and cannot afford a globe trotting figure head that does nothing.
321. Can't mix the 2 anymore. There are no checks and balances.
322. I believe he should simply focus on the latter.
323. maybe, maybe not... in terms of running a business it is not the most efficient way of running it when it is of any size... that being said, it does ensure that the organization is concerned and focused on what could be thrown out the window (sound doctrine) when the bottom line becomes the primary concern... checks and balances...
324. Robert Bugbee is to ineffectual to judge whether this is proper.
325. In view of recent ABC issues the two responsibilities should be separated.
326. What CEO business type decisions need to be made by the President of Synod? If this is a strong component of the position now, could it be better handled by a trained/experienced businessman?
327. A pastor is not, in any way, trained to serve as a CEO. This is a bad practice. This confuses the two kingdoms, and it will always mean that one position will be served, while the other is neglected. And most recently it's been the pastoral care that's been neglected.
328. Kind of like the Pope? LOL, I guess that depends on workload....
329. The current arrangement dilutes the president's effectiveness in both areas of responsibility.
330. The functions need to be separated. The Synod President should exclusively as Ecclesiastical Supervisor.
331. It's been my experience that most pastors are bad Administrators... just saying. I say this as being a victim of a Lutheran school.
332. I'd rather see him as Ecclesiastical Supervisor and find/hire a competent lay person to serve as the CEO of Synod.
333. There needs to be stronger separation between the two. ABC is proof-positive of that.
334. A person should be dedicated as Ecclesiastical Supervisor whose duties are actually as the title implies - not just a fil-in, but an actual assistant who will keep the President apprised of "ecclesiastical matters". This person should be chosen by the President (not elected).
335. Depends on problems faced and President’s strengths.
336. Why do you assume we should have a CEO in an ecclesiastical structure to begin with? Restructure boys, Restructure! NO CEO... none... notta. Elect or hire an administrator (does not need to have anything to do with clergy~ best administrator possible).

337. although there should be a Chief Financial Officer of some sort (not necessarily a pastor, and probably NOT a pastor) reporting to the President. The CFO should probably be an employee of Synod and not elected at convention.
338. The fewer people there are as "managers" the more efficient the organization is. For example, governments often are much less efficient than businesses in providing services because Governments are top heavy
339. We need to have one leader.
340. I think we've seen how that works out.
341. I like what ABC is doing now with two leaders in place - one to handle the business end and one to handle the pastoral end.
342. Separate the kingdom of the right and left.
343. That has been the problem. We need a pastor and we need a manager. We can't have both in one person.
344. ~ we are church NOT some business entity where there are to be numerous tiers of "leadership" at the top. ~ to divide this office would create division in the church. ~ if somehow this were to pass it must be a non-pastor as say CFO and pastor as Ecclesiastical. However, after saying this I still think in-fighting would occur. How long would it be before the CFO would start dictating Spiritual issues? This would spell the end if the church!!!

34. The synodical Convention should divide the President's duties into two positions: a CEO for administration and a President for ecclesiastical supervision (spiritual leadership).

1. Theoretically the CEO might not be a Pastor (Rev.). Is this the direction we want?
2. The CEO doesn't have to be a pastor.
3. Very good plan.
4. Yes! Yes! Few pastors have both sets of skills.
5. CEO needs business management degree and accounting skills. Does not need pastoral background: This person male or female is MANAGEMENT and must be a visionary leader. PRESIDENT: must be a pastor and have strong leadership abilities and apply sound counselling practices which are spiritually based.
6. Two heads normally do not work effectively would incur much duplication of cost and effort.
7. Yes! Yes! Yes! CEO must have strong accounting skills and a degree. He/she must be a visionary leader. President must have strong leadership in pastoral and spiritual advisory capabilities.
8. I thought the vice presidents were there to help the president
9. One President. Use vice presidents more.

a. I'm not sure I'm qualified to asses that. To me the synodical board of directors in conjunction with the CCMS, the synodical president (and perhaps? the district presidents) are in a better position to do this

10. Too vague, who would be in charge and what would the roles entail?
11. I can understand the desire to go down this path, but it seems unwise because it risks turning LC-C into a secular institution, and congregations of LC-C into independent franchises of LC-C (like a fast food restaurant). It may lead to conflicts between the CEO and spiritual

leader, and this path really seems to be in conflict with what is recorded in Scripture concerning the body of Christ, the Church (and church), etc.

12. need prof person as admin not pastor
13. Worth considering but only in light of a badly needed redesign of everything. Think about goals/objectives -- and then create staffing to match those.
14. CEO needs to be professional non pastor.
15. I think that's a great idea. The President is like a shepherd of the shepherds and the administration distracts and takes up a great deal of energy.
16. Yes, this can be.
17. I suppose the Convention would be the body to do this. And the general idea seems sound. However, I'd like to know what other divisions of the current presidential portfolio are possible. Maybe another way of rearranging things would make better sense (e.g., maybe 1 manager-- CEO-- for the admin of the whole synod, and perhaps 3 spiritual overseers-- bishops-- alongside him?).
18. Refer to comment in #33
19. Might be important if the district president's ecclesiastical supervision is lessened or eliminated.
20. Can these aspects be completely separated?
21. Proper doctrine, its application, and certainly the "big picture" are important in many matters of administration.
22. Synod is too small for such heavy structure.
23. Try this if district staffs are significantly reduced.
24. A split in responsibility could lead to dispute.
25. In good times, this probably can be handled effectively by one position, but if there are financial pressures, theological disagreements, etc., two positions may be needed. Having said that, those two would need to work very closely together to provide continuity.
26. I don't know enough to have an opinion.
27. How can you divide it out - really?
28. He needs to be both or else he will become a mere figure-head. He could devolve some of the responsibility of Chief Executive Officer to an assistant (as in the case of the Dean of the Mission Diocese of Finland) perhaps, but the authority should still be vested in the President of Synod.
29. this sounds reasonable
30. Re 33 and 34 - do these not contradict each other?
31. There should be three positions: CEO, Pres. of College of Pastors, Pres. of Congregations
32. Which authority would have the ultimate authority and why?
33. Let us empower our ecclesiastical leaders to be active in serving our church in the areas to which the Holy Spirit has gifted them - that being, spiritual care, mission, and outreach. On the flips, let us empower lay leaders to be active in serving our church in the areas to which the Holy Spirit has gifted them - that being, administration and financial management.
34. Again, it all depends on the gift set of the individual elected as Synod President. See comments from Q33.
35. There are problems arising in Circuit congregations that are not receiving adequate attention by district officials.
36. If this will be more efficient for the church, I agree.

37. The primary leader of the LCC should be a First (?) Bishop selected through a process. A group of people needs to support the First Bishop and the synod by handling administration, but please do not tempt anyone by according this position the worldly title, "CEO." It's true that someone needs to be in charge of waiting on tables. Consider calling him "First Deacon" or "Head Deacon." This person can just as well be a layman or a pastor.
38. The administration should be overseen by the Board of Directors. The President should be responsible for ecclesiastical supervision.
39. This mirrors the structure of our churches: congregational president and head Elder share leadership duties. This would allow laypeople to serve as administrators, which could be advantageous.
40. Is the work load to much for one office?
41. The convention should institute episcopal polity.
42. The Convention should establish an episcopal polity. Where spiritual leadership is at the pinnacle of the hierarchy.
43. I do worry about growing hierarchies and the ability of smaller congregations to support them.
44. I'm not convinced that the synod president's duties can be cleanly divided into administrative and ecclesiastical.
45. Good idea to separate the two very different positions. One is earthly based; one is God based.
46. I believe this works well now and I see no reason that both of these things should not remain as they are. There should be no difference for direction or authority from this person. Why divide what needs to remain unified? Should that person not be thinking with both of these in mind at all times?
47. This seems like it would cut down on the possibility of bias, yes.
48. Ministers, called and ordained should be in CONGREGATIONS - the administration should be left to lay people - so spiritual leadership - should be within the congregations
49. too much confusion possible with this
50. will result in more administration, more opportunity for misunderstandings, etc.
51. However, please note that we are a small Church body ... and we do not need to create an additional full-time position. We've got too much Administration now, and some of it much too ineffective.
52. There would need to be some accountability to each other if split into two positions.
53. Some think president should be counselor but a counselor's case load should be co20. Circuit counselor should meet semi annually for training and reporting. Circuit counselors should be counselors. Each pastor in circuit should choose a pastor-confessor and meet semi-annually. Communion services at circuits should be discontinued. They are an anachronism from when pastors were not communed in parish
54. need a better explanation before I can answer
55. This would mean having two leaders, and it could be confusing.
56. Again, I would like to hear President Bugbee's views. They would STRONGLY influence my opinion. On principle, a separation of powers sounds good -- relieving the president from an overload of minor business details. But I would not want the church to operate strictly on a business model, with a CEO being somehow equal to the Church's spiritual leader.
57. I think the highest office of the Synod should be served by one person, a Bishop, elected by the synodical convention. However, the bishop could be served by two administrative

officers (elected may be preferred, or appointed by the synodical convention at the recommendation of the Board of Governance). One officer would aid the Bishop in matters of administration and governance. The person holding this position may be clergy or lay, however, a person with proper qualifications to serve in such a capacity. The second officer would aid the Bishop in ecclesiastical matters, therefore, clergy. The person holding this position would be responsible for aiding the Bishop in matter of spiritual care in the Synod: the spiritual care of regions, conflicted congregations, pastors, deacons, etc.

58. I do worry about growing hierarchies and ability of smaller congregations to support many levels of governance.
59. The President of LCC must always serve both functions and he should always be a highly educated clergy with considerable pastoral experience.
60. Jethro advised Moses to share his duties. We want the best person suitable for each duty with out overburdening 1 person.
61. The President should primarily be the Pastor for the pastors (and deacons); it is too difficult to find a person who can be both the ecclesiastical supervisor as well as a secular administrator.
62. Given the fact that a CEO has day to day interests over a corporation which may interfere or override concerns having to do with ecclesiastical supervision - if this is true - don't we need to reconsider the same person doing both?
63. To defray the additional costs of two positions consider: - reduced compensation for both positions in comparison to the current President compensation - the tasks of the CEO for administration could be absorbed by current Business Manager and BoD.
64. Isn't this why the ABC district is in the position they are in?
65. I think depending on how the Synod is restructured it may very well be necessary to make two positions - a CEO and a President for ecclesiastical supervision but I do want us to not be over-governed. We need to stay lean and keep our administrative expenses as small as possible.
66. These duties can be handled by 2 people if 1. the Ecclesiastical supervisor is the ultimate authority. and 2. the person chosen as CEO is well qualified and has Christian values that are the same as ours.
67. there are likely more divisions necessary; financial, administrative, outreach, archives, ecclesiastical, legal, etc.
68. I think that we need to stay lean and not top-heavy but with a restructure of Synod perhaps it could need to be two positions.
69. Different individuals have different strengths, and there is a significant difference between the responsibilities of administration and the responsibilities of spiritual leadership. There should be a President (and council) who set the direction, and a CEO who should be handling the administration to work on managing to achieving those goals.
70. Again, how do you have two heads? The head of the synod should be the ecclesiastical supervisor with the CEO secondary. What is our first aim as a church? To be financially solvent, or to share Christ's glorious story? The head of synod must be the spiritual head with the money aspect following.
71. If the position of CEO is a big commitment... we all know the spiritual leadership is a big commitment and if it doesn't get done, then yes.
72. Better served - focusing on job to do to meet God's word.
73. If you can find 2 good people

74. Hi is only one person and "one" job is sufficient.
75. Why have two positions?
76. How does a CEO best serve the needs of the congregation?
77. The one should be a layperson and the other ministerial. Laymen are much better suited for running the "company".
78. It hasn't worked for ABC district. What makes you think it would work at a synodical level?
79. this concept seems to have merit
80. It depends on individual skill set and workload.
81. different expertise and different roles require it.
82. I acknowledge we do ask a lot of one person, however to divide this into two roles is not wise as ultimately we are working as God's people in Synod not as a business with a CEO but as a church who does operate in the secular world.
83. I don't see how this question is different than the last one. What are you trying to get at?
84. It could work out that way but I would give the President the authority to make that decision, and to change it as well.
85. Depends on whether the persons in this role feel they have too much on their plate to do both. If the answer is no, then stay with one person in the role. It seems to have worked in the past.
86. In the local congregation you typically have a president and a pastor. So this would work except we are a synod not a corporation.
87. that is what is being done in the ABC District with Pastor Nolan Astley
88. May be a possibility. Not all pastors are good administrators while those with administrative gifts may not be strong in ecclesiastical leadership or supervision. We have been blessed with some Presidents in our District who have been strong in both areas.
89. These 2 cannot be separated, administrative decisions are theological in that allocation of time and resources for the church's mission are spiritual decisions. I foresee only problems with 2 leaders with likelihood that the administration will eventually trump spiritual head.
90. Also each position should have term limits (6 to 8 years)
91. contradicts 33
92. Who would be in charge?
93. Current and past LCC president's doing/did a fine job. If more ecclesiastical supervision given to DP or regional DPs that would free up LCC president for more CEO focused duties.
94. Disagree, with same qualification as in my answer to question #33.
95. If necessary only, if there is enough time for that person, and if that person is qualified for both functions
96. This does make logical sense, but how many pastors have the training or ability to be an administrative CEO? Few if any. Do they receive training to do this work? Pastors should, of course, fill the ecclesiastical role.
97. See above. I am agreeable to this if necessary.
98. that is, one person looking after both sets of duties
99. If there were more contact between the spiritual leadership and individual pastors, I'd be all for it.
100. Adding to my comment in question 33, if administration is hampering the ability of the bishop to supervise ecclesiastical supervision, then perhaps it makes sense to delegate these duties. Again, I would trust President Bugbee's opinion on this matter.

101. The spiritual leadership should never lie solely with one individual. Using God's Word as our inspiration no one person has any hierarchy over another in spiritual matters. All matters of spiritual growth, doctrine, guidance should be handled in accordance with Christ's example of the disciples, discussed and determined among them.
102. That is what is happening in ABC district now and I am not convinced that some things are so easily in one category or the other.
103. Hire a CEO. have a pastor in charge of spiritual leadership
104. See above comment. To have two leaders suggests that it is perfectly fine for a synod "CEO" to do all kinds of things that really are not the work of the Church to do.
105. This would be a confusion in leadership over time if this became a permanent structure.
106. An individual can be strong in one or the other but not in both so would not do justice to the position. By splitting you can have strong individuals in both positions
107. President to be the best CEO the large company can afford. Direct the best spiritual leadership team with measurables for debate and discussion at the convention each year!
108. This sounds like a recipe for failure. It sets up a situation in which the "CEO" and the "Spiritual President" will vie for power in some way. Yes, take administrative duties away from the synodical president if possible, but DO NOT set up a "CEO for administration."
109. Division will only create problems - two chiefs? You need one leader period.
110. I think it is hard for one man to do both.
111. I tend to agree, but I am not hard and fast on this. It appears that the two positions require quite different skills, and a single person may not have the skills for both. However, it is not clear that two full time salaries are justifiable for two full time roles. Not sure of the implications.
112. I would like to agree to this but I'm not sure I know enough about the two roles. If the duties are split, could the administrative leader be a lay person?
113. I don't think most pastors have the requisite competencies to function as a CEO.
114. I like the sound of this, but would be concerned about the CEO's background and decision making authority.
115. There needs to be one clear head, both ecclesiastically and administratively. However, consideration could be given to creating an administrative position that operates under the supervision of the President to carry out most admin functions.
116. Again, as above it makes sense to separate the two duties
117. this would need a lot of work as how to distribute the implications/duties of each newly formed office
118. Yes, but I would change the term "President" for "Bishop" or even "Archbishop." The term "President" is very unclear to the average layperson (to say nothing of those outside the church). It has strong political overtones that do not help to increase confidence in the man as a shepherd of the church. For that reason, a switch to a more ecclesiastical term would be helpful.
119. Two thumbs up!
120. Are you talking about having two individuals, one for each position? I would totally disagree with that. In my opinion the president could fulfill the duties of both if provided with the proper number of helps in order to do this.
121. It would make the President's life easier.
122. See comment for 33) above. [Finally, at question 34, the survey defines what it means by ecclesiastical supervision!!

123. I repeat, divided leadership is a recipe for disaster.
124. Again explanation needed.
125. There should be only one president/CEO. Spiritual leadership is best exercised at the district level.
126. I believe the pastor should be the "president" for spiritual leadership because he is a spiritual leader in the congregation.
127. I can see how it might be wise to separate the duties into "right hand" and "left hand". But I'm on the fence.
128. See comments above. Who would be in charge > co-leaders don't work due to differences in opinions of 2.
129. this would be a necessary option if the districts are eliminated.
130. A CEO administrator should be a qualified lay person. The spiritual leader, the most capable Pastor within L.C.C.
131. I believe this would allow a greater focus on both the spiritual leadership and administrative needs of the Synod without one person having to split their attention and time between the two.
132. We need one person - who has responsibility for all areas of Synod.
133. If two positions established, the President should be the co-ordinator
134. I tend to disagree, though, most likely, various CEO responsibilities could be delegated. I guess I'm not too keen to think of the Church as having a kind of secular part and an ecclesiastical part.
135. Administration should be handled by a specialist who does not need to be elected and whose term can last for longer than that of a DP. The Synod President should look after inter church relations, missions and the spiritual care of the leaders of the Synod and Districts.
136. This would allow the President of Synod more time to act as the ecclesial head of the church. It would be nice to have the two roles separated, but not as equals, as the CEO would have to be responsible to the Ecclesiastical supervisor. Again this is by and large a redundant question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey.
137. Both would be nice but can we afford it?
138. Other than the Godhead, only one man can serve as leader... the other as second in command.
139. The last thing we need is more bureaucracy.
140. Someone might be gifted in one area and not in the other.
141. I don't think we need be afraid of a strong lay person in a position of high authority within our ecclesiastical structure, but the ultimate authority should always be spiritual and not worldly. I would strongly support the creation of an administrative manager that largely oversaw the "left hand" matters of the church, but still reported to the president.
142. That's where the term and implementation of "Synod Bishop" could be helpful, with a CEO being either a rostered worker elected/called to a CEO position or a dedicated lay person elected to the CEO position.
143. Sure, if this would help us to stay the course and be the Church of Christ, then so be it.
144. But give him an assistant
145. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making

146. are we not trying to "save" money, not increase the number of positions?
147. maybe Chairman of the Board should be "CEO"
148. This could be "overstaffing" Our Canadian membership may not warrant such a division of duties.
149. makes a team and can pull from strengths (individual)
150. Yes. Let the CEO be known as President and Ecclesiastical leader called Bishop or Archbishop.
151. However, the CAO (Chief Administrative Officer) in the spiritual realities of the Church should be under the SP.
152. This would add another paid position to LCC staff. However, should the Districts be discontinued then indeed this should be 2 positions. Too much to oversee for 1 position.
153. What do you mean by administration? I'm not sure.
154. CEO has a Business degree and should probably NOT be a pastor.
155. The National Church should be led by a "President" whose primary focus is pastoral, inter-church relations, doctrinal, educational - with overall authority. There would be a CAO - reporting directly to the National Church Board - who is responsible for administration and finances (and who is not necessarily ordained).
156. Costs more money so he should be able to do both (let's be financially responsible here folks)
157. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
158. Would the CEO for administration have to be a Pastor, or could the CEO be a layman?
159. Though the position of authority must rest with the ecclesiastical supervisor in cases where there is theological issues or implications at play.
160. Not necessary
161. CEO should be lay.
162. No organization has worked harmoniously with two people in charge.....maybe for a short time
163. What is the advantage of the splitting?
164. The President would be elected by the delegates. The CEO or CFO should be hired by Synod's BOD.
165. We are a church body and not primarily a non-profit organization. The President is the "bishop" of the church. He is the servant of all and so the ecclesial supervisor of all the church's doings (including administrative) as you cannot easily separate ecclesial from administrative functions in a churchly setting!
166. I think these two roles should be separate. The chief executive officer should have strong administrative, financial and management background. I would not have a problem if this person had experience as a pastor but I believe the management experience is vital.
167. ...provided that the CEO would be someone who is administratively gifted (not necessarily clergy!)
168. Why do we need a president for Ecclesiastical supervision? Maybe we do. But I think the District Presidents have this responsibility and I see no need for doubling up on this.
169. Please avoid Splitting this up: Splitting this into two positions will create conflict. Sin always finds a way to pit the one against the other, having two people fill these roles will only exasperate this. Currently this is an internal spiritual conflict for the President splitting it up could create a number of unforeseen spiritual issues for the synod.
170. Ideally maybe, but in practice I don't think this would work out.

171. It is unlikely that one individual has the expertise in both these areas to best serve the district's needs.
172. Same answer as 33 for Ecclesiastical Supervision. The administration matters in our church are also substantial in breadth (I.E Worker Benefits, Resource Generation, Accounting) so it too requires a specialized professional's focused attention. An administration professional should be engaged to oversee those matters and the Chief pastor should focus on the Ecclesiastical priorities.
173. Should stay 1 (one) position.
174. only if CEO is under the Synod Pres (similar to Pastor & Congregational Chairman)
175. again...this is similar to 33
176. There could be friction between the 2 positions if they are not lodged in the same person.
177. Administration should be not a Pastor as they are not trained for such matters.
178. You need one individual who is responsible for everything - otherwise it is easy for something to fall between the cracks and for no one to be accountable. There is however no reason why a president can not appoint an operations manager to be responsible for administrative stuff.
179. One guy (or gal) should be able to cover it
180. Former pastors do not make the best business administers, witness ABC District.
181. The CEO Should be a trained professional manager
182. see above. NOT A CEO. An Operations Manager limited to decisions that fit within the Annual Synod Budget.
183. This will result in conflict and confusion. There can only be one head of an organization.
184. They will need to function as a closely knit team.
185. In most times, both roles can be performed by the same person. In certain times it becomes inappropriate, difficult or impossible. We see this in action right now in ABC.
186. He has one position as bishop.
187. would be best if both positions were pastors
188. if both positions were ordained pastors
189. V.P.'s should be assigned main responsibilities for Admin and Ecclesiastical Supervision.
190. If the president's duties are divided, the title of CEO would be acceptable for administration, but the title of "President" needs to be replaced by the title of "Bishop" for ecclesiastical supervision.
191. I suppose as the duties get too heavy on the administration side the spiritual leadership may be neglected.
192. added cost and top heavy
193. added cost and top heavy leadership
194. He would have more quality time to spend on spiritual issues.
195. Don't understand the impact of separating them
196. If the president's duties were divided, then the administration portion could be done by a lay person.
197. Yes, I think this might be a better option.
198. I'm not sure how this would work. You would need to write up a very clear job description for each position.
199. I don't know how this is practically possible ... does this happen in other church bodies?
200. I can see arguments for both single and separate offices, yet our Synod President is primarily CEO and not much of an Ecclesiastical Supervisor, which is not just spiritual care, but also a

supervisor or doctrine and practice within our Church. As our structure now stands the Synodical president does not have much Ecclesiastical say as we tend to the practice of every congregation and Pastor does whatever they want. A separate position of Ecclesiastical Supervisor who need to be endowed with the power and ability to actually rebuke and correct error and lead those who are in error to repentance and absolution.

201. There will always be a balance needed of the head of any organization to be accomplished in multiple areas. However, that doesn't mean the head of any organization needs to be doing all the work. There is a reason that in Scripture the qualifications of a pastor include "be able to manage well his own household". Managing isn't the only thing a pastor does, but it is part of the overall expectations of Scripture.
202. obviously because these roles are very different
203. We don't need a Pastor for administration. We need a spiritual leader (pastor) to connect with all congregations of LCC- in person or by internet.
204. And the CEO should be a layman.
205. district and synodical presidents have typically had a staff member who was competent in administrative and financial matters. That person should be accountable to the president.
206. The CEO administrator should not be a Pastor but someone who is gifted with those abilities. We are not using God's ministers as they are called to be when we put them to work as largely as administers and business men.
207. Historically, both synodical and district presidents have had additional staff who were responsible, under the president, for administrative and financial affairs. That should be sufficient.
208. I think there is value in allowing our pastoral leader to deal with spiritual things and having someone else responsible for the administrative portions of things. Care should be taken to strike the best balance between the cost having two salaries to pay and the benefits of allowing for more focused efforts to fulfill the synod's needs in both areas.
209. I do not understand this question, nor the companion (opposite) - I do not have enough information to make an opinion as I have no idea what that would look like nor how the authority would be divided. also I object to the subtle change in wording between the two questions -
210. I think this should be considered and discussed.
211. This might be an advantage but I'm more concerned about cutting cost of Administration
212. Restructuring is to lessen the bureaucracy, unless any proposed plan would put too much burden on this position,
213. too complicated
214. This could lighten the load for one person.
215. I would need to know more information about the implications of such a structure. Would one supersede the other?
216. Again, would need to know the structure further down the ladder and if districts remain. An added expense for sure but may be beneficial if 2 excellent performers are secured.
217. As above
218. This question does not indicate if the two positions would both be clergy elected. If that is the case that the CEO would be clergy, then I strongly disagree.
219. Not sure.
220. depends on new structure see above
221. Pick one job, and work on doing that one well.

222. Same question as $33. Why the repetition?
223. Additional cost and difficulty in overlap of responsibilities.
224. it would seem that each position carries enough responsibility that they could be separate to do a proper job in each
225. They are all one duty of the president.
226. The skills required to manage an organization are not the same as pastoral skills. Everyone has some gifts, very few have both of those diverse gifts.
227. Same as #33 - A clergyman should be the spiritual leader only. To be fair, our theology always informs our practice, but if by "CEO" it's meant "one who is responsible for the business side of the Synod", then a clergyman should not be in that role.
228. Again, both positions are equally important, so it depends on how much time is needed for each, so as not to overload the President's time and energy. And perhaps a President is more suited to one duty and not both?
229. should be 2 positions
230. Administration duties should be by a certified administrator, not a pastor!!
231. The business matters require that type of talent and interest level. The spiritual side might end up playing second fiddle because the practical side needs immediate attention. The spiritual side should always take precedence so 2 people with different talents and abilities would keep both parts attended to.
232. If there are pastor and lay members of the Board of Directors than they can do much of the administration work. Then it would be OK for the President to act as supervisor of their work and still provide spiritual leadership.
233. When possible it would be helpful to have the CEO with business and administration gifting and background and this person does not have to be a pastor.
234. Cost may become a factor. But see #33
235. That is something I have no knowledge in and feel the people that work/ serve in that area should be asked.
236. would this be more effective?
237. This becomes part of building an Empire. I think from Lay Persons in LCC an strong advisory group of volunteers (expenses only) could be built up to support the president non these issues. It may be useful for them to act as advisors to the Board as well.
238. see above comments
239. Only if work load becomes unmanageable.
240. Both have same mandate.
241. As per #34 I agree with this but I would not call the person providing the spiritual (ecclesiastical) supervision a president. This just creates confusion. Maybe National Bishop would be appropriate for the spiritual role. President is more appropriate for the administrative aspects. Many corporations have a President & Chief Executive Officer in one role.
242. I detest the language of CEO talking about church matters. we should attempt to speak biblically here. dividing those functions looks good on paper, but will result in a lay CEO who will have ultimate authority over the ruling of doctrinal matters to the ecclesiastical leader. look at history. the secular authority since the reformation, has always ended up having more power than the ecclesiastica. it is important though that our synod president has skills in business and admin, a bit, as well as doctrine and theology.

243. Synods board should not be increased in size even though it would be nice to see a qualified administrator.
244. With great caution emphasizing the significant interface and overlap between the two positions.
245. Maybe... but there is a need for one person to be the "buck's stops here" person.
246. President as leader however Vice President would be lay. Executive assistant to look after admin.
247. However, the president for ecclesiastical supervision should have the final word. We are not a business and cannot be run as a business, we need to understand the business world but it MUST NOT be our compass.
248. Maybe, but one needs to be the leader of our church... Don't set up potential power struggles.
249. Yes! Just what I said in the last comment section!
250. I would suggest that an Ecclesiastical President is elected and that he be responsible for appointing the CEO for administration.
251. The CEO could be a lay person.
252. I am not sure it would be wise to separate the two that drastically as it could give rise to conflict in vision. Having said that, the emphasis should definitely be shifted towards greater ecclesiastical oversight.
253. A good suggestion.
254. have not thought about this, but if you do it at the national level, it should be modeled at the congregational level. lots of administration is consuming the pastor's time.
255. Should be always separated, not just at the Synodical Conventions
256. I believe this would be a better solution if the Districts were dissolved.
257. No. We are both in the spiritual and material world. Or to put it another way, we cannot segregate our life of faith from the rest of our life. The President/Bishop must have the ability to legally overrule any CEO or CAO.
258. However, these positions should be joined at the hips and not act separately or in opposite directions
259. Never filled either position, so cannot really answer this question.
260. It is not wise to confuse religion and faith with money matters. Too often this is where very poor decisions are made.
261. This should be a no brainer.
262. The Board of Directors and the President may hire now, under the present structure, a CEO A new board - ONE BOARD - can manage the synod by hiring / appointing a CEO
263. I am very content with the status-quo. That said, I would be very interested in the way things are working in the ABC District where these responsibilities have been divided. If the President's role was divided in two with the result of having two salaries to pay, would we still have enough money for a national mission exec.?
264. That would allow each person to devote more time to their duties.
265. Too expensive if the present structure continues. If districts are modified this can work. There can be authority problems since some "problems" can involve both areas of authority.
266. We need openness, honesty and clarity - not seen that lately.
267. This might be more realistic with respect to one's talents and abilities.
268. I can't specify exactly how to make this work, but I can certainly see the value in it ecclesiastically should someone more intelligent know how to draw the lines of authority, responsibility and reporting.

269. Choose the individuals carefully! (how ever that may be done ??)
270. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
271. not always will the best spiritual leader be the best CEO and vice versa
272. The Synodical President must be a pastor according to the LCC Handbook and pastors are not trained as CEO's, not does a Synodical President have the time to do both jobs and should not be accountable in the CEO area.
273. Seldom could we find one person with both skill sets strong enough to do these responsibilities. Clearly, the President is the head of the church. A CEO would not be a pastor but a business manager with the financial skill set.
274. Is this being done in other church bodies successfully?
275. CEO should not be a pastor
276. I do not know enough about the duties so think the President needs to be able to act in a way that best means that his duties are effectively administered.
277. A knee jerk, "Yes."
278. If the President's duties are too strenuous, this might be a good idea.
279. This shows no vision.
280. This would be part of the restructuring plan [if there is one]. I do not think that the example of ABC where the CEO and ES seem to attend the same meetings so we have two doing the work of a half.
281. In which case, the ecclesiastical supervisory role should be termed "bishop" and the CEO can be called "president"
282. Probably a good idea.
283. Depends on the final structure and the amount of work created.
284. Agree, however I wonder what authority does the CEO/Admin have over pastors and congregations. Is this a lay position?
285. For both of these questions, I think that both options should be considered.
286. As stated above, I think this is a good direction but the CEO must not be a Pastor -- he should have education, experience and skills in business administration while being an active member in good standing of a LCC congregation.
287. I feel this has worked fine in the past and helps streamline the process. However, if one person can not adequately fill both positions then having two positions may be required.
288. Don't need more administration.
289. Ban all conventions.
290. I thought the point of this was to streamline positions and save money.
291. Although I see the benefits of this, I can also see the potential for division.
292. perhaps; but at what cost, and for what gain
293. Although I do believe that he should have more help for the administrative duties.
294. Require experienced opinions of present and past presidents before forming an opinion on two positions.
295. This again adds to the administration costs.
296. See above.... maybe a triumvirate?
297. This would constitute an improvement, provided that the two remain in strong consultation with one another.
298. The division of responsibilities has merit; perhaps the CEO for administration need not be ordained.

299. Church should divide the administrative aspect from the ecclesiastical; single board and one CEO is ok, but the pastoral care requires finer structure
300. NO! The President must be fully cognizant of ALL information relating to the position of CEO and ALL Ecclesiastical matters
301. Whatever works best in the situation at hand.
302. Why do you assume we should have a CEO in an ecclesiastical structure to begin with? Restructure boys, Restructure! NO CEO... none... notta. Elect or hire an administrator (does not need to have anything to do with clergy~ best administrator possible).
303. my comments under question 33 apply at the district level, too. It is essential that the employees who are "Chief Financial Officers" or CEOs be carefully chosen. Must have a business background, as opposed to a "religious training" background.
304. While the idea seems good, I don't believe it is feasible. There must be one person with final authority. I think the right solution is to have a Chief financial officer, or a Chief operating officer under the president.
305. Whenever synod expands its activities to the point of needing a separate CEO, we should very seriously rethink those activities.
306. ~ I understand why this had to be done currently in A-BC District situation. This is not a permanent answer though!

35. The synodical President should be a voting member of the Board of Directors, even though he is accountable to the Board between Conventions.

1. Should vote if a tie needs to be broken.
2. I suppose he could if declared "conflict of interest" when applicable.
3. Like the fox tending the chicken house! Like being accountable to yourself!
4. We need more lay voters on the Board of Directors.

a. not sure how it is now but the congregation has its pastor as a non-voting member at council. I suppose this is to keep the pastor focussed on pastoral care instead of the politics

5. As the head of the church he should have more than just a voice.
6. too much power already.
7. The president has a unique perspective and knowledge that should be respected.
8. Yes, though at times, this may present a conflict of interest. It can work either way ... or fail either way.
9. Terrible idea. This is an impossible conflict of interest.
10. Unless there is an apparent conflict of interest.
11. I can see pros and cons to this.
12. Not sure.
13. It depends on the problem at hand. Sometimes perhaps not.
14. Breaking ties only.
15. Everyone should be accountable - however the synodical President ultimately is responsible to our Lord. Pres. vote could sway or determine outcome.
16. The President cannot be a voting member on a board to whom he is accountable.
17. The ecclesiastical leader of the synod should absolutely not be accountable to the Board of Directors. He should be accountable to the bishops and the synod in convention. The Board of Directors (Board of Deacons?) should support the First Bishop by handling

administration. This is very important. In congregations too the Pastor and Elders do not (should not) report to the Council. The right-hand kingdom must have pre-eminence.

18. The President should not be accountable to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors should be accountable to the President. In the Church, the spiritual matters are far more important than the administrative matters. The administrative branch of the church government needs to submit to the spiritual branch.
19. I think the President's input as a spiritual leader has great value, and see his vote as part of that influence toward determination of the path Synod should take in its various endeavours. However, again, if the feeling is that he could be more effective if not having to work through some vast amount of "secular" housekeeping issues, so as to be aware and to vote on them (to have to form an opinion on "everything" -- would it be the model of Jethro's advice to Moses, to divide the leadership tasks such that he no longer bear an undue burden, wearing him out?
20. Only in the event of a tie vote, should the president have a vote.
21. This is based on the assumption that the structure is corporate in nature.
22. Should only have a vote if there is a tie
23. He should not be a voting member. Is that not a conflict of interest?
24. I believe that the President should, like all boards, have a vote. His vote as most or all boards is only needed in the event of a tie. The board of Directors should be as accountable to the President as he is to them.
25. On every board I've ever served on for my job, the administrator cannot vote because they are responsible for carrying out the boards wishes. They are a servant of the board, not a member.
26. one should NOT be able to vote on the board to whom they report/work for
27. How can you be accountable to the board if you can vote on it?
28. Servant; not Master.
29. I do not know
30. I don't understand why he is not a voting member now.
31. The voting privilege of the synodical President (Bishop) could result in a conflict of interest in some matters of business.
32. I need more information as to the pros and cons.
33. One person - one vote.
34. God has put him in this position and he should have some say in its direction.
35. As CEO the President works on behalf of the Board and should only be allowed to advise
36. The President is elected because his opinions and judgment matter.
37. According to Robert's Rules of Order, the President only has vote in the event of a tie.
38. This could create a conflict of interests.
39. President is at the Board only in advisory capacity.
40. I don't know.
41. He should be an ex-officio member.
42. no
43. the officers; president, CEO, CFO, CIO, etc. report to the board, but cannot be voting board members
44. I don't know.
45. When necessary, he can recuse himself.
46. I am undecided

47. Not sure where the conflict would be here.
48. The Board should be accountable to president: accountability is to everyone in a position of trust and position of trust to God.
49. This leads to conflict of interest and I have never seen this allowed in other organizations. The CEO/PRESIDENT of the organization is advisory to the Board but does not ever have a vote.
50. He will have direct influence over the board which is enough of a vote. One man should not have too much "power" or else he is more likely to fall into sin.
51. He should only vote to break a tie.
52. The president advises the board and has the ability to sway opinions. That is enough power.
53. wish I knew if this were presently the case.
54. if allowed by law. can an employee of a charitable organization be a voting member of the Board of Directors?
55. Corporate boards outside the Church can have the president sit on the board. No concerns either way.
56. The President should not have a vote unless there is a need to break a tie.
57. Increased day to day info / influence on Board vs increased governance of 'staff'. Depends on how it is set up, what are the guidelines for conflicts of interest. I think public opinion is swinging away from hyper powered CEO's / Presidents, but it does come with bonuses.
58. He can always declare conflict of interest on certain issues.
59. Is there a reason why the president has not been a voting member in the past? I do not have enough information on this statement actually. But I could see that on some issues the president having a vote on the Board could be a good situation. Especially in areas directly in line with his duties.
60. only to break ties as is done in most boards.
61. But he must have a voice at the meetings
62. I don't feel strongly on this, but it seems his role should be advisory if only because as the president it is more appropriate to consider his office is in some respect beyond or irrelevant to voting, than to suggest his representative contribution is worth only one equal vote.
63. I wish I knew in answering this in previous question whether this is presently the case.
64. The president of the synod should also preside over the board of directors, voting only to determine the outcome of a tied vote.
65. I'm not particularly bothered by the President being a voting member and also accountable. In practice most issues are resolved by reaching a consensus, so who has the vote is normally not a concern.
66. Should he just have a tie breaking vote? Is this a conflict?
67. I absolutely believe that he should have not only a voice but a vote.
68. No opinion.
69. The Synodical president should not hold a vote except for ties. This allows for more accountability on the Board and less direct influence. The president’s most important responsibility should be to the ecclesiastical supervision.
70. Only in the event of a tie.
71. With leadership comes responsibility (including to vote) and accountability is not established by him not voting. Rather, accountability is established by the Board as a whole establishing it!
72. Can't ground that this is an accurate assessment.

73. Only if a tie breaker vote is required.
74. No, No, No!
75. He should be a voting member. However, I am not sure who fills the role of Chair of the Board of Directors. I believe that the President should not be the Chair.
76. Lacking background knowledge, I'm not sure if this is a conflict of interest.
77. Perhaps as a tie breaker.
78. Conflict of interest?
79. The wording of this question is biased and may affect reliable data. Most presidents will know if they have a conflict that requires them to leave the room. I suspect that on this board, most issues are decided by consensus.
80. As a rule, I suppose the President should not vote, but Perhaps to break a tie or??
81. I would likely say "yes", provided the issue voted upon does not pose a conflict of interest for the synod President.
82. If duties split between CEO and Spiritual Leader, then Spiritual Leader should be a voting member.
83. CEOS should not vote. It is not a good practice.
84. If he is a CEO, he shouldn't be voting at board meetings.
85. I don't know. But I think this question is worded in such a way as to suggest that people should disagree.
86. Perhaps in the event of a tie vote the President would then vote.
87. As a pastor, I have a vote at my congregational Board's meetings, though I am also accountable to it for my service. I think that that is OK.
88. Don't know anything about this
89. Why? What would be the rationale?
90. This doesn't sound like a smart move.
91. That would be a conflict of interest, no?

a. he should be a voting member of the Board for such as settling of tie votes, et.

92. This muddies lines of authority.
93. Whether there is one position or eventually two, salaried employees should not be a voting member of the board of directors.
94. Probably only vote on tie votes
95. Tie breaking vote only
96. I don't know the arguments
97. He should not be influencing the Board to his own agenda.
98. There would be many on-going points of "conflict-of-interest" -- direction should come from the Board regarding His activities or lack thereof.
99. Being a voting member would lead to a conflict of interest in some cases.
100. Conflict of interest; too much of an opportunity to "lead" the vote on issues.
101. The only time I would recommend him to vote is in the case of a tie among the BoD members. Redundant question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey
102. There is a serious conflict of interest here. Look at what happened at Concordia with the Pres. even when he wasn't a voting member. The president already has too much influence.
103. Depends on the subject of the vote.
104. No he should not vote.

105. Tie breaking vote should go to the President.
106. The above concept can work if there is separate Chair of the Board.
107. In the event of a tie when votes are cast
108. If there are items that he would have to declare as Conflict of Interest, then he should do that, but why can he not have a say at the workings of the Board?
109. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
110. Only in the event of a tie.
111. We can trust him, and his vote would be a form of leadership on the board.
112. The President should not vote about himself. Since the President is accountable to the Board of Directors, he cannot be a part of those to whom he is responsible.
113. Not sure
114. He should be ex officio with NO VOTE.
115. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
116. I don't understand what this is asking.
117. Important to have a voice.
118. He is an employee of the LCC, therefore should not be a voting member of the Board.
119. Non voting attendee.
120. I'm not sure what are the pros and cons of this.
121. Conflict of interest in voting.
122. With the proviso that he votes only to break ties.
123. I think Roberts rules of order or whatever guide is used would have some guidance for us here. There is value in having the ability to break impasses but I believe that the person in that role needs to be able to carry out the decisions of the Board with confidence and enthusiasm - show a united front
124. As a pastor is for congregational boards, etc. But he should normally abstain from exercising his vote.
125. What for? More power?
126. getting in the weeds here
127. As a non-voter he can minister to both sides without prejudice.
128. unless it pertains to matters of theology and doctrine, or where matters conflict with theology and doctrine.
129. Vote only to break a tie.
130. This doesn't make sense.
131. Only to break a tie.
132. Is this ethically possible? And then I have to ask; is it ethically possible to ask the question. This makes me question the wisdom of the appointment of Rev. Dr. Les Stahlke.
133. That would be a clear conflict of interest - so why is this question even in the survey?
134. Governance practices would suggest that the president should be a non voting member of the board. If his vote becomes critical then there are already big problems in place. He has voice and can make his influence felt by logic and the power of persuasion.
135. only vote as a tie breaker
136. In business practice, presidents can be appointed to a Board, but this is not always necessary or the case.
137. Break tying votes only.
138. The Bishops always get a vote.

139. How do other Board of Directors work for companies - are they voting members?
140. Depending on if a CEO position is created or not.
141. we don't know
142. Agree, assuming that the board of directors is managing the business affairs of the church.
143. It makes for a conflict of interest, in some cases.
144. I don't really know the implications of such a change, so am not sure how to respond.
145. It would depend on whether the position is divided in two.
146. How is this suggestion not a conflict of interest?
147. Depends on what the role of President is.
148. If the President is not also the CEO then this makes practical sense.
149. President/Bishop - voting member CEO Administration - advisory position to the board with no vote
150. President as ecclesiastical leader should have the vote with the CEO administration serving as an advisor only.
151. The vast majority of boards operate that way
152. The synod president is to carry out the decisions of convention
153. conflict of interest
154. The CEO - no The Ecclesiastical Supervisor - yes
155. This would be unethical! And it was when our DP was a voting member of the board.
156. If he is accountable to the board, then he should not vote on the board. He should, however, be able to speak to the board and they should make every effort to work together well.
157. did not know this was an issue - is he a voting member now? does he want to be? what are the legal aspects?
158. Usual practice would have the President acting in an advisory capacity to the Board.
159. Only to break a tie.
160. As long as the President is honest and knows what he is doing.
161. Is he currently ex officio? Does he cast a vote if a motion is tied?
162. vote only as tie breaker
163. If the President's vote is required to break a tie - perhaps the issue is too big to be decided by one vote. On the other hand, if the President is excluded from voting what is the message being given about "power/control"? We need clear rationale for promoting either position. My hunch is that if the board is generally united in purpose - the President even if he has the vote may prefer to abstain from voting generally except for the most crucial of circumstances in which case we must be in deep trouble.
164. If this does not make for a conflict of interest. In such cases the President should decline to vote.
165. only in a tie vote situation
166. The President should be recognized as the Chair of the Board and through this position gets to develop the agenda and via this mechanism has input into the affairs
167. Only if the vote is a 'tie ballot'
168. I do not know the current status, but whatever it is it seems to work fine
169. I do not know what the current status is now, but whatever it is seems fine.
170. This is extremely poor governance practice. There's no way one should be a voting member of a board to whom one is responsible. I know that it is that way now, and this should be changed ASAP.
171. Feel this could be a conflict of interest.

172. only on a tie
173. Conflict of interest!
174. The Synodical President/Ecclesiastical Supervisor doesn't need a vote. Sharing his opinion at meetings at the Board of Directors should be sufficient. Ultimately, the only power a "pastor" has is the power of the Word of God. A "shepherd" doesn't drive the "sheep", he leads them. A vote is not necessary.
175. Gives too much power to one man. He should be neutral and able to look at both sides of the situation without influencing the Board's decisions so much.
176. Canadian practice is to allow chairpersons and committee heads to have a 'tie breaking' vote on the boards they are part of. Then they are still accountable to their boards and to the members they represent,
177. But he only votes in the cases where there is a tie
178. Not right to be voting on your own accountability. Conflict of interest.
179. As a recorded tie breaking vote only
180. I disagree. According to Robert's Rules of order, the chair of a meeting should not have a vote except in the case of a tie. The Board's vote needs to be an independent assessment of the situation and should not simply be a "Rubber Stamp" of the President's wishes.
181. He should be an informed but impartial participant.
182. Conflict.
183. Really not sure. On some Boards the Chairman has a vote and on others he doesn't. There are pros and cons to each. What do other denominations do? I don't really know.
184. only as a tiebreaker
185. A president should vote only to break a tie situation within the Board.
186. this is a hard question unless I have more information on the context and what would be consequences if things were not kept as they are now.
187. Why would you ask this question... this would be a conflict of interest and our opinion doesn't matter. It would be bad practice. Don't ask a question if the answer is irrelevant (and please tell me you wouldn't consider this to be wise in any way!?!?!) Questions like this erode my trust in the leaders of this process.
188. Someone breaks a tie.
189. If we have selected the right person, why not let him vote?
190. The fact that this question is even asked is highly concerning. This is a clear conflict of interest. Even if 90% of the survey respondents say yes, I would hope you wouldn't do it. And if it isn't an option (because it is wrong), why ask the question?!?!? Again, eroding my faith in the people leading this process.
191. Is this good governance practice?
192. I don't know if having the President being a voting member would be helpful. At the same time, he should be allowed to exercise a 'veto' on doctrinal and/or divisive issues as they arise.
193. Only to break a tie
194. President should not swing a vote. By the very act of making a vote, the president swings the vote as this person is generally well respected. Thus a president should only be able to vote if it is to break a tie after the vote from the board has been taken.
195. That could depend on how many there are on the Board of Directors, and if there needs to be a deciding vote.
196. Let the board decide

197. I am not concerned about the synodical president's position. if we are going to restructure, restructure something that is going to have a positive affect on the local congregation's ministry.
198. Only to break a tie in voting on some matter
199. He must have the legal right to have his voice heard at every Board meeting. Unless it can be so worded that legally the board could not meet without him present, except in the case of disciplining of the synodical president, we would be falling into the ways of the world, rather than recognizing him as the one whom God has called to lead us through the convention.
200. That is like the godfather being the police commissioner.
201. In most societies The President has a vote but in some cases (optional) Pres. has "casting" vote only
202. The president, just like in a business, should not be a voting member in the board of directors.
203. In the East District this is the case. In most for profit cases that is also the case.
204. I do not believe that the charitable status act allows this.
205. advisory only.
206. His accountability to the board is as the CEO. His vote is as a member of the board. The board speaks as One. He should have a vote, yet must execute the decisions of the board regardless of his vote.
207. In the corporate world the president or CEO is not usually a member of the board although it is also not uncommon that he is.
208. Is this ethically possible? And then I have to ask; is it ethically possible to ask the question. This makes me question the wisdom of the appointment of Rev. Dr. Les Stahlke.
209. should be limited to voting to break a tie
210. This is a clear conflict of interest.
211. He is on the Board of Directors, so he should be a voting member.
212. Should be more like the Speaker of the House: tie break only, and not on issues that are a conflict of interest.
213. But only in the case of a tied vote.
214. He remains accountable. I don't think CRA would allow a staff person to be a voting member of the BOD.
215. Is he a voting member now? Is that a problem?
216. He needs to work in a way that will best suit the office he holds.
217. Should be separate duties and separate oversite responsibilities
218. He should abstain from voting on issues that involve him on a personal level.
219. he should have the right to opt out of the vote though if he thinks there is a conflict of interest.
220. Ability to vote only to resolve a tie on any resolution, etc.
221. Not according to CCCC. Please see above.
222. This is debatable in the since there are some that feel there may be a potential conflict of interest having the president be a voting member. I would defer this to legal counsel.
223. The President should be accountable to the congregations and not to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors is simply the President's support and sounding board. He is accountable to the congregations.

224. I think it best that the President only votes when his vote would break a tie / decide if a 2/3 majority vote should pass when it comes to administrative matter. For ecclesiastical votes, the President should vote every time. And for any votes associated with the President himself, the President should be removed from voting on the matter.
225. It is normal practice that the President, while presiding at meetings has no vote, except in the event of a tie, in which the "chair" is permitted to vote.
226. If there is a CEO and an Ecclesiastical Supervisor, then they should each have a vote. However, at this point, I feel that the president is best served as an advisory to the Board without a vote.
227. Maybe only to break a voting tie?
228. The synodical President should not vote. This is a conflict in my view.
229. Ex-officio at all boards and committees.
230. Wrong.
231. Very bad practice and may be illegal (conflict of interest).
232. would he not hold a sway vote... in the case that a vote is tied?
233. He should be permitted to vote in the case of a tie, but he should refrain from voting otherwise. He should lead the Board to make sound decisions.
234. The President should be involved and have a vote with a Board who develops the strategy which he will be implementing
235. I always kind of thought, though, the boss only voted in a tie.
236. The President should only vote to break a tie vote.
237. One can't rightly be a member of a Board to whom one is accountable to. It seems to be common practice, but it should not be. Especially in the church.
238. IS HE! SHOULD HE BE? You are assuming a previous form of structure.
239. If this is the case now, then this is a clear conflict of interest. Is this what we do now? Good heavens.
240. don't have an informed opinion about this.
241. This has long been recognized as poor governance. The President reports to the board. It is absurd that he reports to himself.
242. ~ his training is theological. He is to be theological giant. For the President as well as a church worker his calling is to be: doctrinally sound, lead a moral life, and not be negligent in performing his duties. He can be asked to share things done at a BOD level. ~ the decisions and responsibilities of the BoD fall to the BoD. If they make a mistake vote them out!

36. The synodical President should not be a voting member of the Board of Directors to which he is accountable between Conventions.

1. No
2. What happens now?
3. Not sure, but could lead to a conflict of interest.
4. As the head of the church he should have more than just a voice.
5. This is hardly a point to bog down on.
6. As above: Of course he shouldn't. It's inconceivable that he would be.
7. He could always be a voting member except where there is conflict of interest, which I assume applies to any member of any LCC board.

8. Did I miss something ...?
9. Not sure, probably should not be a voting member?
10. Topic is important.
11. Voting to break ties.
12. Similar to 35??
13. This is based on the assumption that the structure is corporate in nature.
14. Unless I misunderstand what is wanted here, the President should always have a vote in the event of a tie.
15. why do you have the same question twice? I know it's worded differently but its the same.
16. especially if it is a vote by ballot.
17. The voting privilege of the synodical President (Bishop) could result in a conflict of interest in some matters of business.
18. Again as in #35, I need more information. I really don't know how we can have an answer without knowing what problem could arise according to pro/con.
19. Again, according to Robert's Rules of Order, the President only has vote in the event of a tie.
20. Questions 35 & 36 address the same question. Both are not necessary.
21. I don't know.
22. I don't know.
23. When necessary, he can recuse himself.
24. undecided
25. Hard to have opinion when uninformed.
26. I don't think this is even allowed legally.
27. He will have direct influence over the board which is enough of a vote. One man should not have too much "power" or else he is more likely to fall into sin.
28. Again, advise. Don't decide.
29. wish I knew if this were presently the case.
30. Again this is the same question rephrased. Why?
31. Again question is answered in Question #35
32. But he must have a voice at the meetings
33. A board of directors needs to be able to make all decisions as a dedicated board to the total welfare of all congregations and employees.
34. I wish I knew in answering this in previous question whether this is presently the case.
35. contradicts 35
36. Should be informed as to what is happening.
37. Seems to be the same question as #35, but with opposite sense. Is this a test of whether we're being conscientious in answering the survey?
38. No opinion.
39. Why do you have the same question worded differently? If you disagree with 35 above, aren't you agreeing here implicitly?
40. Tricks again!
41. NO If conflict of Interest?
42. The synodical President would only vote in the event of a tie vote by the Board of Directors
43. How could I have any worthwhile opinion on this unless I had either attended a convention or been shown an organization chart which outlines who reports to who. This survey is constructed to make anyone else's opinion worthless.
44. don't know anything about this so can't answer

45. Being a voting member might create a conflict of interest. The role of the president of Synod is to carry out the directives of the Board not to contribute to the formulation of the directives.
46. Lines of authority should be clear.
47. He should have an arm's length distance from the governing of the Synod.
48. The only time I would recommend him to vote is in the case of a tie among the BoD members. I just answered this. Please stop asking duplicate questions. The same things are asked in the reverse of the previous questions. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey
49. Depends on the subject of the vote.
50. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
51. I don't see any reason to prevent him from voting.
52. This statement is the reverse 35. The President should not vote about himself. Since the President is accountable to the Board of Directors, he cannot be a part of those to whom he is responsible.
53. I don't know the pros and cons for doing this
54. This is the same question just flipped.
55. Must be accountable.
56. The expertise of the President will be wasted if he can't vote his opinion.
57. I think Roberts rules of order or whatever guide is used would have some guidance for us here. There is value in having the ability to break impasses but I believe that the person in that role needs to be able to carry out the decisions of the Board with confidence and enthusiasm - show a united front
58. Why does this question appear again, only opposite to the last one?
59. He should only vote to break a tie vote.
60. Shouldn't a president only vote to break a tie?????
61. only vote as a tie breaker
62. Hmmm 'he' ...why not a she
63. Why are there a number of times where the same question is asked in the positive and the negative?!
64. Depending on if a CEO position is created or not.
65. Unless a tie needs to be broken.
66. He may vote to break a tie.
67. It would depend on whether the position is divided in two.
68. Seriously. Why did you have to ask this question twice?
69. Depends on what the role of President is.
70. The President should have a vote especially if there is stalemate and he would have the deciding factor.
71. Pastors (students) should be taught to dress NEATLY and conduct themselves in word and deed as CHRISTIANS.
72. did not know this was an issue - is he a voting member now? does he want to be? what are the legal aspects?
73. Voting is a serious duty. He must be on top of everything.
74. Didn't we just cover that?
75. Same question as #35. Stop the repetition please!!

76. As Chair would hold the tie breaking vote
77. Only if the vote is a 'tie ballot'
78. As a recorded tie breaking vote only
79. See previous comments.
80. Only in the case of a tie.
81. President should not swing a vote. By the very act of making a vote, the president swings the vote as this person is generally well respected. Thus a president should only be able to vote if it is to break a tie after the vote from the board has been taken.
82. That would depend on how the corporation if finally set up.
83. Only to break a tie in voting on some matter
84. This is a duplicate from question 35.
85. Advisory only. Only lay members of BOD
86. He becomes essentially an employee of the board
87. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
88. Is it ethically possible to disagree or strongly disagree? And then I have to ask; is it ethically possible to ask the question. This makes me question the wisdom of the appointment of Rev. Dr. Les Stahlke. Perhaps you are testing my ethics.
89. CRA would not allow this. He can make motions and take action, but not vote.
90. Refer to previous comments.
91. In this day and age where social media and technology is at our fingertips, the Board of Directors should not be involved in the accountability of our President. His reports should be sent out to the congregational members and the congregational members should be the deciding factor of what our President does and does not do.
92. I think it best that the President only votes when his vote would break a tie / decide if a 2/3 majority vote should pass when it comes to administrative matter. For ecclesiastical votes, the President should vote every time. And for any votes associated with the President himself, the President should be removed from voting on the matter.
93. Maybe only to break a voting tie?
94. It would tie his hands to ask him to have authority and then give him no authority.
95. He should have a say in what job needs doing and how it should be done. But once that decision is made, he is duty bound to see it through.
96. Again, didn't I already answer this question in #35?
97. Another redundant question. Answered in #35. Why this question?
98. IS HE! SHOULD HE BE? You are assuming a previous form of structure.
99. I cannot believe you are actually asking this.
100. don't have an informed opinion about this.
101. We have had real problems with "arms length" relationships in the operation of our church. Roles and responsibilities need to be very clear.

37. The titles of the elected spiritual leaders should be changed from “president” to “bishop”.

1. Why? We do not have to do everything like other denominations! Besides the title of Bishop might get to somebody's head too much.
2. Bishop is in the Bible.
3. Bishop is in the Bible

4. Bishop (overseer) - wrong connotation. Can we maintain the LCC "look" rather than conform to other denomination titles?
5. Title does not mean much. The job done is the important thing.
6. The title is less important to me.
7. possibly as Bishop is more descriptive of what I believe the position is (Spiritual Leader)
8. May be seen as trying to be like Roman Catholics.
9. It wouldn't offend me. I like the idea!
10. We are Lutheran not Catholic. Do we not still believe in the Reformation? or do we want to be Orthodox Catholic?
11. It is just a word.
12. The title is unimportant - the person is

a. this represents a shift in our vocabulary and also theology from bottom up to top down

13. Does this matter? What does a change name affect Synod?
14. Things should be changed to their Biblical names for less confusion for lay members when they read the Bible.
15. What would be the point of changing a title?
16. Why? What for?
17. The term "bishop" is Scriptural and is more appealing than "president," which always seemed more in line with a business model. However, the term "bishop" is also loaded with thoughts of the ELCIC and other denominations that use those terms but have (for the most part) abandoned Scripture, etc. If the terms used for spiritual leaders are to be changed, then why not change president, vice-president, circuit counsellor, pastor, deacon, and elder to fit their Biblical correlation. A president could become "archbishop"; vice president, "bishop"; circuit counsellor might become a "deacon" (?); a pastor would remain a "pastor"; a deacon would perhaps become a "teacher" (?); a pastor with alternative training would perhaps become an "elder"; an elder might be called a "lay-elder" (?); and people in the congregation would remain "laypeople," or "laymen" and "laywomen." One or two members of each LC-C congregation could be selected by the congregation to undergo pastors with alternative training, and take on visitations, or provide the pastor respite, etc.
18. We have been Lutheran for many centuries. our people would turn over in grave if that happened. Catholics have bishops not Lutherans.
19. We need to create a stronger bond and relationship between pastor and the person who can help him become a better pastor.
20. Let’s use Biblical language instead of the language of the corporate boardroom
21. Lutherans are not catholic for a very good reason, see reformation.
22. Depends upon function. If it is a shepherd of the shepherds, the pastoral duties, then bishop seems appropriate. However, our history has a practice of understanding the two kingdoms as background.
23. Our cultivated avoidance of this term is ridiculous, both historically and theologically speaking. Get over it!
24. Just the title? That would be useless. If we are going to have a bishop, he deserves more than just the title, but also the historical duties and honour of the position.
25. "President" doesn't relate to me as a spiritual leader to me. I'm not convinced that "Bishop" is the best title, but its better than President.
26. It doesn't bother me personally, but many lay people might be confused by it especially seeing that often it is liberal church bodies that adopt this practice.

27. NO!!! NO!!! NO!!! we're catholic enough now with all this "High Church" nonsense that we are having stuffed down our throats by too many pastors. Much more could be said!!
28. Leave titles as they are.
29. Why?? To official - humble better.
30. Would a bishop have a velvet robe and ring on his finger to kiss?
31. Doesn't matter either way.
32. This would be a far more biblical model of church governance and would be most welcome.
33. Sounds too old fashioned and pretentious.
34. I like the idea of synodical "top man" being called bishop ... then district presidents.
35. Why wouldn't they?
36. While I agree with this my only concern is that this might further confuse the state of Lutheranism in Canada since the ELCIC uses this nomenclature.
37. Are we trying to become Catholic?
38. What does "bishop" mean and what would be the reason?
39. immaterial
40. While I have no problem with the title, I advise caution to avoid planting the seeds of a future version of the papacy.
41. Whether bishop is the right title I am not sure but president does elicit more of a business nature and not an ecclesiastical nature.
42. We should definitely return to Biblical language ("bishop").
43. Feels too "Romish."
44. We are not Catholic!! We already have too much Catholic influence in LCC. We are going backwards with this kind of thinking. Our new hymnals, liturgy, etc. Every year it seems we are going further away from our Lutheran roots and trying to please the Catholic Church by being more like them. Maybe it's time for a 21st century reformation if this continues in this direction!
45. Is this serious? This is pretty petty semantics relative to most of the other things being discussed here. President is fine, we don't need to make ourselves as Catholic as we possibly can.
46. It's just a title... bishop may imply spiritual more so than president does.
47. The structure should be changed to an episcopal polity and the titles would therefore change as well.
48. Not just titles but structure as well.
49. Semantics I hear the word "Bishop" and I immediately think" Roman Catholic".
50. I am in favour of changing the title to "bishop", but this must be in conjunction with a changed focus to be on spiritual matters foremost, and to be the "pastor's pastor."
51. Do titles really matter?
52. Would definition would be more suitable.
53. The title should be changed whether it is bishop or some other title.
54. I can not see what the change would do to help or that the change would hinder. I think we have enough changes to be dealt with but if the body wants the change and has a better understanding and good reason for it then it should happen.
55. Why is this important? Sounds kind of Anglican to me....
56. this survey has now gone way off track in terms of "relevancy" to members of the church - what you call someone is REALLY not important - what they DO is. what they SAY is.

what they EXEMPLIFY is. if this is what we are concerned about - the future of the church is in DIRE straights!

57. personally, the title bishop is not for us but for other denominations such as the Mormons, bad connotations
58. bad connotations, looking at other denominations, very bad idea
59. Are you serious? Our elected leaders serve the congregations. If they are not actively called pastors serving a congregation, they are not a part of the ministry and are no more special than anyone else. they do not hold a divine power, but act in an advisory fashion as a layperson (unless they have an active congregational call). All members of the congregation, as declared in the holy scriptures, are holders of the priesthood. This is stated in our current church doctrine. Therefore, calling the president a bishop is wrong. All that would be is placing the mantle of human authority and power on the president, while pretending it was authority and power from God.
60. "Bishop" has much stronger Biblical resonance ... but it also suggests an Overseer or Master ... and too many stiff-backed Clergy are going to take issue with the title "Bishop".
61. Absolutely NOT!
62. Adiaphora
63. Why? For what purpose?
64. LCMS started with a bishop but wised up. Bishops? the ELCIC. I was offended the D.P. Schiemann's business card showed him a bishop/president.
65. What difference does a "name" make???
66. Why is this being considered?
67. What spiritual leaders would this apply to, other than (I presume) President Bugbee? VPs? District presidents -- if they survive restructuring? Again, I would like to read President Bugbee's views on this. It seems to me a theological question, not simply a change of titles.
68. Should be changed from president but not bishop should be that title.
69. We are Christ's body, we are the Church, we have terms given in Scripture for the leaders of the Church, therefore let us use these terms when referring to our church/synodical leaders. We are not a business or secular institution/organization which use terms such as CEO and President. Let us be distinct for we are in the world, but not of the world.
70. The Bishop title carries too many bad vibes from other denominations
71. What would be the purpose?? Anytime a name change occurs it costs money - i.e. office letterheads, envelopes, other so again WHY? It isn't the name that is important. It is the fulfillment of the position.
72. Semantics! I hear the word Bishop" and think "Roman Catholic and look for the identifying hat.
73. Too many negative connotations with "bishop"
74. Whatever!
75. Stay as is - for good reason!
76. Definitely no!
77. To me it seems like we are trying to be more Catholic or Anglican.
78. Yes, IF their duties are ecclesiastical and spiritual and do not include administrative duties of a secular nature that can be handled well by responsible and experienced laymen.
79. Bishop has the connotation of being above or over someone else and I thought we believe that we are all equal members of the priesthood of all believers. The term "bishop" comes

across as being very Roman Catholic, and I know that some of my own family members would not approve of the term.

80. If the President's position retains the duties of CEO of Administration, the "President" should be the title.
81. If the President's position retains the duties of CEO of Administration, the "President" should be the title.
82. I personally do not care for the use of the term "bishop". It seems to mean different tings in different denominations.
83. To me "bishop" implies a more spiritual focus than "president" which seems more secular.
84. The title is not important to me.
85. It doesn't matter.
86. Bishop sounds more biblical, whereas president is more for business, corporations etc. like CEO
87. agree but in the district there should be a number of bishops supporting the circuits, average number of communicants to each bishop in the district. Bishops report into an ecclesiastical governing board
88. The titles don't matter to me.
89. There is a benefit to maintaining the language of Scripture and the Church.
90. Yes, if the role is separated from CEO and president
91. A bishop is more Biblical, but who are these "spiritual leaders" you mention? I thought this was about synod, where there is one spiritual leader???
92. really! Why? Trying to give yourselves a higher title
93. Going backwards.
94. Nudging way too close to ELCIC - let us be strong and hold our ground as LCC.
95. Sounds too much like Catholics or Anglicans, etc.
96. Why?
97. Only would confuse the issue.
98. Seems like a stupid question! Why would we want to do this? What purpose does it have! Do we want to become like the ELCIC or Anglican structure?
99. What would be the purpose of this? If the intent is to sound more ecclesiastical and less business like, why not choose "shepherd" instead for its biblical imagery and servanthood connotation?
100. Here we go again, all the trappings of a clergy elite.
101. The term "President" implies veto power. The term "bishop" implies a relationship with the Anglican and Catholic churches, which I do not want further confused by the general populace. I propose changing the title to "Shepherd". The shepherd takes care of the flock not to his own gain, but for the protection of the sheep.
102. which elected spiritual leaders - all of them - please be more specific
103. No! We don't need a Pope. Hopefully that is not the next question on titles to be applied.
104. If this title better describes their role.
105. When I hear the term "bishop", rightly or wrongly I think of theological bureaucracy and someone who "tows the party line" rather than someone who leads.
106. It seems that the answer to this question may depend on the answer to question 34.
107. we are not Catholic for a reason.
108. Not sure what the need is for this?

109. Just curious what are they in the Missouri Synod from whence we came? Did we change just to be different?
110. The title isn't as important as the job description.
111. Bishop is a better term. It has more biblical and historical roots. President is more of the secular world thinking. However, the term bishop can easily be misunderstood and has a lot of baggage for some.
112. The title of Bishop is not necessary; the title this person holds is fine the way it is.
113. Is this important? What is wrong with "president"?
114. Bishop - ecclesiastical super
115. I was looking for the "who cares" button. Bishop implies spiritual oversight President implies administration
116. I agree, but with the proviso that the bishop would not be empowered with the corresponding authority that bishops are given in the Roman Church, and that this is made clear in any resolution to effect the name change. The Bishop's duties and responsibilities should not be to tell pastors how to handle matters left to pastoral discretion in their own congregation (note: Communing members of heterodox church bodies is not a matter of pastoral discretion, but of sound doctrine). The Bishop should not recommend resignation of pastors for any other reason than serious misconduct or physical, mental or emotional inability to carry out god given duties of the pastoral office. The bishop should not criticize a pastor's "methods" in front of his flock. He should not understand his authority as being the architect of a district/diocese having the God-given authority to move pastors around as he sees best. The Bishop's judgment in ecclesiastical matters should be to enforce sound doctrine and practice and, in matters of adiaphora to make recommendations to pastors, though not publically in front of his flock. He should not lord over other pastors or use his office as bishop to intimidate pastors into cooperating with him against conscience. All this being said, I do value the biblical church language of "Bishop" as opposed to the office of "president" which is a worldly designation. Calling the DP a Bishop would aid in our synodical identity as the aggregate of the true visible church in Canada.
117. President is a secular term
118. it would give the impression that the Lutheran church is now including aspects of other faiths
119. If we go to the WORD as stated in Timothy the term 'bishop' would be qualified.
120. Bishop to me sounds too high church but it really doesn't matter about the name as long as the function is clear.
121. How about "Ecclesiastical Supervisor"
122. might confuse us with ELCIC what's in a name???
123. "Bishop" is a nice religious fuzzy, totally misunderstood for the most part. "President" lacks the aura of religiosity, but means something.
124. I think the change in title more closely aligns with Scripture and with what he will be actually doing.
125. These questions are becoming increasingly frivolous. "President" or "Bishop: who cares? Why aren't we concentrating on real issues like what is the objective of restructuring?
126. It would be a clear indication of their role and would differentiate them from the Chief Executive Officer.
127. Only if it is deemed to lend more respect to the position or title in the ecclesiastical sense

128. If this name change adds clarity, then yes. "President" is a business title, not an ecclesiastical one.
129. NO!!
130. It kind of makes me think we are stepping backwards. It would be helpful to have further opinions as to why we would entertain this.
131. Is there a different meaning behind the "tag"?
132. no matter what we will call them, NAME is not important. been a servant of CHRIST is the most important thing that we should be. BISHOP, PRESIDENT, BROTHER, whatever, sharing and spreading the word of God is the thing on what we should focus on.
133. Although church terms like "bishop" were not always exclusive to the Church, they have been a part of Church tradition for millennia. I much rather prefer terms like archbishop and bishop over vice-president and president. Not to mention, the LCC president really does the job of a bishop (or archbishop) anyways. This could also be helpful as a point of commonality as we interact with other church bodies around the world, e.g. other Lutheran synods, the ACNA, Rome. Even though Justin Martyr uses the term "President" in his First Apology, it sounds secular and business like.
134. How about 'brother'? The world and certain other denominations place such importance on status within positions. While respect is certainly due those who have truly been called by God, for such work; the concept that they require ranking and acknowledgement above others, not only is not Christ-like, but is negative in nature as it illustrates to the world the error lying within the organized church.
135. I am comfortable with calling the elected spiritual leader a president. I do not like the term bishop as it has connotations of Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican churches. Even if the office of president remained as is but was changed to Bishop I think it communicates the wrong idea. I am very much against having a bishop position modeled after the Anglican church.
136. The idea that "President" is a "business" term is nonsense. It means the one who presides. We have a "Presiding Pastor" or "President" for short. I have not problem at all with the term Bishop, but there is also no problem with our historic use of the term "President." Incidentally, it was long the case in the LCMS that the called pastor was also the "President" of the local congregation--i.e., presided over (chaired) the Council and Voters' Assembly. That was a better model than our current norm which seems to suggest that the called pastor (the NT terms were both "bishop" and "presbyter") is not the overseer of the congregation but more like a "chaplain" providing spiritual services to a body governed by others.
137. Elected spiritual leader should be titled SOMETHING different from "president".
138. Really? Does the title bishop not imply things we want to avoid? Or are we trying to imply something in titles that we are afraid to say in plain words?
139. Too much connection or comparison to the Roman Catholic faith.
140. Bishop sounds too much like the Catholic faith.
141. Sure, get rid of the political/business terminology and revert to a more ancient term - why not?
142. No benefit if change in name only. Title of Bishop should come additional powers
143. It is not the title that matters. It is the heart of the man who is called to serve and whether or not he is a humble servant of Christ.
144. If it works better as a distinct title for the president that would be fine. What would be title for a second President.....second Bishop, third Bishop? HMMM!

145. I think that the title Bishop is more historically rich, tied to our history and more in line with titles used by our closest Christian kin. "President" sounds like we are running a business.
146. I would change to agree if the leadership role is split and then you could have both a president and a bishop.
147. Not sure that titles mean a lot. Spiritual leadership means servant leadership to me, not the wielding of power.
148. Why would you even consider this? Where in the bible did anyone insist on titles except for the Pharisees?
149. Could be helpful, if the term is fully outlined for the Synod. Could help to remind us that we are not a secular organization.
150. Possibly
151. There is no reason to change and might just spark controversy and detract from more important issues.
152. Does that make the Synod President "Pope"? It also infers a hierarchy from the top down!
153. Why? It is a title only Could lead to other changes - Archbishop etc.
154. The term "bishop" I believe has a negative connotation, given the heresies that have commenced within the Anglican/Episcopal churches (e.g. Bishop Gene Robinson in the ELCA), not to mention others (Roman Catholic, ELCIC, etc.)
155. What difference will it make as to what the leader is called?
156. Yes, if it is historically correct and has no negative connotations.
157. This would move us closer to the Catholic model in the eyes of non-Lutherans.
158. The average layperson has no idea what a "president" is, as far as a church body goes. It conjures up unhelpful political associations or even business associations (e.g., the head of a country or the head of a company). Using the term teaches laypeople to not place trust in their spiritual leaders--they know that political presidents (as politicians) are seldom trustworthy. It also teaches pastors and deacons to not treat their duly appointed leaders with appropriate respect. Bishop (or even archbishop) is a much more appropriate term for the head of a church body. It tells us that he is the earthly leader of the church, not a politician and not a businessman. His focus is on spiritual and ecclesiastical matters. And that is precisely what his job-description should be. I would suggest a restructuring of LCC along more overt ecclesiastical terms and phrases, rather than unclear (and, for most people) meaningless terms like "president," "district," or "circuit." We should have an Archbishop who is head of the national church. The church body should be divided into new geographic regions (smaller than Districts but bigger than Circuits) called "Dioceses", in which pastors should elect their own bishop. These local bishops would be in charge of providing spiritual care and ecclesiastical oversight in their own region. Administrative and business matters arising in the area should be dealt with at the national office (which should subsume many of the duties traditionally looked after by districts).
159. Yes!!!! I can't agree strongly enough. We are not a business company. We should not have a president. Church leaders have always been bishops. We should absolutely go back to this.
160. Bishop is a better, clearer choice for that office. President sounds political rather than ecclesiastical. Perhaps there are other names too, but I would accept bishop.
161. This would bring us in line with the nomenclature used in most other major Christian denominations. As you say, it is Biblical.
162. This implies a type of hierarchy that does not and should not exist in our church
163. Don't agree with having Bishops.

164. Why? The term "Bishop" today is used primarily by the Catholic church and not the New Testament usage of the title. "In the New Testament, a bishop is a person who functions as a teaching leader among a local group of Christians. The Greek term episkapos has also been translated as “episcopal,” “elder,” “overseer,” or “pastor.” All refer to the same office and are therefore synonyms." Besides, we are not living in New Testament times. Also see Article IV: The Papacy, The Book of Concord, Smalcald Articles. Many other references from the Lutheran Confessions could be given to put this suggestion of change of title to rest.
165. What's in a name??
166. I think the terms should designate separate meanings, since it is explained that Bishop is a term which is kept from years ago, which don't think necessarily needs to change.
167. I believe this would be very appropriate, as the term itself indicates spiritual oversight.
168. Such a change would be using a Scriptural title to the office. However, changing the title alone doesn't make him a bishop.
169. more in keeping with the historical church instead of the business world.
170. The term President sounds too political, surely we can determine a suitable name for the spiritual leader i.e. bishop?
171. yes, 'president' implies a business leader
172. President - indicates leader of all Synod
173. Not sure how this would change his duties
174. Loss identity
175. It carries a stronger sense of spiritual leadership. After all, we are a church, not a company.
176. I like the title 'bishop', and I'm not too fond of 'president'. I'd say, "Go with it and people will get used to it". The alternatives I've heard are a little lame. At least it's Scriptural.
177. Denotes a stronger sense of spiritual accountability.
178. The term is too loaded. I don't want a pope. He should be called the "Supervisor" or something like that.
179. Leave it alone -- we don't have to join the others who have changed -- we understand what it means
180. like the ELCA - why not make more changes like ELCA
181. That would be really cool, but I don't know that we'd be gaining anything by it. Furthermore, 'bishop' connotes a certain understanding of the office of the keys and the validity of ordination which I'm uncomfortable with. It might also lead to those outside LCC congregations to conflate the LCC with the ELCIC and with the current state churches in the Scandinavian countries, associations we already suffer and don't want inflated. A last point is that 'bishop' to me is not the title of a term-limited elected position; if we're going to change the name, I would prefer lifetime appointments (which also can get a little dicey when we start talking about a Lutheran idea of the office of pastor and the idea of the priesthood of all believers), but, as I don't want lifetime appointments, I'd prefer not to change the title. The vestments could get really nifty though.
182. Perhaps this is a good idea; takes away the concept of running a company to leading in "spiritual" affairs. I like it.
183. LEAVE AS IS
184. As long as they do what they are elected to do, I don't care what the person is called. Changing the title to 'bishop' could cause some to confuse LCC with those outside denominations that are not LCC.

185. "Those who don't know their history are doomed to repeat it." We had a bishop -- we sent him packing with $100 (somehow he came up with another $1,100) across the Mississippi River. While bishop is a biblical term which we have historically used for vicarage supervisors it implies a relationship between a "superior" and his vicars or in other church bodies "pastors." A relationship which does not exist (yet and I hope never) in our polity). Let's stick with president which is reflective of the actual position.
186. What's in a name. It should not influence the person.
187. DUMB
188. President indicates # 1 head of entire Synod.
189. I'm fine with either, as long as we don't waste our breath discussing this. Please don't let the name of the position detract from the understanding of his role. I think our time would be better spent clarifying what that position is and does, rather than arguing over a name.
190. "Bishop" would more clearly indicate his ecclesiastical supervisory role.
191. There is no precedent or use of President in the Scriptures to describe those within the Church. However, Bishop has also been given other connotations through Roman Catholic and Anglican use that we would not enjoin upon our President per se. If we use the term, it would have to be understood properly and that would be a rather large task, I am afraid.
192. "Bishop" is too associated with the Catholic Church
193. I agree only if the term and responsibilities of "Bishop" are defined, and the position doesn't take on the authority of Bishops in the Roman Catholic and/or Anglican churches.
194. The trouble with calling leaders "bishop" is that they start behaving like bishops. The Missouri Synod started with a bishop but wised-up. Traditionally, Bishops are answerable only to God. In my old ELIC my bishop flagrantly, for years, practiced infant baptism, confirmation, and communion when it was disallowed in the national church. He also controlled conventions by refusing delegates elected by Deaneries and replacing them with those of his ilk. It was bishops who made ELCIC LGBT.
195. President indicates head over all areas of Synod.
196. Bishop sounds so Roman Catholic.
197. These titles have become associated with prestige and superiority. There are enough problems without having to deal with pride and "putting on airs".
198. Again the "people" should be in charge as Martin Luther instructed.
199. I don't think it matters what we call them
200. Changing the title does not change the function. It is merely an effort to sound more "up-to-date.
201. That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.
202. Since the church is a religious institution the title of bishop is appropriate.
203. Better reflects Scriptural language.
204. "Bishop" is a freighted term. It is the Biblical term and thus has value, and so long as we understand it in light of the "Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope" it is fine. But would the older generation of our church reject it or be uncomfortable with the term "Bishop" because of the historical baggage?
205. I believe the ELCIC church uses the word "Bishop". I think we should stay with the word President to retain our own identity.
206. WINDOW DRESSING! :) Are we actually talking about "RE-FORMING" our synod...? If we think using more churchy sounding words will change things... not sure what is behind this question. Sorry, I'm reacting badly to this question. It really doesn't matter to me what

we call the president. How about "Pastoral Leader"... why does it have to be either or... how about a third option.

207. "Bishop" is an ancient title which conveys authority and an apostolic church to all within and without the church. "President" seems so secular, authoritarian and remote.
208. The title "President" is too political in connotation.
209. "Bishop" sounds to Catholic and has too many negative things associated with it.
210. No, No, No
211. The less power and prestige, including titles that is given to Pastors the better.
212. This is okay.
213. This is more churchly language; it would need to be well-explained but better fits the terminology of the Bible. "Overseer" would also be acceptable.
214. Negative connotations for me
215. Unless our structure changes to a more episcopal system.
216. Pastoral circuit leader would identify the role clearly.
217. Circuit Pastor would be clear.
218. The term "bishop" still has too much baggage associated with it. While "president" does not carry the understanding also of ecclesiastical supervisor it does not have any theological baggage either.
219. I have known visitor looking for a church, did not feel comfortable in our church due to the pomp. I feel the more we are like common and ordinary Christians people, we are more apt to receive new members.
220. The tittle "bishop" can lead to a more authoritarian position.
221. I don't think we should move to be more 'Catholic'!
222. We are not living in a time when the title "bishop" has meaning (by the way, the Book of Concord does address this term. It is nothing more than a "pastor" according to our Confessions - did a paper on this in College). Why introduce this "new" term. It is also too closely related to Roman Catholic hierarchy. Are we planning a merger with them? Most importantly, contrary to prevailing opinion in some circles, the term "bishop" is not as clear as "supervisor,"" overseer", or even "District President". In this time of upheaval and we are contemplating major changes.... Less Is More.
223. Bishop/Overseer (episkopos) is a Biblical title where President is freighted with American political and north American business expectations and culture. "The saying is trustworthy: If anyone aspires to the office of bishop/overseer, he desires a noble task. Therefore, an bishop/overseer must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, sober-minded, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. He must manage his own household well, with all dignity keeping his children submissive, for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church? He must not be a recent convert, or he may become puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, so that he may not fall into disgrace, into a snare of the devil." (1 Timothy 3:1-7)
224. The term "bishop" may be better used to reflect spiritual leadership and the term "president" used to define a more administrative role.
225. We should go back to the polity that grew out of the NT (esp the Pastoral Epistles) within a generation of its writing. Using a structure based on US politics, as we do, gives the impression of a cold, soulless structure rather than of Church as we find it in the NT.

226. 'President' has become a term that dominates the business world and gives a business sense to ecclesiastical matters. A name change would help recognize the churchly role of the overseer.
227. REALLY? I am trying to take care of people who have lost their savings and are struggling with issues of feeling betrayed by the Pastor's they have loved and trusted and whether it's possible to forgive them...and you are asking about titles? Give your head a shake!
228. Especially if their duties are going to primarily involve ecclesiastical matters.
229. Should stay as president
230. not if it creates confusion
231. If name change to bishop, then better use the role and function of bishop properly and not just as a name change.
232. Why? Would it move us closer to Catholic or Anglicanism?
233. CEO - President Bishop - Ecclesiastical leader
234. Changing titles would not have helped in the fiasco that is ABC; if he was called bishop it would be corrupt bishop just as it was corrupt president. I think Shakespeare said it best "A rose by any other word would smell as sweet" although in this case it is more pungent.
235. Splitting the roles would require distinct titles for each role. What that title is worth discussing, and this survey isn't the place for it.
236. I think the term bishop has a lot of baggage so I don't like it, but I do think that if the ecclesiastical role is separated from the CEO role, president would no longer be a fitting term for the position.
237. A title is only a title what does it matter. Mind you everyone knows the Pope. Lutherans are split all over the place which is causing some of the problems we have today. Each group kind of heads off on it's own with no real leadership.
238. Don't care
239. Am not sure whether the title of "bishop" has other implications within different Lutheran Churches who we have same doctrine beliefs, e.g. Missouri Synod.
240. another name than bishop should be neither spiritual leaders - convey 'shepherd' 'worship leader' president oversees the business end of the organization
241. No, not unless they truly take on the responsibilities of new testament bishops
242. I think that might better describe his function.
243. Or some other suitable title.
244. The term "president" gives the idea that they are primarily corporate supervisors and not ecclesiastical. "Bishop" clearly gives connotations of spiritual supervision and is a Biblical term.
245. Why do semantics have to play into this?
246. "President" is not recognized in Scripture. "Bishop" is a term used in the earliest part of church history and should be used in keeping with the tradition. "President" brings to mind American politics or secular forms of governance. "Bishop" is a church word that should be used.
247. I am not sure what changing the title of a position is going to accomplish. Sounds political. Nothing wrong with the way it is now.
248. Below are four reasons why we must change the title of elected spiritual leaders from "president" to "bishop"... (1) In accordance with the practice of the ancient church and to separate us from evangelical Protestants and other "flavour of the day" churches. (2) The title of "Bishop" is in use in the Evangelical Lutheran Church and various European

Lutheran churches. (3)"President" is a title used in a secular organization. We are a religious organization. (4) Luther's Small Catechism specifically mentions "Bishops" in Section 3, the Table of Duties ("To Bishops, Pastors and Preachers").

249. why change it?
250. Only if a CEO position is created.
251. It is more scriptural but you would have to thoroughly explain the difference so the members do not equate the term to be 'Catholic'.
252. I know other churches have bishops but we are not other churches
253. Other churches have bishops but we are not other churches
254. Just leave 'pope' off the list.
255. President runs a company; a Bishop is the spiritual leader.
256. I don't think the change in term is necessary. I understand that "Bishop" is a more "churchly" term and "President" more worldly, but my initial reaction is to think it sounds too much like ELCIC and it may cause increased confusion in our communications with society.
257. District President should become "Bishop", Synodical President should remain as President, if only to avoid the title of "Archbishop".
258. President implies an administrative aspect of the job.
259. I care far less about what someone is called than what they actually do. We are wasting time on job titles? How about reaching the lost! That should be our primary focus.
260. Seems like a petty issue.
261. If the role remains as-is, then terminology could remain, but otherwise I am indifferent (risk in splitting role is turning "bishop" into some unaccountable spiritual role which becomes divorced from the realities of the Synod in it's totality
262. Are you already planning on doing 2 positions?
263. Why??? My first impression of this is that makes no sense to me. It's a word! Really? It's just another one of those Lutheran words that no one outside of the "club" understands.
264. Let's stick with titles that indicate that we are Lutheran and NOT catholic.
265. Titles are something for doorplates and business cards. The duties and responsibilities of a person in a specific role are not dictated by their title. It is for outward appearance only.
266. To 'catholic' for my liking.
267. President becomes Bishop and second position added as CEO administration.
268. Change President to Bishop as the spiritual leader and add second leadership position as CEO of Administration. This CEO should be a lay person.
269. It is reported that on the eve of the Russian revolution the church was in conference to discuss among other things whether the robes of the clergy should touch the ground or be above it. Surely at this time there are more important issues to deal with. When people start worrying about their titles, we have a much bigger problem
270. why?
271. If we just change the title, we accomplish nothing. The requirements and expectations will also need to be adjusted to fit the perception of bishop over president.
272. This should include the right to wear purple, be addressed as "Your Excellency" or "my lord bishop" and, when appropriate, receive obeisance.
273. A president can be a great spiritual leader and a bishop can still be an over-reaching abusive authoritarian who is refusing God's call to be a servant. A change in the title is not as important as the qualities of those who are called.

274. Yes; for the following reasons: 1) It's biblical; 2) It's confessional (Small Catechism); 3) Many of our ecumenical partners use the title. However, more important that titles are how the office is defined. I would rather see a clearly defined pastoral role of the office than a title that is fluff.
275. Adiaphora. If the greater church so desires this change to be made, it can be made. This matters not at all.
276. My understanding of a "bishop" is one who assigns pastors at will, regardless of congregational calls, according to the Methodist model. I oppose this.
277. Doesn't matter. "Servant" is more important than either "president" or "bishop"
278. Why? R.C.?! Anglican?!
279. The term "servant" is more important than either "president" or "bishop."
280. With all the important decisions to make, to me this is the least important. A change should be made if it is deemed necessary for some reason, but I don't think changing for the sake of sounding more "churchly" is a good enough reason.
281. It would fit in with a more traditional understanding within Christianity, and is in accord with AC XVIII:77, Ap XIV:28, and Ap XXVIII:12-13. However, it would offend those who cling tenaciously to more Missourian ideas and feel it's necessary to avoid this term in order to protest the abuses of bishops in much of Christendom by pretending it's the concept of bishops, not the abuse, that's the problem, as our Confessions state.
282. a rose by any other name .... President implies an elected office; Bishop implies an appointment. On the other hand, bishop also implies pastoral supervision and support as ecclesiastical supervisor, but also comes from an episcopal polity of running a denomination. Why do you ask?????
283. I don't think that titles matter.
284. This is just a title, and furthermore, the change would seem to "Roman Catholicize" us more.
285. Some change is to confusing.
286. Although it can be passed off as a matter of semantics, the title of bishop has a number of implications/assumptions tied to it, as does president. Referring to the president as reverend does not necessarily have the same connotations as being called a bishop. Perhaps this is the long-lasting influence of the early church/Roman Catholic Church.
287. Why are we contemplating using titles from the Roman Catholic, Anglican and other denominational churches?
288. If the question is about what title is more appropriate for our church's ranking leader, Bishop would be appropriate but it would need to be carefully explained to the church at large. If on the other hand there is something more intended then be up front and make your case.
289. I think we have bigger issues that what their name tags will say.
290. This seems appropriate for ecclesiastical supervision, not for administrative functions.
291. it is just a title
292. I don't care what you call them
293. But the term "bishop" needs to be clearly defined and the people of our synod, lay and clergy, need to be helped to understand what the bishop's pastoral oversight must include -- namely real Scriptural and Confessional authority.
294. If that's the biggest thing we have on our plate, then whatever.
295. names will not change anything
296. Don't see that it is necessary to change the title - to what purpose??
297. Why? Because it sounds more "churchy"?

298. The job description is what makes the position real. If we look to the U.S. what is our Prime Minister? or if we look to the weaker German Luth. church do we want to align with their 'titles of bishop' to make the German "state Luth church" appear more "Catholic"...
299. Does Not Matter!!
300. Bishop could tell the secular world the man as authority in the church. President could do the same.
301. It would be more in line with the Scriptures, but unfortunately other denominations have given it a bad and dishonest image.
302. Don't see the need! What's the point?
303. Do not see a benefit in changing the name of this title
304. Bishop conveys a hierarchical authority. I get the idea to make the title of spiritual leaders reflect the spiritual nature of their role, but I think "bishop" carries too much baggage and can only rightly be used if everyone agrees with the reformers that the role and title is by human right only. Based on our history, a different title would be better, in my opinion (Maybe something radical like "Lead Servant" or which better reflects the fact that the "highest" unit in our structure is the local congregation, not the district or synod offices.)
305. To me, the term "Bishop" refers to other denominations and not LCC Lutheran leaders.
306. It's not the title that matters. If they are or are not performing their duties to the Glory of God and his people what difference does the title make. You have much more serious problems!! Not that I am against "bishop".
307. Again, this very question makes me wonder how well informed the committee members are about the origins and background of our current church polity. A better translation of the Biblical term episkipos is "overseer". Let us leave the word "bishop" for the Roman Catholics. The word "bishop" has too much baggage associated with it.
308. Keep it simple and HUMBLE.
309. We split from the Roman Catholic practices 500 years ago. I'm fine with that decision. If we want closer ties with other Christion denominations, then it should be based on the bible and our faith, not of the titles given to our human-selected organization.
310. We have bigger problems than renaming the elected spiritual leaders from President to "Bishop"
311. This helps indicate his role as spiritual not as a business
312. Does this really matter?
313. Sounds to much like "Pope". Maybe "Synodical Pastor"
314. would this be better?
315. Not necessarily "bishop" but something more ecclesiastical than "president."
316. The title Bishop takes us back to where we come from. Bishop may also communicate some kind of top down power whereas President generally indicates you report to a Board of Directors
317. The title is not important, how the job is done is key.
318. We can find another title that doesn't sound too Romanish.
319. Absolutely. I have never really understood why LCC's spiritual leaders are called presidents. Perhaps it is a holdover from LCMS but it is not biblical and it is not ecclesiastical. When I am talking to friends in other denominations they are puzzled by why we call our spiritual leaders presidents as it is a title more appropriate for a leader in the business/corporate community. I think for many in society a bishop is what people expect for the title of a spiritual leader. President conveys something different.

320. President sounds to secular, Bishop is seen by secular world as a God chosen Leader of our denomination
321. biblical language is always good. if people do not understand it, they should be taught it. just because something looks "roman" doesn't mean it is...
322. As long as the Bishop is not the CEO
323. This change seems to be happening unofficially already. Maybe it is the right way to go, I don't know. How much does the position actually change if we change the name? If we divide the president's position into 2 I guess one of them would be a "bishop." What else would we call that position? The title just carries so much baggage (Roman Catholic and early LCMS) that is scares people.
324. Don't care. Stop focusing on trivialities when we our church is hurting at the core.
325. "President" sounds too "business like" and will not get the proper respect from congregations or other leaders with that little.
326. I don't like the term bishop.
327. Don't care.
328. Not unless the ELCIC stops using the title Bishop.
329. Sure why not?
330. Bishop reminds me of the Catholic church too much
331. Let's start using terminology which is consistent with historical usage so that we don't have to explain our terminology to outsiders all the time. It gets to be tedious.
332. Why change?
333. the term Bishop is universally considered a term for Church contexts in and out of the Church
334. I guess that may be the trend in other Lutheran churches, not sure we need to change, but am not against it.
335. We are NOT CATHOLICS
336. Who cares!!!!!
337. I think this is a great suggestion, it is becoming more and more prevalent, and is recognized as a gifted spiritual leader in the Church
338. Only if they are going to be a pastor to the pastors.
339. CEO for president, and Shepherd for ecclesiastical supervision or spiritual leadership.
340. This has nothing to do with restructuring. This is just a word. It is a hobby horse for some. I very strongly disagree.
341. Look up the meaning of bishop
342. I am not concerned about the title - only their doctrine
343. There is good Biblical precedent for this title.
344. From biblical times the spiritual head of the church is the bishop. The term president can be appropriate for other type of leadership.
345. While "bishop" would be more 'churchly'; thanks to Martin Stephan it would probably raise too many red flags.
346. Who cares what they are called?? Both still lead to arrogance. I think that the title should be Synodical Servant to remind him that he is not the leader in a worldly sense.
347. This is a silly question!!! The title means nothing; it is the authority/responsibility which goes with it. Presidents should have more authority to "act" within a congregation. The key here is that it is limited authority--maybe in the sense of "binding arbitrator" in the case of conflict. That said, if you want to call this person a president or bishop it makes no

difference. Either title needs a "job description" with VERY LIMITED, CLEARLY DEFINED authority.

348. That seems appropriate since they would be dealing with spiritual issues.
349. This fits with Walther's understanding of church and ministry, which I agree with.
350. Helpful language for those who are more accustomed to the business world, and less accustomed to the Church and her history.
351. Although this is not a word used in LC--C or LCMS the term does direct itself to spiritual oversight.
352. This would make things too confusing.
353. Changing titles would not have helped in the fiasco that is ABC; if he was called president or bishop it would changes nothing, he was corrupt.
354. really? how does this matter to our worship services
355. I agree with this as long as LCC is careful in its definition of what a "Bishop" is and what amount of authority and accountability he has. Bishop should not be used in the way it is in the Roman Catholic Church or the Anglican Church, but merely as a name change to better reflect his theological/ecclesiastical role of oversight and no more.
356. Bishop is a word used in the Bible, so why not use bishop instead of president.
357. If it is ecclesiastical only.
358. Bishop (Episkipos) has been the historic title, and is universally understood as such. Many of us already refer to the job of Synod and district president as that of bishop.
359. Is there a VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE button?
360. To me the term " bishop " would relate to things basic to theology where " president " would encompass all matters a leader has to deal with.
361. should we try POPE
362. NO
363. I don't understand why we would make the change. Not enough information to Agree or Disagree.
364. The title makes no difference, I trust him to fulfill his duties according to the Word of God and act as God's Shepherd over the sheep!
365. Yes! This would help clarify things a lot!
366. das macht nichts. pick your trappings.
367. That could lead many lay people to thinking that we are the Roman Catholic Church; let's not confuse the issue.
368. A biblical stance is always best. As long as it is not simply a name change and explained well. Many may simply say doesn't the ELCiC do that? And look at their female Bishop.
369. I experienced this happening in the LCA/ELCIC as a pastor. First the title change meant nothing except new letterhead, but over time the new leaders took more and more of the "Romanesque" overtones of the title 'bishop' far too seriously, and became dictatorial, abusive and vindictive in the way they used the office to advance personal agendae without consideration for the views of the laity. The rot began innocently, and none of us anticipated what would happen; but it was the first cells of a cancer which is killing that church today.
370. Only so as not to be confused with another church body who uses this term
371. I don't care what they are called.
372. Bishop title is too similar to ELCIC which is having its own issues - we don't need to go there!
373. Too RC and similar to ELCIC which is having its own issues - don't need to go there.

374. YES, this both biblical and follows our catholic (universal church) traditions.
375. If the Presidents are the chief ecclesiastical overseers of our Synod/Districts, as our handbook clearly states, then they are "Bishops", and we should give them this title.
376. Mixed feelings on this. It makes sense to use a churchly term for a churchly office, instead of a civil term. However, bishops historically are entrusted to care for sheep, as do our pastors. Currently DPs and SPs are not entrusted to care for the sheep in the congregations. It is pastors who do this. If our polity is changed, where DPs and SPs are the chief pastor of the lay people, perhaps we could use the term "bishop" but that hasn't happened yet.
377. I don't really care what the title is. President implies more administrative duties whereas Bishop implies more ecclesiastical duties. Either way, at this point, the position does both jobs.
378. Who are we trying to puff up with big titles? Where has the humility gone. How about LCC Head Pastor.
379. Sounds too Catholic!!
380. It's Biblical.
381. We ain't catholic!
382. The title "bishop" would be more appropriate.
383. More ecclesiastical.
384. I strongly believe that our Ecclesiastical Supervisors, as overseers of doctrine and practice, should have the biblical and traditional title "Bishop". I believe this title change would benefit our church by defining the primary duty of our elected spiritual leaders. The secular title "president" gives off the impression that we are appointing our leaders to be executive CEOs, rather than overseers of doctrine and practice. As a lay person, I have never felt comfortable using secular titles for churchly offices, and so I would like to see this title changed as soon as possible.
385. haha I don't know. It will make us sound fancier and more old-fashioned, so that's good but still... It's so weird! Even though they're called bishops, its not like its following the line of apostolic succession....
386. Sounds tooooooooooooo Catholic to me!
387. District and synodical structures are not biblically mandated, hence the title "president" "Bishop" implies a more biblical category of authority equal to that of "pastor".
388. Its a title
389. I have no strong feelings on this. It makes sense if that leader won't have any CEO responsibilities, but really it's just semantics. If you call him president, bishop, or pastoral leader, he's still got the same work to do. Though bishop does role off the tongue a little smoother.
390. Seriously? Who cares? How about "humble, forgiven sinner"?
391. The title "President" indicates that he is voted to the position and will some day be replaced. The title "Bishop" intimates that he was appointed by God and will always have the title. Do we really want to go down that road? I doubt Luther would approve or have accepted the title himself.
392. I feel that we should be open to considering a title change if there is a more appropriate title for the position.
393. The title is not important, but the authority to make decisions should be there for the office.
394. Bishop sounds too Roman Catholic to me and also leads to greater misunderstanding of the position and duties.

395. The term "president" is often misunderstood and has a corporate and political connotation. Let's use the term which is universally understood: Bishop.
396. I think if the role is split, then CEO and Bishop would be the appropriate terms to use.
397. Bishop implies an episcopal structure. If the whole assembly chooses to do this and explicitly acknowledges that it's by human right, I will respect that, though I would not vote for it. Support from seasoned pastors is absolutely helpful. It doesn't necessarily need to happen through an authority structure.
398. Possibly but not necessarily.
399. Especially if we opt for a change in structure. New nomenclature to go with a new structure. Best time to do it! We can then join once again ecclesiastical world discussion with titles the rest of the Christian world can relate with.
400. "A rose by any other name, etc." While Bishop is certainly a better designation, what really matters is how the person holding the office carries it out - either pastorally, that is wielding spiritual authority/persuasion rather than a CEO wielding the power of his position.
401. The title Bishop has strong authoritarian overtones for many people.
402. We are church not a corporation. As such our leader should be called bishop (or some other churchly title) to distinguish him from a corporate leader or a leader of state. Our spiritual leader should be encouraged to wear a clerical instead of a business suit and tie.
403. We need to get away from thinking about synod as a corporation or political entity.
404. I have no strong feeling but I know a good many LCC members who would be horrified at the thought of being under a bishop. On the other hand, it would clarify that the spiritual authority is separate from the temporal authority of the Board of Directors.
405. In keeping with historical models
406. Bishop is a church term, president is a business term
407. ~ although I don't mind the term, it could create areas of confusing with the ELCiC.

Section 5: Restructuring the Training of Pastors and Deacons

38. The process of restructuring the training of pastors, including the number and location of seminaries, should continue after the process of restructuring LCC.

1. There is only one seminary left. Edmonton is not Christian anymore. What do you want to keep restructuring? You want to allow homosexual pastors like the Moravian Church and most larger churches?
2. Before - during - after - it has to happen.
3. Part of Requirements for benefit of all.
4. One seminary
5. Do we need two seminaries? For sure east and west may have cultural differences. This needs more study. The changes made recently appear to be working.
6. With one Seminary - all pastors would be trained properly - and in full compliance of the theology of LCC.
7. No major change should be made quickly in this area. Lots of consultation and discussion of pros and cons should take place.
8. Do we need 2 seminaries - with churches closing no need for 2 seminaries.
9. Only 1 location is required and affordable. Voting members of each congregation should make this decision after full financial and operational disclosure. Staff, professors, and Synod Board member should not vote except as voting member of their congregation and must not attempt to influence others.
10. Part of our requirements; May be forced to go down to one seminary by courts re ABC.
11. We cannot afford more than 1 location. Voting membership of each congregation should be presented with financial facts 1 month prior to vote on location. Staff, professors and Synod board members should not vote.
12. Do we have the need/dollars for two seminaries?
13. I expect it should be an ongoing thing as a pastor matures and realizes the problems which exist (to the area)
14. Definitely it should. One seminary in Edmonton or none at all. Not enough students for both and too much money that we don't have.
15. We need only ONE seminary in Canada.

a. the CCMS is to do this in their restructuring of synod as I understand it.

16. This has been voted on in convention, and is not part of restructuring Synod.
17. As long as it takes. If it is completed before or at the same time as restructuring LC-C, then this option may no longer apply.
18. can’t afford it
19. It would be wise to reduce the number of seminaries considering the small number of students overall.
20. Why wouldn't the discussion of the effectiveness of seminary training be an ongoing and organic process?
21. can only afford 1 site.
22. This is a chance to consider all aspects of LCC.
23. Yes, it can continue. But don't have the seminary issue happen at the same time.

24. It all depends on what is meant by the restructuring
25. It must be done. But not now. There's enough on the plate already.
26. I hope it does. Its a separate concern that needs to be considered. We must strongly consider only one seminary for all of LCC. I know that this has been discussed and recommendations made by a study group, but I'm not convinced they were listening to our congregations. It looks to me like we are struggling to maintain two seminaries for small amounts on seminarians. It doesn't appear to be a very cost effective and responsible way to use the resources provided to us by our Lord.
27. While there may be financial considerations, overall I don't see the purpose of forcing these two very different and important decisions into one.
28. For sure... close the seminary(s)... especially St. Catharines.
29. Religion - as Christianity seems to be in decline - we need to find a way to keep Jesus Christ in the world as troubled as it is.
30. Rightly or wrongly people associate east with St. Catharines west with Edmonton - one being extremely liturgical and other being liberal.
31. Not sure this is on topic.
32. In my view this is the "elephant in the living room" issue. We say the seminary situation can't be changed but I just do not believe there is the collective will to do so especially if it includes closing the seminaries and forming a new one.
33. The training of Pastors was set by Synod Convention and continues.
34. The process of restructuring the training of pastors needs to continue to completion. While it does not necessarily need to be done at the same time that Synod is restructured, I think that there are benefits to having both processes happening concurrently. One of those benefits is that you have one big painful process instead of two.
35. As a home requires repair of shingles and cracks in the foundation year to year, so should we seek to improve ourselves.
36. This was discussed at the last synodical convention and an MOU was prepared. The existing process should be allowed to continue as planned.
37. Our Canadian seminaries need to be closed. It is absolutely ridiculous to keep these seminaries open for 2 graduates. They should go to the US where they would be better trained.
38. Two seminaries made little sense in the 1980s, and makes even less sense now.
39. This depends on the amount of time required for restructuring LCC and the level of urgency in restructuring the seminaries.
40. Maintaining two separate Seminaries is probably not needed - probably should be combined into one which would centralize seminarians and fill the classrooms. Certainly one Seminary would be more cost effective and cost savings will be paramount as we move forward.
41. It will save money to centralize the location.
42. I would agree that this should happen always on an ongoing basis for changes that need to move our church forward. What I am saying is that if there is a need for change to better train our pastors and deacons then it should always be at the forefront of our work. But always on its' own.
43. It's an enormous undertaking. Why would you add the stress of completing this task to the stress of restructuring LCC at the same time? We've got time, we may as well use it to do it right the first time.

44. with on line courses, internet etc. we should have ONE location. what is the proposal for the "restructuring the training of pastors"?
45. too important to do at the same time, lets get synod done first
46. one seminary in St. Catharines is all that is needed
47. This question is phrased to suggest that LCC is going to be restructured, regardless of the results of this survey. What this says to me is that my opinion, expressed through this survey, regarding whether restructuring is needed, is meaningless. Sounds like you have already decided. Also, you've decided to restructure the training of pastors? All this is asking me is if I think they can happen at the same time or not. I don't think they should be restructured.
48. Do it all at the same time. Why waste more time and money for a second round of "restructuring"? Part of this process needs to be a good hard look at the young men entering seminary and how/what they are taught. There seems to be a lack of HUMBLENESS as well as a lack of SERVANTHOOD.
49. One sem. in Canada should suffice.
50. A major restructuring of Synod will be a huge undertaking. It might be most expedient to leave restructuring pastoral education and seminary institutions until after a restructuring of Synod takes place/effect. However, it will be wise to still consider how restructuring Synod will affect the other institutions of Synod.
51. This has to begin. Seminaries struggle financially and training for our pastors should become more standardized. With all our technology the merging could begin with a view to positions amalgamating through attrition, etc. The number of men going into the Ministry will either need to increase if both seminaries are warranted as they could now easily be accommodated through one seminary.
52. Two Seminars are probably not needed - should probably be combined into one in Edmonton. Such a down-sizing would be cost effective and this consideration is paramount as we move forward. Put our money into people not bricks and mortar.
53. Training of pastors is ALWAYS important to improve training and accountability.
54. Why is this a question? This survey is about Synod- not the seminaries. Does the committee want a deadline? Purpose?
55. I thought this decision was already made: keep both seminaries but work together whenever possible
56. The structure of Synod is not contingent upon the number and location of seminaries. This has been an issue for some time and does not need to be attached to change in structure of Synod.
57. The decisions made regarding training of pastors may be directly impacted by the restructuring of LCC.
58. The seminary issues are too important to be combined with this restructure mandate. They need to be given the time and focus they deserve.
59. with transportation as is - one seminary is sufficient.
60. There may be compelling reasons for having only one seminary.
61. Ongoing-
62. Are there ways to complement rather than duplicate the role of each seminary?
63. I am not sure. Does there need to be a restructuring of training of pastors? I think that the number and location of seminaries that we presently have is fine. I would not change the number and location of seminaries.

64. Isn't this being handled already by the Seminary?
65. they should be included in the considerations of structuring, institutions, publishing, all communities, and institutions that receive any funding from LCC and its organizations
66. Should continue during re-structuring, see #39.
67. We must consider our needs and resources as a synod. We opted to maintain two seminaries as our primary theological training. The result is that there were not funds available to Concordia University of Edmonton, something we must consider in retrospect as a synod.
68. This can wait, for now. I think, in the future, there should be a seminary with housing for students' families built in Winnipeg with both present seminaries closing.
69. We must look at the economics of this. Can we afford to keep a seminary open for two or three pastors a year graduating?
70. Yes...there should be no reason that the two seminaries in Canada as so drastically run and why Pastors come from them so different in thought and training
71. Duplicating not necessary.
72. The pastors were trained better in the USA Sem. years ago, than now in Canada.
73. In Canada I feel the need of only ONE Seminary.
74. Not sure of viability of one or two or (NONE)
75. We could meet in the middle (Winnipeg) and cut costs. Enrolment is not sufficient for two seminaries.
76. We already have 2 locations which I feel is enough. Cost prohibitive.
77. The process of restructuring needs to continue. Not sure we need two sems...how many are there in all of the U.S.?? Considering the low enrollment levels, why maintain and manage two locations?? Don't really care or worry about where a sem would be located, but having just one makes a lot of sense.
78. Financial concerns make this a must!
79. The seminaries are quite strong and are serving their purpose to the church without restructuring.
80. Merge the two seminaries or the most economical move would be to close both. We are not big enough to have our own buildings and the US can provide us with quality training without the extra overhead.
81. If the conversation must happen it must happen after. As a people we need to focus on one thing at a time so that we can make careful and informed decisions. The months to come hold many changes; let's not put too much on our plate at once.
82. Seems like enough change is going on right now and would be wiser to tackle one thing at a time and see how church is looking and working after restructuring before attempting further change.
83. unless it is already complete
84. One seminary is adequate for the training. It is just too costly to have 2 for the few number of students that attend
85. Do what is best for the overall good of the church. Leadership should be trusted to make the right decision.
86. WE can not afford to continue with so little $ in 2 places. Bad Stewardship.
87. While I do know this is happening, as I am not sure what has currently happened in this process and what yet needs to be done, I cannot state whether it needs to continue at the same time or after LCC restructuring.
88. More qualified people than I can answer this

89. Do not have enough information as to whether or not our training of pastors needs to be restructured. I believe our seminaries are good where they are. It would cost a great deal of dollars to close up these institutions and open them elsewhere. I am of the belief that the seminaries are adequate for the most part as and where they are.
90. I strongly agree that two seminaries are redundant and divisive; the issue of expense notwithstanding.
91. That is a decision that can only be made by what would serve the future of our church best and would be financially feasible. With modern technology one central location might serve the purpose very well as is already being done with lessons on line. (Or is it?)
92. Not at same time
93. It seems like enough upheaval is going on without addressing the issue of the seminaries. I can't imagine tackling this topic until the dust of this present restructuring has settled and we see how the new structure functions.
94. The Seminaries are running OK at this time Lets let them work on that level for a time
95. restructuring is a 'fait accompli'???
96. I DON'T UNDERSTAND THIS QUESTION! Tensions over how to train Pastors will always need to be addressed. How we are dealing with these tensions should not be set aside, except at specific need, as we'd prune dead and diseased wood from the synod's governance.
97. The training should continue but I think there should be just one location
98. Let's deal with the synod's restructuring first.
99. Discussed at convention
100. Of course we should continue to examine issues like the number and location of seminaries. That is, unless the restructuring of LCC is so comprehensive that it encompasses the restructuring of the seminaries.
101. Mostly the training of pastors, as some try to play God in certain circumstances, and make it impossible for us frail, mortal humans to be able to love and serve God as we are capable of in our sinful nature. Some pastors come out of Seminary with the idea they have to "change" the congregation after a while, and they forget to work with the congregation and shepherd the flock as their call documents indicate. They also get hung up on the role of women in church life and try to exclude them and insult them in various ways and try to rationalize this with scripture. If it wasn't for women in most/many churches, it would look pretty sad. They become legalistic for unknown reasons, forgetting that we are sinful humans, and that makes it harder to believe in God's love and for us to fulfill his commands to us.
102. This is important to do whenever the timing seems best. There should be some outside advisers, perhaps from a sister synod to offer suggestions on how to deal with the two seminaries. It seems like poor decisions were made in the past because we tried to have it all and not make the hard choices.
103. Yes, deal with the restructuring first.... then the seminary issues
104. I think it is diligent to forge ahead on this. I believe direction in these matters had been previously set.
105. ambiguous
106. If it is not addressed DURING restructuring, then it should be done subsequently.
107. The issue of restructuring of the seminaries was decided in convention and should not be continuing in the first place. Additionally, I do not think this should occur as long as the seminaries remain functional and continue to work within the memorandum of agreement.

108. This process has been never ending - it just finished another round a few years ago. Perhaps if the seminaries could focus on their mission to train up pastors and spend less time making reports and going to meetings to justify their existence we would have more pastors.
109. Plan accordingly and stage the restructuring into phases with maybe a pilot test (feedback) before full implementation at the end of each phase. PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Act)
110. We Need TWO SEMINARIES in Canada and it would be a huge mistake to close one. I do, however, have issues with both seminaries. I believe that too often our seminaries are training pastors for a world that does not exist (training pastors for the 1950's or something). I would ask our seminaries how have they changed or altered their teaching strategies and practises since the 1950's to reflect the changing society...again, not altering God's word, but the way in which it is shared. Ask any school teacher if teaching has changed in the last sixty-five years and they would laugh at you because the strategies have changed so much. Can that we said of our seminaries? I think not.
111. There should be ONE Seminary! Located in Winnipeg..... under the direction of LCC Head office
112. For the number of seminarians we are receiving, I believe we should only have 1 seminary and I believe that this need is growing year by year and should be addressed as soon as possible.
113. We only need one seminary. Maintaining two is poor stewardship of our resources.
114. Not sure if you are adding more seminaries or deleting it is now a struggle for them to survive
115. Neither of LCC's Seminaries will be sustainable after the full CEF fallout -- Therefore Seminary Candidates should be given funding to attend US Seminaries.
116. Let's do one thing at a time, LCC restructuring first and then this.
117. How does the present with 5-10 graduates or less each make sense? We are wasting money. Is this biblical? Are we being good stewards?
118. May be different issues, i.e. candidates may not attend if only one in Canada, far from home. Finances may dictate.
119. This question is ambiguous as you raise two issues - restructuring the training and changing the number and location of seminaries. The latter - number and location of seminaries - should be included.
120. One Seminary.
121. Too many costly seminaries for the limited number students
122. I don't think this to be an easy fix. This will likely take time, and a lot of PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Adjust.) This is no small matter, and should be given the proper time and attention it requires.
123. The process of training pastors needs to be immediate.
124. I don't see why we still have two seminaries when we have so few pastoral candidates. How many studies do we have to undertake until we solve this problem?
125. This process needs to begin NOW!
126. should be done now
127. Two seminaries would be good as long as we have enough students. Westerners are reluctant to go to Ontario and vice versa, plus the philosophy of the two in terms of type of worship service is very different. However, I believe that some of the theology courses could be shared through on line learning.
128. This may be needed

129. Let's deal with the synodical restructuring and if and when that is working and fine tuned we can re-examine the seminary questions. As far as I can see, the Memorandum of Agreement between the seminaries is working in so far as possible.
130. The agreement established at the Synod level in 2009? has harmonized the work of our seminaries. Our country is too big to maintain just one seminary. As long as we can, I believe we need two.
131. There should be a regular/periodic review of pastor training including facilities.
132. By your use of the word "continue" after the process of restructuring LCC, you're telling me that this process has already begun. Since you may be asking me if this process should be conducted after the process of restructuring LCC, I am agreeing. It is this type of badly worded question that has caused me so much frustration.
133. Don't know anything about this so can't answer
134. This is already in place.
135. I was under the impression that this restructuring of the seminaries was studied and decided upon a few years ago. If it is considered again during restructuring and another decision is reached then, why continue beyond?
136. For the time being, this has been settled in Convention. Undoubtedly this discussion will continue over the years as the landscape continues to change for LCC and the seminaries.
137. Have been decided at convention.
138. perhaps at the same time would be more efficient. Overhaul every function of Synod, districts, pastor training, seminaries, Concordia college, LWML, everything. Concordia in Edmonton is no longer a Christen college. this is a travesty that LCC obviously had no control over or even knowledge of until is was apparently too late. why did that happen? how did LCC loose control?
139. It is costly to have two seminaries in Canada, considering the amount of students at each school (especially Concordia Lutheran Seminary, Edmonton).
140. One big item is sufficient
141. Looks like there will be ongoing problems with keeping strong Spiritually based training centers due to Government and non Christian influences. We should try to keep the Seminary as a separate entity from the Federal and Provincial training centers so that the seminary can maintain the highest Spiritual training possible for students entering the ministry. Provincial centers can provide Academic training but not affect Spiritual training.
142. Our seminaries require new restructuring as many of the students are not known to LCC members as only if a person is interested in the Seminary. Refers back to the question on LCC communication between LCC and congregations
143. This is a business component as discussed in the previous section.
144. There should be only one seminary in Canada. Two seminaries are a gross misuse of funds.
145. Unsure as to when and where this should be done. Definitely related to cost effectiveness.
146. The seminaries are self supporting and they can't endure yet more years of uncertainty that make it hard to recruit pastors and get their work done. I thought the questions were answered already.
147. everything needs to change to evolve with the times just because we did it like that in the past doesn't mean it will work today. change should happen at the same time.
148. Do something now!! It is necessary now!! We do not have the need or resources for 2 seminary buildings, staff, maintenance etc. If people feel lead by the Lord to become pastors, they will get there even if it is not "next door". It worked for a long time without any

seminary in Canada -- now we need only 1 OR perhaps even go back to 0 and have them trained elsewhere. We don't have enough places for Vicars now

149. There could be a need for serious adjustments for pastoral training after restructuring has taken place.
150. I think our LCC church needs to get on with training of pastors in both locations and needs to do more to get our congregations on board with support. That would come from getting more input from congregations on what should be taught in the seminaries. Ministers must be accountable to their congregations and have the training to deal with stewardship of their service to their congregations. They come out with spiritual education, but not the soft skills in office work and actually communicating and working with people. Sending a minister into his new congregation so that he has a stack of Bibles and Commentaries next to his pulpit as he delivers a sermon seems like something is missing in this picture. He is not to lecture, but to minister to his new flock.
151. The seminaries are a separate issue of long standing, and should be treated separately. Actually, if we got rid of the districts, it might make seminary restructuring easier.
152. Combining the two processes could derail both. Redundant question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey
153. Two weak possibly bias Seminaries vs. one decent sized with a faculty reflective of the Church at large an not some fringe positions. The politics are difficult but hopefully common sense will prevail.
154. Lets not take on two very complicated and serious projects at the same time.
155. Not easily decided.
156. Don't confuse 2 big challenges.
157. The dialogue needs to continue.
158. This is a sticky wicket. We have two seminaries which are independent entities with affiliation with LCC as a synod. They have their own buildings and infrastructure and serve two different geographical regions. CLTS has a large influence also with the eastern states in the US and has been an option for many US citizens to come and have a solid, confessional education. I am sure CLS in Edmonton likewise serves its region well too. How do you end one or both with these histories involved? Also, ending one or the other would have political repercussions of intrusion claims from one district against another, because everyone knows that CLTS is more liturgical and CLS is less liturgical and more easy going (tongue is in cheek, and being bitten, but I fear that there is something behind the cheek that many pastors and lay people kid about in that kind of remark. Perhaps we do well to talk about that issue too?).
159. The new pastors coming out of St. Catharines are too structure, too focused on "rules and regulations" and not on helping us in our walk with God and our personal relationship with our Lord Jesus.
160. No data to make a decision like that
161. If by "the process of restructuring the training of pastors" you mean "curriculum," I would disagree that it be done at any time except by the seminaries when needed. It should be a separate issue from LCC restructuring.
162. I strongly suggest that the Edmonton Seminary be closed BEFORE or simultaneously with the restructuring of the LCC. Western and Maritime students could be helped financially on

a mileage basis as convention delegates have. St. Catherines is not far from LCMS seminaries and some arrangement made for short tem borrowing of their faculty.

163. Don't mix to big issues
164. Evaluation and revision of methodology and content needs to be an ongoing exercise.
165. Likely this is important fiscally. LC-C also could have its seminaries connected with training in other denominations, or non-denominational colleges e.g. Regent College at UBC. In Saskatoon for e.g. there is some sharing of education with 3 or more denominations, while retaining their own doctrinal classes and graduations. Look with an open mind, in prayer and guidance, as to how Jesus would guide the restructuring. I believe Jesus would bring more sharing amongst the Christian community.
166. This is some of the most important work of Synod. When this is done is an administrative decision and should be decided by those who are aware of the pro's and cons.
167. But they should be teaching the same content as "Lutherans" as they were taught through Martin Luther.
168. Keep two locations
169. The most recent "restructuring" including shared staff and programming between CLS and CLTS, I think, is proving successful, and any program refinement should continue before other structure change be considered.
170. I don't know enough about the current process to formulate a good response.
171. The training of men for the pastoral office is an entirely separate matter from how synod should be sorted out and who should go by what name. Serious questions have been raised concerning the current training program. Some of our seminary graduates seem to be uncertain who is Lord of the church, themselves or our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. This confusion may or may not be the result of activities and teaching within our seminaries. The question has also been raised as to the ability of four or five professors being capable of providing the same quality and breadth of education provided by 25-30 professors in one of the seminaries of our sister church, LCMS. In these perilous times, our congregations need and deserve the finest pastors we can provide. Anything less is simply wrong.
172. There should be room for improvement at any time, whether or not the restructuring process is completed.
173. I think we need to continually be revisiting this as circumstances continue to change.
174. It appears that this decision continues to be delayed with a variety of excuses.
175. I still believe it would be of benefit to have one seminary, though the study seemed to think it was more cost effective to maintain both campuses.
176. There is so much to deal with in restructuring that I think this should be another separate issue to deal with.
177. One seminary for a little LCC church body. I can't believe how stubborn we are to have two seminaries both with very few students. Can we please get realistic? In fact, my thought would be to close both. Train our pastors out of the US. Way better use of resources.
178. We cannot afford 2 seminaries in Canada. For financial reasons, keep the Edmonton location. Eastern Canada has US locations nearby. I also think we would give better instruction to students as we could afford more profs and the students would have better discussions and resources available with more of them in a single facility. Concordia University could be used to teach subjects like Greek and Hebrew to sem students.
179. Makes more sense to do it after when you know what's happening with the LCC structure
180. Do we need two seminaries?

181. We should only have 2 seminaries and only if they can be self-sustaining financially. If they cannot be self-sustaining, then they should be done away with.
182. This issue has already been dealt with. We have 2 locations for seminaries so leave them as they are.
183. This would largely depend on what the restructuring looks like.
184. No we could do well to combine in one place, look at our numbers.
185. Show what the issues are please.
186. We cannot afford two seminaries; it is only self righteous pride that is driving the notion that we need two. Perhaps we need to pay and send our seminary students to the U.S. All clear of debt instead of over spending on our own seminaries.
187. I do not think the seminary question per se is as important as the over-sized bureaucracy of the church body proper.
188. The process should be a continuous process always. Input from Synod would be important but the quality of the training should be paramount. We must train our pastors well giving them the skills necessary to thrive in their chosen profession for extended periods of time. I have heard that not many pastors stay in their career for longer than 25 years. We should be very concerned about that.
189. This is misleading. There is already a Memorandum of Understanding that takes care of that matter.
190. Probably only need one seminary given the size of LCC.
191. Should only be one seminary
192. including an annual review of performance of personnel and programs
193. While this is certainly of concern to address, the restructuring of LCC could get sidelined by a caveat of number and locations of the seminaries - at the same time not addressing it with the restructuring could do the same.
194. ...one big change is better!
195. Supposedly this issue has been "dealt" with. There hasn't been much communication on how this is working out. St. Catherine's is just over 6 hours away from Fort Wayne. 12 hours from St. Louis. Really?
196. This is an unsatisfactory question as careful and productive restructuring of the Seminaries has been ongoing since the founding and acceptance of the MOU at the synodical 2011 Convention in Hamilton Ontario. The mandate of the MOU has been embraced by both seminaries and while change may not be happening at the pace that some people desire much has been investigated and accomplished. Be careful of the temptation to believe that a survey is the proper venue for seeking a mandate to overturn something adopted at a Synodical convention. This survey should not serve a s an end run on a matter like this. Please remember the 2014 synodical convention: Resolution 14.2.04 To Decline Overture 2.04, “To Close our LCC Seminaries” Reference: Overture 2.04; CW, Report 41: Seminary Joint MOU Committee WHEREAS our seminaries in Edmonton and St. Catharines have implemented many of the recommendations developed in a ―Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement‖ (MOU) since 2011; and WHEREAS our seminaries continue to work toward sustainable, cost-efficient seminary training in Canada utilizing the existing two seminaries at their current sites; therefore be it RESOLVED that Overture 2.04, ―To Close Our LCC Seminaries,‖ be respectfully declined. Action: Adopted
197. Both the seminary in Edmonton and in St. Catherine's should be closed and relocated o 1 central seminary in Winnipeg.

198. Discussion of this matter WILL continue, however people respond to this question. My view is: Sufficient unto the day. Sort out structure/polity, and then we have to keep thinking of the matter here raised. But common sense indicates that closing one seminary and keeping the other open will produce grave dissension.
199. There should be options to have cyber teaching
200. We do not need 2 seminaries, even if some believe that the West is more conservative, and East is more Liberal. I have not seen this as a fact.
201. this issue has been studied to death by individuals FAR more intimate with the relevant issues than those of us taking a poll. It is far too involved and intricate to be dealt with by a simple poll. Drop this one its a completely separate issue!
202. We need to constantly review our training program to ensure it is meeting the requirements of our Church Body. This will be an ongoing process.
203. This seems financial responsible. I would also expect one larger facility to provide a better learning experience.
204. One seminary
205. this should consider the number of students - What is a minimum number economically
206. Our seminaries are still training using an outdated model. We need to look at reducing the number of courses in the classroom and putting students (both future pastors and deacons) into the parish far more. A mentoring or coop model should be looked at. Perhaps we should even get rid of our degree program and make it a diploma instead. This would reduce the financial load on the students, allow them to more fully experience ministry, and increase their understanding of the mission of the church.
207. We require only one seminary. It would be beneficial to close both seminaries and send potential candidates for pastors to St. Louis, less expensive
208. Not qualified to answer!
209. Are you telling me restructuring is going to happen? Is that the direction that the questions are leading me? Just to let you know, IPL Rev. Nolan Astley chaired a task force on said Seminaries and location [not that all the recommendations have been effected yet ...or will]. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul including pastoral education. I keep repeating myself.
210. I thought that question was already settled - if it hasn't, then Synod has failed to communicate that face to its membership.
211. I do think it's good to have a seminary in the east and one in the west, but that it would be good stewardship for them to share as many resources as possible by doing things like having online courses and distance seminars, etc.
212. This maybe required as we have the dropping enrolment we possibly should look at other options.
213. I think the issue of where seminary training takes place is not a logical issue - never has been from day one. It is in fact an emotional issue and a value driven one. Only the economics are now causing us to be somewhat rational in reviewing the matter. We should seriously consider closing both seminaries and providing scholarships/bursaries to one of the LCMS seminaries. It would be more efficient and effective in the long run.
214. Make it more efficient
215. Let's see, 2 seminaries in the USA for LCMS and 2 seminaries in Canada for LCC - that makes a whole lot of sense?! Canada should have one seminary based on demand and population.

216. where will the pastors come from if you don’t?
217. Pastors should be encouraged to speak in normal language and voices when delivering a sermon to everyday normal people
218. Change is difficult to manage and emotionally unsettling for most of us. Let us take one step at a time.
219. It is only responsible to maintain the most effective, efficient program available.
220. -this is an entirely separate issue from synodical restructuring and should not even be addressed in this survey
221. We do not need 2 seminaries.
222. Without educating myself on the details, I think we need to be wary of the amount of change we take on. A number of first steps have already been taken. Perhaps more can be done concurrently with restructuring LCC but only in a slow and measured manner.
223. If it makes sense to do so, however, this could be an option.
224. St. Catharines Seminary should stay. Edmonton Seminary should go, as their institution is no longer "Christian".
225. if necessary
226. In a country as large as Canada, I feel that is necessary to have one seminary in the west (Edmonton) and one seminary in the east (Saint Catherine's).
227. Can we really support 2 seminaries?
228. I'm not sure if waiting is an advantage or not.
229. Continuous improvement requires constant updates to process. You are never done evaluating your programs if you want to improve.
230. It should be a continuous process until we get it right.
231. While there is no reason that the two processes have to be combined, my fear is that the seminaries would drag their heels on reform if they are left out of the initial process.
232. LCC should have only one seminary; the one in St. Catharines, Ontario. It services Canadians, Americans, and other nationalities. I doubt if LCC can afford 2 seminaries. It could if enrolments were consistently high enough to warrant two.
233. Only if it can't be worked on at the same time because it is too large a task. But typically every change in our church takes years and years..... I think resources are valuable and limited and timely. Be wise, be good stewards.
234. Availability of funding for seminaries as well as the number of seminary students and faculty should play a role in these determinations. These determinations are fundamentally separate from any restructuring of the Synod/District in nature.
235. If there is an opportunity to bring together to one, it should be considered (i.e. cost effectiveness).
236. I believe it is working fine now with both Seminaries
237. Both seminaries are to be commended for their efforts in working together as much as possible regardless of distance. The understanding and cooperative efforts between the two seminaries should be left as is because it is working and thankfully working well.
238. We only need one Seminary.
239. The 2 Seminaries need to continue to work together and with Synod to accomplish their goals and the training of pastors and deacons for our Church.
240. No, the issues of seminary education as well as the makeup of membership of synod at the basic congregational and church worker level must be part of the process of restructuring for such a process to have any meaning.

241. Not familiar with how this works now.
242. Do we need 2 semi
243. Aries?
244. If the issue of seminaries needs to be dealt with, it should absolutely be done AFTER synod is restructured.
245. Yes, as the seminaries & synod have committed themselves to in the memorandum of understanding.
246. We don't need any further restructuring, beyond what was done in recent years, and resulting in the MOU. There is now sufficient harmonization of the seminary programs.
247. Yes - and pastors should not lose sight of fact they are spiritual advisers, not CEO's
248. No, it needs to be looked at now.
249. How the seminaries currently operate, and how the co-operate, is working well, in my opinion.
250. I do not think that the "seminary issue" is something that needs to be discussed explicitly through the restructuring process. There is already work being done by the seminaries and we should let them continue this as they see fit.
251. yes, but this is not exclusive of the companion question and involves a quite separate issue the synod faces
252. This has to be discussed bearing in mind financial considerations.
253. only one Seminary is needed
254. Absolutely! Two seminaries have been fiscally irresponsible for years and yet the status quo has remained. One synod, one seminary will not only be a prudent use of finances, but also help develop our "walking together" as a unified church body.
255. We do not need 2 seminaries
256. Teach Pastors to care. Teach Pastors people skills.
257. Because the seminary is an integral part of the Church it would seem most efficient to have the question resolved at the same time.
258. Whatever the structure the high level of training and schooling should remain high in accordance to God's Holy Word.
259. These Pastors have to have somewhere to go.
260. This should be part of the discussion now. Restructuring means that everything should be looked at. How can we do a proper job of restructuring if we leave out the parts we don't want to deal with. All the hard questions and decisions need to be made now. Are we even discussing this now...this question is awkward.
261. This needs to change and I do not have the area here to be able to express all my concerns about this issue
262. Unsure.
263. Are we ever going to stop the process of restructuring the training of pastors and where the seminaries should be?
264. If you are talking about the process that is already set up through the seminaries, then yes, let them continue with their plan and work.
265. There was a lot of work done on this over the past 5 years and there are very good reasons why the structure was left as it now is. Suggest we let it work for a while.
266. We only need one seminary or maybe none.

267. Now that Concordia is a secular university and the low number of students registered unless some form of lesser program that trains workers for service in small congregations St Catherines should handle the number of students being received.
268. It seems our new pastors are not coming out of sem. training with enough knowledge of the Word and even the order of service much less how to present a word based sermon for living today...seems more emphasis on religious tradition than being a Christ follower
269. The process of training pastors is very important and needs to be a priority now and ongoing Take time to properly plan and carry out the plan. One strong seminary for Canada is enough.
270. If feasible to do so.
271. It needs to be made much more attainable for a young man to become a pastor without all the ridiculous expense, if you want to keep the church growing.
272. Don't have enough info on the pros and cons on this issue: or what time frame we are considering for restructuring training.
273. Restructuring our pastoral training absolutely needs to happen, but it should happen as a part of the whole restructuring process, not wait until after it, as if it's somehow separate from it.
274. Both seminaries should continue to strive present the same curriculum, co-operate and economize in the delivery of that curriculum. Though keeping two seminaries is expensive, the recruiting in our vast land has shown that if we don't have a representation throughout Canada, we potentially lose.
275. If this continues to be possible
276. What about during this process--are you thinking of shutting them down during the process?
277. There are good reasons to keep two seminaries. I support two seminaries. However, as our church body shrinks we may ultimately be forced into cutting costs, as painful and undesirable as that may be. We should revisit this question from time to time.
278. This is a good time to look into all aspects of our Synod and see where we could be more efficient and effective.
279. What do you mean by "after'? Always restructure as need to improve the training of new Pastors.
280. In my opinion, one Seminary is sufficient to handle the number if seminary students LCC has and the difficulty in finding professors seems to be a problem. It would be more cost effective as well.
281. Based on our population, number of students, quality of education because of lack of students and how the report on this was written two seminaries cannot be justified
282. Change is never easy, but why cause more disruption by doing it twice? LCC is bracing for change now. Do it and make it less painful and drawn out.
283. These are two separate issues
284. Although I thought that this was part of the restructuring.
285. Lutheran Church Canada simply cannot afford the current state. The process of restructuring the training of Pastors should be included in this organizational process.
286. We need 2 seminaries because of the wide expanse of our country and the diversity of our people.
287. To get pastoral students access to more professors with expertise in more parts of the profession and biblical theology there should be less seminaries. It might be a good thing to send our students to a sister synod for some or all of their training.

288. Not sure I understand. In what way would the process continue? Synod accepted the task force report on seminaries and the conclusion that 2 seminaries best served our Synod (or at least that is my understanding). I know there is still much discussion about this, but is there a continuing process of restructuring going on? If so, it is news to me. Closing one or the other would be a mistake in my opinion. If this is what you mean by "continue" then I disagree. If you mean we need to continue to make our current seminaries as cost efficient as possible then of course we should continue. Unclear question in my opinion.
289. We can't stop progress as this will take years, and the restructuring of our seminaries is key. First, the stewardship of two seminaries is an issue. More importantly, we need to define what characteristics and skills we need in our pastors for ministry today (again, that statement of ministry quality) and then design a program to meet that need. I am concerned our seminaries are not producing pastors that meet the need. (please forgive the broad generalities... I know there are exceptions).
290. One big issue at a time please.
291. It takes too many years to become a pastor.
292. How much money and resources should our synod, districts, churches and individuals spend to support something that is not very effective?
293. I believe there should be one board for overseeing theological education in LCC and they make the decisions necessary for ensuring our structures serve the needs of the church.
294. We do NOT need TWO seminaries for our synod.
295. Pastoral training is an important concern but it should not be confused with the restructuring process which ought to be focused on the administrative life (polity) of our LCC as we move forward. The Seminaries question is complex and deeply rooted in both emotions and regionalism. By mixing this in to the restructuring process, I am concerned that it will hamper our ability to move ahead in a timely fashion. While we can certainly begin looking at the Seminaries question over the next triennium, this should be treated as a parallel concern to the restructuring question.
296. Things may need to change to be more cost effective. That may mean how many seminaries we have.
297. one seminary, one staff, or if it is better stewardship close both and send the men down to LCMS. then take all those resources and put them into outreach and evangelism
298. Why the trick type of questions? Our seminaries do an excellent job of training our pastor. No restructuring required
299. Although there is a temptation to do them at the same time, I think we would be biting off more than we could chew. There are a whole lot of emotional factors that people tie to our structure, whether consciously or not. Likewise, there are a whole lot of other emotional factors that people tie to our seminaries. To put them all together, I fear will make for a next to impossible convention debate as far as reasonable discussion and God-pleasing decisions.
300. Seminaries that graduate 2.4 people a year should not exist.
301. I do not have enough information but it would seem to make sense
302. We don’t need two seminaries. With computers we can do more distant education. One main one is all that’s needed if it's located close to LCC office.
303. Why does it need restructuring?
304. There is a demand for pastors, and therefore we should be addressing why there is a shortage and how we can alleviate it.
305. Not sure what the current restructuring process is to comment

306. I don't know what this question means. Is it stating that the process of training pastors and the location and number of seminaries is going to be a part of the restructuring process and recommendations will then be made as a part of that? Or is it saying that those will not be a part of the considerations and therefore should be considered afterward? Or is it saying that it will be a part of the recommended changes but we should continue discussing it even afterward?
307. See comments below
308. What is wrong with 1 (one) seminary for all of our beautiful Canada? Somewhere in the middle?
309. I'm not sure what this question means. We should definitely continue the excellent seminary at St. Catharines along with its financial viability & its excellent cooperation & contribution to the Synod at large.
310. The whole matter of two seminaries is still a major issue that needs to be addressed.
311. I should like to think that the number and location of the seminaries would be part of the restructuring of LCC with respect for the services provided by the seminaries to the whole church and sensitivity to those who educate future pastors and leaders in the church. However, by stating such it seems that both seminaries continue to have a role to play.
312. Unclear to me what is intended!
313. NO! NO! NO! Restructuring of Synod will be challenging/divisive enough. Let's open only one LAREG CAN of worms at a time. Both seminaries are current working very well together under the directives of the MOU. This would continue even if Synod is restructured. If this topic is a major concern in this survey, then it could become an overture to the next Synodical convention; that is, to redefine the mandate of the MOU.
314. Pastors need to be trained to work cooperatively with another pastor/s in the same congregation. Presently they seem to be trained to work as a one-man show. Consideration should be given to having a formal Lead Pastor position where more than one pastor is serving at a congregation. A centralized seminary would be a good idea. It would save resources and provide more consistent training for LCC pastors.
315. One seminary in Winnipeg would work just fine.
316. Our student to instructor ratio is ridiculously high. We could pay to send the students to Missouri Synod institutions cheaper.
317. This has been dealt with. However, if enrollment and contributions drop off, then this will need to be revisited.
318. Only one seminary is required.
319. The geographical realities of our country will not change with the restructuring of our Synod. At this time, LCC still benefits from having two seminaries. Any process of restructuring the training of pastors should be considered independently of the restructuring of Synod.
320. There is no need to support two seminaries in Canada
321. Yes - maintaining 2 seminaries given the enrollments in each is ludicrous.
322. We should just have one seminary. It could be physically located in two locations but there should be one president and one administrative staff for a seminary with two locations and professors could fly to each of the locations or have distance learning connections (skype) etc.
323. Since things are always changing in the world, the training of the pastors should also keep up with these changes.

324. a major part of restructuring needs to include the number of seminaries the type of education going on there and the opportunities to do this training in other ways. maybe we forgo seminaries altogether and have our pastors trained at LCMS seminaries?
325. There should only be one seminary in Canada, possibly with 2 campuses.
326. I think we have enough trouble getting pastor candidates now, don't need more seminaries yet. Pastors have to be trained for the real world
327. Dealing with one area of restructuring at a time will be enough work in itself.
328. Things seem to working fine under the current Memorandum of Understanding.
329. It should be one seminary and be done now. I do not support either seminaries because this is such a ridiculous and territorial circumstance.
330. Wait, are you saying that there is a process going on right now of restructuring the seminaries? I thought it was decided that both were continuing on as is?
331. Question: can we control the content and requirements if we no longer control the board of directors and the vision for the institutions
332. The matter of the seminaries has been addressed at the last two synodical conventions. This question should not be in this survey. See Synodical Convention June 2014 Resolution 14.2.04.
333. Restructuring is necessary, the sooner the better
334. Hands off the Seminaries! Leave Concordia alone already. Or We will vote out of LCC!
335. if need be.
336. Let's do it now and move on from this issue to say spending much more time on making disciples!
337. We don't need two seminaries. This is far too expensive for the number of people and staff positions involved.
338. There should only be one seminary for Canada
339. We do not need two seminaries.
340. One Seminary. Seminary professors who have done successful pastoral ministries should be hired and teach our Seminary students. Seminary professors who are intellectuals but have had unproductive pastoral ministries should not be seminary professors. We should expect that the best pastors should be teaching our students as seminary professors.
341. Even though this question might complicate the restructuring process, I believe that it should be asked and - God willing - answered through the process.
342. The question assumes there is a need for restructuring. I don't believe that is the correct term. There should be constant review and evaluation built into the seminary/synod relationship.
343. Again, I am on the fence about this. The seminaries seem to be working very well together right now and it is nice to have two seminaries with Canada being such a large distance apart. However, it wouldn't hurt to look at how we can better use our resources with one central seminary.
344. The two issues should be discussed together.
345. We need to address this issue.
346. It is quite clear that our current leadership has neither the backbone nor the fortitude to tackle this issue, as they have not already (despite numerous calls to do so at the expensive waste of time and money conventions that accomplish nothing). The only time our Synod will deal with anything is when money forces it to. We worship the false god of mammon in LCC. Both Canadian seminaries should be eliminated and training fostered by the US seminaries which have far greater scholarship and choices available.

347. Too many unemployed people.
348. Two years in Canada at one and only one seminary and the last year of training in St. Louis to have a broader experience of teachers and life of the broader church.
349. There are two seminaries for one church? The seminary in Edmonton should close. The church cannot support two. Sheer demographics support this!
350. Teachings would be more consistent with one seminary.
351. This process should continue at the same time as part of the process of restructuring LCC. However, if it cannot be fully addressed during the process of restructuring LCC (as I suspect it may not be), then it should continue thereafter.
352. I feel this is something that will constant need to be reviewed to ensure we're making the most out of the resources available to us.
353. Restructured pastoral training????????
354. To me it doesn't seem to matter how much talk goes out, nothing changes. There are two seminaries now and there will be when the dust settles too.
355. I agree. However, I dread having to re-visit the whole question again as we have already spent so much time, energy and resources on this question over the past 25 years.
356. There's no reason this can't continue at the same time.
357. It needs to happen ASAP.
358. It should be looked at, only changed if needed.
359. Do it now.
360. I wasn't aware that we're still in the process of determining how many seminaries and their location.
361. One disaster at a time, please.
362. All in all, the most logical solution would appear to be having one seminary located in Edmonton, although this is obviously a complicated and contentious issue. I've reached the conclusion that a compromise solution (e.g., closing both existing seminaries and opening a new seminary in, say, Winnipeg, isn't feasible). I would be open to the possibility of closing both seminaries and relying on LCMS seminaries for the training of all Canadian pastors, but I would need to see some sound arguments in favour of such a solution.
363. We just don't have the money for two seminaries. Do this at the same time as the restructuring.
364. That is if both seminaries could agree to merge at a central location I would be strongly in favour (use Canadian English please!) of that move.
365. Don't get the two processes mixed up, or we will never finish with either!
366. We keep putting off the seminary issue, taking away from mission the money needed to duplicate two programs. It has been a political, not a practical decision to have two seminaries from the very beginning. The present system forms a division in our church that has crippled us.

39. The process of restructuring the training of pastors, including the number and location of seminaries, should continue at the same time as part of the process of restructuring LCC.

1. Do one thing after the other!
2. Dependent on needs of Seminary and work to facilitate best structure for Seminary ongoing growth with change for soundness of training.

3. If unable to complete with restructuring LCC then continue past process as Q38 asked.
4. While you've got everyone's attention and all the figures on the table "go for it".
5. We do not need the high cost of 2 Seminaries. More money could be spent on outreach and missions.
6. But during and after. It's too important and costly an issue to decide quickly.
7. After.
8. This restructure should take place after CEO and President are in position to oversee the necessary changes.
9. Educational work always needs to be looked at regarding how, technology, distances.
10. Should be after the fact so that the CEO and President are in position to oversee the changes.
11. Let’s do one thing at a time.
12. too much change not good! Wait.
13. This has been voted on in convention, and is not part of restructuring Synod.
14. I believe we should continue C. Lutheran Seminary in Edmonton. After they become Pastors keep them in the West. Lending to the East often drains cong. who pay for the move.
15. Get the basic structure in place and let some natural adjustment take place. The obvious may appear in regards to the existence of our seminaries. Maybe we will become so good at inspiring service to the church, we might need a third one.
16. Let's not bite off more than we can chew and do this in sequence. Restructuring synod will shed light on what the synod needs in terms of training workers.
17. It can confuse the issues.
18. There's enough on the plate already. This question MUST be settled-- but separately, and subsequently.
19. his should be an on-going review process.
20. It would make sense to me that our resources need to be focus first on LCC restructure. It seminary overhauls can be studied during LCC restructure without taxing resources I'd be in agreement
21. Should not be based on or depend on the possible or final structure of synod.
22. If Restructuring is taking place it should include the seminaries.
23. After or during doesn't matter...whatever works best for those involved.
24. We should consolidate our two seminaries into one because of costs, and the smaller number of students.
25. It's important to have Pastors!!! But I feel it seems only small technical changes are needed.
26. Merge the two.
27. 39 contradicts #38 as I see it.
28. I disagree with this reluctantly, since tackling both of these might be too much to do at once. However, on the other hand if this matter is not dealt with, it will likely be left for many years and I'm not sure it is good stewardship to do that.
29. The training of Pastors was set by Synod Convention and continues.
30. if possible, or evaluation process can go on forever
31. I feel it would be more efficient to complete one task at a time.
32. That could be a major problem at the present time!
33. Close the seminaries!
34. Sooner is better. I didn't realise this was an option when I answered the last question.
35. Can these both be done at the same time?

36. This depends on the amount of time required for restructuring LCC and the level of urgency in restructuring the seminaries.
37. CCMS has enough work to do already!
38. Work on one thing at a time. Less chance of settling.
39. Yes, do it all at the same time.
40. I believe the restructuring of LCC needs to happen separately from looking at the seminaries. If there is a need for change, then this needs to be looked at alone and not as a package. The restructuring of training is something that needs full undivided attention to insure that it is handled properly. This is not something to be taken lightly in any manner.
41. We need seminaries to train our pastors. We don't have the resources to open new ones.
42. Two Seminaries is way too much overhead. We're squandering our limited resources ... and a lot of it is because of entrenched Individuals protecting their turf. The internet allows us to visit face-to-face with relatives, overseas. The internet can connect Seminary Students, coast-to-coast.
43. Only if the whole restructuring process of both areas doesn't become too overwhelming to compete at the same time.
44. It makes no fiscal sense to operate two seminaries, for a handful of students in each, COMBINE into one.
45. One thing at a time! Decide first how the Synod and districts will be operating.
46. The issue of the number and location of seminaries needs to be tackled immediately.
47. A major restructuring of Synod will be a huge undertaking. It might be most expedient to leave restructuring pastoral education and seminary institutions until after a restructuring of Synod takes place/effect. However, it will be wise to still consider how restructuring Synod will affect the other institutions of Synod.
48. Change is always difficult so when restructuring, such a change could result in a more acceptable time frame.
49. don't need 2 seminaries.
50. See above comments.
51. I cannot see how C.L.S. Edmonton can possibly continue with the way things are.
52. Purpose of! 39? None-the-less, reduce seminaries to one only and expand local training in alternate theological schools with oversight.
53. Really don't know anything about this.
54. Should be under Synod, not Districts
55. I thought this decision was already made: keep both seminaries but work together whenever possible
56. Restructuring of seminaries - either combine into one or close both seminaries and let them go to St. Louis and get their training.
57. Needs to be considered separately.
58. If the process can feasibility be delayed long enough to complete the LCC restructuring, then it should be delayed.
59. Too much change at once. One step at a time.
60. Again, the seminary issues are too important to be combined with this restructure mandate. They need to be given the time and focus they deserve.
61. See previous comment.
62. One Seminary in Winnipeg for the training of pastors, and deacons. Synod office should be in the same building.

63. This should not be done now.
64. But only if Financially accountable and in the black.
65. Take it one step at a time and work through the process of restructuring only one, not both LCC and the training, etc.
66. Isn't this being handled already by the Seminary?
67. There's room for improvement e.g. encouraging more for seminary training
68. Isn't the task of reorganizing our structure enough of a challenge at this time?
69. Our pastors don't get the proper training that they need right now. Too many of them think they are the pope!
70. One thing at a time, please!
71. It should be done at the same time but I think it is un-manageable
72. Pastors should be made to take one year of teachers college so that they know the proper way of teaching Bible and confirmation class.
73. Previous comment applies
74. The study of the Bible really doesn't change. Maybe ways of presenting the material changes.
75. Whenever this is done, it should be done.
76. we walk together and the sems are on our path.
77. Unless you are going to add church worker programs to the seminaries, no.
78. Get it all done at once.
79. There would be no time for careful and informed decisions. As well, I'm not sure why this is even still a question. Two seminaries have served us well for over 30 years. Since the pastors serve the people, having two seminaries allows for diversity in how pastors are trained. St. Catherine's has many American seminarians because of its location. Leave Edmonton where it is so it can serve the people in the west.
80. Seems like enough change is going on right now and would be wiser to tackle one thing at a time and see how church is looking and working after restructuring before attempting further change.
81. Whatever it takes - applies to question 38 as well.
82. Do what is best for the overall good of the church. Leadership should be trusted to make the right decision.
83. Tw different issues and too much to deal with at the same time.
84. Move it along faster, before there is nothing left.
85. May need a separate committee to do so but should be incorporated into the overall.
86. While I do know this is happening, as I am not sure what has currently happened in this process and what yet needs to be done, I cannot state whether it needs to continue at the same time or after LCC restructuring.
87. These redundant questions worded this way and then that are annoying
88. The situation regarding the seminaries does not have to be settled at the same time as everything else. This would be one of the items that may be looked after in the following year(s)
89. I think we have enough to do with restructuring LCC without doing the seminaries at the same time. Unless both greatly overlap, which I don't have enough information on. I feel if restructuring the training of pastors, including the number and location of seminaries is necessary than this is a big undertaking which should be done separately.
90. Do it now.

91. implements the changes necessary in the seminaries after the LCC reconstruction done
92. I strongly agree that two seminaries are redundant and divisive; the issue of expense notwithstanding.
93. This should be an on going effort, not a once in a long while thing. Ongoing evaluations conducted by the congregations
94. It seems like enough upheaval is going on without addressing the issue of the seminaries. I can't imagine tackling this topic until the dust of this present restructuring has settled and we see how the new structure functions.
95. If not restructured in timeframe as outlined in Q38
96. may have some synergistic effects to do together if it has to be done
97. Maybe it would be better to wait and see the result of Pastoral training changes.
98. Discussed at convention. Should not be subject of debate.
99. Agree, unless as per the answer to #38 the restructuring of LCC is so comprehensive that it encompasses the restructuring of the seminaries.
100. Is this feasible? If this is possible to do, then yes. The seminaries are in great need of restructuring and refocusing. Can we afford two seminaries? The answer seems to be "no". Pastoral training is lacking and needs to improve several important areas of mastery like teaching to all ages (not just adult, not just lecture style), outreach, counseling and basic administration.
101. Finish LCC first as it may affect the seminary decisions.
102. I do not have much insight but need to understand what in history has brought us to this place of two seminaries - again duplication of services.
103. an integral part of the whole and contentious
104. it is better to start and finish something 1 by 1
105. Again, I am not very learned in administration, but if changes need to be made to these things, and the manpower is available to address both at the same time, it would make sense to examine them at the same time so that they are compatible with each other for the effective operation of LCC.
106. The dual seminary question NEEDS to be addressed: two campuses all the infrastructure, faculties, etc., For how many students???
107. See question 38. Also, if restructuring were to occur it should definitely not occur at the same time as LCC restructuring.
108. If one of the 8 elements is the training of church workers, then this should be included in restructuring.
109. I was under the impression (and I have fairly good knowledge of the situation) that a decision has already been reached that having only one seminary (thus closing one) would not achieve any positive outcome, and thus the two seminaries are seeking to cooperate and work together, in two locations and two governing boards (under different legislations in two provinces). If in the current process of restructuring there are good ideas for further developing that cooperation, great! But don't push it off into the future.
110. This is an opinion only.
111. Been there, done that. see note on 38
112. We can not afford 2 Seminaries for only a few students. Consolidate.
113. Does not need to be tied into organizational restructuring as training is a different function
114. You do not want two changes going on at the same time. Common sense dictates one change at a time

115. I am not so concerned about the location of seminaries as I am about the training going on there. The seminary seems to have lost touch with the world of today. It is training pastors for a world that does not exist. Also is it legalistic and narrow in its rules. For example, why does the seminary demand an undergrad degree? If a young man feels called to serve God as a pastor, why can't he go to the seminary directly. We have several men in our congregation who would go to seminary and would be good pastors if they could do so in four years rather than having to take a three or four-year undergrad degree and then go to seminary for another four years. Unrealistic. And besides, rarely does that undergrad degree help him in any way in his ministry.
116. As noted earlier, the training of pastors is, to my mind, a mess. Delaying it at all risks delaying it too long.
117. ANY PERSON DESIRING TO BECOME A PASTOR MUST BE ACCEPTED INTO SEMINARY. DISCRIMINATION BASED ON GENDER CANNOT CONTINUE. DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION CANNOT CONTINUE.
118. Centralize seminary at Winnipeg. Develop material for on line use. Add A/V skills. Develop increased on line web presence. Possibly integrated with Canadian Lutheran
119. Focus your time and energy on one thing at a time.
120. The cost and structure of operating Seminaries should be considered together with the cost and structure of operating Synod.
121. Let's do LCC structuring first and have it running efficiently.
122. Se comments under #38. This function accounts for 15% of costs.
123. One Seminary.
124. I can imagine that some, but not all, work could be carried out in parallel.
125. This process needs to begin NOW!
126. If it is needed now is the time to do it. To get them to align together as you would a frame when you build one side you want to have the other line up across from it.
127. One thing at a time!
128. One thing at a time.
129. Can't answer no info about this
130. Redundant. What does this have to do with LCC restructuring?
131. It should be part of restructuring. If we do away with districts, there is even less of a reason for two seminaries than there is now. Whether we restructure or not, the best move would be to close both seminaries and send students to St. Louis. If not that, at least close one seminary. What a waste of God's resources--what poor stewardship--to spend over $1,000,000 a year to educate a handful of students.
132. There may be topics which need more discussion and planning but if both need to be worked on, maybe separate people could be involved in each area. Or, maybe if it takes a long process, maybe they could be planned for during different years.
133. Hmm. I see this is slightly different from #38. I don't care *how* this particular re-evaluation (and possible restructuring) happens, but I do think it's necessary.
134. Isn't this settled?
135. Has already been voted on at conventions.
136. One centrally located seminary should be sufficient.
137. The delay on this question has been too long already.
138. There should be only one seminary as soon as possible.

139. Enough is enough. It should stop altogether for now, and seminaries should have the right to tailor their programs as needed at their own discretion as long as they are theologically faithful and providing pastors that fit the church at large.
140. It should always be part of the on-going look at ourselves and our functioning
141. See my comments in #38; as you are missing the point in this question.
142. I don't know that it has to be a part of the same process, but if the people involved in both processes can make time for both, then I see nothing wrong why it shouldn't continue at the same time.
143. It could be dealt with at that time but so much depends on the outcome of the LCC restructure, that a lot would have to wait anyway.
144. Combining the two processes could derail both. Redundant question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey
145. One thing at a time.
146. Lets not take on two very complicated and serious projects at the same time.
147. Should be done all at once.
148. this process is already complicated enough, please don't add more highly complex negotiations into the mix (especially ones that we have already failed miserably at trying to resolve).
149. Though this is a larger discussion than synodical organizational restructuring.
150. very important
151. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
152. Because of the strong emotions connected with the number and location of our seminaries, I believe the only answer is to "let nature take its course" as one or both seminaries will be forced to close either because of lack of funds or lack of students. This will happen when it happens and should not be forced at the same time as LCC restructuring.
153. Since pastoral education is a synodical mandate, the current synodical restructuring committee must include this as part of their mandate and lead the evaluation and revision process.
154. What is the rush! Take the time to do it right.
155. There isn't any reason to stop them. Their lessons learned could help in the Synodical restructuring
156. Dealing with providing the finest training our pastors can have is a matter that simply cannot wait for another day. We have problems in this area that are not being noticed, never mind being addressed. Moreover, the two processes are inextricably intertwined. our constitution says that we adhere to "All the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Creeds (the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed), the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Large Catechism of Luther, the Small Catechism of Luther, and the Formula of Concord.' At the same time, one of the learned and honoured doctors of our church, teaching at one of our seminaries, has written quite frankly in volume 25 of the Lutheran Theological Review, published jointly by our seminary faculties, that occasionally he omits the Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord, an important document in the Lutheran Confessions, from his required course on the Lutheran Confessions. Being a confessional Lutheran church is similar to being pregnant in that just as no woman is ever partly pregnant, no church is ever partly confessional. Hence

the confessional statement of synod's constitution is at it's very best, merely a pious wish at present.

157. We need to keep the lines of communication open between these groups, so pastoral training and how the synod works should work hand-in-hand.
158. Let's do one thing at a time.
159. It appears that this decision continues to be delayed with a variety of excuses.
160. Should be a separate issue. We certainly hope the Seminary in St. Catharines remains open.
161. Why continue with a matter that has already been examined and resolved?
162. Yes, makes sense.
163. If there's a problem, then we should fix it since education falls under the national jurisdiction.
164. It is all part and parcel of the same problem.
165. Whatever is best and most efficient should be done.
166. Can LCC justify two Seminaries based on the number of students in the seminary program? Need a good, prayerful and honest assessment
167. The process should be a continuous process always. Input from Synod would be important but the quality of the training should be paramount. We must train our pastors well giving them the skills necessary to thrive in their chosen profession for extended periods of time. I have heard that not many pastors stay in their career for longer than 25 years. We should be very concerned about that.
168. This again is misleading. Please refer to the MOU. It is a shame that these questions were allowed into the survey.
169. one major undertaking at a time I think
170. One seminary would forge unity.
171. For more than 30 years, it has seemed inappropriate to me that our small church should have two seminaries, while the much, much bigger LCMS also has only two. We could “out-source” seminary training (to US seminaries) and it would save our church LOTS of money, even if we paid for tuition and books for students. Another option, if we wanted to maintain a Canadian context to seminary training, would be that we combine the two seminaries into one. It always seemed to me that one seminary would logically be situated in the same city as the synodical office, with an obvious benefit being the close camaraderie of synod officials and seminary professors. That seminary would benefit from a more intimate connection with a local congregation, for it would provide a sanctuary setting for weekly chapel, and for installations and convocations and for opening services. Immanuel Lutheran in Winnipeg is still surrounded by farm land, which, if a couple of acres (at the corner of Inkster and King Edward) were purchased, is close to and easily accessible from the airport, would have ample parking, and would be an ideal site for a combined seminary and Lutheran Church – Canada building. It could be built with offices for synod staff and seminary professors, with shared support staff and computer / copying facilities, with a library, and with a couple of meeting / board rooms. If the classrooms at Immanuel Lutheran are not large enough for seminary use, they would need to be incorporated into the new building, too. Proceeds from the sale of the current LCC building and the two seminaries may cover the cost to purchase land and build a new building designed for our specific purpose.

172. While this is certainly of concern to address, the restructuring of LCC could get sidelined by a caveat of number and locations of the seminaries - at the same time not addressing it with the restructuring could do the same.
173. Like question 38 this presupposes that restructuring is not currently happening under the MOU and that the closing of one or more of Lutheran Church Canada's Seminaries is inevitable. The question then reads 'do you want to do this now or later?' Again this is a seeking of a mandate which would be in opposition to the adoption of Resolution 14.2.04 To Decline Overture 2.04, “To Close our LCC Seminaries” Reference: Overture 2.04; CW, Report 41: Seminary Joint MOU Committee from the 2014 synodical convention.
174. One seminary for LCC should suffice.
175. Sufficient unto the Day (as Someone said!) ...
176. Pastors need to be trained better to do missionary work for the spiritually sick and going out to people homes.
177. One step at a time - relation of seminary to District/Synod will be impacted by changes made.
178. I would prefer to see it happen during the restructuring. However, it is cannot be accomplished at the same time, it should continue after.
179. I would like to see the 2 seminary locations remain, if financially possible.
180. not qualified to make opinion
181. See 38. Also, only one big job at a time - it doesn't make sense to have a big restructuring effort going on in one part of Synod that could affect another part of Synod, and be restructuring that as well.
182. Whether it happens at the same time or after, it doesn't matter, as long as it's looked at.
183. Too much on our plate just with the current restructuring.
184. While I believe this is a critical issue and should be resolved quickly, it is going to take a long time and the really hard decisions will only be made when we are up against the wall financially. The cost of educating each student is way out of proportion to the value that we receive. Worse yet, the students join g through are getting a totally inadequate education - plus are often graduating with a debt load that will burden them for years to come- at least that is what I am told.
185. Make it more efficient
186. Need to review the program and ensure future Pastors are trained in communicating to a generation that may not be Christian.
187. Close one seminary as students need to move to one or the other anyway, and make different living arrangements while attending. Don't see why there was ever 2 seminaries allowed in the first place - should have been consolidated decades ago!
188. If it is not too problematic to do so.
189. It can either be concurrent or after.
190. It probably makes sense to do it at the same time.
191. I believe that this subject is not a direct requirement of the LCC restructuring process.
192. Lutheran Church Canada should maintain one seminary.
193. This has to be taken into consideration during and after the restructuring LCC process.
194. Too much to handle at the same time.
195. I don't understand the impact of timing
196. ...although I am concerned that would increase the workload too much, bogging down the process.

197. If there is a positive change that will benefit the seminaries before restructuring is complete, then it should be taken.
198. Oh good grief. Reading this question, I now understand what was being asked in the previous question. I will leave my answer there is and clarify here. As a key function of the synod it would be ridiculous to ignore these questions. Continuous improvement requires continuous monitoring and evaluation of programs.
199. Why do things twice and waste time and resources.
200. should be done at same time, hopefully so that everyone is on board with all the plans.
201. See question 38. This restructuring of seminary locations and pastoral training is a separate issue and likely can be conducted concurrently with any restructuring of district/synod functions.
202. Let's get it all done at once.
203. I do not know how it cannot be, unless it is to be status quo.
204. The 2 Seminaries need to continue to work together and with Synod to accomplish their goals and the training of pastors and deacons for our Church.
205. Yes, the issues of seminary education as well as the makeup of membership of synod at the basic congregational and church worker level must be part of the process of restructuring for such a process to have any meaning.
206. There is absolutely no benefit to restructuring seminaries at the same time as synod. This will only result in an unfair treatment to both issues. There is a great amount of anger tied to the move to restructure synod. The issue of the seminaries should not be treated in connection with how synod is structured.
207. Only insofar as it impacts the overall restructuring process.
208. Though this would be nice and a good time of transition, the likelihood of this happening is nil and would likely push back the restructuring of the LCC itself.
209. After or during - either way this must be done.
210. We cannot financially afford 2 seminaries and this is a truth that needs to be addressed now rather than later.
211. Please consider if the academic accreditation is useful to the mission of the church - it restricts applicants and cost money. Would our pastors be lesser with the same education but without a Masters degree?
212. Ministerial students should be taught to proclaim God's word correctly and clearly. I do not want or need to hear loquacity, sports reports, or jokes during the worship hour! A pastor, please, not a comedian!
213. This should be ongoing until we have reached a sustainable system. We need to be open to various possibilities, including making use of LCMS seminaries, or cutting down to one seminary, possibly with a residential requirement in first year, but allowing seminaries to continue their education by distance while doing fieldwork around the country in subsequent years, maybe with return to the seminary for intensive courses at the beginning or end of the academic year. What we should NOT be open to is farming out the training of LCC pastors to institutions of dubious faithfulness as was tried in Western Canada for part of the previous century.
214. yes, but this is not exclusive of the companion question and involves a quite separate issue the synod faces
215. Absolutely! Two seminaries have been fiscally irresponsible for years and yet the status quo has remained. One synod, one seminary will not only be a prudent use of finances, but also

help develop our "walking together" as a unified church body. But this process should not hinder the necessary restructuring in the short term.

216. We need to look at the complete picture at the same time. The money picture excludes training and restructuring.
217. It would be better, once any restructuring is initiated, to wait and see how it progresses before taking this next step.
218. In my view, there should be one Seminary centrally located to best serve the needs of training within the Church.
219. A large task, but, most practical.
220. Only if this is feasible.
221. I know that this is a closely related matter, however, it might be too much all at once.
222. I do not care when it is looked at as long as it is. If the restructuring committee thinks it should be discussed and a course of action taken, then let them do this. The worst thing would be to change the synodical structure and then NOT address the seminaries.
223. Unsure.
224. If we could do all of this at the same time, I think it would be better since then we could actually put this issue to bed.
225. If you are talking about the process that is already set up through the seminaries, then yes, let them continue with their plan and work.
226. So that on the same page but without excessive financial outcome
227. One seminary only in Canada, location not important, whichever is most viable
228. If this continues to be possible
229. look at individually and in own timeframe
230. We have studied this question of two seminaries for several years. It is time to take a break from the seminary question. It might be wiser to deal with one question at a time.
231. Always restructure as need to improve the training of new Pastors.
232. One seminary and one location for training should be developed in this restructuring process.
233. If time permits, it would be beneficial to have a complete strategic plan for all areas.
234. As long as they are working together.
235. I heard that the seminaries were around before LCC so the report written on the justification for two seminaries so may have been based on the past realities of LCC. New realities require new looks
236. It seems best to have a consistent restructuring plan, and the number and location of seminaries can be discussed as part of this plan.
237. These are separate issues
238. Again, unclear question in my opinion. Not trying to be belligerent, but I don't understand what this question is referring to. 2 seminaries are needed because of our geography. The way I see it we either keep both open or close both and send students to the US. The cost of sending students to the US seems to be too high. Therefore, we keep two seminaries open. We have enough on our plate right now; I don't think we need to reopen this debate.
239. One thing at a time.
240. Only one Seminary is required based on the small membership in LCC and number of students entering the Seminary. Perhaps may even want to consider closing both Seminary and train pastors in USA.
241. Should be an ongoing thing.

242. Definitely broach the question, but keep it separate and parallel to the restructuring of our Synodical polity.
243. We cannot sustain or reasonably justify duplication of tasks that do not wisely use limited resources
244. It could be part of the process, or could be a separate process if needed.
245. Why the trick type question? Our seminaries do an excellent job of training our Pastors Not restructuring required.
246. I really don't want to loose our seminary in our area.... I have no idea how the other one is doing
247. Send the students to the US, pay their tuition, living cost, sell the seminaries and have money left over.
248. Overhaul is inclusive to both the restructuring of the organization and the training of Pastors. We should also be visiting to see if it is necessary that a pastor or deacon be a graduate of a Lutheran seminary.
249. ONE SEMINARY. WE ARE TOO SMALL FOR TWO.
250. This should be addressed all at the same time, though painful. At first I had no preference as to which seminary to close. However, after looking at the costing of both seminaries and other factors, such as the fact the St. Catharines seminary is close to the USA and has potential to receive candidates from the USA, I would recommend closing the Edmonton seminary
251. The process of placement of seminary graduates needs to be changed. Congregations should be given the opportunity to interview prospective grads before they are placed. Too many placements have been abject failures.
252. WE should be done with this process as it seems to be one area that has been dealt with rather successfully.
253. This is an entirely separate issue!
254. I think that decisions like this should be postponed until we realise how we are going to work together.
255. YES! YES! YES! Restructuring of Synod will be challenging/divisive enough. Let's open only one LAREG CAN of worms at a time. Both seminaries are current working very well together under the directives of the MOU. This would continue even if Synod is restructured. If this topic is a major concern in this survey, then it could become an overture to the next Synodical convention; that is, to redefine the mandate of the MOU.
256. The above just needs to get done.
257. One biggie at a time
258. At least for the time being.
259. I guess this depends on how many "paid" people are involved and the individuals involved may be trying to perform both the teaching and restructuring - overload
260. Set the governance structure first and then follow with a review of the programs that support the overall vision.
261. Both
262. Let's do it. It is as if God gave us the direction through Concordia University's decision. What are we waiting for? The seminary needs to be where the Synod office is. Maybe even shared facility.
263. Too much change is bad!

264. Before question 38 and 39, shouldn't there have been a question that asked "The training of pastors, including the number and location of seminaries, is satisfactory." Agree/disagree.
265. In light of what seems to be happening in Edmonton do we still count it as a seminary?
266. I have wondered for some time if we need more than one seminary. Let's make one strong national body with one seminary thereby eliminating waste through doubling or tripling our efforts. It has also crossed my mind if it wouldn't be far more efficient to train our pastors etc. at the US Missouri seminaries. Don't we all believe the same doctrines which are not based on geography. The money to run two underutilized facilities and staff could be spent on encouraging young potential pastors to join the ministry by paying their tuition or a least developing a structure that rewards accomplishment after each successful year at study.
267. Let's get one right before we confuse the direction and purpose of the restructuring
268. The matter of the seminaries has been addressed at the last two synodical conventions. This question should not be in this survey. See Synodical Convention June 2014 Resolution 14.2.04
269. Hands off the Seminaries! Leave Concordia alone already. Or We will vote out of LCC!
270. I reckon restructuring LCC will keep us busy enough.
271. It has to happen. During or after doesn't matter. But these two questions reveal a bias that this restructuring is needed. I am all for it, but the questions are biased. A professional survey writer should have been used for this.
272. My opinion these are different mandates provided by different conventions and should be handled separately.
273. It should be the convention that would mandate this, and that can't happen until 2017. We should see what the new LCC structure looks like, and then we can proceed with the seminary issue.
274. One thing should be done before the other. We need to see how the new LCC looks like before the seminaries follow suit.
275. Too much at once. This would be too overwhelming.
276. That would make sense!
277. These are two completely separate issues in my view.
278. Duplicate
279. One seminary, but training needs to be more practical in the areas of pastoral care and outreach. No more computer geeks.
280. It is quite clear that our current leadership has neither the backbone nor the fortitude to tackle this issue, as they have not already (despite numerous calls to do so at the expensive waste of time and money conventions that accomplish nothing). The only time our Synod will deal with anything is when money forces it to. We worship the false god of mammon in LCC. Both Canadian seminaries should be eliminated and training fostered by the US seminaries which have far greater scholarship and choices available.
281. Concentrate on one thing at a time.
282. I don't believe it would benefit our church to combine these two issues. Let us first deal with restructuring than we can properly readdress the seminaries, if need be.
283. I strongly disagree to having the present Edmonton Seminary associated with the present Edmonton University.
284. I certainly think it is good to look at the big picture.
285. Huge change is needed.
286. It might be best to restructure LCC first and then let the new LCC deal with this issue.

287. See above. Not a relevant question. Decision is made.
288. Get everything done at once making sure that all aspects of any restructuring do not conflict with any other aspects.
289. The process needs to be restructured...I don't know the pros and cons of "after" or "at the same time."
290. They are two separate questions.
291. one seminary at most
292. Too much going on at the same time. Complete one process first and then give the second project (seminaries) full and due consideration and commitment.
293. Find what works best and go with it, however change for the sake of change in unacceptable.
294. Do it now.
295. should proceed both during restructuring and after restructuring of LCC. Because of the complexity of the issue, I don't think a decision can be reached as part of the LCC restructuring, and it is not critical that a decision be made as part of the LCC restructuring.
296. Yes. We don't have the money or seminarians to support two seminaries. In time we might not have the funds to support even one seminary.
297. I would agree if both seminaries would first agree to the above stated viewpoint.
298. The two go together

40. The training of LCC Deacons, e.g. teachers and congregational servants, is in need of restructuring.

1. Why? We have good deacons. They usually get elected here. I did not even know they go to special training.
2. We have never had one, so I don't know how it was.
3. Strengthen these programs.
4. I was under the impression the "Deacon training" was cancelled.
5. Our church (Synod) have not made the best use of lay people as have Bible schools. That's why other denominations have well informed - inspired lay workers.
6. Now that programs at CUE have been dropped, this is very much needed.
7. Should be more available.
8. Regardless of our various positions in life future education is critical until 2 years prior to retirement. Update, learn and use new knowledge/experiences to open doors to growth of individual/community.
9. Length of programs are now appropriate.
10. How would I know?
11. Our teachers put forth great effort and dedication but I feel a restructuring is much needed.
12. The training of deacons should be done so there is uniformity in expectations and agreement between pastors and deacons.
13. A lot don't know the program ins and outs. What do you want to happen after restructuring of the program? what is objective? Is this of value to the students?
14. This has been voted on in convention, and is not part of restructuring Synod.
15. Our church needs more teachers and congregational servants.
16. We are extremely low on teachers and servants (our congregation).
17. we need balance of women in ministry.

18. Wow. What happened to our Concordia? May God forgive us for neglecting this resource. Is there any way to discover this treasure again? Perhaps we can establish a training college within Concordia university -- something to receive more direct and focused attention.
19. Based on how things have fallen apart at Concordia we probably need to rethink this.
20. not sure.
21. There is a process and plan emerging at the Edmonton Seminary.
22. No-one is currently responsible for it, since CUE dropped discontinued its church work programs. Equally important, nobody has been given the funds to do it either.
23. What is left now that Concordia Edmonton is no longer a synodical institution?
24. Yes, especially in view of the change at Concordia College, Edmonton.
25. Restructuring to what?
26. No clue!
27. I think it's going o.k. Finances may be a problem in some cases. Can't spend what one doesn't have.
28. not enough information
29. It's not available at the moment so what is this question about?
30. There currently is no program in place to train deacons. This needs to be a HUGE priority. Deacons serve a completely different role than pastors and need to be seen as having a role in LCC.
31. Not familiar where and how deacons are trained.
32. Where will they be trained from now on?
33. My understanding Concordia has no current deacon program and there is little desire to call a deacon from congregations.
34. Now that our only Lutheran college has been abandoned (seemingly through an opaque process without any chance for input from regular people), it seems our best choice is to move training of all "congregational servants" (good term, actually) to the seminaries, to the extent that theological education is necessary for those servants to fulfill their roles. It is great to see the seminaries (St. Catharines anyway) offering courses to lay people so we can grow in our faith and knowledge, and thereby serve the church better.
35. Each and every lay person can be a deacon, with or without special training. The roles of deacons are many and varied, and may or may not require some special education or training. Depending on the particular role of a deacon, that training may be provided through the Church or through a secular institution. An accounting degree from a secular university, for example, may well equip a deacon to serve the Church in an administrative role.
36. I am not sure what the process of training is right now.
37. Both pastors and deacons need to be better equipped to deal with the practical concerns of running a congregation -- administration, social skills, elder and end-of-life ministry, youth ministry. It seems that our educational programs focus very heavily on theology and not enough on professional skills.
38. I think our whole understanding of the deaconate needs to be overhauled. Even it's theology. There is division in our church about the office of the deacon, and whether that office comes out of the pastor's office or not. What does it mean to be called and how does it matter? As I understand it, these discussions have been put off for a long time. We need to have them.
39. I do not know anything about their training. We have not deacons in our church.

40. I can not say from my experience if this is true or not. If there is a need it needs to be identified and all congregations need to know what issues are happening so solutions can be found to insure the training is more than adequate.
41. Take a page from municipal governments - they have a timeline of reviewing and amending strategic plans and policies that falls between five and ten years. When was the last time the policies concerning training were reviewed and revised?
42. I have no particular knowledge of this area, except to say that I firmly believe that we need to look at everything.
43. I have no information to form a viable opinion.
44. Very much so. We need an end product-PASTORS more inclined to be SERVANTS, than judges.
45. N/A
46. Training of Deacons should take place in our seminaries. Let the church workers of our Synod learn beside each other and from the same orthodox teachers of our Synod. Perhaps those training to be deacons should have an undergraduate degree in place prior to beginning their training in the seminary or can transfer after completing 2 or 3 years at the undergraduate level and complete the remainder of a baccalaureate degree at the seminary.
47. Again what is a congregational servant? Are we not all one?? I would venture a guess that most people in a congregation will not even know where this training now takes place.
48. Not sufficiently informed.
49. How would I know this?
50. This issue (Q's 38-40) should be done separately from this survey concerning Synod/District structure!
51. Need training for them.
52. This should at least be examined, since Concordia University is no longer a Lutheran or even a Christian institution.
53. Are there any such training programs in Canada? I thought that to become an LCC Lutheran teacher or parish worker the only option was to go to the USA?
54. Due to changes that have taken place at Concordia University in Edmonton.
55. I have not interacted with LCC Deacons.
56. I am not familiar enough with this program to know what is needful. However, it is my understanding that Concordia University is no longer offering this program and that it may fall under seminary supervision.
57. Especially now that Concordia Edmonton is in a drastically changing pattern.
58. Since Synod is not longer associated with Concordia University, this is a must.
59. As I understand it there is not a program available for these people in Canada.
60. Not to my knowledge.
61. It needs to be removed from a secular university (Concordia) and returned to the seminary.
62. Practical and online training
63. We need to restructure in a need to bring more people in.
64. With the removal of these programs from Concordia University Edmonton, the lack of students in those programs before they were cancelled, the lack of calls that were available for DPS students, etc., we should revisit our need for these programs.
65. totally agree, you treat your ministers as mini-gods and the Deacons, teachers are low servants and are paid accordingly as well...total disgrace

66. We need to work on outreach, we need to empower our own members to see the importance of volunteering.
67. Only if congregations warrant it. Size, area etc.
a. Not training at Concordia College. At seminaries only.
68. I do not know enough about the process of their training.
69. Is it not a thing almost extinct?
70. We actually need a place to train them now that Concordia University of Edmonton, which had been the place, has been cut off from the church by one of our own pastors gone rogue with too much power.
71. Can we not use LCC Deacons to work as urban missionaries here in Canada??
72. Now that Concordia University of Edmonton has so ridiculously severed all ties with the Lutheran church, we need somewhere to train our teachers, servants, and deacons.
73. Have no idea about the training of deacons, etc.
74. Where? By whom?
75. This needs to be answered by the people who are directly involved.
76. I don't understand this question.
77. As it is unclear what role/relationship Concordia University in Edmonton has with the synod and, in the past, that is where such training took place, we do indeed need to look into the structure and see if it needs restructuring.
78. Don't have enough information on this area. Though I do think we probably need more Deacons, teachers and congregational servants then we have. To accomplish this restructuring may be needed.
79. Do congregational servants include secretaries, caretakers, or organists?
80. from what I hear and read, but I am not to knowledgeable about this
81. need more info
82. The seminaries are independent organizations but they must maintain strong ties to synod both governance and financial.
83. I strongly agree that the training of pastors ought to be re-evaluated. Secular Universities have become faith-destroying institutions. Private Faith-based universities foster unionism and syncretism. Therefore, men who seek the ministry should not be required to get a secular bachelors degree in advance of seminary training, so long as there is a way to be assured that they are up to the academic task prior to seminary enrollment.
84. With Concordia University College changing its image, where would they go for training? Perhaps a section of the Seminaries would be an option, or maybe one of them.
85. I don't know about this.
86. know nothing about it
87. Sadly, it should be ended, not bothering with how to keep trying to do this.
88. Not sure.
89. Now that Concordia University of Edmonton is no longer involved in this training we as a Synod need to see how this training can most effectively be done. I would wait with this until after the Synod restructuring.
90. No opinion, don't know the process presently in place.
91. No opinion except that as suggested in my answers to questions #15 and #21 you need to consider carefully what the objective is of restructuring anything in LCC.
92. Especially with the change at Concordia University of Edmonton.
93. this could be a local thing but I don't think there is a big problem here.

94. Yes, clearly since it is no longer a program at Concordia University of Edmonton. Deacons play an important role and they need high quality training to serve effectively.
95. Not sure if it even exists in western Canada anymore.
96. not enough information
97. No opinion.
98. Diaconal program at Concordia - Edmonton has terminated, right? Let seminaries do it.
99. I do not know the current location for diaconal training with Concordia University closing its program. If there is no other location for training, then there needs to be work down to determine how training will be done. If other agreements or programs are in place, then I do not see the need for restructuring.
100. I think this is paramount now that Concordia has chosen to no longer be a Christian institution and they have primarily been responsible for this training.
101. LCC has failed miserably in its relationship with Concordia University of Edmonton, which until recently served the Synod quite well in its limited teacher certification, pre-seminary, and DPS programs. The Synod did not support the university, and failed to respond when the current CUE administration began taking steps five years ago to weaken, and then recently to sever, the ties between CUE and LCC. LCC needs to engage CUE simply because there is no other real possibility (other than sending possible students to LCMS universities) for training Deacons and teachers. Even with the recent CUE Board decision to change the university's mission and values (which probably should be contested by LCC legally, as a breach of trust and failure of fiduciary duty on the part of the University's President and Board of Governors), LCC could still support Lutheran programs at the University, and I imagine the University would respond favorably if the Synod simply provided the necessary financial support for these programs.
102. There is no training in Canada. Our seminaries are perfect for this.
103. Have no information on this matter.
104. Quality of individuals graduating is suffering greatly - many individuals trained do not really earn their keep
105. The selection process for congregations must be changed, congregations must be able to interview and determine who they want to select
106. If this restructuring will train and give them better knowledge of the bible to be used to help spread the gospel.
107. Right now since Concordia University of Edmonton has dropped the ball it is my understanding that there is no place in LCC for them to receive the training needed.
108. No view of this process
109. On this point, there has been much talk about shortening the 4-year program for Deacons. I believe this would not give them sufficient theological and parish service training.
110. Centralize in Winnipeg. Add A/V skills. Develop digital library for distant training and upgrade.
111. Not enough info on current training.
112. I don't know.
113. I don't know what is currently done and it is not clear to me as to why this should be part of this restructuring process.
114. seems Concordia University of Edmonton thrust this upon us.
115. Based on what?
116. Require more information, particularly with the recent changes in Concordia Edmonton

117. Again, leaning towards "agree".
118. As a publicly trained teacher, I found the colloquy process so unaffordable that it was not a viable choice.
119. This is clearly an appropriate time to consider this aspect of things, especially now that CUE has become a secular institution (and stopped providing training for deacons even earlier than that).
120. NOT AT THIS TIME! See #38, 39.
121. Especially now that Concordia Univ College no longer provides the studies as part of the offered course studies.
122. Since Concordia University ended the DPS program, we have no method for training of future Deacons, so yes, we need to do something about that.
123. There should be a regular/periodic review of deacons, teachers and other specialists training and facilities.
124. I have no clue what's going on right now. How could I know if it needs restructuring?
125. Can't answer have no info about this
126. If we aren't familiar with Deacons how can we answer.
127. With the break with Concordia University College there is nothing to restructure. A new way of educating them (I prefer that term to "training") has to be found. Again, for a synod as small as ours, it would make financial sense to finance those students to attend LCMS institutions of learning.
128. I believe the majority of LCC members are unclear on the roles of Deacons. Because of this ambiguity, Deacons perhaps are not valued as they ought to be.
129. Since our last synodical convention proved that we don't know what a deacon is and we no longer have any training for deacons, I suppose the answer must be yes.
130. I don't know what the current process entails.
131. I believe there is a great need for this position, but we need to have a better understanding and acceptance within the Pastorate and congregations so as to best utilize this still novel worker.
132. don't know what training happens now, but that likely should be reviewed too.
133. The training of Deacons and other church workers is not asked, as compared to seeing the ads for " Do You Know a Person Who Would Be Involved In Church As A Pastor".
134. Not familiar with the current structure
135. Concordia has turned its back on us. Can't the seminaries do the job that CUE quit doing?
136. especially if the College really has gone ALL IN for the "way of the world"!!
137. Since Concordia University of Alberta has withdrawn from the diaconal program, much of the training may have to come from our seminaries.
138. Lay people would enjoy some training and learning opportunities in the seminaries and regional centers. These would need to be flexible in times and locations in order to be truly available to working lay folks.
139. After the church worker program was suspended at Concordia, I have no idea what the process for training deacons is; for all I know, it's already been effectively restructured.
140. Need to find a new location after the change at CUE.
141. Yes
142. Yes, please.
143. YES! We currently have NO mode of training Deacons in our church body. Of course it needs restructuring.

144. The question now is who should do it, and where?
145. We need to utilize our seminaries for the training of Deacons. This will help to increase the student populations of the seminaries and will then provide masters degree level training in biblical, doctrinal and practical studies for future Deacons. Future teacher Deacons can enter seminary with an education degree from a recognized university and then proceed to do their theological studies. Future DPS students can enter seminary with a bachelor's degree and pursue theological training at the master's level.
146. YES! Honestly, how many congregations of our LCC can afford a second worker? How many deaconesses have we trained and produced only to have them not find work? Do we need a separate program for them, or can it be brought alongside the Pastoral program at the Seminaries in an ad hoc manner?
147. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
148. With CUE no longer in the picture, we need to find another avenue for the training of deacons. Of course, as our congregations continue to shrink, where will we place the deacons that we train?
149. Again, more cooperation with other Christian colleges.
150. Don't know enough about this.
151. no information on this so can't say.
152. I am not even sure that there is a structure for this any longer.
153. Depends on the programming available from CUE.
154. Probably. Perhaps rather than restructuring it needs clarification and redefinition. In light of recent events, we may wish to rethink any portion of this training now conducted at Concordia University.
155. Think some congregations need more of training.
156. Yes. Ideally should be done at the seminaries so they can learn in conjunction with pastors.
157. Do we need deacons? How many schools do we have? How many churches in need of a specialized deacon? Can deacons be trained through the seminaries?
158. We have so few Deacons and teachers in East District and few churches that can afford these extra paid staff.
159. I didn't think we trained deacons anymore. If that's the case, then yes, we need to re-examine what we are doing.
160. I assume that this relates to training structure and curriculum, which I do not know.
161. Do not have enough information to make an informed decision.
162. We need a training program in Canada.
163. Combining locations and staff
164. -There currently is not a program available for those who are DPS's. -Many congregations, pastors, etc., have no clue the function of a DPS, and do not utilize them well. Many deacons are moving on to other vocations.... outside of the church.
165. Go very slow.
166. I don't know.
167. Do we need deacons? I would say not at this time.
168. Since CUE is no longer an LCC institution, we have no mechanism formally by which to train such deacons. Perhaps more germane is if the position itself is a meaningful one to LCC; the number on the roster versus the number actually in employment in congregations is a ratio worth considering.

169. What needs restructuring is the pay levels for those working in the church who are not Pastors so it becomes a feasible career/calling.
170. I think this information needs to come from deacons and the congregations that they serve.
171. mostly for clarification of called or not called
172. I don't know enough of what's in place to say
173. We need "feeder" schools to train our new pastors, teachers and Deacons.
174. With the recent decision of the CUE Board of Governors to not identify themselves as a Christian institution and the reality that they no longer are training church workers (and the absence of any meaningful financial support from LCC) it is essential that we do something. That being said, I am not certain that the DPS program really needs to continue given that there does not seem to be a great demand for non-clergy church workers.
175. CUCA is no longer doing it!
176. Especially with the loss of Concordia University.
177. With the recent events concerning the Concordia University of Edmonton this is self evident. However please remember the Church already has a mandate to work on this which was adopted at the 2014 synodical convention: Resolution 14.2.06 To Clarify the Vision and Direction of the Church Work Programs at Concordia University College of Alberta Reference: Overture 2.06 WHEREAS Lutheran Church-Canada exists, in part, to provide for the training and support of our church workers (pastors and deacons); and WHEREAS God continues to call and raise up men and women of faith to serve Him and His Church in fulltime ministry; and WHEREAS CUCA has served and continues to serve the church faithfully in preparing candidates for our Lutheran diaconal ministry, namely Directors of Parish Services (DPS) and Lutheran school teachers, as well as offering a Youth Ministry Certificate, and a Church Music Certificate; and WHEREAS CUCA has been and continues to be active in preparing young men for our seminaries with its pre-seminary program; and 42 WHEREAS the men and women prepared, or impacted by these ministries have been a blessing to many in the church and world; and WHEREAS financial limitations have led to fears that the programs may not be sustainable; and WHEREAS budget constraints have led to CUCA being able to hire only a part-time ―Coordinator of Applied Religion‖ (the Director for the church work programs); and WHEREAS this has led to difficulty in recruiting new students for the various church work programs; therefore be it RESOLVED that the Convention direct the Synod‘s Board of Directors, in cooperation with CUCA‘s Board of Governors, to clarify a vision and direction for the church work programs; and be it further RESOLVED that the Convention direct the Synod‘s Board of Directors, in cooperation with CUCA‘s Board of Governors, to identify and/or designate leadership and funds for the enactment of this vision; and be it finally RESOLVED that the Convention direct the Board of Directors to allocate a minimum of 25% of its higher education budget to church work programs at CUCA. Action: Adopted
178. Please let each seminary pick up this ball dropped by the College/University, which has no cut the umbilical cord that bound it to our Church.
179. I don't know enough about their current training system.
180. regarding DPS/Deacons this was a failed experiment - move on. there is definitely need for a restructuring of the training and rostering of Lutheran teachers.
181. Recently there was extensive task force work completed on Seminary Education. Higher Education effectiveness should constantly be reviewed but is not a huge priority for me in the current restructuring exercise.

182. I do not know enough about the current training structure to comment.
183. Is it needed? Consider how many churches can afford it now. Perhaps time to abandon certain aspects of the deacon program. Training our teachers is still worthwhile.
184. Consider having it as
185. Not sure what type of training they receive now.
186. not qualified
187. With the closing of the program at the University, we will need to incorporate the training.
188. Absolutely; as there is no LCC college or university. Perhaps this is another reason there is some question about the LCC BoD governance. This, now open, reality needs to be addressed very soon. The reality is that Edmonton is and was not a Lutheran educational institute for some time. Do we send these people to the US or other partner Church bodies for their education?
189. Considering that right now there isn't a training program for deacons, darn right it needs restructuring.
190. no one in our congregation has had training other than pastor
191. Agree, but where are the questions on training elders???
192. Don't know enough about current training.
193. We also need training of lay leadership, spiritual, organizational, change management, team building, planning & accountability.
194. I believe that Deacons need more training.
195. Concordia St Catharines should be responsible as it is on better financial footing. Otherwise, both seminaries should be allowed to provide training in case pastors wives want to take courses concurrently with their husbands, if the LCC continues to have two seminaries.
196. It should be given to CLTS.
197. Not aware of any congregations that can afford such a position.
198. Now that Concordia is no longer considered 'Christian' or a part of LCC, an alternative route for the theological training of the deacons could be in the seminaries.
199. The training of pastors is of the utmost importance. Currently we train men to be mostly theologians and hope they will be compassionate pastors. That balance has to be restored so that there is better " taking care of the sheep " as Jesus commanded Peter (John 21: 15 - 19)
200. Those wishing to teach in a Lutheran school should attend a secular university teaching program and colloquy into Lutheran program.
201. To me - members of LCC wishing to be teachers should go through teaching programs offered by the secular universities, then through a colloquy apply to teach in Lutheran schools, this requires the removal of the title Deacon from teachers, male and female. A Deacon\Deaconess program could be offered by the seminaries. The Deaconess program would need to follow the LCMS model.
202. Especially now that Concordia University is no longer considered Christian!
203. I'm not informed on this subject.
204. there is no training of teachers or church workers any more at Concordia in Edmonton. Very sad to see. It was very disconcerting that the person in charge of the program at Concordia before it shut down did not even believe in the importance of the Lutheran Teacher program as this director didn't even see the value in sending his own kids to Faith Lutheran School in Edmonton at the time.
205. not qualified to answer that question because of lack of information on the present system.

206. There should be more informal opportunities to grow lay leaders, not formal programs for a select few.
207. With the loss of Concordia Edmonton as a place for rostered teacher training, questions come into play as to where such training can now occur.
208. It needs to be housed at a seminary
209. If it is found necessary to restructure the training, yes by all means, there are always something new coming up that can be of help in the training of teachers, servants and deacons
210. They should be trained at our Seminaries not Concordia university which no longer views itself as LCCs school.
211. Yes, the issues of seminary education as well as the makeup of membership of synod at the basic congregational and church worker level must be part of the process of restructuring for such a process to have any meaning.
212. As it stands there is no training of deacons. If this is important to the church, it has to be restructured.
213. It should be the responsibility of the seminaries.
214. In light of developments at CUE, we have no choice: CUE should provide secular courses, CLS the theological ones. At St. Catharines, CLTS and Brock can follow a similar arrangement.
215. With recent changes at CUE, we have no choice. We should continue diaconal training at CUE in secular subjects, with theological ones at CLS. CLTS can do something similar at Brock.
216. Deacons are a valuable part of our church, even if they are few in number. We must make every attempt to provide for their training in a cost-effective way, as well as one which provides them with an excellent education for serving their church.
217. Since Concordia University has ditched its mandate to do so, this should be picked up by our seminaries ASAP. As noted above for the training of pastors, this should NOT be farmed out to institutions of questionable orthodoxy.
218. from what I have heard, it warrants consideration, especially with the secular stance of our university
219. Get rid of deacons. Call them "teachers" (as in this question). Congregational servants is too broad. Perhaps "professional church workers" is a better term: the work for the church (and are frequently hired/fired as any worker) and they get paid for it. It also includes church secretaries, business managers, musicians, anyone who received a professional remuneration.
220. I am not sure how this would come about, but have heard that the climate between the church and Concordia University College may have implications in this regard. However, there is much value in having well trained church workers.
221. not sure
222. We need more direction and guidance.
223. I don't know enough about how this training takes place.
224. I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer.
225. Are we even training Deacons and teachers and congregational servants. Without the program and Concordia University (no longer LCC) what do we even have in place. This question is awkward.
226. see above

227. Alternate training needs to be considered, especially for small rural parishes far removed from neighboring congregations.
228. Well since we have no formal mechanism any more we should take a look at this. What could we provide from a synodical level or what could we offer through the seminary.
229. It does not exist any longer. The DSP and Lutheran School Teachers training through Concordia University was discontinued. There are no deacons being trained at this time. Restructure?? Too late?? Start again somewhere else i.e. through the seminaries?
230. don't know
231. This is especially true in light of current "secularization" of Concordia Edmonton and its dropping of church work programs.
232. some of these Qu require inside information
233. not sure what the training is
234. need a new location to make sure this happens
235. Let us find a new location to carry this important training out of.
236. Especially with the shutting down of the church work programs, and the general direction of things, at CUE, we need a solution in this area.
237. Since Concordia University in Edmonton is no longer a recognized Lutheran (or even Christian) institution, where can this happen? We must establish a location where teachers, deacon and other congregational servants are trained for our purposes. The colloquy requirements should be reviewed and adjusted as necessary.
238. We need strong and faithful servants who are solid in their faith in Jesus as Savior and are willing to work hard to care, teach and give courage to everyone that they work with.
239. It would appear that is the case. Concordia College in Edmonton doesn't seem like a very useful education agency for this training. It has become too secular. Perhaps there are programs at the Lutheran schools in the LC-MS that could provide a better option. How about scholarships or grants to students attending an LC-MS school. The international exposure would be very valuable and broaden their horizons. Why did Canadians ever think only Canadian trained church workers were good enough for Canadian congregations. That makes no sense.
240. Is our Concordia University becoming too secular and therefore not emphasizing the spiritual aspect these students need if they are to become future church workers? Perhaps we need to look into how well our church workers are being prepared. I don't know enough about what is taught now or what the general atmosphere is.
241. Especially Sunday School teachers and programs.
242. There is little value placed in pastoral training on second staff as well as no training in team ministry.
243. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
244. do churches want deacons?
245. There needs to be a needs assessment and a look at the requirements for training. It may or may not be something that can be supported in Canada and if required we may to look elsewhere. There is every indication that the Clergy is not united on the needs for these positions in the Church
246. Do we still have a Christian University that is viable for training Church workers? It is my impression that Concordia University of Edmonton has declared itself to be a secular institution.

247. Not at this time
248. as lay people, what are the issues? I need more info
249. The recent announcements coming out of Concordia University suggest that they are no longer interested, capable, or to be trusted with this program.
250. This should become part of the mandate of our seminaries (both of them) as an after degree or certificate program. This would ensure better theological education for our deacons.
251. Of course. Our university that trained our workers has stripped Christ from its mission, and it discontinued the church work programs some time ago. Yes, this needs to be addressed.
252. We need trained specialized workers i.e., youth, music, outreach, etc.
253. This is not a condemnation of our current Seminaries & PAT program. It is just an admission that we could probably do a better job of coordinating our resources for the purpose of developing a stronger educational ministry within the context of our Canadian Lutheran Church. The limited resources that our two Seminaries and the PAT program experience put binders on what our institutions are able to accomplish along the way. Theological education within LCC could be so much more - not just for training clergy - but as a center for theological and spiritual learning for the Church as a whole.
254. if there is an achievable betterment, yes
255. Tough to do now, since Concordia is no longer a Christian University
256. This training should be entirely subsumed under the seminaries, as it should have been all along. Since deacons, whether teachers or congregational servants, are those who assist pastors, they should be trained by those who train the pastor.
257. How can a lay person comment on this?
258. I don't have enough information to have an opinion
259. Only large congregations can 'afford' these positions and are they really a priority - the Pastor in each congregation is key to leading and caring for the congregation, not having this role delegated to a deacon
260. There should be an identified training location that is local (i.e. Saskatchewan would be Briercrest).
261. This is especially important since the demise of Concordia University Edmonton as a Lutheran Institution.
262. I don't know.
263. Not sure what the process currently is. With Concordia University no longer a "Christian" school, such puts the deacon training up in the air. Perhaps the seminary in St. Catharines can provide this in conjunction with Brock University. Then, too, how many future deacons are we even talking about here?
264. Yes, CUE is now secular and cannot do this--even after they dropped this task back in the summer! So, this task should be assigned to the MOU so both seminaries can make it a joint endeavor.
265. Pastors need to have formal training in how to work cooperatively when assigned to one congregation. There needs to be clear levels of authority.
266. Unfamiliar with this subject.
267. training and information regarding training of deacons is not communicated well to congregations
268. Perhaps the seminaries should take this over, with extra funding from synod.
269. It's part of the whole mix

270. Absolutely; as there is no LCC college or university. Perhaps this is another reason there is some question about the LCC BoD governance
271. how would I know the answer to this?
272. This is most important given the demise of CUE.
273. Women could be given the opportunity to serve more equally in all the areas that men serve within the LCC, such as reading the scripture, leading Bible Studies and helping with communion.
274. Especially given the situation at CUE. We should strongly consider moving to the LCMS Deaconess System. Also, we need to either stop saying we "call" DPS or stop firing them when the budget runs low. Either they're not called and can be fired, or they're actually called and can't be fired. I think Scripture shows there is one call: to the Office of Holy Ministry.
275. I see the opportunity to use deacons in Canada as very weak.
276. In need of restructuring how and to what purpose?
277. Especially with the loss of Concordia Edmonton. Let Seminaries do the training for all our ministries such as Pastors, teachers and Deacons.
278. This question seems like a leading question. Why didn't you use the words "The training of LCC Deacons is not in need of restructuring"? Are you trying to elicit a certain answer?
279. We have so few people to train in this regard the natural thing to do is to sponsor/fund/support their education at institutions in sister churches like LCMS
280. I am not aware of what their training program is. If it is not meeting its requirements, then it needs changing.
281. Not sure how it will be restructured. I though Concordia University of Edmonton is not offering this training. Who would offer this training?
282. Due to the current status of Concordia University of Edmonton, we need to re-examine the training of all lay church workers.
283. It doesn't seem we have a need for them as once thought.
284. I'm not sure how the Deacons and teachers would feel. Years ago, it seemed to be effective; I'm not sure how it is now.
285. With no more CUofE we need to restructure. Why not look at CLBI as a foundation for study and move on from there?
286. Where will these people receive any training now that our "college" is no longer a Christian institution?
287. Should be the seminary's job.
288. Since Concordia University, Edmonton is no longer Christian, we should move towards utilizing the seminaries.
289. Especially in light of Concordia's recent move to become a fully, overtly secular institution.
290. The need for deacons and therefore their training should be re-evaluated. As certified church workers, their ecclesiastical training should take place at the seminaries.
291. Honestly - no opinion
292. At this point, what is the training? Concordia no longer has a church worker program.
293. Does this include training lay people; e.g. Elders, Teachers, Evangelism, etc.
294. The program has disintegrated and the Synod lost the University where it was being taught! There is nothing to restructure!
295. There is currently no training offered in Canada for Deacons that I am aware of.
296. Everything needs to be looked at.

297. Concordia university can no longer be trusted.
298. I think it's time to take our training of LCC Deacons out of Concordia University of Edmonton and move it into the seminaries. Especially with the recent news that Concordia is no longer a Lutheran university.
299. Who is really running that institution over there? I don't mean this sarcastically. If it's government that is pulling the strings, then let it go.
300. We don't have a place to train them now, right? So, some restructuring is needed.
301. Especially now that Concordia University is out of the picture.
302. they need to be more familiar with Lutheran confessions than with latest church growth fads
303. Somewhat agree.
304. I don't have enough knowledge to express an opinion. The current system, whatever it is, seems to be working OK.
305. We don't have the enrolment. Our deacons should be sent to the LCMS colleges and seminaries for training.
306. Because it is such a small program, I think diaconal training is best done through our Lutheran universities and seminaries in the LCMS.
307. Especially since what is now Concordia University of Edmonton have broken their commitment to provide such programmes (Canadian please; at least allow it!), especially that of the Director of Parish Services.
308. I know very little about this subject, except that deacons are rare birds in the East District.
309. Where in Canada do we have training for these anymore? Concordia University baled out of this program. What does it matter anyway when our schools are not seeking out Lutheran trained teachers?
310. We don't have a training program at this time.
311. ~ I have heard strange thoughts said or written by some in the deaconate over the years. A more thorough grounding seems necessary.

41. There is value in providing for the continuing education for our Pastors.

1. Today's pastors need to speak to professional as well as to simple folk, therefore yes. But if the object is to higher on the wage scale no. Is it cost effective re: service, who should pay? The best continuing education comes from experience in congregations. Mentoring could be useful. Just more book learning doesn't seem useful.
2. Either in Canada or help in U.S. But online courses could help.
3. Regardless of our various positions in life future education is critical until 2 years prior to retirement. Update, learn and use new knowledge/experiences to open doors to growth of individual/community.
4. Depending on what you educating them for.
5. Updating and opportunity to advance in education is needed.

a. I think it should be a requirement for each pastor and we should have to pay for it ourselves as part of our professional development

6. but needs to be in areas of merit that fit the congregation need
7. Life long learning -- no pastor has learned it all
8. Should make this mandatory on a yearly basis like in other professions.
9. but what is it and how much is the issue.

10. All professions, including the ministry, need continuing education and exposure to new ideas.
11. Yes ... and the Edmonton Seminary is having a Pastor's Sabbatical Week.
12. What other profession has NO continuing ed requirement whatsoever? Even more to the point, pastors should be well aware of their need for continuing growth, as they see their inadequacies surfacing in various areas of their work. I'm not slamming them, just recognizing that nobody can possibly be competent in everything that ministry requires these days.
13. Continuing education is essential though the responsibility lies to pursue belongs to the pastor. Our synod can only provide opportunities and some enabling.
14. They need to be taught more practical application!
15. Only if it's used for the congregation's benefit.
16. As long as it is cost effective.
17. Complacency is a bad thing and the need is great
18. Yes, it is a time when pastors can be fed and learn how to improve their ministries.
19. the years they have to train should be enough
20. Education is our strongest tool and our Pastors deserve to be well equipped in this changing world we live in.
21. Pastors and lay people should highly prize on-going education and training in the Word. Pastors should be required to earn continuing education (CE) credits to maintain their status, just like professionals in most other industries. Seminaries should offer these credits and also accredit other programs (e.g. symposia) to be able to offer these credits. Pastors who don't take on-going study seriously are robbing their congregations.
22. There are many areas of education that would be beneficial to our pastors.
23. It depends who is doing the educating.
24. I don't feel that it is a 'right' of a pastor to have continuing education. It would depend on what the education would be and how it would benefit his congregation. I believe it would be up to the individual congregations to make the decision to their pastors paid continuing education, not a right.
25. Provided it is for the enrichment in knowledge and understanding of the Word.
26. Our Pastors are already very well trained - what they need is assurance that their work is acknowledged and supported, not only by their congregation but especially by the District and Synod staff.
27. It doesn't matter what profession one is in, continuing education is important for anyone
28. Yes, we value the knowledge our pastor has as the questions are pretty complicated these days.
29. This is an absolute. We all need continuing education.
30. Who would actually disagree with this?
31. as times change, so MUST or pastors - in terms of attention spans, media involvement, internet, tech etc.
32. More help should be available for pastors i.e. personal counselling
33. Also personal counselling.
34. Depends on the sort, of course. But most things like "conflict resolution workshops" have very limited value I believe.
35. All professionals need continuing education to extend their learning and also to refresh what they had learned before.

36. An educated clergy and church body should prove to be a stronger church body. Continuing education is important to the professional and personal growth of our church workers. Although it is highly unlikely to mandate, perhaps continuing education should be strongly encouraged. Maybe guidance can be given to those who are unsure of what to study (build up their strengths...shore up their weaknesses).
37. Limited amt $ for continuing education but time allotted for other education.
38. Probably. What types of Continuing Ed. is now offered? where does it take place and do Pastors pay part of cost or do congregations? How often etc.?
39. My Pastor is already very well trained - what our Pastors need is assurance that their work is acknowledged and supported not only by their congregations but especially by "head office". They are definitely not "low man on the totem pole" but are servants of God.
40. Education is for life - for all of us.
41. Help with funds so that they may take courses at institutes of their choice. Tinker with idea of requirement every 2-3 years.
42. Even if it just refreshes and gives them a new perspective.
43. We live in a changing world. Our pastors need all of the support they can get.
44. Value in continued learning is very important.
45. Costs need to be considered though. Continuing education is always beneficial.
46. Most jobs require continuing education of some sort. Pastors are no exception.
47. Do you offer that now? How?
48. Provided it's not tailored to what the pastor wants, but how and with what the congregation needs him to be equipped.
49. every role in the ecclesiastical office of the church should be required to complete life long learning
50. Right now, not every congregation provides financial resources to assist in this. We consider pastoral conferences beneficial for this purpose. We want pastors to be professionals who are competent.
51. A major issue we recently experienced was that our Pastor should have had substantial new training, in particular with new technologies. While this is not essential, it would certainly help. As well, yearly reviews of pastors should occur, with the feedback from the congregational members, to ensure that the working relationship between the pastor and the congregation is strong. (Side note: As a church member, we are there to support the goals set by the pastor, and should be working with him to achieve those goals. But if the pastor is not performing his duties, their needs to be support from the District/Synod to ensure that issues do not persist. Because we "call" a pastor, there is understandable hesitation to step in, but sometimes that needs to occur, and it should not take years before that occurs. Continued training and overseeing pastors might have prevented the problems we experienced.
52. You tell me one career that there is not constant training and more education.... a Pastor does not know everything, can't know everything and the ones that think they do.... well you can tell by those dying congregations that changes need to be made
53. Spiritual leaders are very important and education is important.
54. They serve God and God's people with God's truth.
55. include people skills, sermon writing, public speaking, putting butts in the pews.
56. Yes! but not a free service ed.
57. Make it affordable. Long distance educ.
58. Continuing education should be on their time and at their expense

59. Just to keep up with Technology alone
60. After reading the Bible completely I marvel at what a Pastor must retain to be knowledgeable.
61. As it is for all professions
62. The Bible is immense. Pastors can spend their entire life continuing their education and never learn it all.
63. There is always more to learn.
64. There is always more to learn; education is a lifelong process.
65. In synodically sanctioned courses, seminars, etc.
66. Absolutely especially if we want to remain relevant in society and find new ways to reach out.
67. Learning never ends. There is always value. Use technology to accommodate distances.
68. on ethics, morals and conflict of interest enforcement and staying in their core spiritual business are and what that means is not missioning where cost benefit is not great. Real estate vs. missioning
69. This is part of the ongoing support and care of our Pastors.
70. This can and should be able to be accomplished with minimal expense and travel using today's technology. There is a requirement for ongoing continuing education in most professions. The challenge for me with this statement is what exactly does "providing for" mean? Does it mean funding, time off, actually supplying the educational facilities and training? It is difficult to respond to such an unclear statement.
71. As part of LMWL C, we have assisted some pastors in short term continuing education. It is very important to keep our leaders up to date on the latest outreach service that is offered through the Church.
72. Pastors are the Spiritual leaders of our churches and continuing education for them is never a bad idea!! Money spent in this area only proves in the long run to strengthen our Pastors and our Churches.
73. We should make this mandatory and covered by Synod assessments.
74. Do the words "in providing" imply financial assistance from the congregation of its pastor?
75. Not only value, but in many cases it is critical.
76. Continuing education is important. However, I don't think the Synod needs to fund it through assessing the congregations. Pastors should desire continuing education and be willing to pay for it. Synod should make such continuing education available, so long as it builds us up and unifies us in the Lutheran/Biblical/Confessional faith. Any continuing education that promotes unionism and downplaying of doctrine, such as wiki fivetwo, has no place in our synod, let alone to be actively promoted by synod as it has been in the ABC District office.
77. Professional development must be an ongoing thing
78. I am firm believer in education, that it is always more to learn and it is a life long process.
79. On ecclesiastical matters only, not as counsellors, or administrators
80. as long as they use it in practical ways
81. Must be affordable. Use long distance learning tools to maximum effect.
82. No question about the value of providing continuing education for our Pastors but you need to consider the cost.
83. This depends a lot on what they are educating for. Some need a lot more psychology training and how to work as team members, and not get in a hurry to "change" the congregation without consent of the congregation.

84. Life long learning is critical. Pastors can not possible learn everything they need in knowledge and skills in seminary. Iron sharpens iron.
85. Yes, they need to be brought up to the 21st century. Let's teach them how to utilize modern techniques of communication, education, teaching etc. We need to provide opportunities for their spiritual growth and faith well being but we also need to get them more tech savvy. Many of our pastors are woefully behind the times which hinders the effectiveness of their congregation.
86. Voluntary, not forced.
87. Keep us growing/open to new ideas (and old ideas)
88. All professions require continual learning and education and therefore I do encourage at least supplements for continuing education.
89. Sometimes a Pastor may want to take a course and without the assistance of the Continuing Education Fund this may not be possible.
90. There's no such thing as too much study about Jesus.
91. The world is changing fast and many of our pastors are not keeping up - IE outreach, shrinking congregations, reaching the younger families, etc.
92. How we deliver the gospel must be revamped, Pastor training must have a much better focus on their communication/interface skills.
93. Yes, but only if the training is going to equip them for the world of today and not just more of the training for a world that does not exist.
94. They need to keep their faith alive and growing and they need to be aware of developments in their area. Continuing education should be a requirement for continuing as a rostered minister.
95. Provide pre-approved suggested courses and reading available for use at home. (On line, digital etc.) plus suitable courses available at sources close to home.
96. What does this mean? Theological? They should be well equipped after 8 years of schooling. I see a need in communication skills: dealing with people, conduct and behaviour...
97. Only as it benefits the congregation.
98. Where is the money coming from? Where would the pastor go for this training?
99. If you are not growing, you are shrinking. Education is always valuable.
100. They are professionals. All professionals should upgrade their skills.
101. Always, always, always, please
102. This should be a mandate of our seminaries.
103. Provided the "continuing education" is directly related and not something leading to a new career.
104. We all need opportunities to learn, grow and be refreshed in our service.
105. I sure hope so. No one is ever to old to learn & there are always new ideas to be used.
106. That goes without saying. Without continuing education there would be no growth. That's part of being a professional.
107. This should be separate and not in a restructuring survey.
108. value in some CE, but there is so much training out there, probably LCC wouldn't have to create its own. link to LCMS, ask for some Canadian content.
109. Pastors need to remain current, including their education.
110. Depending on their age and how close they are to retirement.
111. Just convince the pastors that they need it.
112. There really is no end to the help that can be beneficial to helping pastors in their serving

113. Continual changes of cultures in our land calls for training in helping pastors to meet the needs.
114. Just as it is a bad thing for a seminary prof to have been out of a parish too long that he forgets what it's like, just so it's important for a pastor to not forget what it's like to be a student in a larger, ongoing theological conversation.
115. Also need to continue to provide opportunities for continuing Ed.
116. Current continuing education options in the East District have not focuses (for pretty well 20 years) on things like Evangelism and Missions. A change to this would be refreshing.
117. Any job requires on going training, this should be no difference for pastors.
118. Life long learning is important, even for Pastors!
119. The best teachers are us. The congregations.
120. Synodically sanctioned training.
121. Our pastor needs more of a well-rounded training with add emphasis on "people skills" as well as strong theological training in doctrine and practice.
122. YES!! As a pastor, I am ashamed that we have not held ourselves to professional expansion as other professions do. Continued education should be part and parcel of who we are; we should not be left as lone gunners to work it all out on our own. This could be a major part of the Seminaries to keep afloat and working with their hands in the actual field, hearing from the men in the field regularly! YES, please YES!!
123. depends on what their taught
124. Our Pastors seem better educated than any other church I am aware of. It would increase costs and think we need to focus on educating the members
125. Especially for the inexperienced Pastors.
126. We have so much more to learn. If we stop providing for continuing education, we assume that we know enough. We don't know enough.
127. Our world is in constant change and we need to at least attempt to keep up with this change.
128. These are the last days. It is very difficult for me to conceive of an over-trained pastor.
129. There is value in continuing education in all professions.
130. But I don't think synod needs to provide this necessarily. Again, there is so much going on in the US that we can take advantage of and if grassroots movements rise up within Canada, it will because there was an absolute need.
131. Further education always useful. Synod need not pay for this.
132. Continuing "professional development" is crucial particularly as the demands on pastors in a rapidly changing society are so pressing. Indeed, I believe that there should be a form of "sabbatical" for pastors to allow them to engage in focused reflection, learning, reading and writing, whether self-directed or institutional.
133. Absolutely, we all need to be refreshed and be given the opportunity to grow.
134. On going seminars on an annual basis
135. Sabbaticals are worthy of Assistance. Adding to professional education a personal expense.
136. Yes, for stimulation first but not in the desire to get a bigger paycheck.
137. 2/24/2016 8:00 AM

138. In all modern professions, job training and skills enhancement is a constant requirement for maintaining professional designations. Our pastors should be willing to continue to grow in their skills and knowledge.

139. But the continuing education should not be rehashing doctrine but actual skills training to make them more effective leaders, communicators, counseling people, materials and ideas for working with youth, teaching confirmation etc.
140. There is always value in continuing education - it should be available in a variety of formats and at a reasonable cost. My profession association mandates it for all and this is a good model for our pastors
141. This is vital to the health of our churches and the men who serve them
142. In many (most?) other professions, professionals are expected to participate in continuing education and even document continuing education to an accreditation body. Isn't it irresponsible to think that we shouldn't do this? Isn't it foolish to think that seminary is somehow 'enough'?
143. Extremely frustrated with our congregation, the last budget removed any compensation for our pastor to pursue continuing education. More interested in paying "volunteers" than support our pastor in professional growth.
144. Keep them from getting stale.
145. I think that workers and congregations need to work this out as per local needs.
146. Depends on what kind of education.
147. This should be mandatory. We expect laity to attend Bible Study and other educational endeavours [as they should want to]; should not Pastors also be expected to attend? However, with our Seminaries having professors that are years from any significant parish experience I am doubtful about the quality and relevance of said education. If it is mandatory than it should be provided at no charge to congregation or Pastor.
148. Every member of the church would benefit from ongoing training, and Synod should be looking into on-line training possibilities.
149. Absolutely every body like accountants, lawyers, doctors have mandatory continuing education are our Pastors not as important as these groups? As I mentioned earlier I've talked with a number of Pastors and it is interesting the differing beliefs.
150. The world is changing and traditional methods of reaching out need to be reviewed and updated as necessary.
151. It's not obtained from one source, but is an on going education comes in the form of experience, self-study/internet, relevant books and circuit forums.
152. Yes, Congregations and Synod must have a line item in their budget that provides for funding and provides backup Pastors to teach and Preach while the Pastor is taking this education.
153. Pastors are our strongest resource. Continuing education is critical.
154. education is a life long journey. I fully support this idea.
155. Perhaps not to provide the actual training but to hold the workers accountable to doing ongoing education.
156. knowledge is good if it is for serving their congregations and who is paying for this
157. Especially in communication, that is preaching to better engage today's society. It is not enough to deliver theological lectures and think we have done everything we could have done.
158. knowledge is good if it is for serving their congregations, who is paying for this?
159. There should be time and money for the pastors to do this.
160. Pastors are required to fill many needs in a congregation and seminary cannot teach them everything they need to know.

161. The “times they are a changing" and continuing education is a must.
162. As long as it doesn't contribute to the pervasive attitude that pastors are superior intellectually to their congregations, sure. I have more education than most pastors I know and yet you'd think I'd barely finished kindergarten.
163. More of the continuing education should be practical rather than additional theological training.
164. Should be a must. Most other professionals continue with their education...
165. Continuing education is vital to maintaining professional standards and growth in almost every profession and field. To say it has no value for our Pastors is to say they have everything they will ever need when they leave our seminaries and take on their professional roles. This is patently false.
166. As long as this is not mandated.
167. Refreshment. Encouragement. How to respond to changing times and events in today's world. All valuable.
168. We have a pastor who thinks he's one breath removed from the Pope. He feels he knows everything there is to know and doesn't need any further training.
169. This should and could be done through educational allowances locally and not by LCC globally
170. At least some of it...but I would expect we could fulfill all the continuing education needs for pastors. Providing for could also include financial assistance to attend approved programs.
171. And education not just at the physical seminary locations but alternative education as well.
172. Yes, of course! However, in order for us to have a healthy ministerium, the pastors must be eager for continuing education.
173. If Lutheran Church-Canada wants pastors to serve its people, then yes. There is absolutely value in training pastors for future generations. The whole purpose of CLS and CLSSC was to train Canadian pastors for Canadian people.
174. Pastors absolutely need to be taken care of in this area. There isn't enough of it happening.
175. Again---they are to be reminded of their primary role of "Spiritual Advisor"
176. I don't think our Pastor has ever used this though there is an allowance.
177. I see much value in continuing education, though recognize that some pastors aren't interested in having it.
178. Training and education and the support that comes from this is very important.
179. Is there no evaluation of Pastors? Is there no accountability of Pastors? declining congregation size?
180. All congregations should provide for their Pastors to continue to study God's Word.
181. They have to keep up with congregation changes and issues.
182. The question is how and who pays for it? Again - why aren't our leaders putting out the concerns and coming up with recommendations for us to consider.
183. There is value on many levels. What is this question asking? Is it saying that it is of value money wise as a budget line or in a global understanding that our pastors would benefit from continuing education? Unclear
184. mandatory. care givers for the body are why not care givers for the spirit
185. In order to avoid burnout, pastors need a break for refueling and to be re-energized for their work.
186. We need on going education, it shouldn't stop after seminary.

187. some of our pastors are in great need of help with sermons others are very good what has happened along the way.
188. within financial restraints
189. Much of this further training could be conducted online, meeting what most of the world is doing.
190. Pastors need to be informed however in my experience they are a 'mind unto themselves' needing (wanting?) little if any continuing education. In theory Cont.Ed is good but should be of limited offering and scale and focused on very, very relevant topics (e.g. how to handle "practical" matters that may arise.)
191. and giving them support
192. Education is lifelong in any profession!
193. Keeping up with the times and society.
194. With financial restraints
195. There is value in it but needs to have financial restraints
196. Peer support and fellowship.
197. I think continuing education for all our workers should be as close to mandatory as we can make something in our circles.
198. There are issues/areas that are not taught/cannot be taught at seminary. The continuing education for Pastors is an opportunity for them to receive that extra training which can be incredibly valuable to individual congregational member.
199. Make sure it is valuable education! Christ based. Provide courage & strength so they may continue as the Lord's shepherds
200. The problem is... how does a pastor of a small congregation get time away to engage in the luxury of continuing education. That is a benefit which many pastors do not have. I'm lucky just to get some vacation time with my family.
201. Expectations and personality training as well as biblical training.
202. All professions need continuing education!
203. The training and development should be more structured so that at least a portion of the training relates to priorities of the Synod
204. Life-long learning opportunities should be available to all workers.
205. A professional of any sort is responsible to provide the best service possible to his clientele. This requires that they stay current with all facets of their profession. Pastors are no exception. Require them to be accountable and give them the opportunity and financial support to update their skills.
206. A question that comes up during the calling process for a pastor-elect is often does your congregation support the continuing education of pastors. This is important in any profession/occupation.
207. I believe there needs to be continuing Ed offered to Pastors.
208. Our seminaries need to be offering the ongoing continuing education of our Pastors. Our districts should be monitoring the relevance of courses taken by Pastors.
209. All professional associations, and most employers, require continuing education of those in their profession. The church cannot arrogantly assume that this is not needed among its workers.
210. This is critical. I am highly concerned with what I am seeing in many of our pastors - a lack of vision for ministry and leadership, and a contentment to maintain the status quo - the Lutheran formula for ministry - even when it doesn't meet the needs of the people.

Examples: - a pastor's report in the congregation's annual report which could be summarized in three points: I'm tired, we suck, thank God for His faithfulness. - a church secretary almost ready to quit because the pastor is never around and doesn't respond to member needs - from the pulpit "At best, reading God's word is mind numbing" - pastors spending their time in their offices reading about ministry instead of connecting people to God's word and building relationships in Christ's name. - pastors more concerned with liturgical form and heritage than with people and connecting them to the truth and grace of God through the Word Our pastors need to have strong vision and mission and need to be able to lead their people into lives of worship, forgiveness, grace and service. It takes dedication and equipping to change a culture, and we need that culture change.

211. Every pastor would want to continue learning, but it should be voluntary.
212. Yes, we all continue to learn and grow why should we not encourage our Pastors specifically in this regard.
213. As long as it does not just lead to the DMin'ization of church workers.
214. Again, could be done through modern technology that doesn't involve a lot of travel and days away from the congregation. Could be done at the circuit level.
215. I feel some of our Pastors do not support the LWMLC and I strongly recommend further information to the Pastors and encouragement to support the LWMLC.
216. a no-brainer who provides and where provided is up for discussion - not necessary to be LCC-generated programs We must never stop learning, growing to share
217. OF COURSE...Continuing education in any profession is essential.
218. This should be the responsibility of the pastor
219. Not enough of this is provided on a regular basis
220. I don't think we should underestimate the value of the District Pastors and Church Workers Conferences in this process. Possibly continuing education courses should be offered as add ons or just before such conferences with seminary professors putting together short term courses of a DMin or even ThD level which pastors could stay for (or come ahead of time), so that it comes in a chunk. My own inclination would be to offer courses connected with the subject of a conference immediately after the conference in the same location in order to save on travel expenses and possibly get some bonus deals from wherever the conference is held.
221. Education should never end
222. Only if this is used to benefit the work of the Lord not personal gain.
223. We must never stop learning; for someone who teaches to stop learning is a backwards way of thinking.
224. One never stops reading the Bible or reading the Catechism - why would you stop further education. In business one does not stop learning and training and keeping one sharp to be able to answer why one has hope in the Gospel.
225. Pastors face such a great deal of training in seminary already that they would probably benefit simply from more time to study themselves and look back upon what they've learned, rather than being burdened by meeting more requirements after they've already completed a lengthy professional training.
226. This should be provided by the congregations and should be chosen by the congregation and pastor together.
227. There should be mandatory continual education, documented for staying a Pastor.

228. That is a great idea. Pastors, like anyone else in such a diverse and complicated position need to be provided with continuing education. Each pastors have their strong suits (which they could teach to others) and their weaker points. The cont. ed. could avail them of more skills that would assist them in becoming more effective in their jobs.
229. Provided they do so at their own expense and time.
230. We don't want our pastors to "dry up." We call our pastors to study - on their own, with their brother pastors, as a Synod. This is the backbone of ensuring our faithfulness to God's Word. It is also not really negotiable for it is commanded in Scripture. Whether Synod or District "provides" for this is an open question. But the question regarding its value is clear. Yes. It is valuable.
231. Absolutely. As in any vocation, one has to be prepared to continually develop new skills or hone their current ones
232. This is critical to keeping pastors intellectually engaged and to continue in their development. Support to ensure that this takes place is critical - both financially to fund these development opportunities and for coverage so that they can take a study leave and have appropriate back up in their congregation. This directly impacts the congregation they serve as well as the other boards and committees they serve.
233. Including social skills (e.g., communication, conflict resolution etc...)
234. Pastors should keep up with the changing trends of the world in order to connect better to their congregations and community members.
235. All good organizations provide for continuing education for their leaders
236. This should be mandatory. We expect laity to attend Bible Study and other educational endeavours [as they should]; should not Pastors be expected to attend? However, with our Seminaries having professors that are years from any significant parish experience I am doubtful about the quality and relevance of said education. If it is mandatory than it should be provided at no charge to congregation or Pastor.
237. support our pastors fully.
238. This should include both providing money and providing content, likely through the seminaries or through LCMS agencies.
239. Often and definitely a huge joint learning opportunity at the time of a major convention.
240. The world evolves constantly - as do the people within the world. If there is not continuing education for our Pastors, then we will continue to live in the past, rather than look to the future. The way Pastors deliver the message of Christ to the people must evolve and develop if we hope to sustain and grow our membership in the Lutheran Church. Not much has changed during the past 30 years at the church where I presently attend.
241. Both from the perspective of acquiring new skills and polishing techniques
242. I am thinking that training for viable bible studies for congregations would be beneficial!
243. Especially if we develop junior pastors who facilitate child and youth programs and then continue to becoming a congregational pastor and need additional training.
244. We can import the internationally as they appear to be much more available and enthusiastic. 2. Works great but are they LCC or ELCC or do they speak English
245. Pastors need to keep learning so they can be better teachers. Our learning lasts a lifetime; why should a Pastor be any different.
246. Without it they can grow stale!
247. This should be required. Right now pastors are let loose after graduating and seem to have no further checks on them.

248. This should be mandatory. We expect laity to attend Bible Study and other educational endeavours [as they should] should not Pastors be expected to attend?
249. Yes, so long as the continuing education of the Pastors is aligned with the mission of LCC. Local congregations can not afford to send their pastors to education of solely personal interest with little of no practical application to the local congregation. Advance doctoral level education does not translate into better pastors. In fact, in our congregation's case, I would say the opposite is happening.
250. If there is value in continuing education for doctors, surely there is value for those providing care for our souls.
251. Continuing education is important for those in leadership roles as our pastors are. Continuing education would be beneficial for their well-being as well as for the congregations and the church at large. However, education is expensive and not many pastors can afford to pay to continue theirs. Providing for that would be a great way to support our pastors.
252. if they can find the time
253. YES, up to 25 years of service there should be continuing education. After 25 years, it should be left up to the individual Pastor if he would like to pursue any further education, unless the District or Synod deems it compulsory.
254. Perhaps calls need to be reviewed every five years with the expectation that some type of continuing education will have taken place with at least 20 CEU.
255. As long as it is actually valuable education.
256. learning never stops.
257. The internet is a gift from God and Concordia University has great facilities that should be used.
258. Everyone should be open to education and self evaluation.
259. Me too.
260. Only if the training is in practical areas like counselling, communication or leadership. I had a very thorough doctrinal training at seminary so the textual classes don't meet my needs as a parish pastor.
261. The kind of continuing education is the key: not more academic theology, but more training in people skills, personal and family wellness, personal and corporate prayer leadership, trends in creative outreach...
262. I would argue it should be made mandatory.
263. It seems when a pastor has served in the Holy Ministry for more than 25 yrs. his zest for continuing education diminishes. I believe pastors have a duty for self-education as a part of their call. The congregation should approve the self-education and finance this education on its merits.
264. there is value in continuing education of us all.
265. Only if they are doctrinally approved programs. LCMS is struggling with the pastoral leadership institute and wiki five two.
266. I would like to see a mandated two-week study course each year for each active parish pastor. He could choose where he would go and what studies he would take each year, and would be accountable to the congregation to organize this.
267. I agree if we are talking about practical theology expertise, which too often lacking in our seminary grads.
268. Every professional requires continuing education and I believe that Pastors should be no different.

269. Pastors like those in every other vocation need to strive to improve throughout their careers. We should support them in this.
270. This needs to be supported financially and encouraged. Many other vocations require continuing education.
271. Is there any other profession where one shot of university level training is considered sufficient for life?
272. It is not possible to learn all of the skills Pastors need in discharging their duties. It also is encouraging to pastors to further their professional development.
273. I can hardly believe that this is a question. Any answer other than "Strongly Agree" should be completely disregarded.
274. With the changing nature of ministry our pastors need to be encouraged to take time to upgrade their skills.
275. ~ after decades of life I still learn and have never met a pastor or deacon that I respect who doesn't agree. Most other professions require it at some level.

42. There is value in providing for the continuing education for our Deacons.

1. I am not sure what deacons do. In our church, there is a difference of opinion what could be pointed out to each church.
2. Yes, continuing education is always important - workers are refreshed and renewed.
3. Regardless of our various positions in life future education is critical until 2 years prior to retirement. Update, learn and use new knowledge/experiences to open doors to growth of individual/community.
4. Depending on what you educating them for.
5. What is the criteria for a congregation to have a Deacon or Deaconess?
6. They too, need updating in common practises and an opportunity to advance to ordination.
7. Should be made mandatory.
8. Yes, all church workers need support.
9. Again, this is a given. Of course they should see their own need, and of course all of us should require them to take such personal and professional growth seriously.
10. In original LCC doctrine.
11. I would hope so
12. All professionals need updating and refreshing.
13. Education certainly doesn't hurt. But there are monies, etc. to keep in mind.
14. They too can become stale.
15. As with our Pastors, the Deacons deserve continuing education to sharpen our intellectual armory.
16. There is value in providing for the continuing education for all lay people. I fully support that the seminaries currently have courses and programs that are open to lay people, and hope that this continues.
17. It depends who is doing the educating.
18. Have no experience with deacons in our church.
19. The role of the Deacon has to be better defined. This is a changing role especially for congregations that do not have a pastor.
20. I do not know any Deacons.

21. Once again this is an absolute. We need to continue to grow. Training should never end until we leave this life.
22. An educated clergy and church body should prove to be a stronger church body. Continuing education is important to the professional and personal growth of our church workers. Although it is highly unlikely to mandate, perhaps continuing education should be strongly encouraged. Maybe guidance can be given to those who are unsure of what to study (build up their strengths...shore up their weaknesses).
23. Limited amt $ for continuing education but time allotted for other education.
24. Again no real opinion. In other vocations this is often a shared cost with approval of supervisors; in this case a congregation as it is a budget item.
25. What does value mean? For whom does this value flow?
26. Don't know too much about Deacons.
27. same as above.
28. I am sure there is value in providing continuing education for our Deacons but again costs need to be considered.
29. Most jobs require continuing education of some sort. Deacons are no exception.
30. Again, we want those teaching to be professionals who are competent.
31. again continuing education needs to be done for all Pastors, Deacons, teachers
32. Have none here.
33. Same - you attend you "pay"
34. Continuing education should be on their time and at their expense
35. As previous comment applies.
36. Gaining knowledge is GOOD. Ways of doing things change over time.
37. There is always more to learn.
38. also in synodically sanctioned courses, events, etc.
39. This is part of the ongoing support and care for our Deacons.
40. Again, what does "providing for" mean exactly? Does it mean funding, time off, actually supplying the educational facilities and training? It is difficult to respond to such an unclear statement.
41. They are church leaders/workers as well and as things need to be updated/revised they should have continuing education in their roles to be current as well. With this question as well as the one above (41), I realize that this kind of education costs money but I feel it is money well spent to keep our church workers relevant and current with changing situations.
42. In our congregation the pattern has been a short term of service and then--where are they?
43. I am firm believer in education, that it is always enriching and a life long process.
44. As is needed in lines of work
45. No question about the value of providing continuing education for our Deacons but you need to consider the cost.
46. Life long learning helps keep a servant refreshed and aware of what congregants’ needs are and how to meet them.
47. No view
48. Only as it benefits the congregation.
49. Again Where is the money coming from? Where would the pastor go for this training?
50. This should be a mandate of our seminaries.
51. Don't know what deacons job are. Do we even need them?
52. Who asks silly questions like is there a need for continuing education

53. Not quite sure what these questions have to do with restructuring. Providing opportunities for continuing education of both pastors and deacons should be one of the major tasks of the Synod and districts.
54. Children in our schools need the perspective that a Christian educator can provide.
55. The training should take place prior to being placed. Internship should take place in the third year similar to pastors so that they are able to have additional classes addressing deficiencies discovered during internship.
56. I'm sure they would be easier to convince.
57. There really is no end to the help that can be beneficial to them in their serving
58. Church work conferences include deacons -- programs/presentations should be for both.
59. The pastor should decide this on an individual basis.
60. Same as above - congregations the sheep - we need shepherds
61. Synodically sanctioned training.
62. depends on what their taught
63. What kind of education?
64. I have trouble imagining an over-trained deacon.
65. There are so few in East District.
66. Synod doesn't need to be responsible for this though.
67. Again professional development can only enhance their work with parishes and contribute to the vibrancy of their outreach and calling.
68. Absolutely, we all need to be refreshed and given the opportunity to grow.
69. Also as needed. (cost prohibitive)
70. Don't go hog wild.
71. If we wish to actually have a training method for such deacons, perhaps?
72. There is always value in continuing education - it should be available in a variety of formats and at a reasonable cost. My profession association mandates it for all and this is a good model for our deacons
73. there is value in having had them properly trained to begin with
74. There is value in providing ANY education for Deacons.
75. Should be worked out locally.
76. I wasn't aware that there is training options/ continuing education for deacons.
77. This should be mandatory. We expect laity to attend Bible Study and other educational endeavours [as they should want to]; should not Deacons be expected to attend? However, without any college or university how can this happen? If it is mandatory than it should be provided at no charge to congregation or Deacon.
78. Every member of the church would benefit from ongoing training, and Synod should be looking into on-line training possibilities.
79. In all of these cases however, the LCC may not be the appropriate body to do this directly
80. It is a fact in today's society that there are ever evolving ways of engaging with today's society and the needs of an society in any given place, so continuing education is a must that is not to be left in the hands of the individual and at the mercy of his or her finances.
81. There should be time and money for the deacons to do this.
82. Again, the training for Deacons is not all inclusive and there may be a need for education in an area where they are serving.
83. If we train pastors we must also train deacons. Why the distinction? Train church workers in general.

84. As long as this is not mandated.
85. And education not just at the physical seminary locations but alternative education as well.
86. Yes, of course! However, in order for us to have a healthy ministerium, the deacons must be eager for continuing education.
87. I see much value in continuing education, though recognize that some deacons aren't interested in having it.
88. Get rid of deacons.
89. They are valued members in leadership.
90. I think we need a proper program first and a decision as to the actual need of Deacons in our churches. What churches can even afford a deacon let alone a pastor.
91. again, how would this not help us in the long run.
92. within financial restraints
93. With financial restraints
94. Again with financial restraints
95. I think continuing education for all our workers should be as close to mandatory as we can make something in our circles.
96. All professional Church Workers should have access to continuing education.
97. Providing the opportunity is one thing, paying for it is another and should be discussed before hiring deacon. Every other professional appears to require about 30 hours of continuing education each year
98. Life-long learning opportunities should be available to all workers.
99. As above, give them the opportunity and the tools to be the best they can be.
100. For the same reason that it is important for pastors.
101. I am not fully understanding a Deacons function. Most congregations can’t afford another salary this position could be filled with lay volunteer. Training needs to be more available for lay in this
102. our seminaries should do this and more.
103. Yes... same need as above.
104. Make materials available
105. a no-brainer who provides and where provided is up for discussion - not necessary to be LCC-generated programs. We must never stop learning, growing to share
106. This should be the responsibility of the deacon
107. What I said for the pastors, goes also for the deacons.
108. We must never stop learning; for someone who teaches to stop learning is a backwards way of thinking.
109. There should be mandatory continual education, documented for staying a Deacon.
110. Most definitely! Everyone can benefit from further education.
111. At their own expense.
112. If these are the people that oversee the pastors, then they should always be learning new ways to help grow the church and then pass this on to the pastors and church leaders!
113. See previous comments
114. This should be mandatory. We expect laity to attend Bible Study and other educational endeavours [as they should]; should not Deacons be expected to attend? However, without any college or university how can this happen. If it is mandatory than it should be provided at no charge to congregation or Deacon.
115. Same as for pastors

116. LCC Deacons e.g. teachers - no. Teachers already get that from their Teacher's Unions.
117. If they want to continue in the ministry
118. I imagine those who are actually working would be in a better position to answer this.
119. This should be mandatory. We expect laity to attend Bible Study and other educational endeavours [as they should] should not Deacons be expected to attend?
120. We have no Deacon(s).
121. Agreed, however, the priority is first pastors. If funds are available, then deacons surely should be provided with continuing education.
122. above comment also applies here
123. YES, up to 25 years of service there should be continuing education. After 25 years, it should be left up to the individual Deacon if he would like to pursue any further education, unless the District or Synod deems it compulsory.
124. As long as it is actually valuable education.
125. learning never stops.
126. Perhaps some training can be done by Pastors locally with their Deacons.
127. I would argue it should be made mandatory.
128. Minimum mandatory, meaningful, and current standards for upgrading and remaining current should be established just as many other professional designations have done.
129. Only if they are doctrinally approved programs. LCMS is struggling with the pastoral leadership institute and wiki five two.
130. This needs to be supported financially and encouraged. Many other vocations require continuing education.
131. If we don't provide continuing education for our Deacons, they will seek and find it elsewhere. What they find will likely come out of church bodies or theologies that we don't align ourselves with - for good reason.

43. The relationship between LCC and Concordia University of Edmonton requires clarification.

1. It is all done! They are out!
2. From what I read in CUE's President's address to LCC members, there is no longer a relationship between us.
3. Needs to better shared that LCC and Concordia University of Edmonton - no longer in Doctrinal Unity
4. I thought it had been.
5. Right now, and relationship is in question due to hard decisions.
6. They have already broken away from LCC
7. I have no idea.
8. Is this now too late?
9. Isn't it too late!
10. Why is clarification needed?
11. If necessary
12. Especially in the wake of recent developments at Concordia.
13. There is no relationship. CUE has cut all ties.
14. Immediately, before it's too late. Not only pursue clarification, but (if possible) take ownership of CUE, look into ways to provide CUE with the support they need (financial,

encourage future students to attend, etc.) to regain their identity as part of LC-C, etc. Granted, this won't be easy. CUE's budget is huge, but a large portion can be covered by increasing the student population to more than 4,000 full-time students (including international students).

15. Dr. Krispin bravely has id the problems and the solutions he has been left with. Thanks for his forgiveness model. Let LCC allow him to stay ordained and on roster, best model we could ask for as hero of rep. only one role as he does. unlike the many who hold much power and conflict in our other areas of LCC.
16. What happened here is an outrage and a disgrace.
17. No kidding. -- get that done yesterday. Please end the madness of us losing this treasure.
18. The #$%#@#$# stole our school!!!
19. very clear that Concordia has not rec'd funds but LCC wants power and control. Can't have both. Dr. Krispin is an amazing man of God, honest, brave and recognizing you can only serve 1 role. ABC and others need to learn about conflict of interest declaration and action from him as well as forgiveness model that is sincere.
20. And steps taken to rebuild a relationship.
21. I would need to know what the relationship is right now
22. Clarification? It's far too late for that. This was a completely avoidable tragedy. If synodical (and district) leaders been paying attention, and thinking strategically, we NEVER would have allowed CUE to walk away the way it did.
23. Now that they no longer identify as Christian publicly, is there still a relationship? Maybe there shouldn't be.
24. Was this question formulated before the university's latest position statement?
25. This whole disconnect is concerning...
26. Not familiar enough with Concordia.
27. Was the secularization of the University completely legal, especially considering that the president is no longer a pastor now? Is there something in the university board's constitution that requires the agreement of all interested parties, directly and indirectly, before a decision of this magnitude can be made? Is there any way to make it a Lutheran school again?
28. Sure? Why not?
29. If it is no longer a Christian institution, we should not be supporting it.
30. Christian education has never been more important than now. We are losing ground. Education in Christian schools should be a priority.
31. There is no relationship now is there?
32. People need to know the reasons why Concordia and LCC are no longer working together and the fact that the two are now separate.
33. I have no knowledge of how this functions.
34. We all need to be informed.
35. This situation keeps on getting worse all the time.
36. Especially now with the recent developments and changes.
37. I thought Concordia had cut all ties with LCC - therefore we just need to take away the name "Concordia" they have no right to use it if they are not tied to LCC
38. Why?
39. Read article in Canadian Lutheran Volume 31 number 1 "Healing Broken Families"
40. Our church has been betrayed by the heads of this university, who abandoned our faith for hopes of material gain. I don't feel we can sit idly by in regards to this issue.

41. What a fiasco. Previous generations worked hard to establish Lutheran schools and universities. We should support these institutions and send our children to them, not throw them away!!
42. Given the association of "Concordia" with the LC-MS system of schools, the thought crossed my mind, is "Concordia" still a fitting name?
43. It would seem that Concordia University of Edmonton has severed its relationship with LCC, by ceasing to identify as a Christian educational institution. If this is true, then this should be made explicit. An aside note: how does an institution that founded and funded by synod, unilaterally decide secede from synod? I'm surprised this is legally possible. If Concordia University is to an independent institution, should not synod have received some money for it? It is true that financial support for Concordia University was low in recent years, however it did enjoy support for synod for a very long time and that support was probably more substantial in years gone by.
44. I know very little about these and their teachings.
45. At this time the fact that the University has separated itself from the Lutheran church is very troubling. The reason it was built seems to have been totally lost and now is just another government run University. The school has lost totally its heritage and may be lst fr god. Many people do not understand the difference between the Seminary and the University so much needs to be done there as well. My father went to school there and I am very sad that we have lost this heritage we tried to create. I think there has been too much lost here.
46. I honestly had no idea it wasn't clarified right now, but if either party feels it needs clarification then by all means, clarify. I haven't heard of any situation in which increased communication actually damaged a relationship between two entities.
47. we don't know what that relationship is - so it at LEAST requires clarification
48. seems clear that the university is a secular org that has no special relationship with LCC
49. seems to have been clarified recently, i.e. Concordia University is a secular university with no special relationship with LCC
50. We have not been kept informed regarding: -how it was given away -how it is no longer a Lutheran or Christian institution.
51. The recent letter from Concordia's President explains things clearly. Certainly, it should have been handled differently by Concordia. However, if LCC has provided so little nourishment and support over the last so many years, then that lack of support is what has brought about the death of the relationship ... and if fault is to be assigned, it is LCC that must wear it. (But let's NOT assign fault. Let's recognise the changed dynamics and the reasons that led to it, and wish each other well.)
52. IS there still a relationship?
53. Definitely! It appears the relationship no longer exists. Concordia University of Edmonton has removed all references to the Christian faith and to Lutheranism from its' mission and vision statements. They no longer appear to be distinct from the secular world. They are no longer a beacon on top of the hill; they've snuffed out their light. I doubt any current educational service provided to LCC or LCC students will last much longer. Diaconal training should be carried out at the seminaries.
54. Very little contact between ABC, Concordia and congregations to know the workings of Concordia University.
55. I don't believe it should be continued for pastors.
56. What happened here? A real disconnect between CUE and LCC?

57. Pity.
58. Do not know enough about it.
59. It seems much too late for this, given that CUE has "made the decision on November 27, 2015. . .. to remove all references to Lutheranism and the Christian faith from its mission and vision statements." (The Canadian Lutheran)
60. I am not sure there can be a valid relationship any longer given developments.
61. The fact that question the question is on the survey is proof that clarification is required.
62. Over the years, I have learned that there are always two sides to a story. Having read LCC publications as well as Dr. Krispin's open letter, I have empathy for both sides. However, I am disappointed that both sides have taken such a public approach before making opportunity for private dialogue. Our Lord has given us due process by stating that if our brother sins against us, we are to go to our brother first in private before taking more public action.
63. I think Dr. Schwermann is probably turning over in his grave over this.
64. I am not sure anything can be done to fix this - look at a totally different approach.
65. Relationship is already non-existent!
66. Very important in light of recent changes.
67. I am sorry I am not aware of a need for clarification.
68. It needs to be terminated.
69. The university has already decided.
70. For sure, especially now that Concordia University is no longer a Christian educational institution.
71. Hasn't it already been clarified unilaterally by CUE?
72. No communication on subject (only Canadian Lutheran)
73. too late!
74. When the University pronounced itself non-Lutheran and non-Christian, it declared a separation from L.C.C.
75. I think enough has been written to clarify this.
76. To the degree of having a single seminary.
77. Haven't enough information to form an opinion.
78. Yes, what the heck is going on out there??
79. This has already happened! So silly question
80. What's to clarify? Concordia made it amply clear that they outgrew the mandate of the church. Where Concordia is now is not where Dr. Albert Schwermann envisioned it. He worked hard and his family sacrificed much when Summer after Summer he spent weeks on the road preaching and encouraging our youth to consider attending Concordia. He spent hours and hours of evening time (after his Professorial and administrative duties) to care for the young men and women on campus, shining God's love that future generations would be told about The Lord.
81. The relationship has been made quite clear. But for the sake of good communication it could be clarified and pronounced officially dead.
82. It is not viable to continue.
83. I believe Krispin clarified it for us. However, the positions of the Lutheran pastors who were called to be Lutheran professors should be clarified.
84. but maybe it is too late for this

85. Considering you are asking the question and I don't know the answer yes this is needed. A perfect example of something that could be shared in the monthly magazine.
86. As it is no longer a "Christian" institution, then some understanding needs to be reached.
87. And ST. Catherines why pick on Concordia Univ only?
88. Yes, indeed as it looks as though Concordia University Edmonton is changing its relationship with synod.
89. I do not understand the relationship between the two in its entirety, but realize a relationship must be in effect for the University to be on the same mandate and mission as LCC and perhaps vice versa.
90. I guess the real question is - is there still a relationship?
91. What happened to Concordia Lutheran College?
92. need more info
93. They are gone, case closed. But the situation does make a good case study. The only thing that requires clarification is the rostered church workers at CUE.
94. With the current move to remove the faith based identity of CUCA, clarification is definitely in order.
95. Unfortunately, in my experience issues such as --Concordia University and the church extension fund were quite 'hush-hush' until it hit the news casts and strangers would ask us about it. Should our church operate in that manner???
96. Only agree in that I am unclear as to what the present relationship is.
97. This breakup can be traced back to personal conflicts that started 20 + years ago
98. Don't know why there would e a need for this.
99. The RELATIONSHIP can't be clarified, but a clear idea of what it is (if it is) would be very good.
100. I suspect that the majority of LCC members don't even know there is/was a relationship.
101. No relationship at present.
102. I believe recent events have made it all clear
103. Agree, in order to identify and characterize the evolving relationships currently under way.
104. CUE has distanced itself from the Lutheran Church and even Christianity.
105. It needs to be communicated. There is no longer any relationship, correct? Mourn and move on?
106. what an understatement
107. We need to figure out what we really want. May need to offer extra course for Lay persons, deacons etc. At the seminary to augment their degree.
108. Fore sure, many are wondering about this. Was this a matter of positioning for funding?
109. As I understand it, it is no longer apart of the Lutheran church - they should rename it.
110. The political landscape requires Concordia to be as it now is, otherwise we have another Augustana.
111. What relationship?
112. There should be official communication regarding the clarification of the relationship. There is, however, no ability to modify Concordia’s position as LCC maintains no authority over the institution due to the board of director’s past decisions.
113. I am not sure there even is a relationship anymore between the two bodies. It appears that LCC does not have any jurisdiction over them anymore.
114. See no. 40 above. I find it disconcerting that CUE is not even mentioned in the materials that accompanied this survey as one of the various "arms" of LCC.

115. Pretty clear - Concordia University is no longer part of LCC. Period.
116. Why was it discontinued as a Christian University, why don't we receive an explanation?
117. Is this a moot point at this date?
118. I understand that there is now no relationship in terms of Concordia being and Christian university. I am sad if this is the case because I saw what happened to Augustana in the other synod when this happened.
119. I would say, based on the recent articles, that if LCC does not contribute significantly to the financial health of Concordia, they should not be surprised that they have little to no influence on their affairs. To think otherwise is naive and to protest otherwise is quite untenable.
120. Although I believe it has now been made clear that there no longer is a relationship.
121. It would seem that Concordia has become fully secularized.
122. LCC_2002-HANDBOOK is baffling and out dated. Also hard to find.
123. I believe Concordia University of Edmonton has made it quite clear where they stand. LCC should no longer have a relationship with them.
124. LCC and Concordia University are now separate entities, hence there is only a historical connection, not a future one.
125. Especially now that Concordia has disassociated themselves, without any conversation with LCC.
126. Why? They have spoken.
127. THERE IS NO RELATIONSHIP; LET'S BE SERIOUS
128. I don't know what the relationship is
129. Since Concordia has given up its Christian status (and hence Lutheran) it is hard to understand why there would continue to be any relationship.
130. Seems like the relationship has been clarified in recent documents. Each are separate with no connection, except history.
131. I understand a major change has occurred here - more information is required
132. Not only Edmonton, but CLTS in St. Catharines.
133. Concordia Edmonton has already left.
134. I'd like to know what the plans are for any kind of synodical relationship to Concordia. What about training of church workers? It is my understanding that the church owns the property - does that not give it some kind of negotiating ability?
135. there is no longer a relationship, that needs clarification
136. CUE is now secular and seems to have made that clarification itself. We should openly grieve its loss.
137. The events surrounding CUE in the last two months have clarified the situation. It is a fait accompli.
138. I think Concordia University of Edmonton (with their recent move to secularize) has made the relationship VERY clear.
139. The present situation is sad and disturbing. If nothing else, we need to make efforts to better understand each other and release the university in peace.
140. There should no longer be any relation since the University is no longer a faith oriented school.
141. what is the relationship
142. What does this have to do with restructure. Why did they (Concordia) vote LCC out - Funding?

143. A mute question in light of recent events. Nothing more to clarify. The relationship has been severed.
144. The services which are to be the priority could be explained further.
145. Especially now that it no longer identifies as a Christian institution.
146. Not any more. CUE has made it clear they want nothing to do with LCC and do not desire to be a Lutheran institution.
147. -there is no relationship btw the 2. -not sure why in survey.
148. yes, absolutely clarification is needed, 'immediately', like this week. is somebody meeting with the college asap? don't wait, another ball could be dropped (?), does LCC or ABC know? this change by the college and lack of input by LCC/ABC into their decision is a travesty. the college expressed confusion over the ABC leadership. ABC leadership and LCC need business people handling this, not Pastors.
149. There are many LCC active members who have no idea what has occurred at the University as again no communication has been sent to the congregations. The Open letter to LCC members from the Seminary President should have been sent to all LCC congregations for openness in what has occurred.
150. I believe that has become clear recently.
151. I understand it is no longer a University!!
152. I see this as a cost effectiveness measure.
153. It's new and will take awhile to sort out.
154. From what I have read, it is gone the way of other Christian Universities to ensure they still receive government funding.
155. They are not longer even Christian, let alone LCC Lutheran. The entire church should know the story of how Synod signed everything over to them without consulting the convention first.
156. BUT what is left to explain -- read the information that has come out!!
157. Concordia University has removed all training for Christian vocations from its program. We have to learn without the University.
158. A statement from synod would be good, although at the moment the situation seems pretty clear.
159. Need to remove them as they have officially cut the relationship by removing any Christian or Lutheran references from their Mission and Value statements.
160. It's a done deal guys. In spite of requests and opportunities Synod dropped the ball here.
161. Is there any further relationship, or has the horse already left the barn?
162. the latest news indicates that this relationship is now in a state of flux
163. There is now no relationship between the two entities, except that some of our rostered workers continue to be employed by CUE. This is a shame for CUE and a tragedy for LCC.
164. Do you think? I believe its dead, Jim! Concordia-Edmonton has been a sore spot for me after a student in a congregation I served went there and became Pentecostal due to helping out with the student led worship services at Concordia-Edmonton. They haven't been Lutheran for quite a while in my limited experience!
165. From recent statements apparently there is none
166. No idea what it is now so.....clarification between what parties?
167. I'm not sure what more needs to be clarified. CUE has made its position known. There is nothing the synod can do to influence or stop CUE from no longer remaining a Christian institution.

168. Since it appears that CUE has unilaterally terminated the relationship, no further clarification is warranted unless LCC wishes to petition CUE to reopen discussions toward forming a new relationship.
169. It is disappointing to read that there has been a severing of relationship because the LCC has strict definitions of where the President can participate, or not.
170. Beyond a historical association I am not sure there is a relationship between LCC and CUE.
171. In light of recent developments (LCC Info Digest, February 1, 2016), 'Concordia University of Edmonton no longer a Christian institution') this would seem to be an idea with at least some merit.
172. That Concordia chose to delete "Christian" from its description is just plain wrong!! It was formed to train pastors, and has led many young people to Christ. Our daughter-in-law was one of them. I'm greatly disturbed that anyone would consider such a move!
173. Particularly in light of changes made by CUE Board of Directors.
174. At present it appears that there is NO relationship since Concordia has chosen another path. The roots and historical connection is ignored.
175. That ship has sailed sadly. It's been happening for the last 30 years... we've watched the relationship change and we've let that happen. No sense re-visiting this. My gut reaction.
176. I believe all ties should be cut, taking into consideration the latest happening with this university.
177. Concordia has always been though of as a Lutheran institution or at the very least a Christian institution. I don't think that many lay people realize that is no longer the case.
178. Not sure we can keep this up.
179. Why? It is gone. We gave it away when we agreed it is not a Christian school.
180. In order it becomes clear to members of LCC.
181. It is likely too late for clarification as there is too much water under the bridge. This is a prime example of the congregations thinking all things are status quo when the connection between Concordia University and LCC has been very disconnected for a very long time.
182. They are divorced. Let’s move on.
183. This question is irrelevant in light of Concordia's Board of Governor's decision.
184. I think it has been largely clarified in recent weeks but a formal dissolution of the bond between LCC and CUE seems in order.
185. I was very disappointed to hear of the recent changes. I know from personal experience with Advanced Education, these changes have much to do with equality, integrity, universality.... I am confident there is a way we work together but it will take perseverance and a willingness to be innovative, cooperative and inclusive.
186. Concordia University in Edmonton has officially no relation with Christian values. This matter has been resolved by CUCA already, so there is not much to be clarified.
187. Too late. We needed this clarification prior to separation
188. it became pretty clear after the latest communication upon the resignation of CUE president
189. The University seems to have done that for us. This is a very sad predicament.
190. In many ways we have failed CUE as a synod. We simply have not had the funds to support them as we should have done. With the recent decision of the CUE Board of Governors to not have CUE identified as a Christian institution our relationship needs clarification. What was said as the last Synodical convention about an ecclesiastical bond seems to have just been lip service.
191. That has happened since this survey was written.

192. ooops. Too late.
193. It appears that Concordia University of Edmonton has made the relationship painfully clear. There is no longer a relationship apart from a shared history.
194. In view of recent developments at Concordia University of Edmonton, this is in dire need o being addressed immediately and the entire body of Lutheran Church Canada notified.
195. This horse is out of the barn!
196. There is now no relationship.
197. It required clarification 12 years ago when the door opened for the very betrayal that took place this month.
198. Pretty clear, however that CUE is cutting all ties from LCC
199. How much clearer can it be? Cut it loose. They have made ecclesiastical bond impossible.
200. That clarification process is already underway
201. I do not know enough about the current relationship to comment.
202. A clear statement...transparency.
203. Locally we know nothing of this.
204. I think that Concordia has completely left our church body behind. With the direction it has been heading over the past number of years it is unfortunate that LCC did not sell it off as an asset a number of years ago. It would have funded a number of potential ministries and missions in Canada and elsewhere.
205. I believe this has already been established so the question is already irrelevant.
206. I know nothing about this relationship.
207. Would like to know more about this!
208. It should have.
209. I believe it is very clear. It is not, nor has been, a Christian [let alone Lutheran] institute in a very long time. What requires clarification is the status of the Pastors that are affiliated with this non Christian organization. LCC leadership, you are up to bat.
210. What relationship? From what I can tell from the recent announcements Synod has given CUE token attention, little funding, and hasn't maintained ties with the University for years.
211. As far as I know we are no longer involved with the Concordia University of Edmonton and it is no longer having anything to do with Lutheran teachings.
212. From what I read there is little or no relationship between the two bodies
213. Especially in light of the change of designation to Doctor of Philosophy and move to secularism.
214. I'm not aware of the relationship they have now
215. It is unfortunate, but unexpected. But we do need reassurances that Seminary is safe.
216. Don't know extent but agree relationship is important.
217. -in light of recent developments, a clear explanation of what happened that CUE no longer is a Lutheran or even Christian institution would be beneficial for the church at large
218. Not clear as to what this means
219. That this question is being asked tells me that clarification is needed.
220. in recent days I believe any such relationship has been clarified. Concordia very clearly does not want any official relationship with LCC; unless the relationship is accompanied with significant Dollar signs$$$$
221. Concordia University of Edmonton has always been associated with the LCMS and the LCC. But, with name changes and the controversial November 2015 removal of references

to Christianity from its mission statement, maybe clarification of the relationship between LCC and Concordia University of Edmonton would be a good idea.

222. Especially since CUE has completely removed all 'Christian references' from their vision and mission statements. The laity and alumnus had no inkling of what was coming and were devastated by CUE's decisions. I could not recommend CUE to any prospective church worker but there has to be an alternative for these young people.
223. perhaps it needs to be like a mission, most people don't even know of any change
224. I don't know if there is much more that can be said. We have lost Concordia and maybe ownership is the only issue that needs to be clarified.
225. perhaps it needs to be like a mission, most people don't know that there has been any kind of change
226. More information needs to be made available to the membership, especially in the ABC district.
227. Seeing as I am responding following the President of Concordia's letter, yes.
228. If Concordia University is no longer considered a Christian university, then yes.
229. This is another fiasco of our Lutheran Church and sends a very bad message to anyone from the outside looking at our church body.
230. Seems pretty clear Concordia has gone its own way. This ship has sailed. Let it go.
231. This appears to be clarifying itself as Concordia de-Christens.
232. If LCC gave land to CUCA, can we get it back due to the change in politics at CUCA or now CU of Edmonton?
233. Concordia University must be Christian based.
234. why?
235. The president of CUE has made it clear he is saying farewell to the church as a pastor...but God's mission continues there...LCC at some level should fund a full time chaplain, or even raise funds to endow a chair of Reformation Studies to help continue the mission and support the faithful Christians in that place.
236. If there is a problem between LCC and Concordia clarify it so that there is harmony between the two.
237. But Concordia seems to have clarified the relationship for itself.
238. .... especially now that CUE is no longer a Christian University.
239. For sure. If LCC will not determine whether it has need or use of the level of education CUCA provides then it must be able to cut CUCA entirely free.
240. I think this issue has been made clear.
241. Recent events seem to have done that for LCC as CUE no longer considers itself a Christian institution.
242. What is their relationship?
243. There is no relationship any more. The LCC should cut its losses with CUE and let them be a secular university as they desire.
244. This is especially true in light of the University's recent actions.
245. Sadly, and shamefully, it's too late for this.
246. I think it has been clarified.
247. I think the letters sent out by the president of CUE and the presidents resignation from the pastoral roll shows us all we need to know about the relationship - there no longer is one.
248. I think that has been clarified. What it has needed for many years was an open and honest discussion of the problems.

249. Sadly, and shamefully, it's too late for that.
250. Please keep Concordia as a Christian university
251. It seems as though CUE has removed themselves from our fellowship. This is very sad. We as a church body should ensure that our members know of these changes and are clear on our new relationship (or lack thereof) with this school.
252. Since CUE is a secular institution, we have no relationship, other than a sad historical one.
253. as it stands now, in light of all reference to Christ and Christianity removed, we have no relationship with what was the synod's school
254. I think it has become quite clear that there is no relationship between LCC and CUE.
255. This institution needs to be brought back into the governance of LCC through an appointed school board of directors and a called president accountable to the president of LCC and the LCC board of directors.
256. I guess this is a mute point now.
257. Concordia University of Edmonton is sadly o longer a Lutheran University, and at times it is questionable as to whether it is a Christian institution
258. Dos not matter IT GONE
259. But it's not hard. The synod divested itself of Concordia at a synodical convention (I don't know which year.) While dismaying, Concordia can do whatever it wishes as the synod severed ties years ago. What will be necessary is a relationship between the synod and its seminary (note the singular), as the seminary provides theological education in preparing pastors, but also for others who want/need such education, from Sunday School teachers to choir directors to building committees to Elders ...
260. my knowledge of this is limited
261. Congregations have not received very much if any information on how this situation developed and what is next contemplated. Communication is key!
262. Concordia University of Edmonton is becoming increasingly secular. We really need to examine their practices to ensure they are compatible with LCC doctrine.
263. Yes. Is it still a Christian University or not?
264. They should know what is going on.
265. Recent events would indicate this is necessary.
266. In light of present disturbing news...all funding to Concordia University should be severed until "they (the BOD's)" come to their Christian senses!!
267. That's been decided by CUE for us.
268. Wow! Considering that there is no relationship between LCC and CUE this is a ridiculous question.
269. do not know what it is now
270. Especially now, after CUCA has served notice that it is no longer a Christian Center of learning.
271. Well with the recent decision I think Concordia has made it clear where it stands.
272. It's pretty clear what the relationship is or rather, isn't!!
273. Looks like that has happened already with recent CUCA announcement. Not sure why this is part of this discussion - doesn't impact restructuring
274. I think this is a moot point now.
275. I think at this time that has been clarified.
276. To what end is the purpose of this
277. don’t know what the relationship is

278. Need to tell the university that it is the possession of LCC.
279. Don't know. Is it clear?
280. To what end to this purpose?
281. To what end?
282. Have not heard or read anything on this topic.
283. As of Nov. 2015, apparently not. There is no relationship left to clarify or protect.
284. Is there a relationship as ties are now closer to University of Alberta than to LCC? Monetarial support to Concordia from LCC is minimal. Can they still help in training of our professional workers?
285. Why this question? Concordia University has declared they are no long a "Christian institution"--no faith ties!! And our LCC president tells us he didn't know this was happening! Shame on you. This situation is a disgrace to everyone that has been supporting Concordia, because it was Lutheran, Christian, for many, many years! What will go down the tubes next?
286. My impression is Concordia Edmonton has simply become another secular educational institution.
287. I don't know enough to say anything.
288. I agree with this statement. Having said this their actions of late have indicated that they are no longer a Christian institution and want no part to do with LCC. This makes clear the point that we have all known for quite a while.
289. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
290. It seems clear that Concordia University is no longer a part of LCC - I suppose if I am wrong on this than clarification is indeed required!
291. Since it became independent it no longer has any say as to the operation of the University, therefore does not require any clarification.
292. This is one instance that LCC members had no information that this was in the talks and about to happen. That is so sad that hey broke away from being a Christian College.
293. While you are restructuring there is no harm in looking at this as well.
294. As I see this it is not really a Lutheran University. Nobody I talk to including clergy is very clear on this.
295. see the comment on #40 above
296. Concordia says it is no longer a Christian institution but believes the relationship with LCC can continue. I believe it cannot so definitely clarification is needed.
297. There is no way I would consider endorsing a college who considers its self a NON CHRISTIAN institution.
298. I am afraid Concordia is lost as a Spiritual, doctrinal educational facility. I don't understand why, seems to me the Evil one is at work here.
299. what is going on with Concordia Edmonton? I hear rumours but not more...
300. It is already declared. It is already clear enough. It only needs to be openly and fully acknowledged. All members of
301. Even though Concordia University is now secular, there are still theologians on staff. These are not all heretics. Some courses should still be transferable for credit towards pastoral studies.
302. The situation seems to have clarified itself, but an official resolution is needed.
303. Yes... is there a relationship any more? This is a tragedy.

304. Isn't this moot at this point? This should have been an important issue months ago. How is it that now, after the horse is out of the barn, we are looking into this?
305. At present it looks like it requires elimination. More use could be made of the seminaries, training the deacons / teachers there. Thus people might become more aware of the existence of deacons and what they are.
306. As CUE has decided to declare itself a secular university without a Christian confession, it should be removed from any relationship with LCC.
307. Although given the current situation I don't think there's much we can do.
308. Given the recent changes at CUE, as lamentable as they are, should we not redirect our financial support to the Seminaries & PAT program instead. CUE has removed itself from any meaningful identification with our Church. I am not sure that we will be able to change this. We need to be realistic about what has happened and not let nostalgia get in the way.
309. This was always meant to be a Christian school and college. We have sold our birthright to the Alberta government for porridge. Shame on our leaders. This is truly a great betrayal of a trust that makes the serious Christian within the Lutheran circle want to donate to other organizations who are more faithful in stewarding their Christian resources. What a great loss we have experienced in losing Concordia college to secularism for money.
310. It seems a mute point now with the latest news on Concordia University.
311. Dump them and remove the president of the University from the roster of synod for gross dereliction in his duties. What their board of governors did should never have happened. (As you can tell, I am still seething mad.)
312. if it is a question then it must be on here for a reason. I have no idea about them at all.
313. Get rid of it.
314. Recent announcement seems to clarify to some extent
315. Doesn't seem to matter now!!
316. It has been an institution for decades, what is the problem?
317. A university should not have a monopoly within a denomination. Preference and partnerships should be to Concordia but there are other great schools out there that LCC can build relationships with.
318. the sad part is that there is none.
319. Not sure as I am not aware if there is a problem here.
320. MAJOR CONCERN
321. From my understanding the University has made its position clear, the church only has to decide what it's going to do now.
322. Let’s face it; we lost everything here & there is no relationship. Sorry to say but another problem created basically by the ABC district.
323. Upon receipt of recent info from the synod's president, this relationship appears to be at an end.
324. Are board members of CU of A just a rubber stamp?
325. Why are you asking me this? There are more important topics to be covered...
326. I'd say "strongly agree," but then, they have already told us and lied to us for years. Without our opinion they stopped being Christian (let alone Lutheran). That said, the status of rostered clergy serving at a non-Christian institution needs clarification. Also maybe LCC should seek to pay for a missionary-chaplains to CUE. In fact, maybe LCC should look at providing missionary-chaplains to as many universities in Canada as possible.

327. I am not sure what the relationship is right now, therefore I cannot make an educated comment.
328. Sooner rather than later.
329. Concordia was wronged by our district, and the conduct of our former executives, and boards of directors is a complete embarrassment to everybody.
330. You betcha! In lite of the recent statement - which was rather traumatic to those of us who were part of the Concordia college system.
331. I believe it is very clear. It is not, nor has been, a Christian [let alone Lutheran] in a very long time. What requires clarification is the status of the Pastors that are affiliated with this non Christian organization. LCC leadership, you are up to bat.
332. Yes, and communication between CUE and LC-C needs to improve. Due to the recent moves by CUE, a severing of the relationship is the only likely outcome. Which is sad.
333. They have decided and shame on them.
334. The relationship (or lack thereof) has already been defined
335. What are you talking about?? Clarification with regard to what?
336. It is already clarified - There is NO relationship between the LCC and Concordia Edmonton.
337. Sadly, it has become abundantly clear that the relationship between LCC and CUE is one that the CUE sees less importance in adhering to Lutheran traditions and has become a secular institution set upon self preservation.
338. Latest announcements from Edmonton make me wonder what direction we are heading for?
339. Have they not made their position evident?
340. Yes, there should be clarification especially since the last article in the Canadian Lutheran on-line came out. It sounded like Concordia University of Edmonton (CUE) is no longer Christian let alone Lutheran institution. Things at Concordia University of Edmonton are both sad and frustrating to me since I am an alumnus. Changes at this institution were discussed at length & voted on at the Synodical Convention June 2014 which didn't reflected the latest information from CUE.
341. Hands off the Seminaries! Leave Concordia alone already. Or We will vote out of LCC!
342. Not anymore.
343. especially with the change of Christian designation. how and why does LCC have a connection (other than historical) with the university.
344. If that is even yet possible!
345. I don't like how Concordia University of Edmonton does not call itself a Christian school anymore. If this is to stand, Concordia Seminary should separate from Concordia University of Edmonton.
346. This is an area of huge concern to me now that we have rostered clergy serving in a secular institution.
347. That relationship was clarified when the LCMS cut Concordia loose years ago.
348. Absolutely
349. It's time to let Concordia University of Edmonton go.
350. Having just read the media release about CUE, LCC needs to cut ties with that organization - it appears CUE has cut ties with LCC
351. Although CUE is not, has not been Lutheran for a while.
352. It's clear Concordia has left the church in its wake. No clarification needed.
353. According to recent news, the Concordia University is no longer associated with the church and is solely another "secular university". If that is the case, this is a mute question.

354. http://www.canadianlutheran.ca/concordia-university-of-edmonton-no-longer-a-christian-institution/
355. The University has self-excluded themselves and should no longer be a recognized entity of Synod.
356. I would add that Concordia has already clarified the relationship in my mind.
357. If LCC is unable to provide extensive funding for Concordia as is the case, then LCC has no right to demand anything from Concordia. I think the relationship speaks for itself.
358. What relationship?
359. I read the news. At Least Concordia University has a balanced budget.
360. LOL! There is no relationship now! Another great legacy moment of our current leadership's inability to do anything of value.
361. What relationship? They have classified themselves as a "non-Christian" institution, and I believe this act has caused them to self-exclude themselves from Synod. The Synod should, therefore, no longer send funds to this institution or have anything to do with it.
362. Concordia is LCC's shinning jewel.
363. Concordia has not been much of a "church" institution for years. It has basically been an Edmonton regional college. Maybe it should be sold to the province, rather than letting them just walk away with it.
364. I believe that Concordia has made it quite clear that it has severed ties with LCC.
365. CUE is no longer Lutheran. This is evident. I told this to Bugbee, other LCC officials, and District official and no one listened. The name will change to University of Alberta in a few years, the name Concordia will be deleted.
366. Concordia needed to decide whether it was a Christian institution or a public institution. It has since decided what it wished to be, so there is no further need for clarification in its relationship with LC-C
367. Given the announcement of the removal of all Christian and Lutheran references, the relationship should be terminated.
368. If Concordia is ready and willing to cut official ties to LCC, perhaps its time for LCC to do the same.
369. Clarity of purpose is always a good thing.
370. Sever the tie and move on.
371. I don't know what that relationship is, so cannot comment.
372. I think the relationship is clear according to what we hear from Concordia University: there is no relationship. But it needs to be clarified for the people of our Synod.
373. Strongly agree, although I think it is obvious that Concordia University wants nothing further to do with LCC.
374. CUE is a secular University with no official ties to LCC.
375. It seems like it's been made pretty clear. After 2014's convention, we had only an "ecclesiastical bond". Since the recent re-working of CUE's mission statement, it seems they no longer desire to be associated with LCC. Seems pretty clear to me.
376. Should be made plain and communicated. No secrecy needed.
377. This is to much inside baseball.
378. Is Concordia University of Edmonton in any way connected to LCC if not why not? Many dollars have been provided by LCC members from day 1 I understand that the University does not pray at convocations so that they do not offend any one this is terrible if true.

379. I read on Sola Gratia that Concordia has removed "Christian Faith" from its mission statement. I think that makes the relationship pretty clear.
380. Perhaps all ties, both formal and informal, should be cut. Since Concordia University is now essentially a secular institution, should they be providing training for future Deacons/teachers? I don't know the answer to this question, or what alternatives exist for the training of deacons/teachers.
381. Concordia University of Edmonton gets most of it's funding from the province and student tuition. If we were funding them with the majority of their money things would be different. As such their ties to us are very weak. This would be a good time to renegotiate our relationship.
382. Clarification? Perhaps to those that aren't yet aware what the ABC District have allowed to happen.
383. In what way. Is this relationship different from that of St. Catherine’s?
384. There is no longer a relationship between LCC and CUE. That needs to be very clear.
385. The leadership of LCC needs to finally and honestly tell the church that they have given away our university and that it no longer has identified itself as a Christian institution. Our present leadership needs to inform the whole of LCC about what has happened at Concordia. Concordia has had a key role in our churches history and that loss will be felt over the next decade. We gave away our most critical asset because our present group of leaders didn't see the role of Concordia.
386. ~ it "seems" as though it is more of a secular institution with Christian gloss than a pillar of Christian witness.

Section 6: Restructuring the Relationship between the Synod, Districts, Auxiliaries and Listed Service Organizations

44. The relationship between my District and the Synod is healthy.

1. I have no information. How can I be expected to know this?
2. I have no real knowledge in this area.
3. Occasionally think of district first Synod last
4. Don't hear anything to base an answer on.
5. Synod sat back and let the High Church movement infiltrate our District.
6. LCC is over organized!
a. as far as I know it is
7. How would I know?
8. I hope so, but I'm not certain seeing as my district is struggling for survival (so to speak).
9. corruption in both.
10. I feel there is a big cover-up in the Canadian LCC. and district. actually I know so, many facts show it.
11. There is tension and a history of misunderstanding.
12. I guess.
13. Poorly worded question. So I'm choosing to define "District" here as "people who belong to congregations in our District"-- as opposed to, "our District's administration." And I think there's a fairly widely shared sense in our District's congregations that Synod should have somehow been much more aware of the problems our District administration was having. Whether this is reasonable or not, I don't know. But this sense has harmed the relationship between the people of our District, and the Synod, for sure.
14. The special gift of LCC-East to LCC at the district convention in light to fiscal shortfall due to difficulties in the ABC district was touching!
15. I'd like to think that it is, but I have reservations in light of the recent ABC DIL & CEF disaster.
16. I'm not sure at this point...
17. Don't know.
18. As far as I know.
19. I pray so.
20. not enough information
21. for the most part
22. A synodical bishop with a college of bishops with more spiritual oversight would create a healthier relationship between District and Synod.
23. If so, district is not passing on info to congregations.
24. Unknown
25. I have no idea
26. It is healthy in the sense that it is not in conflict.
27. I have no idea, but I am skeptical of everything to do with church leadership now.
28. I have no idea how the relationship is between the District as a whole and the Synod.
29. I do not know.
30. I believe it is healthy but changes would definitely improve things with all districts.

31. No idea. I don't get told one way or the other.
32. not sure what it is
33. The synod is there to serve the districts and congregations. Not the other way around.
34. I'm a Lay Person. I'm not privy to these matters.
35. I don't know
36. No information - no information.
37. The ABC District seems to have been making bad choices all around, so I don't believe its relationship with the Synod could be healthy.
38. I don't know if it's healthy. This statement could be clarified. By appearance, I think so???
39. As a member I have no idea for sure. I would think the current problems at ABC have caused some degree of stress or malaise between the two.
40. It may be healthy, but is it sufficient.
41. It seemed to be at Convention.
42. I would like to agree with the above, but cannot, given that at one town hall meeting Pastor Astley essentially said that ABC District had become conceited and deserved to be cut down a notch. This came from the pastor who has, in the interim, been given the task of leading the spiritual care of those in ABC District.
43. Not fully aware of the nature and quality of the relationship as it stands, but that is my hope!
44. I'm sorry but I have no idea!
45. With all the hurt caused by the CEF problem there can be tensions between the ABC District and Synod. However--and to the glory of God--our beloved Synod embraces the ABC congregations in love. We are still and always will be welcomed by Synod with open arms.
46. Lay people have no idea about this and aren't qualified to answer.
47. Difficult to determine from a lay perspective, but certainly the CEF and DIL in ABC District has put huge stress on everyone.
48. I think that it may be a little strained in view of the ABC District financial crisis, but the Synod has definitely been very supportive to our district and we are so thankful for our LCC family.
49. I don't know.
50. I don't really know what the current relationship is?
51. I have no knowledge about this.
52. Only Rev. Bugbee knows for sure.
53. It seems that all goes well in that area!
54. Who polices who. Goals and achievements communicated to all!
55. I don't know, you tell me, is it?
56. After the C.E.F. meltdown, there needs to be admission of poor management. I have not heard a humble apology to investors.
57. I am too far removed from this concern. I assume they get along.
58. Hardly!!
59. Don't know.
60. the CEF and DIL financial crisis has caused big problems in the relationship
61. They are still need to establish a relationship. Synod is playing the "I'm not talking to you because you're dead" game.
62. ABC district is NOT dead. Synod needs to understand that and stop treating us like our body is dead and cold. District has more power than synod does, and synod needs to realize that.
63. I don't know.

64. Don't really know how healthy the relationship is between my District and the Synod
65. Not sure because of our District at present
66. NO healing here, no action taken that was requested in a timely manner.
67. I don't know. As I see it, the relationship seems OK.
68. I don't know
69. I know of no disagreements outside of the dissolution of the Church Extension Fund, which has been more of an issue for some congregations and its members than others. I believe that the Service Organizations are well structured as they are.
70. I haven't heard of any problems but I am not close enough to know if there are problems and how major they are or how often they occur.
71. I do not know. I have never asked. I have had no reason to inquire.
72. No way of knowing.
73. The Synod divided the role of our DP because our District made grievous mistakes through poor financial management.
74. Why is it about Authority not servant transparent accountability
75. Don't know.
76. what is it?
77. Districts have never been what was intended and are, instead, liabilities; given that, the relationship is surprisingly good.
78. Though I would not describe the relationship as "unhealthy," I think there are areas of overlap and there could be greater efficiency in the relationship.
79. I have no idea.
80. I hope it is better. I was quite surprised at how little Synod knew about the CEF DiL situation in the ABC District.
81. Agree, though I perceive various inefficiencies and overlap alluded to in my answer to question #17.
82. I have no knowledge of anything negative at this time and I believe Synod is giving ABC district exemplary support at this time of need with the Church Extension Fund and in particular our own congregation at this time.
83. I think so....
84. My perception is that Synod have been upfront and bold in their support of our District.
85. I really have not idea.
86. No opinion.
87. There have been several situations where the relationship between ABC district and Synod has been strained. Examples include the installation of an interim pastoral leader and funding directives. To improve the health of the relationship there needs to be very specific guidelines to the roles and responsibilities of each and the discipline to not overstep bounds.
88. I don't know what the relationship is as this is never really explained but only evidenced in the Canadian Lutheran.
89. Our ABC district seems to be struggling now, and I wonder how healthy the relationship between the two really is when there seems to have been a lack of communication between the two bodies.
90. It seems clear that the ABC District was dancing to its own tune and that this was a disaster, spiritually, financially, legally, and administratively.
91. Don't know
92. Unsure....appears communications between the groups could stand improvement.

93. I don't know what it is like.
94. No knowledge
95. Don’t know
96. I have no way of seeing into that relationship
97. Suggest new streamlined, updated, and simplified LCC constitution with suitable congregation and LSO templates modifiable for local provincial requirements etc.
98. Unknown....
99. Open conflict proves it is unhealthy
100. I do not know if it is, I have not heard of any problems.
101. Since they share a building/office I assume it is
102. Don't know.
103. Don't really know, I believe it is healthy but there are always going to be problems
104. I'd say mostly "yes". But I can't speak for all districts (obviously, given the meltdown of the ABC district last year.)
105. I would not know.
106. Their offices are in the same building.
107. The ABC District is seriously if not deathly ill. Therefore, one could not say it is in a "healthy" relationship with synod. Thank God the Synod was willing to step in and appoint an ecclesiastical supervisor for the District.
108. No information was provided to assess this.
109. My district is in trouble. I don't blame the Synod for this, but wouldn't use healthy as a way to describe the situation.
110. I don't know otherwise.
111. The new District Board of Directors has met with the Synod President, and we have agreed to keep in regular communication.
112. I think so, but how would I know for sure?
113. have no idea - never been given any info
114. I hope so. How do I evaluate this District and synod are not in my backyard?
115. Instead of having given ABC district support in its hour of need, the Synod refused the help requested. Had all the members, circuits, districts worked together with the ABC District and legal advisors to find a solution to the financial crisis, countless numbers of people could have been spared the agony of losing their investments--many their life's savings. Undoubtedly many souls have also been damaged because of their loss of faith while going through this experience. Many more (myself included) are struggling to reconcile their concept of what it means to be a member of the Body of Christ with the hatred, vengeance, animosity and even legal actions that have resulted. Had the ABC District had support from Synod, what a glowing example of Christian AGAPE that would have been. Instead, one hears of one outside official saying in all his years of working with churches he has never seen such acrimony ad in this case. It saddens me to think that a situation in my church has created this atmosphere.
116. I don't have enough information or knowledge about this.
117. I don't know.
118. Too vague of questions.
119. as far as I know yes.
120. The ABC financial crisis has strained the relationship. LCC appears to want greater control of the affairs of its congregations.

121. Again, the ABC District CEF crash has soured the relationship with Synod.
122. In light of what has happened in the ABC District, the relationship is severed.
123. Synod seems to have presupposed that the Districts are dead, especially ABC, and is treating ABC as such. Their representative to the congregations even said publicly at our Town Hall meeting that the ABC District is dead. How can you have a healthy relationship with the Synod when its representative in charge of building trust says that?
124. for the most part from what I gather as an interested party to the information provided
125. I was only recently accepted as a member at my new congregation, and while I think I would agree, I haven't been involved enough to know.
126. They share the same office space.
127. Don't know - never hear. No info given to us.
128. Unsure at present
129. The relationship is strained because of the CEF situation. I think the Synod President is perplexed on what to say to the ABC District, since the legal part is acting more as a corporation in great difficulty that the Church proclaiming the Gospel. The District President and the District Pastoral Supervisor are trying, but it is such a mixed situation with "divided loyalties," corporate or Church.
130. What is "healthy"? Growth in numbers? Continued funding? Faithfulness of pastors, deacons and congregations?
131. No data - no idea
132. Unknown
133. Don't know.
134. I do not know.
135. These are difficult times! But it can be healthy.
136. The relationship has now changed
137. I have no opportunity to observe this
138. I certainly hope so, but I really don't know.
139. Districts' organisation and function is ineffectual at best. For a convention effectively to bring about change in the behaviour of any individual member of Synod or any group of members of Synod is so close to impossible as to be indistinguishable.
140. No knowledge to know.
141. Too unwieldy.
142. What does "healthy" mean?
143. -ish. Our remittances to Synod are down, but we value and support Synod
144. Don't know what this means?
145. Trust shaken, it will take time to mend and rebuild the bridge.
146. As I have no idea what my District does, I cannot comment
147. What procedures are in place for Synod to know what is taking place in District? Does Synod have any meaningful influence over what is happening in Districts?
148. Not a question to ask a lay person since how would I know. Ask my pastor.
149. The East district is fairy healthy but A/BC and Central are not.
150. I don't know
151. In truth, I do not really know what the relationship between my district and synod are.
152. Not sure I can see any problems.
153. If there is free communication and respect, then yes. Otherwise it needs to be worked on.
154. I hope so.

155. Don't know - haven't heard bad stuff. Is ignorance bliss or are there no challenges?
156. The purpose of the districts appears to be diminishing. The relationship may be healthy with the Synod, but the district structure itself is not doing very well.
157. To my knowledge
158. don't know
159. Not even close. I have seen nothing from Synod to help our District. Only pressure to shut it down. From both President Bugbee and Pastor Astley.
160. Don't know
161. I see nothing unhealthy in what I perceive of the relationship.
162. I don't know how to assess that relationship.
163. How do we know?
164. So far as we know.
165. I thought that the ABC district was competitive with the Synod and other districts for a number of years.
166. seems too unstructured to be healthy
167. I think that they talk to each other, let me know.
168. To my knowledge it is. With the pending changes due to the CEF/DIL situation and the almost totally new Board of Directors and administration the verdict is still out on the health of the relationship. Time will tell but I anticipate is will be healthy.
169. I have no reason to believe it is not.
170. I do not know
171. Synod didn't stop the district from destroying CEF, I know you are " separate legal entities " but the damage caused is so great synod should have demanded accountability. Neither synod or district followed the synod handbook which requires annual reports from the district presidents and treasurers.
172. Not close enough to make a call.
173. I would like to think that it is. I don't know
174. Too high up for my opinion. We rarely think in those strata terms.
175. I sat a convention and watched my district try a number of times to do an end around Synod to avoid having Synod step in during the CEF crisis. To me, it showed a complete lack of respect for Synod, and a complete unwillingness to restore accountability.
176. How would you know as we are not informed about this relationship at a congregation level?
177. No idea
178. At least as far as I know!
179. Synod needs more say.
180. again - this would have been more helpful if you had identified what healthy means
181. I don't see how it can be healthy after what has happened in our ABC district.
182. As far as I know everything working well, I have not heard any complaints.
183. I wish I knew
184. As someone has said, we have 3 mini synods in one national synod. Otherwise I do not know what the state of the relationship is. It seems though, that the relationships between the Districts is fragile at best.
185. I wish I knew
186. Strong communication and openness is not there.
187. Needs rebuilding.
188. I don't know.

189. $100M losses? How could that help a healthy relationship. ABC congregants are angry
190. Seems to be...
191. I don't have enough information on this to make an intelligent determination.
192. It is healthier than it has been in the past.
193. Not sure but our congregation senses tensions, competitions and bad feeling, such as blaming the other for failures.
194. I hesitate to describe the relationship as "healthy." There is a great deal of work that needs to be done in order to get to a healthy state.
195. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
196. I don't know - no info provided to laity.
197. I feel like the CEF crisis has given our district a black eye.
198. I have sensed a lot of tension and power struggle between District and Synod.
199. but that does not mean I think districts are needed - so strongly agree merely means there are no current problems
200. It had better be; they share the same building.
201. Districts should have been, by definition, arms of the synod, but in fact the synod turned out to be an "add-on" to the districts. Why money went from congregations to districts to synod is in comprehensible. Money should go from congregations to the synod, who then make decisions on where it should be spent. Such a "walking together" is a model for the various auxiliary organizations.
202. my knowledge of this is limited
203. If it were healthy I don't think we would be having this discussion.
204. I would hope so.
205. Our Pastor fills us in.
206. There is a large gap between ABC District and Synod. This relationship if fractured and will require a long time and great effort to heal.
207. don't know how it works now
208. Not in a position to comment.... not in the know.
209. We are still embroiled in the CEF fallout so until this starts settling I don't see our relationship improving.
210. Not sure what the relationship is? A relationship implies communication, care and concern. Is there really a relationship between Synod and District? Does Synod do anything for the Districts?
211. Healthy, but redundant
212. ABC... need I say more?
213. Not sure
214. If this was really the case, then the church would not be in the position it is today
215. not sure the state of health...perhaps somewhat unwell at this time
216. I do not know
217. I do not know
218. Don't know.
219. It can't be healthy until all of DIL and CEF is resolved and we can start fresh. That could be a number of years away.
220. I really don't know, but I have the impression it might not be the healthiest of relationships right now.
221. I don't have enough information to make a decision. The questionnaire is too ambiguous

222. How is a lay person to know?
223. How would I know?
224. I don't know.
225. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
226. Unfortunately, I see some pastors get their "back up" when discussing synodical matters, especially when they seem to clash over issues. This is unfortunate.
227. The relationship between my Parish and the District is not good so not sure how that would make the relationship between District and Synod good
228. If it were a healthy relationship, we would not be considering all the changes proposed.
229. I have no idea.
230. Not enough information personally to answer this.
231. I think the relationship is Good but maybe I am not in the know
232. Under the current structure, this is true. Under the restructured form it will need to change.
233. My district is not healthy at this time. We have a president and board that is doing nothing for the benefit of the church. They are only dealing with the financial mess.
234. My district, yes. All districts, no.
235. Our church as a whole is unhealthy.
236. Yes, in the fact the president came to preach at our small church.
237. I have no idea. Other than occasional notes in the Lutheran Witness, I have no idea what is going on in Winnipeg.
238. NO INFO
239. Don't know anything about the dynamics of the relationship
240. Not sure at this time.
241. Don't know.
242. Both are suspicious of each other as I ponder and digest actions and reactions in the past year or so. Lawyers have no place in advising where scripture speaks so clearly.
243. How would I find this out?
244. Unfamiliar of what the relationship is.
245. This is largely a result of the CEF issues.
246. As far as I know it is healthy but once again I have little understanding of what the process is.
247. I don't know what their relationship is like.
248. How would any one know?
249. There seems to be tension, disappointments, and frustrations, especially following the insolvency.
250. Really have no idea!
251. I am not really aware of the relationship.
252. Not sure.
253. I think that they talk to each other, let me know.
254. Nothing about the A-BC district is healthy right now. the trust is gone.
255. There is major confusion on the part of our Synodical and District leaders on the division of labour between the District President, Glenn Schaeffer and the District Pastoral Advisor, Nolan Astley. There is no way that Nolan Astley should be representing the ABC District on the Council of Presidents and Glenn Schaeffer being rejected. This is NOT what the District in Convention agree to.

256. As far as I know, it is healthy.
257. I don't really know. I hope with the infusion of extra funds to the Synod from east district to help compensate what was lost from ABC should be respected. I felt very sorry for the congregations and individuals in ABC who were affected by the CEF there. East District did the right thing to help.
258. Don't know
259. Once again, I am a lay person who has never been on a District or Synod board. How would I know if the relationship is healthy?
260. Collocation in Winnipeg is a cost-saving to my District but that should not be the min reason for this type of relationship
261. I think it is healthy. Due to declining congregation member numbers, our circuit has embarked on the route of a " tri parish " response to keep things viable and have had no negative feed back from the " powers that be ", to my knowledge.
262. nether open nor honest - but do we have a district in ABC
263. I believe that my District has been mistreated by Synod since Jan. 2015. You should know that I feel like my District has been treated like a naughty child and not as a loved child of God by the Synod. This makes me very sad.
264. We need more focus on our Synod and the Mission of the Church, and therefore, I believe we should be doing this directly through the Synod, not using two entities to perform the same task.
265. The East always tries to attack Alberta. Leave Concordia alone already.
266. The District and Synod would be in a better position to answer that.
267. No knowledge
268. I don't think it is right now; again, because of the mess with CEF.
269. I think the present CEF crisis has brought about an us vs. them attitude between the ABC Dist. and the Synod Office (not so sure about the Synod as a whole) and my sense is that it is not the Dist. that is causing the friction.
270. Our district seems to have been a cowboy, doing its own thing, with no correction or possibility of correction.
271. There have been many stresses expressed through the crisis that happened in the ABC District. It is my prayer that we shall overcome and be stronger together as we move ahead.
272. I can not speak for either District or Synod. This is not a question for a member to answer.
273. nothing to add here
274. as far as I can see
275. It remains to be seen whether there will be transparency on the part of the ABC.
276. I believe our Synod President has failed to oversee the work of the District Presidents and hold them accountable.
277. Both lack transparency, democratic processes and the will to change. Both need to change but will not.
278. Have not heard of any conflicts but if there are then there needs to be better communication with the membership.
279. They are in the same office!
280. I am not sure what affect the CEF/DIL situation has had on this relationship so cannot say one way or another.
281. I'm not sure. When the CEF crisis hit the fan, it seemed like Synod wanted to distance itself as much as it could from our District instead of offering a helping hand. And then, over the

following months, it seemed that its primary concern was to make sure it got its District remittances; and at our District Convention, when Synod was given opportunities in worship and in reports to speak to us, it felt like scolding and rebuke. We were hurting and we really needed the Gospel. I hesitate to say all of this and please remember that this is only one man's opinion.

282. Ambiguous
283. The CEF fiasco in the ABC District has totally destroyed any respect that the congregations have for he Synod and its ability to function in an ethical and business like manner.
284. Healthy not the right word. Does it function to the best of its ability... no!
285. I thought we handled that already
286. Appears good to me, although I'm not really qualified to answer.
287. I believe the whole business is a bit dysfunctional
288. I think the relationship is reasonably good, but it is a personal relationship, or a series of personal relationships. It needs to be spelled out in more detail.
289. Too much competition, too much overlap.
290. ~ we are fortunate to have President Bugbee as our leader he is truly a pastor's pastor and well as a pastor to the people!

45. Some changes in the relationship of the Synod and the Districts are needed.

1. This is the reason for restructuring in the first place. I have no idea why this question was every asked.
2. More information to congregations.
3. Need to walk together not separate ways.
4. I have no information. How can I be expected to know this?
5. We don't need 3 mission exec's or Parish services.
6. Synod has to take responsibility and leadership
7. Probably not my area of expertise.
8. Need to get away from federation of districts.
9. Perhaps our church leaders have to become a little more liberal and get with the times.
10. I think there is a problem. When our young ministers come to a congregation they have wonderful preaching skills and delivery and correctness according to Bible but maybe not people skills and some seem to have judgemental attitude. I believe that comes after a few years of preaching. We are so blessed to have a fine minister.
11. Yes, changes are needed, Synod should be in charge.
12. Any relationship can always be improved.
13. Improvement is always a good thing.
14. major changes with revision to constitution and not throwing out the constitution rather applying and enforcing what we have with code of ethics and enforceable, consequences for lack of. Can't leave it up to God.
15. Districts must end and smaller regional resource oriented, congregation connected areas need to be established -- perhaps of 15 to 30 churches.
16. We need to figure out if we are a federation of three districts or one Synod with three geographical districts to help with governance.
17. no district is best.
18. Does this assume that both will continue? That may not be wise.

19. Far more of the critical work done by the church-at-large takes place on the Synodical level than on the District level. This is partly a matter of economy of scale, and partly simple necessity. But in any case, it has never made sense to me that funds flow to Synod through the Districts. This has hampered our most important shared work (missions, higher education) in countless and chronic ways.
20. Clearly ABC District needed oversight to protect it from itself which it didn't have.
21. I lean toward "Disagree", but it would depend on final structure.
22. More accountability for Districts!
23. Don't know.
24. Not aware of any.
25. Only those in authority would know. Lay people are not aware.
26. Just what?
27. Less duplication for starters.
28. Does this statement mean Districts remain?
29. LWMLC is also in restructure mode.
30. Am not aware of any problems between the Synod and my District.
31. Major changes are needed.
32. In regard to structure.
33. Probably, but I do not know.
34. Even though they are healthy improvements would definitely help.
35. I'm going to agree with this statement only because the fact it's on this survey indicates some changes are required. If everything were perfect in the relationship, no discussion on change would be required.
36. see above - I would think that synod should be taking a LEADERSHIP role in the church - we have this thought of each church is on it's own ... the district, synod etc. is there for support - should take a LEADERSHIP role - supplying guidance, resources, evaluation of progress and how to improve
37. The synod should start supporting the districts, not trying to disband or dissolve them.
38. I don't know
39. Again no info
40. Districts should be eliminated
41. A District should not be a fiefdom.
42. I think Districts should be dissolved and replaced with a regional structure. Our Synod is geographically large, but statistically small.
43. How would an average church member know?? In all my years as a Lutheran no one really talks about internal problems if they do exist. As Lutherans there are things “we just don't talk about" - especially conflict (or so it seems). I think we are trying to improve.
44. Agree, but what are these changes. Poor question.
45. Perhaps
46. Districts need to be more accountable to Synod.
47. Given the fact that our districts existed before our Synod and the fact that districts have not always been willing to exemplify the reality that they are extensions of the Synod - not the other way around.
48. Perhaps more coordination of objectives and strategies.
49. Especially as current crises are still open.
50. Again, I have no idea!

51. Districts need to be terminated.
52. I have no knowledge about this.
53. there's always room for improvement.
54. I am concerned about relationships with ABC District.
55. Do we need the level of structure that we currently have? If not, there is a need for change.
56. Streamline the management and have a clears set of goals and direction.
57. Not sure, am not aware of issues.
58. If communication counts yes!! The world and its ways are closing in on those in authority.
59. more communication
60. To the point of EVERYONE under Synod.
61. Meeting and exchanging info is important for an organization to run smoothly.
62. The Districts need to be dissolved!
63. But I am not qualified to give a reasoned response
64. They need to establish a relationship.
65. The lines of power need to be clarified, and the people need to know what those lines are.
66. Whatever is in the best interest of the restructuring.
67. No issues that I am aware of.
68. Not enforcing the constitution and bylaws we have in place. and the spiritual law either.
69. Due to unknown information regarding this area, I would have to think that perhaps some changes in the relationship of the synod and the districts are needed with respect to the Service Organizations. Not really sure.
70. We do not really need the current District structures. We can accomplish the work through regions of Synod with part time or congregational pastors serving as 'presidents' (or whatever you want to call them).
71. not enough knowledge of the subject.
72. could be
73. The question is too broad. If the proposed change were specified maybe I could opine.
74. I am assuming this is the case because you have this restructuring committee in place and because of what happened with ABC.
75. Districts are not independent organizations. There has to be checks and balances in place
76. needs to be more together - left hand, right hand not knowing what each other is doing
77. what is it/
78. The synod should not be divided into district. Circuit counsellors should be agents of the synodical president.
79. I think Ecclesiastical Supervision, Training of Church Workers, Missions, Social Ministry, and Financial Services are best done at the synodical level, while activities for the Care of Church Members through parish services (conferences, gatherings, workshops, mission festivals, fellowship events, musical events, etc.) are best done at a circuit or district level.
80. Get rid of Districts.
81. In regards to the ABC District changes are needed. I don't know how the other districts relate to the Synod.
82. Agree, in the sense that inefficiencies and overlap need to be reduced.
83. I know of nothing at this time that is negative so I cannot make an informed answer.
84. As a lay person, I really do not know about the relationship between the two..... I think it is fine.

85. We need to reduce administrative costs. I don't think that we can afford that much overhead for the number of LCC contributing members.
86. Too much autonomy in the districts.
87. The authority of each need to be laid out clearly. The relationship should be structured in a way that makes both more effective at running the church, ensuring doctrinal compliance, and utilising resources. In the end the goal should be to better serve our pastors, congregations, and the people of Canada and the world in matters of faith.
88. A more honest, transparent relationship is in order.
89. Districts must operate as "Synod in this place." They should have small staffs. They should be engaged in supporting congregations (visitation, support of pastors, assistance with vacancies, etc.) and the institutions of the church that congregations cannot do themselves, like creating and supporting the university and seminaries, and supporting synodical efforts like theological education, church relations, ecclesiastical supervision of pastors and congregations.
90. Specifically, there should be changes in the way the ABC District was operating too much on its own without taking the advice of Synod with regard to its financial affairs (audits).
91. There needs to be more accountability from District to the Synod. The Synod should be more aware of the 'goings on' within the District, & step in to govern when required.
92. Changes for the good should strengthen the relationship.
93. No knowledge
94. I have no way of seeing into that relationship
95. No discernible value in sustaining districts
96. None that I am aware of.
97. Don't know.
98. Again, I require more information
99. If not changes "needed", at the very least discussed and thoroughly explored, considered, and even tried.
100. Districts should be abolished. The ABC District should be separated into two regions. The other Districts could choose to stay as they are or separate into smaller regions as appropriate. Perhaps we might have 4-6 regions, each represented by a synodical vice-president. District boards, vice presidents, etc. could be replaced with a small advisory council (3 lay, 3 clergy, 1 deacon) to the regional vice-president. Offerings from congregations should be sent directly to synod.
101. Many, if not most, district services should be subsumed by the national church. Districts should be dismantled, and regions smaller than them (but bigger than the existing circuits) should be constituted as diocese, with locally-elected bishops serving in ecclesiastical supervision. These bishops should be responsible primarily for pastoral care and ecclesiastical supervision, while administrative and business matters should be referred to the national office.
102. E.g. Call process
103. If Districts remain in the new structure, I think that we need to forge a relationship much more cooperative with Synod. There should not be dissonance between them.
104. I believe that the Districts should be subordinate to Synod. Since I don't know enough about how these levels function, however, I don't know what the implication of carrying out this suggestion are.
105. Don't know. Why do we need all this auxiliaries and Listed Service Organizations?

106. I don't know.
107. Changes in relationships need more than authoritative restructuring.
108. I believe we should consider abolishing the Districts.
109. I believe the Districts should be dissolved and replaced with a small two-person satellite synod office in each former District.
110. The whole church must work together.
111. I think the Districts as they are now should be abolished, so, to me, whatever the relationship is, is irrelevant.
112. We can no longer afford two hierarchies.
113. They should communicate more openly and respect one another's right to exist.
114. Revise the Nomination committee procedure -- get qualified people in the positions -- and changes will take place
115. As a general principle, I think the districts should be abolished, which counts as a changed relationship.
116. Dissolve the Districts and unify them into Synod. With modern communication and inexpensive travel, one central location for all three districts and synod in one location would be helpful.
117. If so - make changes
118. Don't know - Never hear anything from either one.
119. We need to think creatively for the sake of the Gospel.
120. If it is felt we no longer need districts as they currently are, then, yes, we need to change things.
121. possibly I would be open to that if it were shown to be needed
122. Since two of our three districts are now down to "bare bones" staff and finances, do we still need districts?
123. No data - no idea
124. Unknown - however if there is overlap or changes for a smoother more efficient delegation of responsibilities it should be changed.
125. Relationships always should be reviewed in order to remain healthy.
126. URGENTLY!
127. The Districts need a greater role in leadership and providing direction as they listen to congregations = church.
128. I don't think we need Districts. We need ecclesiastical oversight over regions and areas, but we do not need district administrative apparatuses. House all of the administration in Synod and leave the regional Ecclesiastical oversight, or rather, free such persons (whatever equivalent position to DP exists in the future) for actual doctrinal oversight.
129. Why do we have districts? We are such a small church body. 365 congregations or something across the country? I don't understand the compartmentalization of the districts.
130. Greater accountability needed of district activities. District presidents should give an account of their congregations and pastors to the synod president. E.g. how often he has visited each pastor/congregation in his district; what the circuit meetings are discussing as areas of concern; and offer suggestions as to how the Synod could assist in their district. I think it is assumed that no news is good news, but we know that is not always correct.
131. Yes, we should do away with Districts and Circuits.
132. Restructuring is necessary for financial sustainability as well as unity, transparency and ACCOUNTABILITY.

133. What is going to help us out?
134. In specific, Districts are no longer necessary at all for the well-ordering of LCC.
135. Three administrative districts are not required based on low LCC membership
136. Don't know - haven't heard bad stuff. Is ignorance bliss or are there no challenges?
137. The districts should be abolished.
138. Emphasizing the word 'some'
139. Elimination of duplication of services and coordination of activities.
140. don't know
141. District level is not required
142. discontinue the districts
143. perhaps
144. On the whole, I'd like to see the synod president as presiding bishop of the whole Church, with regional bishops under him who preside over units smaller than our current districts. But the size of these units is an adiaphorous matter, one to be settled by God-given prudence.
145. The current structure is outdated and over-governed. It is utilizing too much of our current resources (both financial and people) to maintain. We need to streamline administration and direct our resources to critical services (outreach being a priority).
146. It would appear to me that a different relationship between the Synod and Districts could have prevented or limited the ABC crisis.
147. One Synod. Dissolve Districts. And Make Synod strong with God's help.
148. ask those at Synod & District
149. Districts should be dissolved.
150. Congregation missions that are received from congregations should go directly to the Synod and the Synod then allocating funds to the district for the purpose of carrying out the work of the Synod.
151. Dissolve Districts
152. Do we need Districts?
153. I think that I have answered this a dozen times [but here goes]. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul....
154. "Some"?
155. The newness requires that. Also, if changes to mandate and responsibilities change as a result of this review the relationship will also change.
156. We are too small a church to have all of these jurisdictions.
157. Do away with the districts, one body, more efficient more, accountable
158. Mainly due to finances and the church being under attack from society's ambivalence.
159. Not sure if changes are needed. Maybe better clarification.
160. communication.
161. They need to be clearly defined. Synod should be given power to step in and at least call a District meeting for matters they deem serious. i.e. failure to publish Audited financial statements. Discussions on allowing gay marriages. etc.
162. As I understand it, much of the 'power' lies with the 3 Districts. The Synod should have most of the power and authority.
163. As previously mentioned, I believe that we need a stronger central authority in LCC.
164. Information flow.
165. Probably changes are needed but as a lay person this is hard to answer.

166. The general consensus is ABC district got very little synodical support during the CEF crisis.
167. I wish I knew
168. I don't know exactly what needs to happen, but eliminating districts should defuse some things.
169. I wish I knew
170. The Synod needs to take a stronger leadership role.
171. to be able to make adjustments as new needs are identified would indicate a vibrant relationship and a response #5 would mean that ossification was desired.
172. If there is duplication of administration, then yes.
173. Blow it all up and start over. I know I keep saying this - but what we had didn't work long term. Starting from scratch is the only solution.
174. Districts are not required in this day and age. It appears that in recent events there is more division than unity.
175. As mentioned in previous questions I believe the districts should be amalgamated under the auspice of Synod.
176. Possibly but I am not aware of the relationship.
177. there is too much overlap and cost. My view is that local congregations are enslaved by the district
178. We need an elected, full time DP
179. Change can help if it is necessary
180. We need to get rid of the District structure altogether and figure out how to do what we do and what we need to do more effectively and efficiently.
181. Not sure if there are solutions to this long-standing problem.
182. Do districts need to continue in their present form? I don't think so.
183. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
184. Always room to improve, but this is largely a matter of personalities, rather than structure.
185. Absolutely this has been revealed. There is a lack of accountability in our structure and in our attitudes.
186. We should eliminate the districts as separate entities altogether - is that a change in relationship?
187. Get rid of districts.
188. Always room for improvement.
189. Under restructuring will there be districts?
190. Better communication is the key.
191. Outside of the current crisis within ABC district, I am not aware of how the relationship works. Although common sense would dictate that there are probably a number of redundancies in areas such as administration.
192. Leaders should spell out the "problems" that currently impede ministry and propose recommendations and their rationale.
193. "Some changes" so vague as to make this useless. We have a central district that is fading into nothing, an ABC district crumbled. This is an understatement.
194. I would presume so.
195. Yes... there shouldn't be any more Districts.
196. Probably
197. More info to be passed on to each other such as methods of outreach and planning of such.

198. E.g. Call Process
199. How do I answer this? My opinion is that MANY changes in the relationship are needed. If I disagree, is that going to be read as "many changes are needed" or "no changes are needed"? So I have to answer "neither" because I don't have confidence in how this will be read.
200. There is no congruity between districts and synod. Synod should be giving direction and Districts enacting the direction of Synod. Appears sometimes they don't know what one another is doing.
201. Not some--MANY changes!!
202. I don't know.
203. I don't have enough information to make a decision. The questionnaire is too ambiguous
204. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
205. Synod needs to take more of a roll in a direct relationship with all congregations. Districts should only provide spiritual leadership to the professional church workers within their district. No need for administration by the District office. This will eliminate any conflict.
206. Eliminate the Districts
207. I would expect the restructuring process to identify if changes in the relationship are needed but I am not aware of if or how it should be changed.
208. DISTRICTS ARE NOT REQUIRED.
209. Clarification of flow of information and responsibilities resting at each level.
210. Districts ought to be arms of the synod
211. Yes
212. Synod needs ultimate control.
213. Three Districts is to much Administration and duplication for small LCC membership.
214. We have too much upper management and thus the three vice presidents of Synod could be the three District presidents.
215. I don't believe that we are big enough as a Synod to need separately incorporated Districts. These become a burden on both the human and financial resources of our Church that could be directed more economically for evangelistic purposes.
216. There is always room for improvement
217. Ongoing change is healthy for communications.
218. Don’t know
219. Yes, we should seriously look at dividing up LCC into smaller districts (or regions or sees or whatever if a name change would help avoid confusion) with each region having a part-time vice president of synod) and a synod having a full-time Canadian mission executive to oversee mission congregations and a full-time overseas mission executive to over international missions.
220. I am favor of no districts
221. Disagree for my district (central). However, if this is a way to avoid the problems that ABC got into, then I certainly will agree for all districts.
222. Not sure of the relationships between them but from what I hear it should be better.
223. Consider Regions rather than District - this may also help to heal the wounds in the ABC resulting from events.
224. Presently there is too much overlap, or at least it may seem so.
225. Too many layers of hierarchy.
226. There is overlap in many areas that is unnecessary.

227. I believe that the Synod did not provide appropriate support to the A-BC District during the CEF crisis. In my opinion, they came across as judging & critical of our District leadership, rather than grace oriented and Christ-centered. As a result, they set a negative tone and example for the congregations involved.
228. Absolutely - but the answer to "how" is the difficult part.
229. I think that I have answered this a dozen times [but here goes]. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul.
230. If they are to join together, then some changes will have to be made.
231. ABC had become too independent. The synod still needs to lead if the districts remain as they are.
232. I feel that - at times - churches are left alone to monitor themselves. More involvement from the District and Synod could help to ensure that congregations remain vibrant and healthy; and when they are struggling, the District and Synod need to offer their help and support. With aging populations in churches, the leadership is often left up to the people who unwillingly accept the duty. This leads to stagnant congregations where people are satisfied with the status quo because nobody else is willing to lead. Annual reviews of churches and pastors by the District and Synod would ensure that congregations are happy and healthy; and when they are not, it is my hope that the District and Synod would step in to offer their support.
233. Collaborative and/or joint planning and execution of ministry objectives and priorities should be undertaken. Administration of human resource functions and establishment of salary guidelines across Synod should be possible.
234. Perhaps we could be made aware if other districts are moving in the same direction as we are.
235. Districts are not needed, Synodical Representatives in each District are required though.
236. The District and Synod would be in a better position to answer that.
237. No knowledge
238. Namely, it is time to discontinue the Districts, and create one level of 'structure' that covers the entire synod.
239. I would say the dissolution of the districts would suffice.
240. If they weren't, we wouldn't be completing this survey.
241. I'm hoping that the restructuring process can answer this question.
242. The relationship between Districts has much room for improvement. I think the Synod is doing ok in its relationship to the Districts. I was not impressed with the lack of respect shown by a certain District to another District at the last Synod convention. Apparently that was nothing new. A better working relationship between the Districts would go a long way to helping with unity in the church
243. Restructure and eliminate the districts
244. I am not sure relationship is the correct description. The defined roles between the two need to be clarified.
245. Federation has not worked.
246. Districts & district level oversight should be eliminated.
247. Major changes are needed.
248. That may be answered better by the Council of Presidents as well as the individual Board of Directors. There is always the fear of stepping on toes, and I would personally rather see

overlap in ministry rather than a lapse or gap in ministry because someone was afraid of overstepping.
249. Both lack transparency, democratic processes and the will to change. Both need to change but will not. Real leadership is needed.
250. Avoid duplication. Need to reduce financial costs of administration.
251. It seems that some things overlap.
252. Synod should be working more with the districts and if districts aren't doing as they should then the synod should be advising church congregations about the situations.
253. The districts should be abolished
254. Right now the Synod is at the whim of the Districts for funding, which we saw with ABC crisis can easily cripple the Synod. The money flow should go the other way with Synod passing funds to the Districts evenly, or on a per member basis.
255. In my mind, I wonder about the need for a District. Can this all be managed by Synod?
256. I think we need to focus more on the practical side of what it means for District and Synod to be "synod".
257. The districts are a needlessly redundant component of the synod.
258. cancelling districts
259. I agree that changes are needed. I don't agree on the amount. Not some, but *many*.
260. There should be no districts, only synod and circuits.
261. Ambiguous
262. they are happening whether we want them or not.
263. Talk to the Bod's
264. no real opinion. I am open to the possibility of eliminating Districts totally, if that is a logical solution.
265. The possibility of eliminating districts should be considered.
266. I'm comfortable with dissolving the District and replacing it with the twelve larger geographical circuits as proposed at the Calgary all-synodical workers conference.
267. For example, a single operating plan, definition of powers and responsibilities, definition of the chain of command and authority.
268. Both need term limits on leadership. Too many of our leaders are retiring in office.

46. There is overlap in the services that the Synod and the Districts provide our congregation

1. I have not found any.
2. I have no idea!
3. I don't understand.
4. I don't understand.
5. There may be but all members are not aware of what or where they may be.
6. Not that I'm aware.
7. I assume there is.
8. unknown to me
9. In terms of support - yes.
10. Don't need Districts. Just one L.C.C.
11. Districts could not provide that which Synod does i.e. seminaries and foreign missions.
12. I don not know the services that they provide, so I do not know if they overlap.

13. yes. including control and cover-up.
14. Sometimes. And some things are overlooked.
15. At this point I don't think they have provided much but let the congregation do as it pleases.
16. It's hard to tell when we're never too sure if we (cong.) are getting all the info that Synod and Dist. send out etc.
17. Don't know.
18. Do not know
19. Don't know... I doubt it, however.
20. This is not a bad situation.
21. Unknown
22. Yes, but perhaps less so than previously.
23. Again it seems congregations including Pastor, Council etc. are not always aware of synod and district service.
24. Maybe you could let the congregations know what services they are to receive, from my point of view we don't receive any services from either. They just want us to send money.
25. As a lay person I do not know of any services provided by the Synod or the District.
26. Perhaps not as much overlap as lack of efficiencies.
27. Not knowing this for a fact, but would believe to be so.
28. Direct contact has been through the District only which gives the impression that the Synod is superfluous.
29. I do not know.
30. don't know BUT do know that LEADERSHIP is lacking
31. Don't see many "services" from either Synod or District to our Congregation ... but do believe there is overlap ... for instance, a "Spiritual Message" article from Synodical president and from the President of each District, in each issue of "Canadian Lutheran" ... usually themed to coincide with the Ecclesiastical Calendar ... so often quite similar in content. Redundancies abound!
32. Once more, no info-no opinion. There needs to be a better flow of information.
33. Our church governance is too big for a small church body. Four presidents (one for Synod and 3 for Districts) are not necessary. Services in the church could be centralized and governed under one structure instead of four (Synod and three Districts).
34. Not sure.
35. Again I do not know as we hear little from either.
36. ? Hopefully not
37. Q's 44-46 overlap... Current work is reasonable, but some personnel/resource overlap and should be reduced.
38. Don't know it all.
39. I don't know what those are.
40. I am not aware of an overlap. However, if such an overlap exists - then yes, there needs to be change so they're not duplicating efforts except if and where that is required for the sake of the Gospel.
41. Publications and electronic communications for example.
42. I cannot comment on overlap but I do feel that there is confusion about who does what.
43. As a lay person I don't directly see what services are being provided by either to our congregation. Perhaps our Pastor is more qualified to answer.
44. Absolutely.

45. not sure what services are provided at the congregational level
46. Maybe not so much of an overlap, but a redundancy in services offered.
47. I have no knowledge about this.
48. I'm not familiar enough to comment one way or other.
49. Info required
50. There is not overlap, but there are significant differences in the level of services the individual districts have been able to provide historically.
51. do not know
52. Budget tells story.
53. too many administrative positions
54. Synod is forcing themselves into District matters. An Ecclesiastical Supervisor who is appointed by the Synod (who should be serving the District not forcing power and authority over them) is unnecessary especially since the Ecclesiastical Supervisor has not tried to serve the District but instead take money for the job and do nothing to help the District instead hurt synod/district relations by spreading rumours by claiming the district is dead. Very poor job Nolan Astley. Very poor job.
55. I think some of the Synod's duties could be handled at the District level.
56. Synod and district need to figure out who is in charge of missions.
57. If there is, then restructuring will hopefully eliminate any overlap.
58. Not at this time
59. If there is, it’s possible that there shouldn’t be.
60. There may indeed be overlap, but I don't necessarily know where. We do need to look into this.
61. They seem to provide different services.
62. Perhaps streamlining is needed, but when you read the list of Service Organizations they all seem to have their own purpose and job.
63. don't know, but if there are it should be corrected.
64. don't know, need more info
65. One office could well be sufficient, and it would definitely avoid duplication.
66. Lay membership needs a list these so-called services. There appears to be some empire building going on
67. what services?
68. It's more of a "conflict" than an "overlap."
69. Not aware of
70. Districts have trump card.
71. Maybe a little bit from time to time.
72. I don't really know.....
73. For a rather small church, we're top heavy.
74. I am not very knowledgeable in this, but would not be surprised if this was the case.
75. From what I know of the services provided by District and Synod they are separate and appropriate. Things with national or international scope should be run by Synod, things local to a region should be dealt with on the district level.
76. Overlap is not itself a bad thing. But coordination is important.
77. I'm sure there is!
78. I don't know this.
79. No knowledge. Should always be in sync

80. Can't say that I see a lot of Synod services in our congregation.
81. Not clear what services District provides.
82. Unknown.
83. Not clear what services District provides.
84. I do not know.
85. Don't know as this is not filtered down to the congregational level.
86. I would think so
87. We are in a state of flux, e.g. where to send mission offerings.
88. There are only perceived overlaps.
89. Don't know.
90. There is some overlapping which could be looked into
91. this helps because each geographical are of our nation has its own blessings and problems to deal with
92. am not well enough informed.
93. It seems to me that the services provided by synod and district are quite distinct. Services are not the problem.
94. Probably, but I haven't seen any documentation analyzing this.
95. Neither provide any services to my congregation in French.
96. I think we need to look for areas that would be to our advantage to share, rather than have duplication. That said, some things that work well on the Prairies won't fit in Ontario and shouldn't be forced to do so.
97. The districts reduplicate not only themselves, but also services that are (or could be) provided by the national office.
98. I actually do not know exactly what services the synod and the district provide the congregations.
99. Isn't this something that should be investigated before restructuring is considered?
100. I cannot think of an example of this.
101. Would hope that LCC is organized such that Synod is looking after issues which are nationwide/global in nature and that the Districts & Circuits are looking after issues locally. i.e. Gov't of Canada = Synod, Provinces = Districts, Municipalities = Circuits.
102. Don't know. Never been given this info
103. I don't pay attention to where the services are provided from.
104. Services were being carried out rather well until the ABC crisis. It is questionable that restructuring is the answer to the crisis, nor that a different structure would have prevented it.
105. I would think so because some of the services required are the same.
106. This is why restructuring needs to consider this.
107. don't know
108. Don't know
109. Overlap should not be construed with working together
110. LCC has relatively little involvement in the operations of our Congregation.
111. There is only overlap in how Synod gets much of its support via District remittances.
112. We never hear of one -- and hardly ever hear of the other -- so how could there be overlap?
113. There is not enough overlap to require a change in how we are all working together.
114. Not sure; but probably, especially if they are divergent in approach.
115. I was only recently accepted as a member at my new congregation, and while I think I would agree, I haven't been involved enough to know.

116. Over-administration needs to stop.
117. We can't afford the duplication of work . . . can we just be Canadian and give up our regional issues?
118. This probably applies to all congregations at various times.
119. Unknown - change only if definite advantage
120. Do not know - not enough information given to us.
121. Agree, but not grossly.
122. Perhaps, though I believe that Synod is mostly working with international realities while the districts work with the local congregations.
123. there can be
124. Perhaps - no data
125. If there is - change if it provides a smoother more efficient system
126. There is bound to be some overlap, and I feel that this is not unhealthy.
127. Ours is a francophone congregation. I am unaware of any program either district or synod provide us in French. The LLL- God bless them! - provides a number of brochures *en François* for which we are profoundly grateful.
128. sometimes necessary
129. Districts provide services to congregations. LCC provides designated services for congregations.
130. There isn't supposed to be overlap, but what can and does the District provide these days that Synod via internet couldn't provide except ecclesiastical oversight?
131. Don't know.
132. Probably some could be combined.
133. No overlap, but a lot of silence.
134. What services? Websites? Canadian Lutheran postings on line? I see NOTHING
135. There likely are - it is always worth looking at whether we can cooperate to achieve efficiencies for both
136. I do not see the service provided by the district in our congregation.
137. don't know
138. Missions
139. I don't know what services each provides, so I can't say if there is overlap or not.
140. Especially in the area of receiving and then directing congregation mission offerings.
141. Not much overlap,
142. We hear very little from either.
143. At times in the past.
144. What services?
145. Right now I see it as a king with a bunch of Dukes helping to run the kingdom I'm not sure they all march in the same direction
146. Not that I know of, however, the District abides by the constitution and bylaws of the Synod and the congregation and District support programs of Synod.
147. This would be obvious, as the salary load is likely almost 3 times what it would be should there only be one Canadian district, instead of the three as there are now.
148. I believe this to be true although I have little data to back up my assumption.
149. Would like to know more.
150. I think the district and synod have both worked fairly hard to offer services that don't overlap but that compliment each other.

151. As a lay person this is hard to know.
152. This could be true but I am not in a position to know what needs to changed if anything.
153. I suspect there is, we want our mission money used for mission, not on administration
154. I suspect there are, we want our mission money used for mission, spreading the gospel, not on administration
155. I don't know.
156. If there is overlap, that needs to be corrected in order to be better in providing said services.
157. I do not support the waste related to duplicated services.
158. I think that all the Districts are working within their own area and are absolutely duplicating things based on the leader of that particular area. For example, Youth services, Treasurers, Pastors wives care, Missions, etc.
159. Probably, but they should be easily identified.
160. IF there is an overlap in the services provided a proper review should be made so that any overlap would be eliminated.
161. There is some overlap, especially administrative. Streamlining Synod without districts would allow all regions of Canada and LCC to be on the same page regarding Parish Services, Outreach, and regarding congregational support.
162. The Synod has purposely overlapped some services in our District at this time. However, that service is simply a duplication of everything that our District is capable of providing.
163. Actually the synod provides more services in the form of seminary education and missions, but in general these do not directly impact my congregation. The district's services don't impact my congregation in any meaningful way.
164. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
165. I am not certain if the synod and district provide our congregation with the same resources, but I do feel that it would be better if each district did not have to provide resources on its own. I think that those things which can be centralized should be. I think this would make the best use of our resources.
166. It might be more fitting to say there is a wasteful and poorly-functioning overlap in bureaucracy.
167. I cannot answer this question in spite of strong opinions -
168. Although I do not really understand the real nature of this relationship.
169. Such as there are services.
170. Unless one is directly involved there is no way of making this determination.
171. why keep on doing it?
172. Everyone knows their responsibilities.
173. Not privileged to have that info
174. Those in office are in the best position to either negate that perception or to identify and make some recommendations for consideration.
175. I don't know.
176. I really do not know.
177. I don't know what Synod provides to our congregations besides the Worker Benefits and Pension Plan, District is more involved with congregations, it's members and church workers on a one-on-one basis. I don't believe Synod is involved at that level.
178. Average parishioner is confused by our current structure. Two levels is a hold-over from LCMS days - definite opportunity for streamlining
179. We don't need Districts any more.

180. There is no overlap as there are very limited services provided to our congregation
181. not really sure
182. I do not know which services are provided by each
183. I do not know which services each provides
184. The only service that I am aware of is providing us with a pastor.
185. Possibly
186. No question there is.
187. There are areas that could be economized or Synod and District make a clear distinction as to each's responsibility.
188. I'm not sure they even communicate with each other. Both are so busy doing "their thing" and seeing how important they can be. Their agenda is more important than listening to each other or the people.
189. There is, and should be. Same services but with a different emphasis.
190. I don't have enough information to make a decision. The questionnaire is too ambiguous. I have no insight as to what problems there may or may not be as a consequence I cannot provide an informed and intelligent response.
191. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
192. District should only provide spiritual help to the PCW's
193. There might be but this will show up as you under go restructuring.
194. The service we get from district is minimal and their budget would indicate an overlap
195. I believe there is often confusion in congregations about who is responsible for what. Perhaps with the changes this will become more clear.
196. Not sure.
197. I'm not aware of any overlap.
198. A very large overlap in staff and services.
199. There is overlap at 3 levels (include circuit). You need some overlap to prevent "gaps". Do not need 3 levels.
200. I do not know??
201. I actually don't know because I don't think either body is providing a great deal of "services". Again, out Limited resources are stretched to the point that "services" are slim to none.
202. no info
203. Don't know what we get from synod.
204. Sharing the Gospel is sharing the Gospel. Yes, there are different cultural things to take into account, but frankly with Canada being so multi-cultural, the difference between a mission exec at district and a mission exec at synod is not with regard to how missionaries are to be supported and trained or even language support but rather with the legalities of operating in different jurisdictions. All missions should be at the national level. Likewise, all parish services and financial services should be at the national level. Until God blesses us with greater outreach success within Canada, we should be centralizing.
205. I know of no such overlap.
206. ???
207. If so it isn't obvious t me
208. We don't benefit anyway.
209. It's sometimes hard to determine the difference between the two.

210. I don't know, but I will assume some overlap because this, unfortunately, is more than often the case.
211. I assume there maybe in areas where this is important.
212. This can be easily solved by defining what services are provided by whom
213. What services??
214. We don't get much service from either
215. There is not that much overlap, at least as far as I can tell.
216. It may not be, but there likely is.
217. I really don't know but I'd like to think there's not a great deal of overlap - an educated statement on this will be reflective of the other re-structuring that is/will take place
218. Not sure.
219. Neither seems to provide much service to our congregation. This is probably O.K.
220. There shouldn't be.
221. There is duplication but not overlap.
222. Currently our District doesn't provide any services to its congregations. We basically have a District President, a secretary, Accountant all receiving salaries, but actual workers among the congregations is non existent.
223. No knowledge
224. I know of none. We receive all of our congregational assistance from those within our District with Synod and general helping us to walk with all 300ish congregations in foreign missions and church relations.
225. I don't see any services provided to our congregation from either. There is overlap of what they DO in general though.
226. That is my understanding.
227. This is a great waste of resources - financial and people
228. Services does not mean more employees, but careful use of committee using gifted church workers/lay people in the areas of missions, evangelism, stewardship, finances, youth, communication, etc.
229. In both cases it is a waste of time and money.
230. Duplication of administrative staff, programs, etc.
231. some communications, and some programs (outreach and other resources).
232. Services should be provided by the synod
233. What services? Other than a pastor lead communion service once a month.
234. I am not intimately aware of what the services provided by each are, therefore I am unaware of any overlap. That being said, perhaps the Districts and Synod should review their respective services to see if any redundancy exists.
235. I don't really know!
236. I think our areas of responsibility and the subsequent services District and Synod provide are fairly well defined.
237. There doesn't seem to be, but that doesn't mean the structure is working.
238. YEP! Talk to the BoDs
239. None that I know of. It is my understanding that Synod does get involved at the congregational level, if a congregational problem can't be resolved at the circuit or district level.

240. Merge out-of-country mission work and in Canada mission work with the same mission's representative. The synod supports some payroll functions and the District gives support with this as well.
241. Which is both a waste of financing, which is already in serious short supply; also this is exasperated by the needless duplication in many areas of responsibility.
242. I don't know what each provides so it is not possible to answer this question.

47. LCC at the district and synodical level is over-governed.

1. As a whole, yes, but if districts had their authority reduced or eliminated, synod would need more personnel to handle the work load!
2. It could be, but I am not sure. I did not get that impression so far.
3. Perhaps but it can be changed as all things human are subject to review
4. Seems to be a lot of going and coming and people involved.
5. Probably for this century.
6. I really don't know what you are talking about here.
7. Yes, they can and should consolidate their administrative positions.
8. I can't understand the need for so many vice-presidents??
9. I'm tempted to say yes, but I really don't know.
10. high censorship, double talk, control, games, broken promises
11. It is unnecessary and wasteful to have so many people in district and synod offices providing minimal value when it comes to the primary mission of the Church (Matthew 28).
12. It's not so much a matter of duplication of services or governance as it is matter of is it possible to do this more effectively given limited resources.
13. Yes, evident at the number of boards and directorships and leadership positions expected for a small church body.
14. Ridiculous to have 4 separate administrative offices and structures in a church body of about 300 congregations. Seriously?
15. Probably, though our vast Canadian geography will not change even while our congregational presence throughout the land has changed and will continue to do so.
16. Seems to be a lot of administrative costs; streamline the organizations and give more to ministries.
17. Didn't we cover this in #13 and #14
18. Don't know.
19. Don't know
20. Do not know.
21. Get rid of those in Ivory Towers and get them pounding the pavement and pulpit for new members.
22. How can a layperson know?
23. ... with the proviso that there is error in the structure of the governing.
24. Four administrations for a church body our size seems quite expensive, especially today.
25. I assume you mean too much bureaucracy and in that case, yes.
26. Our entire synod is smaller than "a District" in LCMS. no need for so much administration.
27. The Lord chooses our Pastors and continues to lead them as they do their work. They need every leeway to govern their flock as best serves the needs of each particular congregation.
28. I believe both district and synod need changes made, with most being done at the Synodical level to reduce the overlapping of positions.

29. With what I read I kind o f thought so.
30. If there is overlap of structure or governance, this can be fixed. Overall we need to make sure that if we remove governance it is for improvement. Having such a large country to cover creates problems that need to be continually addressed. Some at a synodical level but also some in the closer areas. Do not abandon what works and helps at the local level.
31. with falling memberships, falling offerings, etc., the synod must downsize its admin and become more effective
32. They way our church is designed, the districts get autonomy, but are part of a whole. Therefore, the synod is needed, but so are the districts.
33. The geography of Canada is the challenge. Given the size of the membership - number of churches and people - It certainly appears there is duplication relating to "over governance.
34. Don't know
35. The quality of governing depends on the capability, integrity and devotion/adherence to God, not on the number of people doing the governing.
36. Extra government always costs more money which could be better spent elsewhere.
37. Yes, yes, and yes! Too many titles, too many committees, too many conventions. If this survey accomplishes nothing else, it should lead to a thorough streamlining of LCC's governance.
38. Our church governance is too big for a small church body. Four presidents (one for Synod and 3 for Districts) are not necessary. Services in the church could be centralized and governed under one structure instead of four (Synod and three Districts).
39. Probably - most organizations get to this point in general until change is essential and usually due to finances.
40. What does overly governed mean?
41. Works reasonably well - allows parishes autonomy to work as needed, in their locales.
42. present structure inherited from LCMS suggests that we have some governance concerns which we would like to adjust to fit our Canadian ministry needs.
43. Possibly, but it depends on how much time is spent on governance versus administration for key positions.
44. This is what I am told and, based on numbers, expect to be true.
45. Do we need full leadership venues and boards at every level? I don't believe this is the wisest use of limited funds for a relatively small church body.
46. Maybe the congregations need an increased flow of information.
47. Synod needs to be more frugal with spending, World travel District, president needs to be in the field more
48. It appears that way, however, leadership and organization as well as accountability are needed. Accountability happens at the congregational level now.
49. too many pastors in district positions that could help the parish ministry.
50. The challenge that we face is providing adequate governance in light of the geographical realities of our nation.
51. too many cooks and too many ministers
52. I tend to think there is too many doing the same things
53. Top heavy.
54. These bodies should not be called governing bodies because they do not rule or hold power over the congregations. They are serving and support bodies. Therefore, yes. The LCC districts and synod is VERY over-governed.

55. Too many clergy doing what laymen are better at.
56. Synod should not be a governing structure; it should be a serving structure. The district board is working as well as it can to serve its people, synod should try doing the same for once.
57. If there is duplication in structure, then one level could be eliminated or reduced.
58. It is a bare bones operation. More oversight of individual congregations and Pastor's likely wouldn't hurt.
59. It's possible that it is.
60. Old boys club, top down, and patronizing. generally,
61. Unsure, but I do think we could look into what roles are being performed, how, where and if we are overlapping the work unnecessarily.
62. Not enough information to make an accurate comment. I do know that each district seems to have more than one Associate President to handle various areas. Perhaps some could be combined.
63. don't know
64. need more info
65. By duplicity!
66. The synod and district seem to over-govern worldly things like CEF and conventions. However, in my experience, they fall very short in governing the doctrine and practice of individual congregations. There are congregations in my district that have practiced open communion for longer than I've been in the ministry; and speaking to the situation of my congregation, the District is aware of it and does nothing. Synod should be less involved in CEO type things and more involved in direct and continual ecclesiastical oversight of congregations.
67. I find this to be the case on the district level and I imagine that it must also be so on synod level but I have never been part of nor seen stuff at work on a synod level. And I guess I rather be over-governed then under-governed.
68. Too many cooks spoil the soup
69. Let’s define "what has to done" and have transparent accountable of what is done
70. should be all synod governed
71. too costly
72. There's far too much governing structures, which causes the synod to be "under-governed."
73. For the size of our synod we have far too much administration, especially with all the long distance tools now available to us.
74. Many administrative matters could be dealt with at one office, leaving District Presidents free to attend more fully to pastoral matters.
75. I wouldn't say "over governed", although there are some inefficiencies and overlap.
76. Not sure, but rest assured, that as time marches onward, more rules and legalism usually creeps into organizations little by little, so yes, there is a possibility there is too much governance. Again, the average lay person isn't in the loop on these matters.
77. That is my perception.
78. hmmm..... I don't know. I have very high regard for Pastor Bugbee and Pastor Zabel. Both are excellent servants of the Lord. I don't think either over-govern -- whatever that implies.
79. Although I think the structure may look substantially different going forward I am not positive that we are over-governed in terms of numbers. Possibly in services though.
80. A lot

81. For the size of LCC, this is quite possible.
82. The District was top heavy, I believe, with administration, But not LCC, no.
83. The system of governance that puts democratic authority into the hands of the church body as a whole is an integral aspect of LCC and LCMS. It is what we were founded on and relate to CFW Walther's theses. Separation of Synod and District allows issues to be dealt with appropriately depending on if they relate to local congregations or national concerns. The separation also helps hold the national church together as without it the differing East/West opinions might strain the church to breaking. This is obviously not a healthy thing to exist in the first place and should be dealt with delicately and is perhaps dealt best within the current structure.
84. The ABC District before the CEF crisis and the subsequent resignations, had too many people on staff. I am not sure about the situation in the other districts as to number of persons on staff.
85. The authority should remain with the congregations.
86. As much as it might seem so, geographically we are so large and some of our churches so small and in need of support that I don't believe we could do with less. In fact, its a shame we don't have more leadership in missions, schools, parish services in all districts.
87. Need much flatter structure
88. I tend to agree. I have always wondered why we need the district level and if things might be done more effectively on a circuit level.
89. No knowledge
90. Very hard to tell. No background information on governance or the Board of Directors is provided with this survey, and no governance model information is provided on the LCC web site, nor on the East District web site. This aspect of the church's operation appears to be on a "for your eyes only" or "need to know" basis.
91. Too much duplication and wasted resources. We are small in number and widely dispersed and shrinking.
92. Unknown
93. I do not know.
94. not enough info. Where is the heart of these people in serving Jesus or is it in their title?
95. Administration at ABC District was overloaded with administration.
96. Considering the size of our country, in order to keep people connected to the church and its work, the current structure makes sense although numbers and finances may say otherwise.
97. Over- governed how?
98. Our ABC District has been overstaffed in the past but I think that has changed lately.
99. am not well enough informed
100. Elimination of Districts would entail significant reduction in positions to be filled in our shrinking church body.
101. Perception of a lot of bureaucracy, given the size of LCC.
102. We are a shrinking church. We need to look at shrinking administration before we shrink the number of workers in the field.
103. Beware of micro -- mangers within the organization
104. We do not need so many different boards of governors.
105. Not sure, really do not know.
106. This may be the case, but I am not sure.
107. Don't know how they are governed so can't answer.

108. I have been told for a few years it is. So I have to believe those in the know, know.
109. I believe it may be under-governed.
110. Not sure how to answer this. In one respect, I agree: I don't think we should have so many trained pastors in solely administrative roles. In another respect, I disagree: I don't think there's a whole lot of "governing" going on, especially in the area of ecclesiastical oversight. When there are spiritual problems in congregations, and harm being done, the perception is there's no recourse.
111. What does this mean? We have too many bodies holding too many positions, yet we see little to no ecclesiastical oversight from those bodies in those positions.
112. Some things are duplicated within the district & synodical levels.
113. Due to the reduced number of member congregations, we need to reduce the size of our governance model. One central office for all of LCC is sufficient in this current age of technology.
114. governance needs to focus on material subjects, not just do the same old thing. for example, why did the Edmonton college make their decision without even the knowledge of LCC/ABC? there seems to be a disconnection.
115. Appeared to be so at the District level but not at Synod.
116. I agree at the District level not so much at the Synodical level.
117. Evident at the District level.
118. I sometimes think there is too much at the district level but can't speak for synod level
119. There could be fewer members of their respective boards, but the two levels of governance don't overlap, so there is no over-governance.
120. Probably.
121. it usually is top heavy in any organization
122. The ABC district seemed to be a little out of hand before all of the kerfuffle over the church extension fund, but the Central District and synodical office seem pretty pared down. I'm not too familiar with the East District, having only recently become a member here.
123. Unknown
124. Perhaps... though it could be the other way around too. What is it we actually need manned?
125. Unknown to me
126. There is a Board of Directors for each, and somewhat similar boards and committees for each. Finding people to serve on each is becoming more and more difficult.
127. Perhaps - no data
128. Unknown
129. I don't know enough, how this works.
130. I do not know.
131. At Synod level it is
132. With the recent changes in ABC District, this is now of lesser concern.
133. Over-manned, perhaps, but not over-governed.
134. Not educated to know.
135. This statement is misleading and implies "over-governed". LCC and district have their own governance needs.
136. Which one????
137. Don't know.
138. Too much staff. We don't need 4 presidents - one for Synod and one in each district. We need one central unit. One president for accountability, transparency and unity.

139. somewhat. Taking good men out of congregations isn't feasible.
140. -agreed. -I have noticed that most things in the church are over-governed, which can serve as a real hindrance in accomplishing the mission of the church.
141. What are all of the tangible and intangible fruits that are being produced from these positions? Do those fruits warrant this many positions?
142. By eliminating the districts, much of the over-governance would disappear.
143. We may not be able to financially afford the present governance.
144. Don't know
145. don't know
146. Many of the things done by District presidents could be done by regional/synodical vice-presidents.
147. Requires redefining of roles and responsibilities.
148. Question is unclear. Do Districts over govern? Are they over governed by Synod? The District runs by virtue of the Resolutions passed by District Convention. They do not "govern". Synod? not so sure about that.
149. So it is said, and I find no reason to disagree.
150. it was ... at the district level
151. Should be governed by more qualified individuals
152. Answered in previous questions.
153. LCC is a small church. I question the usefulness of district governance in this age of travel and telecommunication.
154. at district level
155. Check out the DeBlock and DeBlock report and see if changes are needed.
156. Change this to "misgoverned" and I'd agree with you. When I read / hear stories of misconduct by Synod and District officials and said mis-conduct not being corrected, the church has become a bully not a minister.
157. District used to be but it is not now. Not sure about Synod.
158. Get rid of the districts
159. Do not have info on this
160. When we find a need to come up with a statement at East District of our belief in the literal 6-day creation as per the bible, one knows that we are working overtime on non-issues. It's 2015, why is there a need for such a statement? Are we so challenged by science that we need to counter their statements? We can surely come up with many many more doctrinal statements if we put our minds to it. This kind of local brainstorming, if one could call it that, is non-productive and frankly could lead to doctrinal divisiveness on some other issues. This is why (not only financial concerns) we need a central body for both spiritual and administrative matters.
161. lottsa chiefs
162. -this is a poorly worded questions, as this is two separate questions
163. Probably, but as a lay person this is hard to answer.
164. For the size of the membership within the Synod, we have duplication of positions.
165. It is always important for any large organization to be more "top-down" to avoid chaos and confusion and to help keep things more uniform.
166. need wiser decisions, less travel and waste of money in every way
167. three sets of people being paid to choose and decide to do things that could be chosen and decided by one set of people.

168. need wiser decisions and less travelling around and waste of money in every way
169. Have no information about this.
170. I need to understand how many layers are in the decision making authority
171. I think if the district level was eliminated and governance was only at the Synodical level, that would be a better balance. I think the areas of governance on each level is good -- but that we only need one level.
172. If this is the case, then restructuring should occur to streamline the structure.
173. Probably - there seems to be a lot of layers.
174. Too much time spent on governance and not enough time preaching the Gospel.
175. As mentioned in previous questions I believe the districts should be amalgamated under the auspice of Synod.
176. Likely.
177. ABC district has gone totally renegade. Clean house.
178. Not necessarily over governed, but over administered. Most of this is just a we always did it this way in the LCMS so we are just going to do it this way in the LCC. But we do not have the resources, neither people wise or financially, to act like the LCMS.
179. Over-governed? What does that mean? I would say that we have too many seminaries, too many buildings, too many trained and talented and called church-workers working in a structure that can no longer support it and continue to do significant mission and ministry at the grass-roots level. However, over-governed --- that is something different -- unless you count the pastors in synodical positions as simply governors.
180. This question needs to be more specific. In some ways this is accurate and in others it is not. Work certainly needs to be done in order to strengthen the relationship between district and synod.
181. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
182. Possibly, but don't have the evidence.
183. maybe a bit at the synodical level, but at the district level it is grossly understaffed.
184. I think that we could do more with less. Centralize what we can rather than duplicating some things in three districts.
185. I cannot answer this question in spite of strong opinions - what does "over-governed" mean? I do not think the synod needs the district level, yet I also think that as a whole our synod is under-governed in terms of adherence to synodical conditions of membership and doctrinal practice - thus I cannot answer this question in spite of strong opinions -
186. Our District office was over-staffed; rife with patronage appointments; available positions not publicly advertised and often filled by unqualified staff. Too many pastors were removed from congregations to serve in District offices in positions that could have been filled by laity.
187. It is over governed by some members who are probably not qualified for the work they are doing.
188. Two layers of administration is at least one too many.
189. Hopefully, restructuring will vet the governing practices and create a more streamlined entity.
190. I think maybe so.
191. One has the same power as the other
192. Don't know enough to offer an informed opinion.

193. ABC is not at the present. To me it appears that there is much work and not that many workers....
194. I don't know.
195. We have less Lutherans in LCC than the Minnesota North District in the LCMS, we don't need three levels of bureaucracy lets have just one.
196. Especially at the synod level.
197. It is over-governed at the District level. A good restructure will change District down to its proper level of control.
198. too many people and not being effective
199. It nearly appears that a system of governance has come about that rewards those who do not want to serve in Pastoral positions to progress into some director/governor/consulting position the rewards the presumed service.
200. Possibly
201. Unsure at synodical level, district level is okay.
202. There is a fine line here, we should have enough people to do the jobs efficiently and economically, but not too many employees and not neglecting any important area of service to our congregations. Like my home budget, this requires fine tuning and wisdom.
203. Not knowledgeable about this.
204. Not sure what the district does for us!
205. Don't know if there are some areas in both levels that are duplicated unnecessarily.
206. This is absolutely the case.
207. Too many officials and a big overlap. That is expensive.
208. It seems the bureaucracy in the ABC District had become too large. I blame much of this on their financial ministries. It is interesting at how the District lost so many employees with the recent Church Extension Fund fiasco, yet I hardly notice an change on the local congregational level. It would seem the ABC District was over-governed by the District Office in Edmonton.
209. Let's simplify and get back to more grass-roots thinking, use common sense and be humble in planning and actions.
210. There is much work to do and few who inclined to do it. (See the story of the vineyard and the workers.) There is always a need to examine human-created structures with the goal of improving them.
211. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
212. If there is duplication of services that is expensive in both time and money.
213. I think it use to be but now ABC district has had to down size there is not as much salary waste.
214. District currently tries to replicate in structure on a smaller scale that happens at Synod. Unfortunately, what happened the Synod took its' eyes off what happened in ABC because they had their own governance model If Synod takes its fiduciary duties seriously they eliminate the District governance
215. It is over-governed in some respects, but completely lacking in vision and oversight in others.
216. We were definitely top heavy prior to the forced restructuring.
217. Unsure
218. That is my perception.

219. I do not know??
220. It is also "over-populated" and often appears to be a place of employment for those "with connections in need of a job." This has given the appearance that Nepotism rules the hiring practice of all levels of administration. Lay persons who note that a job opening is available have said in my hearing, "Why should I apply, I am not a Pastor's wife so I would never get it."
221. The current structure is unsustainable.
222. I don't have information to answer this.
223. A flow chart along with this survey would have been helpful so as to make useful comments and suggest a better structure.
224. Again, however, this over governance has to do, not with the current staffing of Synod, but the present structure which requires the presence of a full complement of District officers. Let's remove the District structures and consolidate our energies & resources at the national level.
225. In terms of physical plants. it seems office space could be incorporated into existing congregational
226. With Central District and ABC District office staff having been downsized and East District paring things to the bone with regard to staff and hours and with many of the tasks and concerns of the Board for Parish services being not of a local nature but across Canada, we would be better served with these things looked after on a national level.
227. ???
228. having a district governance, as well as a synod governance is too much for the size of the congregations they govern.
229. There are districts in the LCMS and other denominations larger is size but small in administration.
230. From all my encounters the workers at district are overwhelmed
231. On the district level, the question needs to be asked: Do we need the amount of administration that we currently have?
232. I think that it tends to be governed by people who are interested in governing and not serving. Who are more interested in the exercise of power than the exercise of true servant hood.
233. not 'over-governed' but "over-conventioned"
234. Not so much over governed, but too expensive for our population size. Our large area requires some very creative solutions to meet the needs of the synod and congregations.
235. Seems to be some duplication.
236. This is especially true as we decrease in numbers, and can expect more of the same, at least from what I see of our synod.
237. Not governed enough in the areas of supervision of deacons/teachers/pastors, and in the area of CEF. Otherwise, I'm not sure if there is too much governance in other areas.
238. I'd say not, as long as those in these positions are working together and not duplicating services
239. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. Check out the DeBlock and DeBlock report and see if changes are needed
240. usually the case...
241. Too many levels of administration.

242. Those who hold offices at the district and synodical level should always be looking and receiving input from the LWMLs in the individual congregations.
243. Cautiously I agree. I suspect the district could be reduced to a President/Mission executive or only a mission executive. I think no district should own a building, but rent an office in a shared Lutheran setting. I am not sure about the finances. If this major problem had happened at a national level, all of us would have been hurt. CEF for individual districts can really help local congregations.
244. This is such a general statement..."Over governed?" What does this mean?
245. It was over governed. Now it is under-governed.
246. Perhaps District Boards would know better if there needs to be a different split of responsibilities.
247. The District level, YES! Within our Synodical structure, I would not say we are over governed. However, if the Districts were to no longer exist, it would mean a more active role for the Vice-Presidents elected as Synods representatives to become more involved in the lives of the congregations under their care!
248. I hope the CCMS can answer this. Perception and fact is mutually exclusive.
249. No knowledge
250. That may be the truth for the # of persons that make up LCC. But centralizing all is not the answer! There needs to be ownership, involvement and leadership in and from regions or our church in this post church era may very well unravel.
251. model of governance at the District level is too complex for the size of the District - simplify it and make it more manageable and meaningful
252. I think it may be on the District level. District should primarily seek to help co-ordinate the congregations under it's jurisdiction to help facilitate reaching the goals of the Synod.
253. We live in a world where more efficiency is needed, not less. The current structure is top heavy.
254. There is a lot of bureaucracy at the upper levels. However, the lowly lay-person in the congregations really doesn't experience this a whole lot.
255. Synod OK, East, OK, Central OK, ABC remains to be seen.
256. And ineffectively over-governed to boot. It's incompetency at all levels.
257. Both are top heavy. 45% of ABC budget is used to pay for administrators, it should be between 10-12%
258. We are not a large organization. My perception is that we have a lot of management for an organization of this size. I most cases congregations should self sufficient.
259. Question is too vague to be answered.
260. More government is always bad.
261. I'm surprised you have to ask this question. We are only a body of 60,000. Simple math says we have too much governance.
262. I neither agree nor disagree because of my lack of knowledge, but I can see where this is a possibility of this. That being said, with the reduction in staff in the ABC District necessitated by the CEF/DIL situation, I would think that there is a greater possibility that the ABC District is understaffed v/s overstaffed.
263. I think the restructuring committee can provide insight on this question.
264. LCC should function as one unified entity with any District function reporting to and under control of the Synod. Eliminate all the duplication and implement effective controls and reporting.

265. Our membership is shrinking, maybe our government needs to reflect this.
266. Yep.
267. Probably, but I can't really give an informed opinion.
268. 4 boards of directors, 4 investment funds, 4 treasurers and business managers for 70,000 people? The absurd waste hardly needs to be emphasized.
269. ELCIC seems to have a more manageable organizational structure. Reassessing the governance may allow for better financial stewardship.

48. LCC should continue to function as three federated Districts as it does now.

1. What's the point of LCC if it doesn't even hold the authority to enforce the doctrine and practices of individual church bodies?
2. I don't understand.
3. Don't understand.
4. It may be hard to change as our land is so big and diverse.
5. Two districts enough.
6. due to current population - we should go down to 2 districts East and West - starting at T. Bay.
7. Unsure, maybe even more, smaller districts?
8. No Districts, one L.C.C.
9. Synod should be in charge.
10. I'm tempted to say no, but I know that each district has its own set of unique challenges and needs. Getting rid of districts might result in those special needs being overlooked or neglected.
11. There is no reason to have divisions like this. These geographical divisions create other, more serious divisions.
12. Districts are just a carry over from the US model. There was little thought as to their real effectiveness as we formed a Canadian synod.
13. ABC has been doing their own thing for way too long and look where it got them.
14. abuse of power and communication control is done. enough. stop it.
15. There may be other healthier models.
16. Nope. Not working. The inequities between the Districts has been evident for a long time, and as long as their relationship is merely a federation, there is no mechanism for leveling them out. Centralization is the way to go.
17. Have not seen much evidence that ABC District has brought value to our congregation.
18. The Districts do not need to be incorporated separately as is now, but the organization at the Synodical level could be as such that there were Districts as part of the organization. It would cut down on the government administration required in our church body at the district levels
19. If that is what could be made to work best.
20. That should be up to review committee.
21. The average lay person would not know.
22. ABC doesn't work right now.
23. We should only change this in favour of a more ecclesiastical model with bishops and perhaps regional parishes or deaneries. Secular business models, should be avoided at all costs.

24. I'm not informed as to how we function.
25. Some sort of merger is likely needed.
26. I feel whichever promotes the best efficiency is the best course of action.
27. Nothing has been shown that indicates otherwise.
28. I'd expect various options to be presented, which might include this? I don't know the implications of dissolving or otherwise. At the same time, I'd not feel tied to maintaining districts if there is a better, more efficient structure proposed. I'd think a solution we'd move to should be like a "win - win" for our Church. Hopefully we'll be united in the direction that enhances our service and ministry as Christ's people.
29. Again we are too large a country geographically to work effectively otherwise.
30. After examining what is going wrong and looking to the future then we can determine this. If it is better to change this structure to keep the church body healthy and to bring the word to more people, then change it. Otherwise the structure is sound but needs changes to make it work better then do this. A set answer on this is very tough to give since all the information needed would not come out until a major discussion with all groups takes place.
31. Increases in population since the districts were formed would indicate more than three districts are needed.
32. should be one
33. waste of resources, duplication, confusion
34. dissolve the districts and have only LCC central with selected staff that would be assigned to assist each area of Canada based on geographical realities, but all report to president
35. The recent ABC debacle once again comes to mind.
36. not sure what the restructured look is supposed to look like
37. Our three districts are about the same size as some LCMS Districts.
38. Our church governance is too big for a small church body. Four presidents (one for Synod and 3 for Districts) are not necessary. Services in the church could be centralized and governed under one structure instead of four (Synod and three Districts).
39. I wish once again I had more information but I really wouldn't know who to ask for a clearer picture.
40. At least 3.
41. Depends if you mean the same three districts or newly formed ones.
42. Can we afford to do so?
43. The Districts are geographically much too large and too expensive to maintain. LCC should be composed of, roughly, a dozen districts (for example, each present district being divided into 4 districts each, similar to the present circuits), thus enabling much less travel and closer contact. However, each district president (spiritual leader) should be a pastor (active at a congregation or institution, or retired) without a full district salary (perhaps a partial remuneration). Most of the administrative duties of the districts may be fulfilled nationally.
44. It depends on whether the necessary services can be delivered without Districts.
45. I don't know how we can continue to do this when membership numbers and available dollars are decreasing. However, I am concerned about the continued opportunity for congregational voice and vote if districts cease to exist.
46. Do not need three offices should be restructured some way.
47. East attitudes arte totally different from west attitudes you force them into one group you will have issues.
48. 2 districts

49. I would agree to fewer districts if it is done in a manner that strengthens circuits and individual congregations.
50. I have heard that we have been compared to a three legged stool, with the danger of one leg breaking and bringing down the church. There is also the danger of reducing the districts and there being only one entity that can go down. That said, the hope would be that we become more united if we would work closer together, thus striving for the goal of walking together.
51. Are the three districts required to achieve our vision?
52. Poorly worded statement
53. In Canada we are very different from one area to the other!!
54. Or maybe just two? East and West. Why is there 3 anyhow?
55. Maybe not three, but definitely two. we need to look more into this before making that decision.
56. Yes. The country of Canada realizes this - there are three forms of government, local, provincial, and federal. An Ontario government cannot govern Alberta on a provincial level because one, there is too much work to be done, and two, Ontario doesn't understand Alberta the way Albertans do.
57. Whatever is in the best interest of restructuring.
58. Depending on the weaknesses that will be found that have led to this restructuring being required.
59. Geography is a challenge, but there are alternatives to face to face meetings. Three districts might be the right size for CEFs.
60. I think we should look to structure ourselves to the best for the entire synod, but I am unclear as to what that best might be. (Something we do need to pray about.)
61. The Federated Districts would be more in tune with the needs or directions of the local congregations with the Synod overseeing defined shared areas e. g. Worker benefits, world missions, LSO's, Auxiliaries etc.
62. This is a huge statement to respond to with one stroke.
63. Each District has different focus as demanded by the congregations and members. Each District has different elements that it works with.
64. It should structure itself for the greatest benefit for both the single congregations and the larger entities. To much structure kills / deforms the roots, too little and the thing 'falls over'.
65. Each district has its own size, number of congregations, and needs. Probably not effective to change the structuring outside of what it is now.
66. We should repent of this. This is not how we were set up to operate.
67. Should each president (or whatever title) of each district continue to be pastor of a congregation? If the congregation was large, could that church have a vicar?
68. need more info
69. There are lots of potential options. This will require study.
70. We are one church -- one governing body should be able to administer our church with the same rules for every area and as the feasibility of the 'church' as a gathering place is compromised, that too could be an issue of change as we strive to go forward.
71. Changing the church structure seems to me to be a sleight-of-hand which gives the appearance of "doing something about our problems" when the real problem is that district officials don't supervise the doctrine and practice of congregations. All other inefficiencies of our synod, I believe, are symptoms of an internal and suppressed doctrinal division. When doctrine is divided, it takes money and programs to artificially hold a Synod together. It is

easy to blame the structure, because the structure won't get offended and resist. The root of our synodical problems is that we are a doctrinal divided synod, and synod appears unwilling to admit this or do anything about it in the light of day.

72. I would have said yes in the past but in light of what happened with ABC district, I am not so sure anymore.
73. needs to be under one header
74. Should try two
75. Decided already at Convention
76. As long as the need for restructuring is clearly enunciated and the resulting proposals meet those needs, then let's see what's proposed, whether it be zero, three or some other number of Districts.
77. It seems to have worked reasonably acceptable this far, so unless there is a very compelling reason to consolidate, maybe we should concentrate on other more important matters now, such as the ABC district mess, breathing as much life into LCC as possible at this time of need, and cleaning up any general messes that exist within LCC or any local churches. I could agree with consolidation as a desperate measure if necessary, to save LCC.
78. Is there a better structure? Do we divide strictly by geography? Is there disparity? I think there could be an improved structure, but I do not know what it is.
79. It really comes down to a matter of dollars and cents. We can't afford continuing with the old model.
80. NOT as it is now
81. Geographic Districts
82. If the current districts operate as somewhat legal and autonomous entities duplicating work, then I do not think this is necessary.
83. There could be a benefit to combining the districts into Synod as it could lead to improved efficiency. However, Canada is a large country and if all decisions need to be made centrally it would likely lead to some conflict. If the decision was to abolish the districts and have just the Synod, likely based on financial reasons, I would not be completely against it but I do believe the best option is to maintain separate districts. A change to a single administrative unit should only be made if a very careful analysis has been done on the effects and repercussions of the change.
84. With fewer congregations, not as many District positions are needed - there is a lot of money being paid out at the three district levels. However, I am not sure only positions at the Synod level are the solution as there are vast differences across the country.
85. SOME regional help and oversight is beneficial; not necessarily as now.
86. Not sure this is accurate.
87. I can't see a better way to function.
88. The whole geographic structure need to be reviewed and streamlined - you're on track by doing this review.
89. Size of the country gives limited choices
90. I would feel very out of touch with the church is we had no districts but were all lumped together.
91. It could continue in this way, but likely is too costly.
92. Districts (if they continue to exist at all) are only branches of Synod, not separate governing entities

93. I believe there has to be some type of District office or centre, I cannot see how Winnipeg office would be able to do it all. How would they know each congregation's needs?
94. Things need to be sorted out. There needs to be focus on serving the Lord as it is laid out in scripture. We were at a recent meeting where a retired pastor mentioned how glad he was to be retired so he didn`t have to deal with the politics at the District level. How sad. What is going on at our leadership level...
95. Ask me again in 5 years.
96. It all depends on what the alternatives are. See also my comments to #47 which are applicable here as well.
97. Whatever is best.
98. strictly because of the numbers
99. Again, this should be reviewed, and changed if deemed necessary.
100. With the reduced number of congregations across the prairies, I don't know why we don't have just two districts, east and west (Saskatchewan west and Manitoba east.) There are an enormous number of churches still open with 15 to 20 members when people are driving to work or for other services regularly during the week. They are a drain on resources and on the time invested by pastors.
101. Whatever is practical, given the size of LCC.
102. In some things, districts may be an advantage given the diverse nature of our country. However, we need to shrink out all the overhead we can.
103. Geographically it makes sense but is that what is best for the synod I am not completely convinced.
104. The districts should be dissolved in favour of smaller regional ministry areas (e.g., "dioceses") with locally elected bishops whose service is focused on ecclesiastical supervision and pastoral care, with business/administrative matters being referred back to synod's national office.
105. Open & constant communication is a must. With Canada's Geographical size, fewer Districts will loose the small amount of family feeling that exists. A cold, impersonal relationship will result. The bottom of the pyramid will be lost to the folks at the top
106. Not sure. It would be good to see options of what LCC could look like and operate like.
107. What might the alternatives be?
108. Unless research proves otherwise.
109. I would be open to a different structure if it would serve us better.
110. ".... three federated Districts" - is the average lay person to understand what this means? Each District should retain authority or control over those issues which are local to churches within it - see comment 46) above
111. would need more info
112. What does this have to do with restructuring.
113. The organization was working well in carrying out the eight objectives listed at the beginning.
114. It could be fine with these Districts but may also function better with more than three districts.
115. unless geographical considerations would make it more efficient to change location or no. of Districts
116. Each district has urged a restructure.
117. In general, has worked well

118. I haven't heard of a better plan at this point without each District losing its identity in one large conglomerate. Local issues need to be identified not ignored.
119. Too much man power and resources are now being used. With communication and technology available today, four governing units are not required.
120. Districts serve as firewalls. There is a great distrust of the high church theology in East District on the part of the West, and a great distrust by the East of the Waltherian, Congregationalist Lutheran theology most prevalent in the West. Get rid of the Districts, and the Synod will break up into smaller synods representing those respective camps that coexist in one Synod today.
121. because of the great distances and the differences in people, areas, etc. that are currently evident, the individual districts are needed to work through the elements in each area
122. If we no longer work as Districts, we will need a type of area representation like the Central District is presently doing.
123. If division of duties is well understood, perhaps they can remain as 3 districts but clear responsibilities must be established between the districts and the Synod. What I am most concerned about is how we outreach to our members, to those we would like to see return to our church, and to those who don't understand a need to be in church. I have detected a slow implosion of LCC and LCMS for years.
124. As already mentioned, need to dissolve the Districts and unify them in Synod. I am disappointed that there are only two options for change in this survey. I expected more and greater vision. This is why I answered #21.
125. This model predates the establishment of LCC. It has served its' purpose and to be blunt it isn't constitutional. How many younger pastors and laity even know what we are talking about here?
126. Whatever the restructuring decides will answer this.
127. Change only if a smoother more efficient system
128. Unification of the entire church is key.
129. No more than two
130. Perhaps smaller regions. E.g., BC and Alberta are two very different regions politically, culturally, etc.
131. We need more authority at the Synod level.
132. Synod and Districts need to work together and never be competitors.
133. not really sure
134. Perhaps - no data to suggest otherwise Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
135. Unless some changes needed for smoother more effective system
136. The purpose of the restructuring committee is in large part to explore alternatives to the current structure and put forward options to improve. Since I do not yet have the suggestions of what can be, I cannot comment on whether they (the suggestions) are better than the current structure.
137. We are spread out over such a vast territorial region.
138. This is absurd. This district is bigger than the US east of the Mississippi River. This district is bigger than India, Argentina, Greenland, Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Turkey, Chile, France, Ukraine, Spain, Cameroon, Sweden, Iraq, Germany, or Poland, to name just a few of the sovereign nations smaller than this district. To sincerely believe that an area of this size with a population speaking two distinct languages can be led spiritually by one man sitting behind

a large desk in a city hundreds of miles from most of the persons he allegedly leads beggars the imagination.

139. This statement is misleading since it implies that "federated" is a correction description. LCC has its functions. The districts function with their respective responsibilities.
140. If so let's just call it quits and go back to the Missouri Synod with all her problems.
141. Travel costs are less if District staff is used. District president should be able to handle most issues.
142. That would be a conclusion drawn from the structural review.
143. Scrap the Districts.
144. With the today's technology there is no need for this. It is easy to communicate over distances. Not financially sustainable to run as three Districts. Need the unity and accountability of one Synod.
145. It is necessary to look at a new and improved structure (soon)
146. Maybe more.
147. Change should happen is this is not effective.
148. We need to be ONE.
149. The flow of money from District to Synod works well. The District is able to direct money to resources that assist church workers and congregations in their work. Regional offices have their finger on the pulse of the needs of local congregations in local communities.
150. This is the root structural ill which has caused the bulk of the problems LCC faces, in my opinion.
151. But does each District need to have a president, office building, staff etc.?
152. We believe in the power of the congregation - we need to have decision making close to that base. The challenge for all levels to ensure that happens in a productive, effective way
153. The districts should be abolished.
154. If we are going to function as a unified church body, then we should think like a unified church body. If supervisional and ecclesiastical duties need to be divided for efficiency, then have it based on density of congregations rather than by provincial barriers
155. There is a lot of criticism due to poor communications and 'ill will' between east and west.
156. I would prefer geographically smaller units than our current districts.
157. Not necessary.
158. If we continue to operate the way, we are now our congregational membership will continue to shrink and eventually we will just be reacting with a haste driven infrastructure downsizing. We have an opportunity now to pro-actively plan on a structure we think will be sustainable and that can grow to meet the needs of our church in the future.
159. As I see it, there is great value in pastoral leadership being provided by individuals who understand the local needs of congregations. It seems to me that the districts differ enough that having districts is valuable, although I do not know if 3 districts, as currently designated, is the best possible structure.
160. 1 President 1 Ecclesiastical supervisor 3 regional synod VPs (one from each district) 1 Ecclesiastical supervisor from each district =3 total of 8 BOD members
161. until LCC grows - perhaps a review every 10 years
162. Seems there should be change, but not sure what that should look like.
163. Is this how the Handbook mandates the relationship with Synod and Districts? If not; then why not?

164. It is clear to me that effective investigation and adjudication of issues requires dis-interested parties, and in some cases that cannot be done effectively by the District in which the offence has taken place. Also, federated Districts means there's no way to bring an erring District back into line when they wander away from the correct path.
165. Given the sheer size of the country, I'm not sure that we could do with fewer districts, especially for the purposes of building community.
166. there is a role for District that Synod cannot fulfill as well as District because of its distance from congregations.
167. due to the distance between us it is money we can save and use wisely
168. Yes...as smaller districts allow for more guidance and leadership to the local community...no only for costs.
169. This quote is appropriate, 'If we go in the direction we have been going.... we will surely get there'. In other words, do nothing and you will continue in the direction you are headed.
170. change boundaries
171. don't need double the coverage.
172. The current federated districts seem to work in silos and not as a whole for Lutheran Church Canada
173. Perhaps have various sections divided in smaller parishes that then send the leading pastor to synod for conventions. LCC is small in number but spread out. It may make more sense to have smaller bishoprics under one archbishop.
174. unless there is a style that would suit our demographics better
175. I believe two Districts would suffice (one LCC East and one LCC West)
176. One synod, with circuits within.
177. I wonder if this model results in duplication of services and extra costs?
178. If the future for this to remain seems financially viable
179. I do not know, may God grant wisdom to those who do
180. I don't know, may God grant wisdom to those who do
181. We need to find the right structure which could be 3 or 2 or 1 - there would need to analysis done to understand the impact of all options - and those options clearly laid out to all congregations
182. Not enough information to make that choice
183. If duplication of services occurs, then no.
184. Ecclesiastical districts but not administrative districts.
185. As mentioned in previous questions I believe the districts should be amalgamated under the auspice of Synod.
186. Seems over political.
187. One Synod, no districts.
188. This is a strange question. The definition that has been passed down over the years is that Lutheran Church - Canada is a Synod (made up of congregations and church workers) that operates regionally as Districts. I was taught in confirmation that a District is simply Synod in that place. However, now that you have brought up the idea of synod as a Federation of Districts.... that sounds like it could be the ideal arrangement for how to deal with our supposed vast cultural and practical differences between East and West. Membership can be voluntary as it is now based upon a subscription to the Confessions.
189. It is what we as the people know. However, this is not completely necessary for the proper operation of the church body.

190. Does LCC function as three federated districts now? If so, it's contrary to what synod is. Each district is the synod in that place. The synod is not the combined total of the three districts.
191. I'm not at all convinced that this is a good use of resources.
192. This is an abuse of our current structure, and should not be happening in the first place. If the Districts have the independence they've been acting with, we have no need for such a large synodical infrastructure/bureaucracy, especially as the current Pastoral Supervisor of ABC District thinks LCC should have little to no say in District matters (even as he somehow has taken such a position).
193. We should at least discuss this concept.
194. There is no need to maintain three major district offices with the effective avenues of telecommunication that are available today.
195. This should be examined.
196. Absolutely not!
197. I think that's one of the main questions we need to deal with.
198. The Church is much too small to support the Federated District concept.
199. To be determined.
200. This needs to be restructured.
201. Such division allows each district to concentrate on its own areas of need.
202. Perhaps the Districts require supervision....
203. It all depends on the level of trust that exists. If there is a broad based consensus that we're all on the same page in terms of doctrine and practice that having one central structure makes sense. As long as there is a sense that maybe things aren't done elsewhere as they are here then having the federal system may need continue.
204. In view of what has occurred in the ABC District, this may need to be re-visited and changed.
205. Let’s try something else, this isn't working.
206. But it is time to discuss the resources that could be shared.
207. I'm not sure at this time
208. Get rid of Districts entirely. We are too small and don't need them.
209. We will have to wait to see where all this takes us. It does look like districts are a thing of the past.
210. It is difficult to meet the needs of such far-flung geographically distanced congregations as we have in Canada with one national body. However, care needs to be taken that we don't needlessly have administration, simply because we have districts.
211. "3"Federated districts is probably the smallest we should go to in a country as regionally diverse as Canada. Diversity is always good if we are encouraging "bottom up ministry" throughout the establishment.
212. Not enough info to comment
213. I am unsure if this is economically feasible.
214. Perhaps it would be better stewardship of time & resources if the 3 districts were combined.
215. What a loaded statement! If we're functioning as a federation of Districts, then shame on us. Districts are simply "LCC in a specific geographic location" and if their identities have broken out of that (which I hear that ABC specifically has, not sure about the other ones), then that's a mockery of our current structure and by extension of our people.

216. The only district that was providing a good amount of funds to Synod was ABC until CEF. Synod was providing funds to Central and Eastern was holding its head above water. The old LCMS model adopted from 1989 has outlived its usefulness for Canada.
217. We need less government and more concern. Why are we paying all this money for buildings and staff salaries? That's not mission.
218. Geographically, we are a large church body. BUT... we are not large in terms of the number of congregations and pastors. Do we really need three Districts? Remember, in the LC-MS it was the Synod which created Districts. We did it backwards here in Canada when the Districts created LC-C.
219. Definitely need to restructure but not totally dissolve Districts. Maybe a person or a few people could be liaison so that we are not duplicating services but also not being dictated to by a few people at the synod level. Each district has different need, talents, etc. and needs to have some say in the Synod.
220. If you want to change this, then just tell the members and ask them for support. I think a decision like this should not be made simply to react to what (appears to be) a series of poor decisions in one area. That district needs help, and we should be planning on how to achieve this help. We should not waste time restructuring unless this enables the members to provide the help that is needed.
221. is this taking away from ministering to the congregations?
222. It is obvious that this is not viable, efficient nor effective.
223. Is it able to be administrated efficiently as one level, and can our East-West Canada differences be put to rest to cooperate?
224. It can have regional programs
225. It seems that the current Districts are too far removed from the individual congregations.
226. This is part of analyzing the restructure - nothing is status quo without being reviewed.
227. regional reps would be better. circuits should be stronger. I heard about a "deanery" model from somebody and looked it up. looks good for a smaller church.
228. Two districts might work better.
229. Our present 3-District structure is a huge problem - both in terms of fostering a national sense of unity & purpose - but also in the way in which it has lent definition to regional pridefulness. This needs to be put to death in repentance.
230. The circumstances in each District is different and there are different needs and expectations in each District.
231. If there is a significantly better way, there should be change; if none is clearly known, no change
232. There is always room to improve.
233. I think its working
234. If the Districts were drop and only the LCC left, remote church in the small communities would never ever see anybody from LCC. Its bad enough now and we have Districts
235. oh - sigh, it doesn't seem to be as well out west and I believe they need help
236. We are to spread the word of God not abuse the money given to the work.
237. it should be more regional, and then have one over arching "district" i.e. the synod.
238. We are a very large geography to cover. To centralize or decentralize is always a question in large governing bodies. We are centralized by admission of our faith and the doctrines that govern it. We should not confuse the role of the church in society to the degree of creating a larger administration that becomes untouchable. The current system seems to work fine.

239. The reason that I agree is that I am fearful of centralized governance which can be just as bloated as we have it now
240. We should "WALK TOGETHER AS ONE" under one Synod and one board of directors. Otherwise we keep the same thing
241. Federated Districts?? That's not what the LCC constitution says.
242. Shouldn't you see what the restructuring committee recommends first? Oh, right, it is the same people who are governing, do they will continue to think I'm the same ways. Fresh ideas, fresh people.
243. We only need LCC to function as the leader of this Synod not three federated districts.
244. need more info to answer
245. Creative solution required as above
246. It's time for changing this, even if it is functional, especially in light of continued shrinkage.
247. geographical areas are too large
248. Two districts only required. West - Manitoba west; East - Ontario east
249. This has now been shown to be dangerous to the health of the Synod as a whole and an irresponsible way forward. Districts are no longer needed in the federated way in which we formed. Synod would be best served in an unified way.
250. I think it's too early to comment on this as the restructuring will have an impact on whether this is true
251. It is usually better for organizations to be led by districts, who then work with each other. The districts usually know their members better, and have a better idea as to what the needs are of their members. (Like in a business, the boss usually doesn't know his workers needs but the managers usually do, so the managers work with the workers and the boss to balance any issues that come along). Having only three districts may not give an accurate representation to individual needs of some congregations. Perhaps having more districts would be better, but do not over fill the districts leadership roles with unnecessary people, as more people is not always better.
252. As a Church body LCC should always be open to major or minor overhaul. I am reasonable happy with what we have [sure ABC is not].
253. we need to be open to options but if everything was centered in 1 office that may lead to a further separation between the Synod and congregations
254. For such a small church body there is no need for Districts.
255. Maybe, but not with the current boards etc. If both the districts and synod boards etc. were significantly smaller, then maybe.
256. With less people and less resources, but more connect to a synod office.
257. I believe that regionally, maybe more than three would be advantageous.
258. Are any other districts having problems?
259. This is a waste of time, talents and treasure's. We can get more work done, with less official positions.
260. I don't think that we need 4 levels of governess. i.e. Church/district/synod/GOD
261. I voted in favor of the prospect of restructure. So I am also prepared to consider dissolving district(s).
262. I think we need to straighten out the CEF mess first, then decide.
263. Lord show us clearly what is gong to be the best for us as your LCC people to best feed the saved to reach the lost?
264. I am open to change if it improves our mission, purpose and grows the Kingdom.

265. For legal purposes, this is very wise as there was a legal "firewall" between the ABC District and Synod. However, operationally, it may create redundancies.
266. It's isn't three federated districts although at times it has operated as if it were.
267. I think the Districts should be smaller in order that they can focus more on individual smaller congregations that need help.
268. Other options should definitely be considered.
269. I struggle with this. In a lot of ways, we would be better off under one banner, however, Canada is very large and to only have a Synod, would we lose touch with the little person??? Synod would have to be more than what it is to fulfill the needs of the congregations and people if there were no Districts.
270. Unless there are major concerns with the Eastern District. I can't see how the ABC and Central Districts could be set up any different given the obvious geographical settings.
271. I believe this is important. Our country is so vast, the demographics and geography are so different. This creates different needs. If we were to eliminate the districts, my fear is we would hurt the "grassroots" input which I feel is vitally important.
272. Ban districts, they are a waste of time and money.
273. Too much overlap.
274. I'm not sure how else it could be done... there are too few congregations east of Ontario to form a district... unless, Ontario was split somehow...
275. I would like to know the options before making this decision.
276. There are too few members for this, make West Canada and east Canada, abolish ABC District.
277. There may be a better way. Perhaps business and missions nationally and spiritual local??
278. Because of overall population in Canada, if all regional needs are met do we need districts?
279. The synod is not a federation of three districts, so if we are currently operating as a federation we are operating in in violation of the constitution. How can this question, then, be answered?
280. I think we need to be creative in finding other alternatives than simply continue with the same. I can't answer the question until we consider other alternatives.
281. However, I am open to looking at another model if it proves more effective.
282. A loaded question...
283. Depends what people want more centralized power in the Synod or spread out amongst the districts. Do we want the feds to have the power or the provinces or a balance? Depends what kind of country we want to live in.
284. can't say. With the (apparent) reduction in the number of congregations across Canada, perhaps the District level can be eliminated.
285. This proposal would sink of its own financial weight in a decade or so.
286. Our country is demographically large and differs significantly in lifestyles and attitudes. To decrease representation on a national level would sacrifice the needs of various congregations in each district.

49. LCC should function as one national administrative structure with regional ministry areas and spiritual leaders living in each area.

1. This might then soon be the end of the LCC.

2. One Structure with one national ecclesiastical leader administrator and spiritual leaders in each area.
3. This may work if the cost of doing it were not too great.
4. This sounds interesting. If there would be a spiritual leader in each area, then that would probably be too many. Now with District Presidents, there are not seen unless problems arise. This is not good either.
5. Could work if leaders are active and get out of the office into congregations and rather than have people come to conventions etc. They go to the people.
6. Down size to 2 areas.
7. I think it's too big a geographical area for that. LCC would be even more out of touch with congregations.
8. One structure needed with Ecclesiastical supervisor at Synod.
9. Spiritual leaders would be working Pastors.
10. We need an organized body in each area to oversee the work in each area.
11. What is meant by this question?
12. Really a structure that is worth exploring.
13. That sounds like an interesting idea. In a practical sense, what would this look like if it became reality?
14. Yes. Yes. There is no other way. It is all about ministry and how to make joint resources work most effectively.
15. Yes. We need more unity of purpose and direction
16. yes, but that is not the issue. all the other matters will still be there, w/out discipline, accountability and consequence for the actions of so many.
17. This would provide consistency and better use of all resources.
18. This may work ... as long as there is strong grass roots ministry and adequate representation out in the church at large.
19. Absolutely. I regret so much the resistance toward this idea in the past, which has killed it each time it's been suggested. Maybe we can finally see the light.
20. worth considering
21. From my perspective the ABC model didn't/isn't working. Perhaps it is in the other two districts.
22. This might work better than the separate Districts. More continuity and accountability...?
23. Leave as is.
24. Sounds like a plan. Unless one has hands on, how would one know.
25. Sounds like the ideal - however only as good as the person who is to be responsible.
26. Perhaps the leaders could be parish pastors as well.
27. 1 circuit member from each region could be spokesman @ occasional national level
28. The LCC needs to function as one solid structure to increase our unity and efficiency to handle to troubles of the days ahead.
29. This does sound reasonable, efficient, and doable, with modern telecommunications. I expect and am interested to see a viable plan or even several along this line for our new direction.
30. It seems that our current circumstances necessitate this kind of pulling together, particularly to support the ABC congregations which are affected by the CEF fiasco.
31. Episcopal polity.
32. Yes! Also, the regional ministry areas should be small and nimble, and exist for the purpose of aiding congregations.

33. Would it simplify things? We sure need spiritual leaders nearby.
34. I believe the answer I gave for 48 covers this as well.
35. should be one but not sure that "regional ministry areas and spiritual leaders living in each area" is required
36. only way to go, offices to remain in Winnipeg as a central point for synod
37. absolutely
38. Current technology provides so many options for communication. It's a different world from what it was when LCC was established.
39. How would "regional ministry areas" differ from districts? Would the spiritual leader also be a pastor of a congregation, or would it be a separate position?
40. There should be one administrative structure for LCC (Bishop and Board, synodical convention, etc.); regions comprised of 3 or 4 circuits (with a regional "bishop"...the regional bishop also serves a parish as a second pastor, perhaps financially supported by the parishes in the region); circuits comprised of 8-12 parishes.
41. My first thought would be yes as it would be closer to the members which should be a benefit. However, one national administrative structure could be problematic as Canada is such a wide and diverse country. It should be investigated though due to the need to better serve its members and mission programs, etc.
42. If it doesn't cost any more but still effective.
43. This is probably where we will go, and should go.
44. Q./s 48-49... Regional spiritual leaders coordinated from centre would be good, allow circuits (bigger? to specialise for District/provincial regions. Question of funding for geographic leaders (3/4 or 1/2 time pastors) and need of funds for resources/materials/travel.
45. It would be interesting to see how this would function.
46. It could work as long as congregations maintained sufficient access to the administration and resources.
47. Don't understand how that would work. Administratively, possibly, but for other needs I don't know how it could be effective.
48. Perhaps. I don't have sufficient knowledge of the benefits/drawbacks to make an informed choice.
49. This is a point for consideration
50. This is a leap? This might be "in the box" thinking. This statement might be one option to consider.
51. what does that mean in terms of authority structure?
52. consensus voting
53. Now you're talking!
54. How would this structure really work differently than the present way?
55. your suggesting a solution already? We should let the review suggest the best possible solution
56. This notion of "regional ministry areas" is too amorphous & undefined. Cannot agree on something so vague.
57. What's the difference between federated Districts and regional ministry areas? Does the latter depend on volunteerism which is not as consistent or reliable?
58. This seems to be a logical structure.
59. Sounds like a good solution!
60. ABC/Central/Eastern are great with each ministry per District.

61. If this is a less costly way and still provides the assistance to congregations, then this might be a better way to go.
62. Could be costly yet effective. You would have people closer to the problems of each area.
63. Maybe this would be a good idea. What are the pros and cons?
64. This would save money and would allow for better governance and spiritual leadership
65. This is a very leading question which portrays an option which is not supported by our theology. Poor job creators of the survey.
66. If LCC decides to centralize, it will follow the way of the ELCIC and split into two synods. Centralizing is against Walther's theses and needs to be cast down as an option. For example, it is natural for people to hang out with those of like minds. A more High-Church area can stick to themselves and a more liberal area can stick with themselves. But, put a High-Church central leader in, and the liberal minds will be asked to cease certain practices (which are not against scripture), e.g. contemporary music and other practices. This would lead to uproar and the division of LCC.
67. If administration is duplicated at the District level, then this plan would make sense. Hopefully then there would be more money for missions, continuing education, etc.
68. I suppose it would work if you consolidate CEF, but you lose the intimacy that CEF committee has at the local level. The administrative aspects would likely suffer.
69. I believe that is what we have now.
70. what do you mean spiritual leaders living in each area? They do now as they serve a congregation> with circuits> That is all we need reporting to LCC. not a district.
71. I think I need clarification on this to agree or disagree.
72. This is a huge statement to respond to with one stroke.
73. This could work, save some on administration globally, but lose some local admin ability while maybe increasing local ministry potential
74. Sounds like it could be a good idea, but I don't have enough information to comment. Would certainly cut down on travel expenses if spiritual leaders lived in the area. But then we might not every see those individuals involved at higher levels of the church.
75. too vague
76. This is one very detailed option. Like question 48 all options will require study.
77. Not sure just what is meant by regional ministry areas but each congregation has at least one spiritual adviser in the pastor.
78. I'm not sure what this is meant to accomplish. Is this to cut administrative cost, or is it to improve the quality of ecclesiastical oversight? We already have Circuit Counselors in each area.
79. Cannot answer in that that I am totally unclear as to what is meant by term 'spiritual leaders'.
80. synod and circuits only
81. This may be a possibility.
82. Would like to see the accountability chart -How many Regional Ministry areas?
83. could be more sufficient & less costly
84. There is no reason for any sort of regions in the synod. There are good reasons for circuit Pastors conferences to meet together as regional conferences as they now do, but that should not be part of the SYNODICAL structures.
85. May be a little much
86. There should be no infrastructure permanent outside of the national HQ. Spiritual leaders should work from their homes.

87. If that is possible - if we have enough pastors and leaders.
88. This would be one possible proposal that might emerge from the process outlined in my answer to #48.
89. This could work. It would eliminate some of the costly administrative positions, but is this possible in such a large country. Communication would need to be highly effective and streamlined.
90. Requires much planning and supervision
91. I say "yes" but I also realize that it will further stretch involvement between the synod and congregation. That gap will be pretty wide. How can synod keep in touch with all its congregations in a meaningful way? That's a pretty tall order.
92. This might be a good way to transition to a less cumbersome structure; however, I feel it is very important that any regional ministry leadership be able to focus on the needs of their particular areas, building up relationships and efficiencies within each region. A large national administrative structure (especially in a far-flung country like Canada) may otherwise overlook regional concerns and needs.
93. Certainly not opposed to this idea but it requires a deeper look.
94. Sounds like a plan!
95. I like the sounds of this statement. It makes LCC sound more unified.
96. As long as "spiritual leaders" in their regions are aquatinted well with all in their region, not concentrating on the congregations/pastors close to them and largely ignoring the "hinterland."
97. See question 48. A national financial/business plan would be valuable but this can be achieved without closing the separate districts. Lay people strong in business should be instrumental in this.
98. I don't believe we are big enough to warrant multiple layers of administration.
99. It sounds like this idea may have merit - but hard to strongly endorse with no details as to how this would be carried out.
100. That's what we're supposed to have with three districts under one Synod.
101. Not enough information.
102. Isn't that what we do now? Or are you suggesting circuits would report directly to the synodical president? If so, I would suggest our circuit counselors are no where near trained enough to provide that kind of leadership and support for workers and their congregations. I would take years to train them up and if they changed each convention, the training process would never end.
103. Yes, I think this might work better.
104. There could be a more cost effective structure that allows for greater transparency, better overall planning, improved governance and yet retains (or encourages) grass roots involvement and feelings of ownership.
105. This could lead to better flow of information and services.
106. Sounds like a good idea to me....
107. This could lead to better flow of information and services.
108. This could be a good idea, instead of the current district offices and building, we have now. A smaller centre being rented in a local LCC church might be the answer.
109. Interesting idea. Would need more clarification to what this means. Ecclesiastical oversight is important.
110. I think so

111. Define regional ministry and spiritual leaders living in each area! Don't we still have pastors…?
112. sounds sensible, but don't know the thoughts behind it
113. It all depends on what you include as administration. In general, centralization leads to alienation.
114. If this is best. However, regional is problematic. For instance, some locations in Canada, Lower mainland, Southern Ontario are heavily populated while other regions are sparse. It is more important for "Spiritual Leaders" to have similar work-loads and responsibilities that can actually be achieved then geographical regions that seem to be equitable in size.
115. Never!
116. There could be some benefits - more research needs to be done Should have spiritual leaders in a smaller area
117. possible
118. although the need for "standing together" applies with the size of synod and the amount of area that we are serving
119. This makes sense as our country is huge.
120. The ABC District should be separated into two regions. The other Districts could choose to stay as they are or separate into smaller regions as appropriate. Perhaps we might have 4-6 regions, each represented by a synodical vice-president. District boards, vice presidents, etc. could be replaced with a small advisory council (3 lay, 3 clergy, 1 deacon) to the regional vice-president.
121. If this is most efficient.
122. Good grief! What does all that mean?
123. one administration YES, but NOT necessarily a spiritual leader in each area? What is 'an area'??
124. This sounds like a good approach - the details will take a lot of careful consideration.
125. this model sounds much more appropriate because of the ongoing spiritual care of the pastors and other church workers and lay people in each geographical area.
126. Yes. Dissolve the districts and the administrative reduplication that comes with them. Leave administrative matters in the hands of a unified national office, and set up smaller "dioceses" (with locally elected bishops) to offer local pastoral care and ecclesiastical supervision.
127. This is a well designed question. You should make more questions that are clear and easy to understand like this one.
128. Girl Guides of Canada did this in Ontario. Guiding in Ontario had never been the same. The family feeling is gone. Slowly in an evolutionary way, the structure is going back to where it was only using different titles. The massive geographical size of Canada does not operate efficiently from a national tower.
129. Definitely need to see what this would look like and how it would work.
130. This perhaps could be a model.
131. Like other denominations?
132. This description is a bit weak on detail for me to decide to agree or disagree. What do we mean by spiritual leaders? What would their responsibilities be?
133. Yes, and No - LCC should have Synod with both national administrative structure (i.e. CEO) and spiritual leadership (i.e. Synod President).
134. has its merits but need more info on what it would do

135. Remove districts and circuits and create regions that are larger than circuits but smaller than districts
136. This sounds reasonable if it can be organized to work.
137. I don't see any advantage at all in that. I'm puzzled by the suggestion that spiritual leaders should be living in each area. I'm trying to visualize where else they might live. What would a church area, district, circuit look like without spiritual leaders?
138. This sounds like a viable option if those Regional spiritual leaders receive adequate support to fulfill their mandate.
139. The vast distance may create too many problems
140. If functioning as 3 federated districts isn't working this may be an alternative
141. Has some potential.
142. See #45 comments
143. Districts could decentralize within their current structures into sub-regions that cover just a couple of Circuits with Vice Presidents providing care in those areas. Centralization of the Synod will only open the door for Grabau's disciples to rule all.
144. What would be the personnel requirements, the establishing of "responsibilities" at the levels to come? How many areas, leaders, boards (memberships on these), departments (memberships on these)? What are the implications for conventions?
145. We already have Circuit Counsellors; we do not need more administration. The current structure is flawed, but adding more administration will not improve things. Again, I am disappointed that there are only two possible models of change proposed in this survey.
146. But within reason. You can't expect a man (president or circuit counselor) to be a full time pastor and accomplish everything that needs to be done. The model which has a congregation with a called pastor and served as well part-time by a DP seems to be best. Secretarial . . . building expense could be shared.
147. Whatever the restructuring decides will answer this.
148. Change only if this would result in greater advantages to spread the gospel.
149. Don't know how that would look.
150. These seems like a fairly reasonable model. I would be willing to pursue it.
151. This may simply be more effective if local leaders are encouraged and empowered "to do the work of an overseer/bishop" of God-people in a locale with a number of congregations.
152. I can see this being a better model.
153. I see a danger in appreciating the diversity of regional situations if everything is handled out of "head office"
154. Now you're gettin' it!
155. Perhaps
156. the spiritual leaders should be the Circuit Counselors
157. I believe our Districts in general have worked well - only fix in any areas needed. One administration office could be a problem with the vast distances of our country.
158. Sounds suitable, but don't know - how have other denominations changed their structure, to meet the current needs and fiscal situations?
159. Preposterous. Here is a proposal with three ('one national administrative structure', 'reginal ministry areas', and 'spiritual leaders') terms that are completely undefined. I am a confessional Lutheran not a medium. I cannot read your mind, and I doubt that anyone else reading this can.
160. Maybe this would work.

161. This "centralist" approach tends to ignore the congregation = church. This statement may be considered misleading since it implies enhanced efficiency.
162. This will add administrative duties to pastors for the regional ministry areas. District leadership is necessary. This is what LWMLC is looking at doing too and I am not in favor with this either at the present time. You will lose that close connection with the individual congregations.
163. LCC should function as one national administrative structure. Period. Don't substitute the word "district" for "regional".
164. District president has ecclesiastical role only.
165. This is one model which might work.
166. We need one over-arching leadership to exist.
167. Not simply as "one national administrative structure" but also as one national ecclesiastical structure.
168. This could work.
169. This is a troublesome endeavor.
170. Please take a lesson from Lutheran Church of Australia
171. We have regional ministry area and spiritual leaders living in each area. They are called District Presidents and Circuit Counselors. Circuit Counselors are taxed by their duties as both pastor and circuit counselor. A full-time District President in each District is needed so that complex congregational and church worker matters are properly and objectively addressed. Each District President needs an assistant to support him in his work especially since he spends a lot time on the road visiting God's people.
172. Sounds like there are some possibilities here - would need to hear lots more about it before committing to support such a scheme.
173. regions to be divided up again depending on congregational density for a more evenly distributed 'area' per individual serving as that area representative
174. That sounds pleasantly functional
175. This is an excellent idea. I strongly support it.
176. I might have been able to agree to this statement had it read "with Districts exercising ecclesiastical oversight and ensuring that the resolutions of District in Convention are fulfilled in a timely manner.
177. Let’s see a draft model and go from there
178. I conceptually agree with that model.
179. This recognizes the points I have listed in #48.
180. Yes, but these "areas" could be the current Districts.
181. 1 President 1 Ecclesiastical supervisor 3 regional synod VPs (one from each district) 1 Ecclesiastical supervisor from each district =3 total of 8 BOD members
182. This sounds confusing - part centralized - part decentralized.
183. This is moving in the right direction.
184. Regional spiritual leaders could offer support to our Pastors as a source of contact when they are in need of support in carrying out their ministerial duties. Also for retiring pastors to have a source to which they can reach out as their lives greatly change at this time in their lives.
185. Probably would be cheaper!!
186. I would need more information on what this would look like.

187. I am reasonable happy with what we have [I am also sure ABC is not]. However, if the structure changes and we have the same corrupt leadership that ABC did and does; expect the same result.
188. Business activities that don't need to be handled regionally should be handled centrally. Spiritual matters are generally local so they need local resources to meet those needs.
189. I think I'm leaning toward this idea, but don't know enough about the practicalities of it to say for sure.
190. If it can show us how it would do so capably and sensitively I would say I agree. However, I don't think a centralized system can do so as I have seen too often centralized systems fail because of their inability to stay in touch with all of its end users (in this case the congregations). Personally I think you are asking too much of Synod to be all things to all people, when they are so far removed (physically) from most of those people. District or regional groups have to be responsible to the congregations and not just to their Synod leaders.
191. Agree with second have of the statement, but not the first half.
192. Reduce the burden rate focus on operations as a Church.
193. -this question raises too many additional questions: - what is meant by the term spiritual leader? -how large would a regional ministry area be?
194. Yes, to national administrative structure. Regional ministry could work as long as there is still central planning and direction.
195. I understand this to state that LCC would be restructured as a national synod, no districts, and restructured larger circuits.
196. would need to see study this format
197. would like to hear more how this format would work
198. This could be a very effective structure with the regional ministry areas (one East and one West) with one of the regional ministries housed in the one National office.
199. Not sure I understand what this means; but I think so.
200. Simplifying to one district is too much ground to cover. It is better as 3.
201. This might help reduce administrative costs and help make things more efficient.
202. This could perhaps work well in some areas where distance is a problem.
203. There would have to be a better working relationship between synod and the regional ministry areas than there is now. I see very little direction from Winnipeg at present and the districts do 'their own thing'.
204. Synod and circuits - that's it!
205. See previous comment on Zones....question 16, I think....
206. We need to find the right structure which could be 3 or 2 or 1 - there would need to analysis done to understand the impact of all options - and those options clearly laid out to all congregations
207. If this would eliminate duplicate administrations, then yes.
208. Possibly?
209. YES... exactly.
210. As mentioned in previous questions I believe the districts should be amalgamated under the auspice of Synod.
211. This could work, but Isn't that what Districts are, including Circuit counselors in each area? This needs more explanation...

212. And not just living. Every Pastor who acts as a spiritual leader should also serve a congregation, at least on a part time basis, so that they do not lose touch with the reality of congregational life in the Synod after spending too much time in the ivory tower.
213. I believe that much of the discussion about the need for re-organization has come about from concerns about finances. A proposal to have LCC function centrally with regional ministry areas and numerous (paid) spiritual leaders in various places could very easily cost more than is spent by congregations on the current structure. Perhaps if money is the issue it would simply be better to have part-time paid leaders operating out of an office in a church and congregations can wean themselves off of the ceremonial functions of the leaders and stick with just the spiritual essentials.
214. We are Lutheran Church Canada: not LCC-ABC; LCC -Central; or LCC-East. Our goals in ministry should be national.
215. If this will change the state of the church for the better, then yes. If it is simply a "new" way of doing things, then why waste the time and effort?
216. We need something smaller than a single national administration. A centralized church will not have the resources to address local needs and challenges. The sense of estrangement from Winnipeg will be greater than it is now.
217. This would be much more efficient, and would promote "walking together", i.e. THE WHOLE POINT OF "SYNOD". There is no need for duplications of infrastructure and bureaucracy at national and regional levels. The regional units/districts should only need a part-time president/bishop/leader/chairman to deal with local implementation of a national, shared goal/vision of Synod.
218. If restructuring involves the dissolution of the districts, extreme care must be taken to ensure that the services to congregations and their members do not disappear. This becomes even more difficult at present as ABC District may be forced to reduce its services owing to its receivership.
219. One national administrative structure - yes "Regional ministry areas and spiritual leaders living in each area" - sounds like "districts" to me. No way!
220. I believe this could work.
221. Too complicated to meet regional needs & challenges.
222. Each should take care of there own district.
223. Does this suggest that the spiritual leaders are active serving pastors or is this a separate position like our current DPs? IF that is the case then this is crazy. Replace a top heavy structure with a more top heavy structure.
224. sounds logical but I am no expert in these things I leave this in the capable hands of the committee
225. This appears to make sense, since LCC's total membership is small, though very spread out.
226. I like it
227. I'm not sure at this time
228. who knows where we will end up Not a very good Qu. for a survey
229. I am not sure what this would look like. If it reduces administrative costs and avoids duplication of services, then something like this could work. If it simplifies things for congregations' needs being met and improves the cohesiveness of congregations, that would be good. If it impedes a congregation’s access to services or having a voice in synod, that would not be good.

230. need more info...sounds like a plan. There are questions that need answering first...Discussion?
231. If this is more economical, it could work.
232. Not sure how many or what those regions should look like, but yes, if we are to be a formal organization at all (which, again, shouldn't be presumed at this point), then this is the structure we should have.
233. Minimizes cost.
234. Maybe? What would that look like? Would it serve a purpose?
235. This would definitely be more effective than it is now.
236. What are the areas you are referring to?
237. That makes sense.
238. The circuit system modified could accomplish that
239. As above
240. I need more info on what this looks like, and implications. I think I agree but am hesitant to commit. if presidents as spiritual leaders or bishops, are closer to local pastors, then I agree.
241. Maybe
242. Canada is too big a country for this. We need regional governance.
243. This might work better.
244. I thought that's the way it is now.
245. I don't understand what you are suggesting. Many of my members don't understand most of this survey and refuse to complete it.
246. The study should show this.
247. While our Districts do continue to create problems along the way, I do believe that we need to have regional 'areas' with appointed spiritual leaders. This could be a continuation of our current vice-presidents - and could be expanded to allow for smaller territories so that these spiritual leaders (let's use the term 'bishops' - please) could exercise more direct oversight in both pastoral and missional nurture.
248. How would this make it different?
249. If this would constitute an improvement in a significant way, there should be change; if none is clearly evident, no change
250. That is one option to look into.
251. This could also work, depending on good leadership
252. Only if extra money isn't paid to do this.
253. This seems like the most viable option.
254. I agree. This will take some work and patience to work through.
255. Perhaps splitting the districts into three or four regions would be able to fulfill the objectives of the synod without the current administrative costs.
256. How would I know what will work best? Ask some professionals or get Best practices from other non-church organisations or from church organisations that are successful
257. The spiritual leadership is very important.
258. This is a possibility
259. This is the change I think we need to really consider.
260. Much more efficiency required.
261. Of course. Let's reduce the administration and increase the Ministry and spiritual oversight/care.
262. Hmm - how costly is this?

263. What would be most efficient?
264. Why the duplicate? (i.e., asking the opposing question)
265. again open to options, this may work better than what we have now
266. Not sure. Travelling to a head office can be costly and communications can suffer. Regional indicates to me that there would actually be more people involved travelling and communicating. I lean toward disagree.
267. Have other national churches done this successfully? Why are you proposing this? What "problem" does it solve?
268. how is this different than current districts other than proposing extra district positions?
269. Seems good at first blush
270. Should function as separate Districts.
271. Lord show us clearly what is gong to be the best for us as your LCC people to best feed the saved to reach the lost?
272. Refer to previous comments.
273. Perhaps we need to examine the doctrine of the Call to find out if those without a congregation have a valid call
274. I think that this is a good idea how I still like the legal "firewall" of Districts and how Districts can further assist in region-based oversight and planning as needed.
275. What is the definition of a "regional ministry area"? If that definition is the same as a "District", then the answer is NO!
276. I believe the Districts should be eliminated and smaller regions established in their place. The regions would appoint/elect an ecclesiastical supervisor to oversee the doctrine and practice within the region. The regions would also create their own Council/Board of Directors to oversee the administration/finances. Offerings would flow from the Congregations to the Region (we would need to create a suitable name for the regions) to Synod. This more grass-roots structure would give congregations a stronger voice and representation, as opposed to getting lost in the shuffle within large Districts. It would also make the oversight of doctrine and practice stronger, since the overseers would have a closer relationship with, and more access to, the neighboring congregations. The closer relationship between supervisor (a suitable title would need to be given) and congregations could also provide checks-and-balances, with congregations being able to hold their supervisors accountable, making sure they are fulfilling the duties of their office. This structure would also allow for the regions to more effectively look after the spiritual and financial needs of the congregations and ministries in their respected area. By eliminating the office of District President and the administration costs of District, more money could be spent on supporting local ministries/missions/struggling congregations/etc. All additional monies would be sent to Synod to support our institutions and ministries. As well as having their own regional Council/BOD, the regions could also hold their own forums periodically, in order to build up unity and fellowship. I believe three pastors should be appointed/elected to oversee the regional supervisors and serve as members of the Synod BOD (using the old District boundaries) in essence combining the current offices of District President and Synod VP. I believe these supervisors could serve in this role while also serving their parish. However, it may be wise to arrange for these supervisors an assistant pastor, as old-Missouri did when DPs still served in the parish.
277. I'd be open to considering this option. The hows, whys, etc. would help me decide whether I support this move.

278. What constitutes an 'area'? What is a 'spiritual leader'? How do they have any authority? I don't really like the choice of words - ministry areas and spiritual leaders - too Pentecostal leaning
279. This might be an idea I would have to see a draft of the structure to speak on this idea. It may alleviate my concern of loosing "grassroots" input.
280. What those regions look like has not been discussed since 1976, but probably looks more like ELCIC. What does spiritual leader mean? Like the Anglican Dean of Conference? Or regional VP who is already a full time worker and takes on additional duties.
281. We don't need ministry areas to do the same thing as we ineffectively do now. Ban districts and just go to a Synod made up of congregations. We haven't needed district level oversight since the telephone was invented...
282. I believe this would lead to a much stronger structure.
283. this sounds like a good track of thought
284. As with circuits, I believe that regions would cease to communicate with its members and eventually there would be nothing.
285. Demographic do not need two seminaries, and three districts. LCC administrative structures need to slash positions.
286. Retain the eastern district and combine central and ABC into one "western" district with greater authority given to western circuits.
287. That is essentially the District model but with different names.
288. "Regional ministry areas and spiritual leaders living in each area" sounds a whole lot like another expression for "districts". Given the great advances in communication and travel since the beginnings of our synod, all we need is one synodical structure. It is easier to travel from one coast to the other today than it was for our forefathers to travel across a province. And options for communication are plentiful, many of which are free.
289. 1 word, 1 doctrine...internationally.
290. Reduced "management" should reduce overall costs and duplication of efforts so that we can make better use of income for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God.
291. Sounds like a workable alternative but it depends how many or if any of the spiritual leaders are full time.
292. A lot of questions on this one. Could Synod in Winnipeg effectively serve our church in Canada through these regional areas? Are the spiritual leaders to be "bishops"? Do we need one national administrative structure or should we be focusing on one national ecclesiastical structure? etc.
293. BUT..... I need a clearer definition of "spiritual leaders living in each area". I hope you’re not asking or suggesting for the creation of a whole slew of "almost district presidents"!!
294. If it works best.
295. Talk to the Central BoD.
296. This is probably the solution which I think makes the most sense, but I can't give an informed opinion on this topic.
297. That's the structural solution.
298. To me this is the only proposal that makes sense.
299. Need more information on the structure to have an opinion.

50. The process for the accountability of our District's Board of Directors to the Synod is adequate.

1. They should answer solely to synod, as districts should be part of a whole, not their different fruits in a basket.
2. ABC doesn't report or do they?
3. Not really sure what this current process is.
4. I have no idea what that accountability is.
5. Don't know.
6. I don't know enough about it.
7. I believe that our East District and likewise Central are doing an adequate job as is. That does not mean we should become too comfortable - always we watch for ways to improve.
8. Note ABC did not report until too late. How do I know what my District reports?
9. East District seems fine and likewise with Central. It appears that ABC is questionable.
10. There are so many problems arising. I feel sorry for our ministers and congregations.
11. How are we to know.
12. Our District Board don't listen to L.C.C. Board. Too many High Church on District Board.
13. District's Board of Directors does not have any accountability to Synod, as I understand.
14. look at the outcome with CEF
15. It there any?
16. very inadequate old men's club. breaking spiritual laws to cover ego and pride
17. The process is practically unknown.
18. I am unaware of there being ANY such process of accountability between a District BOD and the Synod.
19. When considering my perspective from LCC-East, I would say yes, but with the events of the last year in ABC I'm no longer sure.
20. ABC board of directors doesn't seem to be accountable to its congregations; I doubt that it is to Synod
21. Obviously not, with the whole CEF crisis....
22. How can anybody answer this?
23. Obviously not - if back EAST was unaware of CEF difficulties!!! and other things??
24. Do not know
25. Is it??
26. If this was the case, we would not be experiencing the issue regarding the Extension Fund - How could two boards ignore the problem for over 10 years.
27. What is the accountability of the Districts to Synod now?
28. Obviously accountability is our synod's biggest concern. Again, perhaps our district has a healthy and ethical direction, but I can no longer assume that to be the case.
29. I'm not sure what accountability is in place.
30. I know nothing about this.
31. I think this needs to be examined more.
32. not sure what it is - but the fiasco with the church extension fund in the west indicates issues
33. no, get rid of abc district as separate entity
34. there are definite issues between abc district and the synod, not healthy for the members or the synod
35. ABC-CE should serve as a perfect example of lack of accountability.

36. Districts should be eliminated
37. I am in the ABC District -- obviously not!
38. I don't know. With my opinions set out above, this question doesn't matter.
39. Once again I would ask what ordinary members could honestly answer this!!!
40. What does the "process of accountability" mean. What does "adequate' Mean?
41. What does adequate mean?
42. However, eliminate boards in Districts.
43. Not enough knowledge of what that entails.
44. My understanding is that the Synod is accountable to the Districts, just as the Districts are accountable to congregations and not the other way around.
45. What is the current accountability? How can that be improved upon?
46. I have not heard otherwise.
47. I do not have sufficient knowledge to make an informed choice.
48. I've been on the District Board many years past and could not honestly answer as to "what is the accountability" and "in what areas?"
49. Once again, the average lay person has NO idea about our Districts accountability to Synod. I'm unable to answer.
50. I agree but don't have enough information to judge.
51. I don't understand how the District is accountable to Synod?
52. As evidenced by the fiasco in the ABC District.
53. I have no knowledge about this.
54. if that were true, we wouldn't be in the situation we are
55. Example - the ABC fiasco might have been prevented with increased accountability.
56. Recognizing that ABC CEF is having a severe impact on our overall church I believe some change is necessary.
57. The goal of accountability is to provide check and balances among sinners who fail. There is never an ability to prevent failures, but to minimize the risk. In light of what has happened in ABC, it seems that the checks and balances were not adhered to -- this is part of the problem.
58. What are you really asking here?
59. I again, cannot say as I do not know
60. No information on subject.
61. up to now - no accountability to synod
62. What is the process?
63. We would not be in this DIL and CEF debacle if this had been so.
64. Don't really know -
65. The lack of accountability is part of what ABC District into such a mess!
66. District is not accountable to Synod. Synod is accountable to District. Poor job creators of the survey.
67. At present our District has a strong voice and a good balance of smart people there.
68. ABC District has failed in it's accountability to its membership, so it is apparent that it was not accountable to the Synod either.
69. Perhaps an improvement would be to create an audit oversight committee with representatives from each district. This committee would provide an ombudsman type function to investigate concerns raised by congregations or individual members.
70. I'm not aware of the process.
71. ABC is perfect disaster example.

72. Isn't that obvious, given the decades of mismanagement and misinformation re CEF?
73. If the process for accountability of Districts to Synod, the ABC District's problem with CEF hopefully would not have happened.
74. Not enough information to comment.
75. There is a disconnect. They do their stuff and we do ours.
76. don't know. Don't have enough information to give an opinion.
77. Do not know what the process is.
78. I do not know enough about this to answer with any certainty.
79. If there was transparent accountability, the ABC Pastoral President and the Board of Directors would not have lost $ 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million dollars)
80. if it were, would CEF had happened???
81. Not always; not fully!
82. I have no knowledge of the structure of accountability between the two.
83. Don't know.
84. It doesn't seem to be in light of ABC CEF situation.
85. I don't understand the question. The District's Board of Directors isn't supposed to be accountable to the Synod. It's supposed to be, and is, accountable to the members of the District that elected them.
86. I would presume so as it may be a difficult question for the average Joe to know if it is adequate.
87. Not sure on this one.
88. How about accountability to its churches?
89. No opinion.
90. I do not know the accountability process from the District BoD to Synod. It was my understanding there was not considerable accountability. To me an appropriate amount of accountability to Synod would be that the District BoD operates within the constitution of the LCC and works to maintain harmony with the other Districts and the Synod in matters of public relations and doctrine. The Synod should be able to intervene if the BoD is erring doctrinally or is in opposition to the constitution.
91. Again, it is not adequate as it appears that Synod knew nothing about the CEF crisis in the ABC district.
92. Don't know.
93. Not familiar with the process.
94. I don't think the accountability is adequate. If it had been adequate, the whole CEF fiasco from the ABC district, may have been avoided. Everyone needs to be accountable to someone.
95. I really have no idea what the process is. Perhaps that is an implicit disagreement?
96. No knowledge
97. Whatever this process is, it is not at all clearly communicated.
98. Do not know what process is in place now.
99. Witness recent difficulties encountered by AB-BC District Extension Fund.
100. Unknown...
101. District accountability to Synod needs to be strengthened and enforced. Unfortunately, the existing Synodical Leader has chosen to abandon all responsibility for enforcing what accountability presently exists.
102. Don't know what process is in place now.

103. If it had been ABC CEF crisis would have been controlled by the synod and hopefully would not have happened.
104. not enough info
105. The premise of this question is wrong. The District Boards are not accountable to Synod. The Districts are accountable to Synod through the President.
106. Not enough info.
107. Don't know enough about the process
108. It would be if they could get on the same page
109. some information is not shared, and this is not all bad, but much more is heard and shared after the decisions have been made.
110. The events surrounding the ABC District CEF/DIL boondoggle have shown the inadequacy of ABC's accountability to synod, to District membership, and especially to the investors in CEF/DIL.
111. They decline to speak French.
112. More accountability was certainly needed in ABC.
113. constantly be vigilant in looking for inconsistencies and discrepancies in the accountability factors.
114. If I knew what the process was, I could comment.
115. Not sure of the current accountability to respond
116. I don't know otherwise.
117. In the present system, I don't think that there is a problem with accountability between District and Synod. The problem had more to do with relationships that did not seem to be as good (at least between ABC District and Synod).
118. don't know anything about this
119. I don't know. How would the average membership grade / have a comment on this?
120. I didn't know that District Boards were accountable to the Synod. I thought they were accountable to God and the congregations that elected them.
121. Vague question - not sure what oversight they have therefore no opinion.
122. Don't know
123. At this point the LCC does not have the authority to demand more. Districts are mandated to govern themselves, having a "watchdog" is not necessarily a bad thing.
124. Obviously, CEF and DIL are proof that the Board is inadequate.
125. Shouldn't the Synod be accountable to the Districts and not the other way around? The highest line of authority is the congregation, followed by the Circuit and the District and only then the Synod. Since when did that get turned around?
126. Not sure.
127. I think so, but I've never been to a convention so I'm not really sure. My impression is that the process is fairly open.
128. I do not know how this operates.
129. What accountability?
130. The AB-C District CEF situation strongly suggests more accountability is needed, while acknowledging that both serve an ADVISORY function only (Synodical Handbook Article VII page 9; 3.09 page 35).
131. Whatever the restructuring decides will answer this.
132. Appears to be
133. Not enough information given to us to make a sensible decision

134. The district Board of Directors is accountable to the convention in which they were elected, not to the synod. The synod's Board of Directors is composed of people from each district. The District Presidents are ex-officio members of the synodical Board of Directors. The minutes of district Board meetings are shared with the synodical board. Such overlapping is adequate, even redundant in some cases.
135. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
136. Unknown
137. Don't know
138. Don't know.
139. I do not know.
140. Have not observed this process
141. I don't know precisely what that process is.
142. When it is impossible for the District's Board to know what is going on in any given congregation, how can they reasonably be held accountable for it?
143. Not involved, don't know
144. Case in point CEF
145. Who determines that the process of accountability is "adequate"?
146. Not even remotely. Synod has no oversight currently. They merely come hat in hand to the Districts letting them know what they are doing and asking for money to do it. The power (money) flows from Districts to Synod creating the opposite flow of authority (ecclesiastical oversight). Moreover, structurally the Districts are too independent of the Synod for there to ever be any oversight.
147. I'm not familiar with the mechanism for keeping our leaders accountable. Assume it's adequate.
148. There appears to be no accountability or transparency at this level
149. I am not in a position to respond since I have never seen a document outlining the District's accountability to Synod.
150. Transparency and accountability do not exist across the system. To many things have been hidden and a lot of damage has been cause.
151. Does the CEF crisis fall under this? If so, then accountability was obviously lacking.
152. Not sure they are playing fair.
153. Are there checks and balances in place?
154. No idea. How would I?
155. The process failed in Alberta - was the process at fault in AB or at the national level. This is not clear in anything I have read - I don't think we will ever know
156. I don't know what that process even is so I can't say
157. It is my understanding that the District BoD is accountable to the District that elected them. Why does the Synod want the District's to be accountable to it?
158. There needs to be much more accountability and transparency by the District Board of Directors to the membership and to Synod.
159. this has not been the case
160. The ABC District CEF crisis illustrates just how inadequate that accountability process is.
161. I am not in ABC District, and have not been aware of a problem.
162. If congregations and pastors are members of synod, perhaps, again, public minutes of BOD meetings sent to members of synod as a start.

163. I've read the Synodical Handbook and some District Handbooks, and there is no way to hold either the Synodical or District boards to account. The only way to hold the Synodical president to account is to
164. I have no idea how it works today.
165. The recent problems in ABC District bring that into question. Don't know how it should be reconstituted to enable those problems to not occur in the future. Potential solutions need to be sought.
166. Do not have info on this
167. No need for district directors - It's not millions of people - keep the number of governors small!
168. No Audited Financial Statements. Many Pastors refuse to give reports. They refuse to face annual reviews. Lay people do not have that option in our daily lives, we all face accountability to corporate budgets, approved expenses and annual employee reviews. There currently is little Accountability.
169. No idea
170. -is the District BOD accountable to Synod, or to the District that elected them?
171. I do not have knowledge to answer this.
172. Not sure
173. ABC District troubles.
174. I don't think ABC district would be in the turmoil it is right now if they had been held accountable for their actions long ago.
175. It would appear not.
176. I really don't know.
177. I have felt that there is very little accountability to the synod, only to the district.
178. don't know, no one has informed us
179. we don't know, no one has informed us
180. I don't know
181. I do not have enough information to make an intelligent determination on this question.
182. Is there any? ...is it through the DP?
183. I do not know much about the District's BoD accountability to Synod. But it appears that the BoDs are not really accountable in any real way after the ABC disaster.
184. I believe that LCC has just proven through the ABC CEF crisis that our system of accountability works. Some might have wished it could have worked faster and more efficiently, but none-the-less, it worked.
185. The financial disaster in the ABC district is evidence of no accountability. No accountability before the crisis or after the crisis.
186. I don't have enough knowledge to answer positively or negatively.
187. No info
188. I'm not sure what the current structure is, but I think that strong lines of accountability need to in place and that they need to be enforced.
189. I have no idea
190. They are, in fact, not accountable to the Synod. They are only accountable to the district in convention.
191. my knowledge of this is limited
192. We are receiving adequate information.

193. Is the accountability only through the DP's? If so, then no it won't be adequate if we get rid of districts.
194. I don't know what accountability is in place now with the CEF situation I am going to assume no?
195. Unsure.
196. I have no experience with this.
197. I don't know what the process is.
198. There is very little accountability in practice, as it stands today.
199. Look where we are. This is not good.
200. Back to strategic plans and the development of district plans to support. The synod should be able to take district director to task for not fulfilling their role in developing workable plan for their urban and rural congregations
201. I do not know that process.
202. Not enough info
203. I do not know
204. Based on the debacle of the CEF, I would guess that the answer is no. Perhaps someone at Synod could have prevented the disaster, or at least mitigated it.
205. ABC is clear evidence that it's not adequate.
206. Need more of a transparent process. It is not at this time. Minutes of meetings are not widely dispersed. Hence do not know what is happening at either District or Synod.
207. ABC was obviously not accountable to Synod and really did not want to be. (CEF) And Synod really did not care. Mission money?? Our district and synod sadly are no different than our provincial and federal governments. Self serving and non caring. How sad, when we claim to be Christians
208. How would I know this? I don't know what goes on in District and Synodical board meetings.
209. A lay person does not have the knowledge to comment on this.
210. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful. Just wondering if we are putting qualified people in the right places, e.g. CEO with administrative background. CEF with financial background
211. We say again we do not need District administration whether staff or volunteer boards. District should give spiritual help only.
212. egg - Did the District know about the trouble the CEF of ABC was in?
213. The Synod was unaware of the problems in ABC because the structure did not require actually reporting on these issues to Synod. As we haven it today there is limited accountability
214. Is there a process to question accountability between conventions?
215. Unsure
216. We would not know - although we have tried to find answers.
217. only active pastors would know this
218. If the Directors were involved with the Church Extension, then accountability was not good enough
219. There does not seem to be any. If there is any accountability, how did the CEF fiasco in ABC get as far as it did without the Synod saying something.
220. If this were the case, then Synod would be responsible for the mess ABC is in now!
221. I have no idea what the process is. Are you really making an effort at restricting?

222. How would the average layman know that????
223. Again, let's do away with the Districts as we have them now.
224. I do not know what the process is
225. It would be nice to see minute of their meetings and what issues they deal with.
226. Improvement should be made. A lot of times the right hand doesn't know what the left hands doing. "CEF"
227. They are not accountable now.
228. I am unfamiliar with this.
229. I don't know. I also would be surprised if the average member would be able to give an informed answer to this question.
230. As it pertains to the East District.
231. Not sure what kind of accountability is implied here or required.
232. Who knew ABC district was going to fail?
233. They seem to work in such a way that the one hand doesn't know what the other hand is doing.
234. What process?
235. I don't have enough data to comment on this
236. again, what? how would I know...
237. It could be better.
238. I don't know.
239. If accountability was adequate, we would not be having the DIL or CEF or Concordia Edmonton situations.
240. What is the process for accountability? Lay person here. Again.
241. it didn't work - so what is different
242. I suspect currently there is very poor accountability.
243. I have no qualms with DBOD
244. No knowledge
245. At this point, it seems obvious to me, that there was little accountability in the ABC District, or the CEF would not have had the mess with which it is now dealing. Many lay people in my congregation saw this whole mess over 10 years ago.
246. Yes, but each District needs to make some changes to have a head Pastor and a head Administrator (not a Pastor) with BODs made up of persons who well know finances and the laws of the Land.
247. Obviously not. They haven't even been accountable to the people.
248. E.g.; ABC
249. This is apparently not a true statement, as attested by the collapse of the ABC District right under the nose of LCC.
250. What accountability? The Districts function pretty much independently from the Synod other than sending money. They are incorporated separately and therefore are seen as independent by the government which has different laws and regulations depending on which province you are in
251. with the financial crisis in the ABC District that occurred it appears not and it appears huge business decisions are being made by incompetent people in the areas of business.
252. It seems non-existent, but have no knowledge of reports, if any, to Synod.
253. What accountability? Is there some?

254. I think that the accountability is there, I would just like if there was a little more communication about what they're doing and which direction they're headed.
255. There is a lack of transparency, accountability and fair play throughout!
256. ABC church extension disaster a case in point.
257. This is why we are in our present financial troubles.
258. Adequate in regard to ecclesiastical/spiritual matters, inadequate in regard to corporate.
259. I am unaware of this process.
260. However, we should always look for ways to improve.
261. Just take a look at the ABC District CEF to see just how little accountability that there is and was!!
262. Ours is but not all are adequate or we wouldn't be in this situation.
263. There is none. They are not accountable to the Synod BoD. They are accountable to the constituents who elected them.
264. If this would have been exemplary and adequate, we would not be in the state we are in with the CEF and DIL in ABC.
265. not familiar with current setup.
266. I think we have accountability problems as evidenced by the Church Extension fund collapse. I can't believe that the Board of Directors didn't know anything about this earlier
267. I have no idea how this works.
268. District Board of Directors are not needed functionally; their current responsibilities should be assumed by a single synodical board with some sort of regional contacting committee.
269. There is no process! A district convention enacting a measure beyond its powers can be shot down by CCMS, but there is no brake on the powers of a district BoD, or even a meaningful review. If there were, we might have avoided the debacle in the ABC district.
270. ABC district failed in it's accountability to Synod as witnessed by it's actions with CEF/DIL.
271. I suspect it is not, but I have no information to back that up.
272. Clearly in the ABC District it has not

51. I am comfortable with my District ceasing to be a separate legally incorporated entity.

1. Not sure if provincial laws would get more difficult to do this.
2. We need a district but must be responsible to Synod.
3. I don't have the expertise to say - but I'm comfortable with whatever more knowledgeable people decide.
4. What do you mean
5. Difficult to understand
6. I have no knowledge of this.
7. A sensitive area
8. Keep a strong bond between District and Synod. If we separate, we would lose strength.
9. What difference would it make?
10. What would it look like if this became reality?
11. they are imploding
12. As long as ministry continues.
13. Do it tomorrow.
14. See comments for questions 48 and 49.

15. We are basically all one (in God's sight). Only experienced people would know though.
16. We as a congregation could get lost.
17. It really doesn't seem to make much difference at the congregational level.
18. Discuss structure our self separately but not legally incorporated. President could be more helpful to congregation.
19. If a truly beneficial and viable unified synodical entity is established, this seems like the thing to do. However, I have no negative feeling against the district, where I feel "it has to go."
20. Questions of how the Church Extension Funds will be managed post-Districts are important to answer proactively, openly, and honestly. However, this is a cause which should be pursued.
21. Depending on what type of structure is put in place.
22. I do not know the consequences of this otherwise.
23. I am interested in what improves the church body and helps do the work we need to do. If changing it works do it. If changing it makes no difference, why do it? Spend our effort where it needs to be.
24. not sure of the ramifications
25. essential to future of synod
26. But I'd be happy to see the three Districts and the Synodical office explore ways to achieve efficiencies, eliminate duplication, etc., etc.
27. Does this mean there would be no districts? I do not understand what this would look like?
28. We need only one legally incorporated entity with capable people at the helm working to Glorify God and extend HIS kingdom.
29. I think it is necessary for the future of LCC. We need a smaller governance structure.
30. Don't know what the ramification would be.
31. Once again I would ask what ordinary members could honestly answer this!!!
32. What would that look like?
33. That is, as it is presently structured. If the districts are greatly reduced in size, there may be reason for legal incorporation, although that may not be necessary.
34. How would this work given national and provincial requirements?
35. Maybe. But I am concerned about the impact it would have on District missions that currently exist - would they be lost or less significant in the big picture? I also fear there would be less opportunity for congregational input.
36. I have no knowledge of what might be provincial laws that might come into play--but would suspect there might be some.
37. I don't know - this needs to be discussed.
38. If restructuring takes place which I support, then yes, separate legal incorporation has to go.
39. Only if synod does not drive everything from the east.
40. its very, very sad that our church has to question legal incorporated entities amongst ourselves. We have truly wandered from our purpose
41. If we were not a separate entity, then the total church would have had to step forward to address ABC CEF issue.
42. Not sure how to comment without appropriate information
43. Under L.C.C.

44. If it ceases to be independent, it puts all the power in synod's hands and way too much money in one place. From Walther's fourth thesis: "The ministry of preaching is not . . . set up over and against the common estate of Christians... but it is an office of service."
45. Hopefully one larger governing body with more stringent guidelines for governance will provide transparent and honest leadership for the future.
46. outside my expertise to say.
47. No. We would not be insulated then from issues in the ABC and vice versa. Keep separate.
48. Very. Sooner the better.
49. But we need an alternative in place before we take out the current structure.
50. The way these statements are formed is ridiculous. "I am comfortable with".... Is this statement even an actual legal option? Again, the following statement is the same thing reworded in the opposite way.... What is that about?
51. Have always felt that the districts are a good thing. Unless something else more desirable is brought forward I like the structuring as it is.
52. Provided that there is a mechanism in place to legally protect all of Synod.
53. provided there is still regional representation.
54. need more info
55. We were not served well in the two vital matters as already noted.
56. I do not know enough about this to answer with any certainty.
57. What are provincial laws and what is accountability chart
58. Actually, "ecstatic" would be more true than "comfortable."
59. Who cares whether the District is incorporated or not? There presumably are technical legal issues that would favour incorporation or not, but I don't see how this question affects the average congregation. Well actually I suppose it could matter in the case of unincorporated congregations, but since they're members of LCC, it should still be OK as long as LCC remains incorporated.
60. Again, show me the compelling evidence that this would be a healthy move.
61. What are the exact implications of this? How would the average parishioner know this?
62. Not entirely.
63. What would be the downside?
64. See question 48. I do believe that my District is a valuable organisation and should exist to maintain some regional autonomy. I could understand it ceasing to exist if it was absolutely necessary to continue the work of the church in light of financial conditions. This decision should be very carefully made.
65. Hard to give a ringing endorsement when I don't know what it is being replaced with.
66. This depends on things like provincial law.
67. Not enough information to make an assessment.
68. I thought we keep the district's legally separate to protect against lawsuits.
69. I have some concern that fully amalgamating the legal entity structure could just make that single structure a larger, more desirable target for lawsuits against what will be perceived as deeper pockets.
70. More information is needed to assess this question.
71. No more Ponzis or financial crisis please.
72. I believe we need a district office/centre. Does it have to be a legally incorporated entity? Is this a requirement by the government? Or is it a safe guard to protect the synod?
73. need more info

74. I think so
75. My disagreement is based on not knowing what the alternative would be. That opinion could change when I see a recommendation for change and a rationale for change.
76. if that is best
77. Again, more information is required Cease only as a legally incorporated entity or cease entirely?
78. Change is never "comfortable." Sometimes it is necessary. I don't know if that holds true of the districts.
79. We still want 3 Districts but all three Districts need to be accountable to the Synod with common goals and agenda.
80. I haven't seen the pros/cons of this proposal.
81. I am not sure what this means
82. Really do need to see how this could work effectively or why you would want to do this.
83. I am open to this happening, though I am not sure that it is the right action at present.
84. There has to checks and balances in how Synod and District business is conducted so perhaps present status provides this. It also ensures District can address issues which are local to their geography.
85. Don't know anything about this.
86. I don't know. Is this part of LCC restructuring?
87. Consolidation of power (authority, governance, supervision etc.) is dangerous in the religious arena as it is in the political.

a. this has been voted on.

88. As long as we remember the congregation is the main decision making entity within LCC, not the LCC Bd. of Dir.
89. Not unless the work can be accomplished more efficiently.
90. Local District contact with personnel is more conducive to growth and cooperation
91. Not enough information to make a decision.
92. What can't be done well on a District level won't be done better on a national level. We are not Anglican.
93. There is a need for a "closer to the grass roots" segment of the church body -- the district serves this purpose-- and its service could be enhanced by qualified and responsible leadership
94. This would be like trying to fix something which isn't necessarily broken.
95. Legal issues need to be examined.
96. Whatever the restructuring decides will answer this.
97. Agree, as long as that doesn't not put the synod as a whole in any danger. The whole is more important than anyone of the parts.
98. There would be legal considerations.
99. The ABC District has lost much credibility in the last while. It at least needs a new start and a new name if we are going to continue with Districts. Other regional entities would be more helpful.
100. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
101. District offices are aware of current affairs in their area.
102. The legal status of the present district is beside the point.

103. This statement is misleading since "I am comfortable" is subjective and not related to function and purpose.
104. But only if you disband the District.
105. We need one overarching Synod to increase unity, transparency and accountability.
106. I am not well enough informed on the implications of the legal aspect to make an informed comment.
107. No problem, change is inevitable (survival)
108. We still want the 3 districts to remain but all 3 have to be accountable to the Synod and have a common platform.
109. Provided that what is proposed will continue the district/regional mission work and eliminate red tape.
110. I can only imagine the legal complexities and the amount of money spent to have only one national incorporated entity.
111. I'm not sure if I'm comfortable with that. Each District does have its own needs, problems, strengths etc. Can one administrative body function in such a spread out country? Does a District have to be a legal incorporated entity? Can one not have a District organized less formally?
112. Stay with the congregations having the locus of control
113. Again, this is a knee-jerk reaction to the CEF crisis. Now that CEF has ceased to exist in the ABC District, the District has an opportunity to reinvent itself into a meaningful, thriving body whose focus is on the Mission of God.
114. There is no need for the Districts to separately incorporated.
115. My "comfort" would be dependant on the measures in place to supervise expenditures.
116. I'm in favour of Decentralization not centralization.
117. In light of the CEF disaster, it's obvious that accountability to a higher authority is necessary!!
118. If it makes business sense, then why not?
119. What does this mean?
120. I wrestled with this one as I said earlier the extension fund should not be centralized perhaps it can now be centralized as we know the dangers first hand of what can happen if you are not very careful.
121. I think Districts have to be accountable just as Synod is expected to be accountable.
122. Site the ABC district issue re CEF
123. Change brings uncertainty - no change brings a foreseeable and in this case, an undesirable, certainty.
124. Agree if CEF is abolished.
125. I suspect that for legal purposes each District should keep its CEF/DIL as a separate legal entity. But otherwise we can keep the assets of Synod/districts minimized so there is little to target.
126. What happens to the charitable tax status?
127. I don't know what this means - need more context
128. Although it was helpful for the other districts and synod during the financial crisis with the ABC district, if there were no longer district levels, I would be comfortable with being under the synod as legal entity.
129. If this would benefit LCC.
130. Considering the criminal acts of the district, this is the only option in my opinion.

131. This would be an expensive legal undertaking.
132. I don't know what consequences this would hold.
133. Of course.
134. I have no idea where this is going. Why do you assume that you do know? This is a very bad question!
135. Whatever aids in the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the church.
136. but what if I thought it had to be done, yet it made me uncomfortable? why are such "feelings" words mixed in with other questions that simply say "should"
137. Absolutely!
138. Of course, it depends on what replaces the district!
139. We should be more united.
140. Does this affect any legal matters that work with provincial laws?
141. no idea what the legal implications of this are
142. I'm not sure what this would mean in practical terms.
143. I think that is going to happen when everything finally gets resolved with the CEF.
144. don't know what the implications or ramifications of this would be at this time
145. This would be difficult to get used to, but I think it may be a necessary move for our synod.
146. I am comfortable with my District ceasing period!!
147. do not believe that the church should place itself in the same light as a DuPont or BP Petroleum in ducking the responsibility of their pervious decisions/work by forming another corporation that assume no responsibility for previous actions.
148. I do not know the implications of that.
149. not sure
150. Far more than comfortable. I expect it to happen.
151. Can structure as part of Synod.
152. Don't know. I would need to have more information.
153. What impact would this have to the LCC structure? Pros? Cons?
154. Couldn't happen soon enough
155. This will be a lengthy process with many legal hoops to go through.
156. I need more information
157. I would be more comfortable with dissolving circuits, which are too small.
158. I need more information on what the implications are either way. I cannot answer this without more info.
159. We are in the courts.....
160. Awaiting recommendations.
161. The congregation needs guidance.
162. I do not know what that would entail e.g. In the East District, French-language ministry has been a district mission priority, though often misunderstood and questioned. Would being in a larger, more geographically inclusive entity remove that interest and support of this precarious and important LCC ministry?
163. Change is not easy - we are doing better here than others and I hate to lose that - but if there is to be restructuring then how else would it happen?
164. Tell me the what happens if it is not?
165. Pastors are needed in the field not in offices.
166. All that would mean is that the district would no longer be a separate legal incorporated entity and the synod would take its place.

167. We should "WALK TOGETHER AS ONE" under one Synod and one board of directors. Otherwise we keep the same thing
168. Confessional Lutherans in the past have been burned by cooperating too often with those of differing opinions and then suffering the loss from overeager ecumenism. When conservatives and liberals come together and then split, historically the liberals get the assets. As such, it's probably wise to keep things as distinct as possible.
169. If the LCC should change its structure from three districts to a greater number of regional areas, then the district would cease to be a legal incorporated entity. However, if this is not the direction of the LCC, I would prefer that it remain a separate legal incorporated entity.
170. If the other way would function better, I would be comfortable with that.
171. Haven't decided
172. The time has come.
173. At face value I would disagree, but were it to cease to be a corporate entity but continue to exist as an ecclesial entity (Province or Diocese), this would be less of an issue for me.
174. It is one way out of the horrible catastrophe our Church has been facing. Once integrity is gone, it doesn't matter much what you do, if you don't replace integrity. That won't happen until depositors are compensated fully for their losses.
175. Simply don't know.
176. they wouldn't be if they hadn't robbed our members, and lost their license
177. Not sure what this would mean. Does this allow more or less likely hood of misuse of funds?
178. Separate Districts are necessary as each District has different strengths and weaknesses. ABC leaders are not aware of problems in the other two Districts, and probably couldn't care less.
179. As long this does not hinder the work of God's people in each District to feed the saved and serve the lost!
180. Would defer the pros and cons to legal counsel to provide information to make an educated and inform choice.
181. As a Church body we should always be open to major or minor overhaul
182. I am comfortable with the District ceasing to be a separate legally incorporated entity EXCEPT for the benefit of it serving as a legal "firewall" to help protect the Synod.
183. I am very comfortable with this. I wouldn't want to be the one to have to do the paperwork though.
184. This is where we should have a national incorporated entity. There is strength in numbers.
185. Sure.
186. Keep the legal entity only as a firewall.
187. Only if a new district formed by unification of ABC and Central into one western district.
188. It would depend on the replacement structure.
189. not sure, more info needed
190. Does this provide a useful "firewall" for Synod? If so, it may be worth keeping.
191. There are distinct advantages to legal incorporation. We should not be too quick to dismiss these.
192. Such a change would not impact the Local congregation one iota. Even offerings.
193. I am also comfortable with them ceasing to be a separate spiritual identity.
194. Yes, if a logical argument can be made for this solution.

195. Yes, let us be one Lutheran Church Canada, not several divisions. One criticism of the Christian Church is that we are so divided. We spend too much time discussing what our differences are instead of being one Church under Christ
196. I don't understand this question.
197. In principle, I agree, but I would want to see the details of the proposal before giving up the present independence.
198. ~ I am concerned that there is less Biblical and Confessional agreement across LC-C as there should be for a group that is to walk as one.

52. Our District should be maintained as a separate legally incorporated entity.

1. probably
2. Separate from what? No Synod? This isn't clear to me.
3. Difficult to understand
4. No District. Just one L.C.C.
5. Only to satisfy the needs of government.
6. Why are you asking again?
7. I need more info on the implications of such a change.
8. If we adopt CEF's as part of the district, then it would be safer that way; but do we really want to go that route?
9. lawyers will ensure we don't, and leaders did themselves in.
10. This is a repetitious question. A redesigned structure needs to eliminate all the legal identities.
11. Only if it makes the most sense given we're heading into a time of persecution against the church.
12. This question may put the cart before the horse. What will best serve the church?
13. An idea whose time has come and gone.
14. We wouldn't want to be engaged in a difficult national entity similar to the present situation in ABC Dist.
15. Not if restructuring takes place.
16. This is a safeguard, when considering the ABC District event.
17. Why!! What profit?! Only in court or trouble is it a good idea.
18. I am willing to let the new proposal suggest to me what is best. I expect the reasons proposed should address concerns of dissolving the district. I trust it will not be dissolved unless there is viable solution to address (at least the greater part of) what district has to this time provided.
19. I like the separation to keep matters closer to home.
20. will doom synod in next 50 yrs.
21. Does this mean there would be no districts? I do not understand what this would look like?
22. This is the same question as above in reverse. Are you trying to confuse us?
23. Districts should be dissolved and restructured into regions.
24. Once again I would ask what ordinary members could honestly answer this!!!
25. For some legal things it may have to be.
26. Regional autonomy/sensibilities should be kept in mind.
27. If the Synod is the legally incorporated entity, what benefits and what disadvantages are there to having districts also being legally incorporated separate entities? I am not aware of such and so cannot answer this.

28. Maybe. I don't feel as closely related to our District as I once did.
29. Considering the mess they have made in the past i.e. Church Ext.
30. This should be discussed.
31. Could still have the district identity but with all administration at synod level.
32. However, given the duplication between Synod & Districts, Eliminate duplication for the sake of efficiency, & streamlined functioning.
33. Districts should become "Regions" who consist of circuits. Regions do not need presidents!! Can be managed by ministerial leadership
34. Confidence has been lost in the ABC District leadership.
35. outside my expertise to say.
36. It will be dissolved thanks to the performance of our infamous leaders on CEF and DIL. Courts and SEC commissions will see to the fracturing of our entities in the legal process> probably before the LCC gets to it. People speak with their feet and wallets; I am concerned we won't have many people left. If drastic action is not taken in 6 months by this survey.
37. Is this to the best interest of the whole synod or even our district and the congregations in it?
38. What option is there until the finalization of the CEF disaster? Why is this question being asked at all?
39. But....once again, there are more informed people than myself and I would defer to their judgement.
40. need more info
41. The purpose of restructuring as I understand it should be advantageous to the well being of LCC
42. is it still???
43. God forbid!
44. Seems to be the same question as #51, but with opposite sense. Is this another test of whether we're being conscientious in answering the survey?
45. At this time, yes, because the other districts may not want to be associated too closely with ABC until our mess gets cleaned up with Church Extension
46. What are the implications of this change in practice?
47. There is no problem with a district being legally incorporated, as long as its mission is clear to be "Synod in this place"
48. I have some concern that fully amalgamating the legal entity structure could just make that single structure a larger, more desirable target for lawsuits against what will be perceived as deeper pockets.
49. More info is needed to assess this question.
50. For the protection of synod as a whole.
51. Perhaps in the future after major growth and strengthening.
52. How can this be changed with present CEF in the position it is in....
53. Again, until I see an alternative it is difficult to provide a meaningful answer. There is not anything fundamentally wrong with being a separate corporate entity unless it interferes with the carrying out of the purpose of Synod.
54. From a CEF perspective it might be necessary. If this provides the best structure for LCC then, yes.
55. within Synod
56. I believe each district should be a separate legal entity
57. I haven't seen the pros/cons of this proposal.

58. Again, depends on a lot of things in the whole restructuring process.
59. I think so - see comment in 51) above, unless it can be shown and proven that there is a better, fairer, safer more efficient way.
60. need more info.
61. Redundant - same question asked in another way.
62. Is restructuring considered because of what happened in the ABC District or are there other reasons. If the latter, what, specifically is not working with the present structure that needs fixing? The answer to that, in turn, would lead to suggestions for restructuring.
63. -unsure
64. Until a better plan is agreed upon.
65. There is a balance of power in what we have now. With the ABC District example, our problems are mostly our own and don't directly affect the other Districts. There is no way the troubles would have been contained even as much as it was if there were only one corporate entity.
66. With possibly a few adjustments.
67. This was just asked! Duplicate question: the same thing was just asked in the reverse in the previous question. In the future please respect my time and do not ask the same question twice. Others have expressed the same frustration with this survey. It is incredibly frustrating and a waste of time to have to answer the same question twice, over and over again!
68. Disagree ONLY if the District Incorporation is replaced by a Centralized LC-C Synodical Incorporation. How much would it cost in legal fees to dismantle the Districts and re-incorporate the Synod?
69. Whatever the restructuring decides will answer this.
70. NO way.
71. Business folks will have to parse this out. If its needed in the courts and in the land, then we need it. If not, then why keep it? It all depends on our need.
72. Would that have made the BC legal issues bigger and affecting more persons
73. not necessarily
74. Perhaps - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
75. Unless a more efficient way to accomplish the tasks.
76. save money on administrational costs
77. The legal status of the present district is beside the point.
78. District responsibilities need to be enhanced and adequate services provided to congregations.
79. I am not sure.
80. The District should be disbanded.
81. We can do better by combining
82. Don't know.
83. Stay with the congregations having the locus of control
84. I am in favour of Decentralized authority.
85. If it makes business sense, then why not?
86. As noted above. CEF program needs to be separated however from District programs and services.
87. Repeat of question 51, but asked in reserve. Is this an IQ test?
88. Only the CEF/DIL funds should be separate.

89. I don't know what this means - need more context
90. If this would benefit the churches in our District, then yes.
91. Not a chance no, no, no, no, no.
92. I am comfortable either way. A wind down should occur, but may be costly if not handled properly.
93. I think so however am not positive I am correct on this
94. Hmmm -- this appears to be the opposite question than above -- but not truly opposite. I think that if the ABC District hadn't been incorporated separately from LCC then LCC would not have been able to go into the ABC District and claim to have no financial or legal responsibility for the crisis. As LCC why would we want to forego this compartmentalization? It worked just as Synod hoped.
95. It hasn't worked in the past.
96. If this is the best way moving forward after all things are considered, then this could still work.
97. Absolutely not!
98. We should work with what we have.
99. Are there legal issues involved?
100. Unsure.
101. don't know see above
102. I feel that Synod should deal with the legal corporate entities wholly
103. Again...there is not enough info to make a comment
104. (See my response in the previous question.)
105. One church. One body. Many parts.
106. I have not been provided with the options and consequences of said options.
107. I am optimistic that LCC can make this work.
108. I do not have enough information for this question.
109. I am unsure of what would be the consequences.
110. Have to consider Provincial laws etc. which may differ thereby separate may have advantages. Also legal ramifications need to examined. So that a law suit in one part of the country can not bring down all of LCC
111. That is the same question as above. I hope whoever put this survey together doesn't do the restricting. You are making little effort to be understandable by the lay people. This survey at times is structured like a psychological test or school test where the teacher is trying to trip up the student seeing if they are even reading the questions. That is a terrible way to conduct such an important task as restricting the church.
112. Not a big deal structurally.
113. We should not be taxed for poor management like the Calgary district.
114. I don't know what that means for the other districts who are not doing so well.
115. Not in favor of districts
116. Confessional Lutherans in the past have been burned by cooperating too often with those of differing opinions and then suffering the loss from overeager ecumenism. When conservatives and liberals come together and then split, historically the liberals get the assets. As such, it's probably wise to keep things as distinct as possible.
117. I don't understand the options and the implications of these questions. Present me with the reasons, rationales, and choices and then I can have an opinion. At present, the district financial misdeeds restricted the legal liability to only ABC. If we get the wrong people in

place with the same lack of servant mindedness and lack of oversight, and it is at the synod level of would take down the whole synod....
118. We might be better served in BC was its own district and Alberta a separate district.
119. Time to simplify.
120. Is this about the District - or the Gospel? We are able to administer our entire Church under one structure. We would still be smaller than the Texas District of LCMS. Let's reduce the corporate reality to what is necessary for healthy function, and increase the focus on Ministry.
121. Again, I think it's too early to make a comment on this - it will be interesting to see how things progress
122. Once integrity is lost, close the district and start again with a new plan, and do better.
123. Is this a trick question? It is the same as question 51, just worded differently. That seems like bad survey design, unless you don't trust the respondents to be consistent and conscientious. Which seems like bad faith on your part.
124. Give the ABC problems I have trouble agreeing but I think it makes sense if there was one inc. entity
125. As long this does not hinder the work of God's people in each District to feed the saved and serve the lost!
126. As a Church body we should always be open to major or minor overhaul
127. I am comfortable with the District ceasing to be a separate legally incorporated entity EXCEPT for the benefit of it serving as a legal "firewall" to help protect the Synod.
128. Not if we are uniting under the Synod and getting rid of the Districts
129. Not necessary as long as there is a structure that gives ample opportunity for input from the individual congregations up towards Synod. Also there needs to be structured forums/meetings in place for congregations to get together.
130. Nope.
131. Part time officers
132. not sure, more info needed
133. The districts should be abolished
134. Again, pretty sure I answered this on #51.
135. We are stronger when we are united.
136. I would rather answer, "Not necessarily."
137. Unless, of course, we move to regional ministry areas.
138. We tried that... it failed.
139. But we must be diligent to stick with being the church ~ overstepping ourselves in financial endeavours has already proven itself to be dangerous and unnecessary.
140. Eliminating Districts probably makes sense, but such a decision must be based upon careful study.
141. I don't understand what this is getting at.

53. The Auxiliaries, listed at the beginning of this survey, are valued strategic partners in the overall ministry of LCC.

1. Info is missing on several
2. The questionable theology espoused by more than one of these organizations has lead me not to support them in the past. The term "ministry" implies the use of both word and sacrament

and as on is obviously missing and the other is often misused to encourage the works of their members' lips, I must disagree.

3. They may be valued strategic partners but are not growing organizations - may need to be revamped to meet current social needs and what congregational members are willing to commit to.
4. Should each be legally separate so if one fails we don't all.
5. Do not always think of them as part of Synod.
6. I don't know because we are always behind in our offerings so can't really think of helping others when we can't help ourselves.
7. We are busy trying to keep our own church doors open. And the roof from leaking!
8. Some are unfamiliar, do not understand function
9. Without these auxiliaries much of the work could not be done - give them as much support as possible.
10. Too many organizations with the same objective.
11. I think their lip service paid to some. I think pastors should take more interest in auxiliaries.
12. I don't know anything about the Auxiliaries, so I cannot say that they are or are not valued.
13. have to show their results for the financials
14. Who am I to question the integrity of those who devote their effort to these specific ministries?
15. Auxiliaries aren't the church. They are not necessary to the survival of the church despite what some of their members think. In any case local LWML groups seem bent on driving themselves headlong into extinction.
16. some and some not. whoever provides financials when asked has a good start. otherwise, suspect as our lessons show. with CEF. they may be valued but only if good stewards.
17. They are good organizations, however, recruiting volunteers, holding national meetings and fundraising from so many auxiliaries is not good stewardship. For example, there should be one mission group with different projects led by the former leaders of partner auxiliaries.
18. Absolutely.
19. Only if they actually have say but if they don't follow the taught doctrine what is the point of having them
20. Most of them are, I think, hold-overs from the distant past. I'm not sure their approaches are still valid or important. I don't think they'd be missed if they were allowed to slip away.
21. Perhaps the Auxiliaries could be added to from the list of Service Organizations (e.g. LAMP, LBT)
22. They sure are valued partners... but, far too many pastors do NOT promote them... use them... they just give them "lip service"
23. I don't know what they contribute to LCC.
24. Only if overall value satisfies the efforts and monies available.
25. to some.
26. I do not like the buzz word "strategic partners". This is not ecclesiastical language and should be avoided. Yes, the Auxiliaries are valued as part of the overall ministry of LCC. However, they are not business partners with us, they are a part of us as Church.
27. Without auxiliaries would mission ministry happen?
28. Some are, some have outlived their usefulness, yet continue to consume resources.
29. Perhaps these are ways to work more with Auxiliaries to enhance services and grow our ministry, mission work and support our Pastors and congregations.

30. The work they do is good but does it have to be a separate entity or just a division of LCC
31. I agree they are valued partners, provided they do not start holding sway over the LCC like certain corporations use our governments.
32. Some of them are important, others are not.
33. LHM is very significant, with its Bible resources and outreach conferences, Lutheran Hour, and etc. (Is this the affiliated ministry directly tied in with Int'l LLL - and LLL-Canada?) LWML's Mustard Seeds are a very neat thing, too. (unfortunately, our church ladies group has not participated directly in LWML)
34. Some are, some aren't.
35. But should be considered as part of the restructuring.
36. what does Concordia Lutheran Mission Society do?
37. There are many aspects of ministry and I've personally supported several of them over the course of my Lutheran life. There are groups that are in need of ministry who may 'fall through the cracks' if we don't have these ministries in place.
38. I do not think we need all these Auxiliaries. I do not know too many of them, but charity begins at home.
39. Absolutely
40. not sure that there is REALLY a "working together" of any of these - all have executive directors, staff, different locations and different mission statements - there should be ONE umbrella for all
41. They seem to pretty much "do their own thing" ... and I cannot see how well they mesh (or don't) with the overall goals and objectives of LCC.
42. There should be a lot more co-operation with other Lutheran Synods as well as other Christian organizations. After all we are all trying to do God's work.
43. Do not need Bible translator's duplication with other churches.
44. Many of them do the mission, service, and outreach work of the Synod.
45. How can the auxiliaries exist and function properly without a strong LCC? Restructuring must take priority over supporting auxiliaries.
46. A couple of the auxiliaries could be incorporated into one entity or organization with some combined and some distinct ministry opportunities (i.e. Lutheran Laymen's League of Canada with Lutheran Women's Missionary League). I think this could benefit and strengthen these entities by combining financial, material, and worker resources into one organization.
47. Probably but as a life long Lutheran, I do not know anything about three of them and little of a for more - this answering something about communication once again.
48. Not fair to group them all into one question
49. I am unaware of too many of them and of their specific and general ministry. What does "valued" mean?
50. As a whole, yes. As individual organizations I cannot necessarily comment.
51. A perceive all as supporting the extending the mission work of LCC while working within its doctrinal guidelines. They provide opportunities for volunteer involvement that would not exist otherwise.
52. Must be subject to periodic review.
53. I think so.
54. agree they have purpose but district and synod have lead them down the bureaucratic path such as them

55. I cannot comment as I don't know what some of them are
56. What are these valued partners actively doing for each congregation?
57. Have God and His word and purpose first and foremost. No self serving.
58. A couple of them I think can be amalgamated into fewer entities.
59. Only ones that have nothing to do with District hierarchy and CEF DIL
60. I think they hold different values to different people in the organization. They do indeed contribute to the synod.
61. Are you kidding? Question 53 and 54 now asking me to recall something listed at the beginning of the survey and stating my opinion here??
62. I would certainly hope so, or why do we have them. Maybe we need to look, there could be some overlap that could be saved, there could be fabulous local programs that it would be great to expand / recreate in other districts.
63. They each have their role to play in achieving the mandate of LCC. I especially have been involved with Lutheran Women's Missionary League. I feel this auxiliary has done excellent work with LCC to raise monies for various needs/causes abroad and at home. I feel proud to have been a part of its work through my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Also the fellowship, friends and bridges it has built is undefinable. I feel sure that people involved with the other listed auxiliaries have had like experience.
64. I would hope these Auxiliaries are valued.
65. Well, yes in that I value work of LWML, etc. but these auxiliaries do not all seem equal, I have never heard of some of them so I cannot give a definitive yes.
66. Everything should be looked at -If you want lay money -Prove your worth by transparent accountability
67. some I have never heard of
68. I would do away with any duplication such as the LLL Canada and International.
69. What do they do for my church? Discussion should be at convention.
70. Yes, and I'm in favour of apple pie and motherhood too.
71. If they no longer have validity or performance, they will eventually weed themselves out, or be changed to become more effective. Therefore, if they are providing spiritual and physical needs to worthy recipients, then they most likely have validity.
72. They are important but not as effective as they could be. The don't reach the next generation and struggle with communication.
73. With this question and the two below I do wonder whether there are again a duplication of administrative efforts and services.
74. I will agree, but I do not know to what degree each auxiliary is important.
75. The work of the auxiliaries is excellent and is very important to the church. Any organisation that gives back to the community or provides a valuable, Christian service and has a connection to the LCC are valued and should be valued.
76. But there needs to be clarification on who can become an auxiliary.
77. Synod can't do it all.
78. In many cases more things happen and outreach takes place than in our district and Synod
79. No idea we don't even know what some of them are responsible for, very vague definition of their roles
80. too bad a lot of our congregations and their Pastors do not ensure that we have auxiliaries such as LLL or LWML as active groups in our congregations

81. I really value the work the Concordia Lutheran Mission Society is doing. The others I am not so sure about.
82. Not sure.....should be up for review
83. We need to have more Canadian developed content for Lutheran Men's' Network. Too much is rah-rah American jingoism that leaves a really sour taste in one's mouth.
84. Don't know difference between LLL Canada and ILLL.
85. Need some redefinition and prioritization?
86. Don't know difference between LLL of Canada and ILLL.
87. Let`s make sure they are run in a biblical, financially sound way and serve the purpose of helping our fellow man and furthering God`s kingdom.
88. Not sure
89. Have been a member of LWML since 1973.
90. They have negligible presence in our small congregation. They may be significant elsewhere.
91. The LLL provides useful materials in French.
92. And, they continue to do their part.
93. Not needed so many. Would need to know what these do.
94. What does this have to do with restructuring
95. Not sure how this relates to restructuring. Is there talk of severing or changing the partnership with each one of them?
96. Not sure what a "strategic partner" is, but I wouldn't advocate LCC breaking ties with them.
97. Much of what I see coming from the auxiliaries is not necessarily solid theologically. It doesn't really seem like they work with LCC at all, but are rather independent, doing whatever they want.
98. -this is something to be discussed at another convention/gathering.
99. It's a mixed bag.
100. They serve a purpose in their own mandate --- just make sure they keep their focus as an extended entity with affiliation to the Synod and its goals.
101. They are a valuable part of our Church's outreach.
102. Don't need L.L. of International - use L.L. of Canada
103. They have been a blessing. Usually they do all the work for Christ.
104. Some are, but not all need to continue in the same capacity.
105. In many cases these auxiliaries and LSO's have been doing the major part of ministry, especially in mission work, overseas and local.
106. Some are great, some I didn't even know we had. One thing I do know, is that they should not all expect a separate Sunday for worship... the Church services are to focus on Christ, not us! Ever.
107. LWML does not need restructuring! We seem be getting it right, with our mission work locally, nationally and internationally with very little cost!
108. Our congregation is deeply grateful for LLL's acknowledgement of Canada's bilingual character and its strong support of ministry to Francophones.
109. I value them, but that does not mean that they must be preserved, or that they are the only way these activities can be conducted. Sometimes organizations reach the end of their usefulness.
110. I'm not sure what it means to have "auxiliaries"... what benefit to them and to us... I don't have anything against their mission or anything. Of course, partnerships are

huge...Collaboration is huge especially trying to reach the lost with Good News. But they need to be strategic partnerships.

111. It is ridiculous to lump all the auxiliaries into one question like this. How can adequate feedback be given when the unique ministries of each are lumped together under one brush stroke? This is a very poor question.
112. Some may have run their course.
113. -They are all grouped together, so it is hard to give an adequate response.
114. Not if there are no salvation organizations in our church.
115. They all need to be evaluated. Perhaps some overlap.
116. The Lutheran Layman's leagues don't seem to be active in our area - very seldom see anything about them but an ad in the Canadian Lutheran. LWML active and productive
117. I believe that these auxiliaries are valuable, but unfortunately are in some cases becoming 'obsolete' in that they are not attractive to the younger generations - perhaps due to an aging membership and a lack of creative outreach to church members at large "same old same old"...
118. not all
119. These need to be examined along with everything else to determine their continuing relevance or if anything should be trimmed.
120. But why do they solicit funds from individual members? If they are "valued" they should be funded from LCC funds and not rely on fickle fund raising!
121. Not informed as to their missions
122. I agree they are valued. I think that they need to be held accountable for the support they receive from Synod and the other congregations of Synod.
123. I question however how much real oversight the synod or districts are able to provide given limited resources.
124. They are good partners; I just don't think they are 'strategic'
125. As a Church their work should be our primary focus.
126. Does this include women?
127. I think they are highly valued; I think they do good ministry but they don't participate in a process that could in my mind be called strategic. They don't do any planning together that attempts to spread the gospel. The auxiliaries hope that they can maintain their partnership because it would seriously alter their finances if they couldn't communicate with their donor's from Lutheran Church Canada.
128. With shrinking church membership and financial hardships, it might be time to cut the number of Auxiliaries or eliminate the Auxiliaries altogether.
129. They should be 'partners', that is, working together and complementing each other.
130. Should have listed them again
131. Can they survive without synod? Can we survive without them? How do we work together? Without knowing this it is hard to say.
132. Some are and some are overlapping with others.
133. Most are, but sometimes they seem to dictate direction and agenda rather than help and bolster the direction of LCC.
134. Of course -- why would they not be valued?
135. Do not have contact with these organizations with the exceptions, the Rock and LWML
136. While they are often supportive financially and "morally", I'd hardly characterize them as "valued strategic partners". I suspect, particularly in the area of missions that their work is

often not coordinated with the synod's mission plan. This category should be re-thought in the restructuring process.

137. No all - therefore as a bulk group - I cannot answer this question in spite of strong opinions -
138. The value of these auxiliaries vary a great deal. Some are essential to our purpose. Many are not and some, in fact, work against our purpose.
139. Some auxiliaries are of higher strategic value than others.
140. We don't see much feedback on accomplishments.
141. Auxiliaries do wonderful mission work.
142. These auxiliaries are not available to me
143. I am not aware of the purpose of the LLL.
144. Do they strategic plan with Synod? How do they fit into the overall LCC ministry? I am sure that some may do beneficial work but I don't know if they are strategic partners.
145. The Auxiliaries of LCC are essential in having our church achieve its mission objectives.
146. Again only if we consider "what are the overall goals and do they fit (into) the long term plans?"
147. Certainly some are Again not enough info.
148. Some need to be reviewed and re-evaluated.
149. They can be utilized more than they are. LLL has many evangelism programs which Synod could make use of and advertised to be effective. They are US based but many of the principles still apply. The problem with LLL is that it needs to be rejuvenated-not all pastors see LLL as a blessing. Membership support is waning because of it. The same is true to LWML.
150. They all started out to be great missions but in the last few years the prime objective of one of these has been to boast the ego and importance of their people with mission and servant hood coming in second. I don't know about the other 3 listed.
151. But annual reviews of these partnerships is important.
152. Again no evidence has been provided as to their value or lack thereof
153. But must remain under the direction of LCC.
154. are the auxiliaries bringing in fresh members and fostering continued membership in our existing members?
155. I agree on the basis that the Synod has thoroughly reviewed their status as organizations that fit well with our teachings and doctrine
156. Each auxiliary is valuable to someone. It all depends on the interests and priority of an individual.
157. They are valued, but not strategic.
158. Extremely important - "workers of each congregation".
159. Yes, but I do not agree with the vision of the preamble which talks as if our synod is basically a service organization. there is a presumption that our synod works in a certain way, but I am not sure that it actually works that way or if it does, it should. church history tells us that synod is more than just filling in gaps of what congregations cannot do. we are American in our thinking even though we are trying not to be.
160. A review of all Auxiliaries is required. There appears to be overlap in some.
161. Only if they work together with complimenting goals.
162. I agree. At the same time, I do think that we need to re-evaluate their role and value within the overall strategic mission of our Church in Canada and throughout the World. These auxiliaries need to be given guidance and direction as to how they contribute to our work

and mission as a Synod rather than allowing them to become autonomous communities with little or no connection to the bigger work of the Gospel which the Lord has given us in our Church today. As noted, through the ABC CEF crisis, I strongly believe that we should not be involved in so-called 'housing ministries' or anything which involves speculative ventures relating to finances.

163. their presence represents a necessary and real face various aspects of LCC in the world
164. However, they are not indispensable. There may be a time when Lutheran Hour Ministries ceases to exist or LWMLC ceases to exist and the Church will go on, though for a time it will be poorer for it, until God raises up another way to care for the things that these two auxiliaries do.
165. There wasn't a focus on auxiliaries that support bringing the next generation into the church though.
166. By their very nature, auxiliaries may or may not be necessarily vital. In the past, for instance, the LWML-C has often functioned as a "church within the church" with their own order of worship, etc. Lutheran Hour Ministries does provide services to congregations and its members, ex. Advent and Lent devotional books, the Lutheran Hour on the radio for shut-ins, etc.
167. I don't believe that they are valued strategic partners by those who are not members of the various auxiliaries or service organizations. Good works can be done by these groups, but...
168. They should, however, be financially and organisationally separate. If they lose membership or motivation, the synod/district should not prop them up.
169. Their conventions should become a part of the Synodical Convention. This may require adding an additional day to the LCC convention with each of these auxiliaries having time at each day of the LCC convention to discuss items. LCC delegates who are not a part of these auxiliary conventions could take in an education presentation by one of our seminaries. We need less conventions (District, National of Synod and LLL and LWML) and better harmonization between these conventions.
170. I think we need a centralized organization that would support lay members travelling to do mission work on a regular basis. People who participate in one of those trips are usually more invested in missions in general.
171. All are, but maybe not all are sustainable.
172. I am not even familiar with some of them. The day to day people in churches might have no idea what these things are.
173. Each Auxiliary should designate 10% of their donations received annually for the repayment to our LCC family members in the ABC D CEF/DIL.
174. some are and some are not
175. Seems to focus more in Alberta and BC.
176. Every one of this partnerships needs to be periodically reviewed to determine whether or not they are serving the purpose for which they came to exist, and also whether or not that purpose remains valid.
177. They do a lot of the work that LCC doesn't have the time or resources to do
178. the association should be reviewed and clarified. A review of what service they provide and their value should be undertaken as they have people resources and assets that if their usefulness has changed then maybe changes to the partners should also be considered.
179. Lutherwood and Concordia University no longer meet the requirements

180. Overlap with LLL; CLMS would better serve LCC if it were national, and not in competition with Districts or LWML.
181. Sure.
182. LWML! Yeah!
183. Streamlining needed.
184. I do not understand the differences between CLMS and LWML, or between LLLC and ILLL. They may be slightly different but CLMS and LWML are both mission advocacy groups. Same for LLLC and ILLL.
185. Some appear to be healthier than others. Some appear to be more effective than others in reaching people with the Gospel.
186. I know of some, but am unaware of others.
187. I would not lump all of them together for one agreement or disagreement.
188. Only some of them
189. Some are - you missed a few & should have deleted a few
190. Some are and some aren't.
191. Really! You want me to go back to the beginning of this survey.
192. some are probably more important than others; some can possibly be eliminated or merged.
193. As lay members of the church, we know very little about these entities, and how effective they may or may not be.
194. The auxiliaries are valuable in the practical ministry of LCC and need more emphasis

54. The Listed Service Organizations, listed at the beginning of this survey, are valued strategic partners in the overall ministry of LCC.

1. Yes, I believe they are. Our LWML has donated to many of them.
2. They are value but there may be too many.
3. Affiliated with other synod involvement may weaken our ministry or we hopefully may strengthen theirs.
4. Are all necessary?
5. They really do what we are supposed to "serve" not administer, etc.
6. Some of them.
7. Of those that I recognize and know, I am confident are valued strategic partners.
8. Lutherwood - we do not have much say in how it is run because of government funding and involvement. Water down our theology as other synod is also involved.
9. of those I recognize and know, I believe they are valued.
10. They would be if we felt we could afford to help out.
11. Have not heard of all of them
12. The hundreds of willing volunteer workers provide much service that otherwise could not be done.
13. Ministry, as I understand it, is word and sacrament. These organizations are not ministry organizations.
14. They are good organizations, however, recruiting volunteers, holding national meetings and fundraising from so many groups is not good stewardship. For example, there should be one mission group with different projects led by the former leaders of partner auxiliaries.
15. Generally, yes.

16. I would rather see LCC itself receive proper funding and "take back" most of these ministries. Presently, and for many years already, they tend to ride off madly in their own directions, with very little accountability or coordination of effort. It would certainly help people value Synod more, if Synod itself was the group that organized and led such work.
17. Some of them are; others are questionable (e.g. LAMP) and some are nearly defunct (e.g. Phyloxenia).
18. though there are a couple with which I am not familiar.
19. I would shorten the list and add some to auxiliaries and delete some.
20. Confessional behaviour should be considered important enough that straying from scriptural precepts or tenets should be addressed.
21. Yes, some of them seem valued and could perhaps be listed as auxiliaries and some we don't know much about as they don't know much about them, but in their provincial areas are probably well-known.
22. Same comments of 53: They sure are valued partners... but, far too many pastors do NOT promote them... use them... they just give them "lip service"
23. Maybe not "strategic partners" but I believe their existence is beneficial.
24. Perhaps! A review occasionally would be beneficial!
25. I never heard of half of them. Does the money spent bring converts or new members? What is the cost per head?
26. Most of them are - I don't really know them all.
27. Once again, I do not like the phrase "strategic partners". It is business speak. Yes, the Listed Service Organizations valued as part of the overall ministry of LCC. They are not business partners with us, they are a part of us as Church.
28. Yes, they are arms where ministry can happen.
29. Should get out of the retirement home business. Have no idea of what Wagner Hills Farms is or services.
30. some are not known to me
31. Some of them are important, others are not.
32. I think a review of all listed service organizations is important on a regular basis to ensure they are valued strategic partners.
33. As to the full list, I'm aware of some more than others. Nevertheless, I think they help target the variety of valid ministry opportunities which we would not be involved with otherwise.
34. Some are, some aren't.
35. But should be considered as part of the restructuring.
36. Some have never heard of - perhaps they are very regional in nature?
37. I do not know how valuable they are to the ministry. Do we need them all?
38. we must be careful about our relationships with orgs that are not in pulpit fellowship with LCC
39. Please see Comment at Question 53. Ditto for this Question 54.
40. All are involved with missions, service work, and evangelism/outreach.
41. Yes, but defining/redefining their relationships with LCC is not a pressing issue at this time.
42. I think so?
43. I have the same concerns here as in #53
44. Not fair to group them all into one question
45. There could be fewer, combining some.

46. Q. 53-54. Why are they included in the over-all spending of LCC when they have separate banking, bookkeeping, and fun-raising "houses"?
47. Not a good question.
48. As a whole, yes. As individual organizations I cannot necessarily comment.
49. We would hope that most would adhere to the doctrinal guidelines of LCC as they carry out their mission, but there is no guarantee.
50. not at all familiar with 8 of these orgs.
51. I don't think that all are necessary e.g. BC Mission Boat Ministry. I do think that LAMP, Lutheran Bible Translators and Canadian Lutheran World Relief are necessary and valued strategic partners in the overall ministry of LCC. Some of the others I am unsure of and don't know enough about some of them to know if they are necessary or not.
52. Some of the LSO's have more value in relationship to LCC than others. Perhaps it would be valuable to have an ongoing evaluation of our relationship to our LSO's. Perhaps that forced communication would have prevented CUE from cutting ties with LCC.
53. Isn't this the same question?
54. What are these service organizations actively doing to participate in the ministry of LCC?
55. L.A.M.P. in the north - exceptional work. L.W.M.L. - foreign ministries key to us.
56. I don't know what all of them do, but at least half do good work. [LLL and CLWR are definitely two].
57. All mission work is important.
58. Some more than others and some more recognized and used than others
59. Are you kidding? Question 53 and 54 now asking me to recall something listed at the beginning of the survey and stating my opinion here??
60. See above comments. These service organizations are the church alive and at work. They give each congregational member the ability to be involved in areas of God's work that are of interest and suitable for them.
61. most of them, however there are some I have never heard of.
62. I read about some of these service organizations in the Canadian Lutheran, a magazine I read and like very much.
63. Well, yes in that I value work of those I know, etc. but they do not all seem equal, I have never heard of some of them so I cannot give a definitive yes. I was a little surprised by the size of the LAMP budget, I know it is expensive to fly into remote regions but I did not realize almost half our Canadian mission budget goes to LAMP.
64. some
65. Any cooperation is good, but thus far partnership seems to have been avoided.
66. I am not familiar with many of the listed service organizations. Those that I know are valued.
67. Need to look at each carefully and decide which to support with limited synodical funds. E.G. is Crew Ministries required?
68. I agree with the organizations I am familiar with and assume the others are equally important.
69. How are these organizations chosen? Should the list be added to? What is gained by being a service organization, is it only financial support?
70. Most yes -- but not all. Lutherwood should be removed. It in no way does anything to help spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It has a wonderful chaplain -- who is hamstrung at every

turn because Lutherwood management and board of directors constantly stymie all his efforts. It is not a Christian organization!!!!!!

71. I will agree, but I do not know to what degree each auxiliary is important.
72. The work of the LSOs is excellent and is very important to the church. Any organisation that gives back to the community or provides a valuable, Christian service and has a connection to the LCC are valued and should be valued.
73. But there needs to be clarification on who can become a listed service organization.
74. Never see any data on what they accomplish
75. Some are, and some aren't. Why is LAMP getting almost as much money as the two seminaries? That is questionable. If you are going to call into question funding the seminaries, I also think LAMP should be on the table as well.
76. Knowledge of five only, the rest are unknown
77. Again, should be up review
78. I am not sure what all of the Service Organizations do. There may be opportunities to review their roles.
79. All are valued, but with restructuring and current financial constraints, each one will have to be thoughtfully considered and accountability and affordability to the national body will have to be remain a measuring stick. It would be wonderful to fund every mission possible, but practicality of choices within budget realities will have to be the order of the day. No different than changing financial situations of a household or a business. You can operate with what you can afford, otherwise you risk the financial ruin of the foundation.
80. Am familiar with several of the organizations but couldn't find any information on Philoxenia Hospitality Ministry. Also noted most of the organizations are listed on LCC website in blue but three are in black, don't know why.
81. Detailed review needed. Add LHM and Strengthen it. It is needed in our far flung country.
82. Am familiar with several of the organizations but couldn't find any information on Philoxenia Hospitality Ministry. Also noted most of the organizations are listed on LCC website in blue but three are in black, don't know why.
83. They compete for funds.
84. But with differences of doctrine should not be part of admin/voting
85. not sure
86. Yes, although some more than others. Some are national in scope while others are regional.
87. Unfamiliar with 5 - web sites helped. Add Lutheran Bible Translators of Canada - was this an oversight?
88. They have negligible presence in our small congregation, other than CLWR.
89. Unclear if they are tying to 1 overall strategy.
90. How would laymen know?
91. In general yes, but it must be stated that the Christian outreach 'effectiveness' of each of these is unknown.
92. They do excellent work but they should be formally part of the LCC structure.
93. don't know what they do. Seems like too many
94. I don't know what all of them are. Some seem very specific and I wonder why they are on this list. How does an organization get on the list?
95. Why is this asked. Most of the organizations listed aren't familiar to the ordinary member.
96. Not sure what a "strategic partner" is, but I wouldn't advocate LCC breaking ties with them.
97. Some are; I don't know to answer concerning them all.

98. What do they contribute to LCC - not knowledgeable to answer this?
99. I am not familiar with all the mentioned groups; however, they have a purpose.
100. Some known - others unknown
101. Most as I understand are
102. They serve a purpose in their own mandate --- just make sure they keep their focus as an extended entity with affiliation to the Synod and its goals
103. I would say strongly agree, but I can't remember everything that was on the list. Some of the ones that were there I'd never heard of; but LAMP and the BC mission boat, for example, are great.
104. Crew ministries not a necessity
105. Yet I do not know what each of the LSO's do.
106. If we are to get out of this hole we find ourselves in growth wise our aux.'s especially LHM are going to be key players.
107. The LSO's do not have any place in our current POWER structure (no vote- for reasons of doctrinal fellowship or lack thereof) and never should. Our work together should continue in our current relationships with each Listed Service Organization.
108. Some known - others unknown
109. Some are, but not all need continue in the same capacity.
110. Some known - some unknown
111. All these organisations report solely in English, a language foreign to my congregation.
112. I value them, but that does not mean that they must be preserved, or that they are the only way these activities can be conducted. Sometimes organizations reach the end of their usefulness.
113. Although I have never heard of 5 of them.
114. I am not in a position to evaluate each one. I don't know.
115. They all seem to be doing the Lord's work, and at no cost to LCC.
116. I agree with the caveat of LSO in principle however the number on the list should be reduced.
117. They are not all defined as Lutheran. I have not heard of many of them. How valuable are they if I, as a lifelong member, am not aware of what they are?
118. May need to look at each one. Which ones are worth saving.
119. They are vital in Outreach
120. More information needed on their doctrine, how monies are used. Not familiar with each one.
121. Some of the LSO's have some questionable theological elements to them.
122. With some reservations for some of the organizations that seem to act outside of what I would consider appropriate for LCC. Need to re-evaluate some of the criteria of what is considerate appropriate with respect to our confessional and doctrinal stance.
123. I have been to Wagner Hills Farms. Their practice of re-baptizing and Pentecostal teachings (one resident told me was forced to "dance in the Spirit") is alarming. To say the least. Which I usually don't.
124. However, how often are they reviewed to determine the nature of their subscription to the doctrine and confessions of Lutheran Church Canada? Is there currently a way to sanction or remove a LSO that is not walking with the rest of synod?
125. not all
126. I am not familiar with the work of all of the LSOs.

127. These should also be examined to determine their continuing relevance or whether any should be trimmed.
128. They have some value in their local contexts, but not all have significance to the synod,
129. But are we spreading our resources over too many organizations? Our church attendance numbers are decreasing; and our members are aging.
130. Don't know enough about their work to make a valued opinion
131. I am not sure how to answer this question, it is so weird. Since they are not accountable to LCC that may or may not be a valued strategic partner. LSO may actually detract from LCC's ministry as what they do may be contrary to the doctrine of LCC.
132. They are good partners; I just don't think they are 'strategic'
133. I am not familiar with the purpose and function of all those listed. They may have a Christian aspect to their mandates however are they a duplications of other organizations doing the same work in their community.
134. most are - some are not
135. -not sure of the work of some of the LSOs (i.e. Bethany Pioneer Village and Wagner Hills Farms)
136. I have personally worked with one of the LSOs. I am a firm believer in their value.
137. List could expand to include Lutheran Hospital Chaplaincy, etc.
138. As mentioned above, with shrinking church membership and financial hardships, it might be time to cut the number of Auxiliaries or eliminate the Auxiliaries altogether.
139. I feel that the LSOs should be partners in working together in carrying out the Great Commission. Partners work together. They allow the individual members to contribute personally to a project that has special meaning or concern for them.
140. however, not familiar with all of them
141. not familiar with all the organizations
142. Should have listed them again
143. I think some of them are valued strategic partners, but there were quite a number that I had never heard of before and don't know what they do. So, it would likely be a valuable to review all of them to see if they fit with the ministry of LCC.
144. Again, don't know how we work together with these partners so it is difficult to say.
145. Some of them could be collapsed into the auxiliaries to reduce the need for individual boards, sets of books, etc.
146. Most are, but sometimes they seem to dictate direction and agenda rather than help and bolster the direction of LCC.
147. Of course - why would we not give thanks and value these organizations"?
148. While they are often supportive financially, this is in some cases, an exclusively local phenomenon and could not be characterized as "valued strategic partners." This category should be re-thought in the restructuring process.
149. In varying degrees.
150. No all - therefore as a bulk group - I cannot answer this question in spite of strong opinions
151. Some are and some aren't.
152. Governance of such LSO's needs to have accountability to LCC, which they presently do not. Lutherwood for example has wandered very far from its original purpose and methodology and has drifted totally into the secular realm.... it cannot continue to have our support nor reference unless it regains overall governance by LCC as do all LSO's.
153. I am not familiar with about six of these organizations or of the work that they do

154. The value of these LSOs vary a great deal. Some are essential to our purpose. Many are not and some, in fact, work against our purpose.
155. Some LSOs are of higher strategic value than others.
156. Lutherwood is basically Province funded; Philoxenia hospitality ministry is almost defunct
157. Everyone should have a say on how things should be run.
158. I don't know what they all do. Consider issuing a future LCC pamphlet providing some info on all 15 organizations.
159. Not sure how "strategic" they are. Seems like most of them were the pet project of an individual or group that has garnered support from a broader though limited base.
160. The LSO's of LCC are also essential in having the Synod achieve its goals and objectives.
161. some means should be developed to weigh the effectiveness of each, overall contribution and need for each to justify their budgeting requests
162. Newer ones are coming of age i.e. Central America/Ukraine -where is Haiti at -or is the US just steering us?
163. The ones I know about are.
164. As I am unfamiliar with some of the organizations, I cannot give an overall vote of approval. The ones I do know about are valued partners, but can we afford to financially support all of them?
165. The church should not be involved in life insurance. BT should teach villages major languages in which Bibles are already written.
166. Do not know the purpose or function of some organizations such as: Wagner Hills Farms and Philoxenia Hospitality Ministry.
167. Not sure if so many different organizations should exist (by that I mean, can/should the church be providing for their work more), but the work they do is extremely valuable.
168. If they have continued to be missions, working to spread Jesus as our only salvation, and not using donated money to further their own agenda and goals. You probably realize, by now, that I am very upset with all of LCC and what has been happening.
169. Some could be discontinued. Waste of money.
170. My impression is the label LSO simply gives them the privilege of raising funds in our congregations. Sometimes, their scope is more regional and local than national. I don't get the sense they are considered very valuable or meaningful to my congregation... and I get tired of being constantly solicited for money, money, money!
171. But annual reviews of these partnerships is important.
172. Again no evidence has been provided as to their value or lack thereof
173. See no. 53
174. If we are looking and measuring in some way and then making decisions on the outcomes
175. Not all of the LSO's are equally valuable. Some of them could be merged with others, or discontinued, in my opinion.
176. I am unfamiliar with many of them.
177. They are valued, but not strategic.
178. Too many and some not needed.
179. Once researched on the internet, they are partners of our ministry.
180. Yes, but I do not agree with the vision of the preamble which talks as if our synod is basically a service organization. there is a presumption that our synod works in a certain way, but I am not sure that it actually works that way or if it does, it should. church history

tells us that synod is more than just filling in gaps of what congregations cannot do. we are American in our thinking even though we are trying not to be.

181. Need to be reviewed
182. their presence represents a necessary and real face various aspects of LCC in the world insofar as consistent with LCC doctrine
183. Same comment as for the auxiliaries. It should be noted that Lutherans for Life Canada is also an LSO.
184. Review needed on at least some of the LSOs
185. Don't have enough information on all of them.
186. But this list could be re-evaluated (Whether that means adding some and taking some away, or just adding some).
187. Some are. Some are not. Some are theologically suspect - in particular Wagner Farms.
188. Some are probably more so than others.
189. They should be separate financially. If they lose membership or motivation, the synod/district should not prop them up.
190. Their conventions should also become a part of the Synodical Convention. This may require adding an additional day to the LCC convention with each of these service organizations having time at each day of the LCC convention to discuss items. LCC delegates who are not a part of these service organizations' meetings or required to attend an auxiliary's convention could take in an education presentation by one of our seminaries. We need less conventions (District, National of Synod and LLL and LWML) and better harmonization between these conventions.
191. Highly valued by districts and synod. Very poorly valued by many pastors.
192. Highly valued by districts and Synod, poorly valued by too many pastors!
193. Maybe one or two are but no more.
194. The degree of value is unknown to myself
195. Since they are not accountable to LCC that may or may not be of value.
196. many are very good some I feel are questionable to the actual amount of good they do I have tried to contact 1 specifically for a few months and I get no response, this becomes disheartening to people who want to help
197. Fantastic missions by people who know their specialty.
198. I have little direct knowledge of some of these so am hesitant to render an opinion
199. these sound more like remote projects that serve their purpose then are probably disbanded. They are not strategic to LCC, as in most cases we have existed and will exist without
200. I didn't know some of them existed.
201. I didn't know anything about a few of the listed organizations and spent some time looking them up online to find out who and what they were. Some of the organizations seem a bit distant from what I would call mission or outreach and others sure could use some more promotion, in my opinion. I understand the need for LCC to be involved in social service organizations but not at the expense of more direct spreading of the Gospel.
202. I am not even familiar with some of them. The day to day people in churches might have no idea what these things are.
203. Most of the LSOs; however, there are some that appear to cloud the relationship with other church bodies.
204. Each LSO should designate 10% of their donations received annually for the repayment to our LCC family members in the ABC D CEF/DIL.

205. some are and some are not
206. It is my understanding that LSO have their own internal responsibilities and therefore not subject to LCC oversight so have freedom to assist or hinder as they will.
207. Every one of this partnerships needs to be periodically reviewed to determine whether or not they are serving the purpose for which they came to exist, and also whether or not that purpose remains valid.
208. with the exception of a few
209. They do a lot of the work that LCC doesn't have the time or resources to do
210. Some are but not sure all are anymore.
211. Some of these would be better served if only congregational or circuit based.
212. Sure.
213. Streamlining and real change needed.
214. Some appear to be healthier than others. Some appear to be more effective than others in reaching people with the Gospel.
215. Some of them are; some are not; others are questionable.
216. I know of some, but am unaware of others.
217. As above, they should not be lumped together for agreement or disagreement.
218. Some of them, such as CMS
219. Some are
220. Some are and some aren't.
221. Really! You want me to go back to the beginning of this survey.
222. some are probably more important than others; some can possibly be eliminated or merged.
223. ~ some are more regional or local that others which makes it less national

55. The relationship between LCC and Canadian Lutheran World Relief is healthy.

1. I would not know this. If Canadian Lutherans World Relief is or becomes too liberal, the LCC should get out of it.
2. ELCIC also part therefore doctrinal issues - may we strengthen them doctrinally
3. It would seem so.
4. That question best answered by leaders of LCC and CLWR.
5. In our congregation they actually communicate with the lay people mare than any other group. They encourage, inform and compliment.
6. I hope so.
7. What
8. Social work is good but we lack doctrinal input and control.
9. I would imagine our small offerings are an embarrassment to those who would like to offer more.
10. Don't know
11. I don't know!
12. Yes, much charitable work is accomplished.
13. Not sure! I would think the relation ship is worth maintaining because of the work they do (refugee, immigration etc.) but I'm sure working with ELCIC is not getting easier.
14. Who cares? What does this have to do with restructuring?

15. Good question. It is a joint venture between LC-C and ELCIC, with most of its funding coming from the other synod. Many LC-C members enjoy the opportunity to financially support and help out with communities and peoples in need around the world, and CLWR is one of the only Lutheran ones available for those who hesitate to support non-Lutheran programs. Is LC-C's relationship with CLWR healthy? I don't know, but I think it's beneficial to support this program / mission.
16. need to remove conflicted board members who are now being? in leadership roles> due to their ties to CEF
17. I have no idea. I hope so, because we give money to CLWR.
18. As I understand the ELCIC is the dominant partner. Given their departure from Lutheranism and historic Christianity I don't see how we can continue to work with them.
19. If Pres. Bugbee and Pastor Schaeffer are not on it. as they are tied to our CEF issues.
20. It has strengths, though there are some areas of difference.
21. I hope so? But I'm not at all sure. I rarely see anybody from Synod voluntarily or wholeheartedly endorsing CLWR. Our support seems to be pretty perfunctory (which I think is a shame).
22. I am not sure how it actually works. I have always avoided donating to projects in areas where LWF has its finger, as they notoriously bully churches into adopting their liberal agenda.
23. There will always be a need to keep our eye on the relationship we have with CLWR in light our joint participation with non-LCC entities.
24. We have members in our congregation with CLWR and they keep us updated.
25. I've been concerned that in some cases the work of the CLWR is not being carried out in Christ's name and that people of non-Christian faiths seem to be getting hired to provide the delivery of aid on a local basis. In which case, CLWR becomes nothing more than a secular aid agency that markets itself to Lutheran donors. I've been personally directing my aid funds to Compassion Canada and GAIN as a result, rather than CLWR.
26. See above. Some things have been said or published regarding CLWR which make me uncomfortable. Influences outside of LCC are probably responsible. If accurate, a restructuring of this relationship may be something to investigate.
27. There seems to be quite a bit of work between the two.
28. I hope it is!! However not much is over verbally communicated to the congregation.
29. How would I know?
30. I believe it is for now, but as the differences in theology between LCC and ELCIC continue to spread, I am concerned as to whether this relationship will be a viable one in the future.
31. Don't see figures etc.
32. I hope so.
33. As far as I know, CLWR is an active ministry.
34. Despite some of the fellowship issues.
35. A Lay Person has no idea - information is not shared
36. I have no idea
37. Continuing our firm ties with the CLWR will always be a great asset.
38. unknown
39. We need to get out of this relationship with liberals.
40. seems to be.

41. (Is this question asked because there are some theological concerns?) We need to do what CLWR does.
42. While I understand the good that CLWR does in the broader world, I question its efficacy at actually addressing the root causes of the issues it administers to.
43. My charity of choice. I admire administration and ability of CLWR to support humanitarian needs where needed, often showing a Lutheran front to un-churched or members of other faiths. Doing so says something about who we are, taking care of the needy as scripture demands, loving our neighbor, feeding and clothing, etc.
44. I do not know.
45. I would say it is but there are some issues for sure.
46. probably but cannot be closer due to ELCIC participation
47. I don't know.
48. Don't know. In the past, I have commented directly to CLWR, encouraging them to more specifically support CHRISTIANS (often in precarious minority positions) in the Middle East, in Africa, and in the Indian Sub-Continent and the Far East ... but I had no response from CLWR.
49. I don't know
50. don't know
51. In view of the info I've received about the recent LWR trip to Ethiopia etc. there seems to be too many CHIEFS. Further more, congregations should be given reports about trips into the mission field. No point in spending the money if the info is not shared. up front/personal with photos etc.
52. My husband and I support CLWR but we have never heard it mentioned within our own congregation, so I wonder about the health of the relationship.
53. I don't know how the relationship stands. Does LCC support ALL of CLWR's projects? Most are excellent, but some are questionable.
54. We don't promote it enough.
55. I believe this to be true, but I find it concerning that we are in partnership with a heterodox church body through CLWR. I support the mission and service activities of CLWR, but I am concerned about what might be espoused as Christian doctrine through this organization as a result of the partnership with the ELCIC.
56. This is one organization I am very familiar with however, how would I know about the relationship between LCC & CLWR? I do know it has value as the Federal Gov't recognizes it.
57. What does healthy mean? It seems to be healthy but is this sufficient?
58. Unfortunately, CLWR, in their international projects, does not identify their assistance as coming from Lutheran Christians.
59. I assume so, but do not know for sure.
60. I have no experience relative to this question.
61. Has CLWR become a social group only?
62. I have no idea!
63. Given that I have no information about the overall LCC relationship with CLWR I am unable to answer. I do know that my congregation has and continues to support the work of CLWR.
64. As a lay member from our congregation it appears healthy but I really don't know.
65. Don't know.

66. I hope so. I think CLWR is a necessary to permit, and to give opportunity for Christians to be good stewards of the gifts God has us.
67. I have no knowledge about this.
68. Why do we reach out in mercy? It is because Christ has been merciful to us. I do not see that message being communicated with CLWR. While there is a benefit to international aide, CLWR already has partnerships with other agencies. Is there a way for churches in the ILC to cooperate in these ventures?
69. How would we know? Ask Tom Brooks (CLWR?) and Rev. Bugbee and then let us know!
70. I know we used to send many things to CLWR and now we don't so again...can't say.
71. Unaware of relationship other than need during disasters.
72. Unsure of this.
73. Really have no info to make an opinion.
74. Would need more info to answer this one as strongly agree
75. A good organization doing good work on our behalf.
76. I have no knowledge of the current relationship, so I cannot give a meaningful opinion.
77. Also very important
78. I am uncomfortable with being partnered with ELCIC when we are not in fellowship and it is already confusing to people that there are 2 Lutheran churches in Canada and this joint effort adds to that confusion. And there are many good secular organizations giving out aid and I want ours to be one that gives a cup of water in Jesus name and tells who that Jesus is which I am not sure is always happening...That being said, I love being able to give symbolic gifts at Christmas (like goats) from our own church rather than world vision, etc.
79. Have no idea
80. No idea.
81. I don't know.
82. How would a layperson have any response to this? What is the purpose of this statement, really...?
83. I don 't know it to be otherwise.
84. I have no idea what their relationship is but I know CLWR does excellent work. I would hope LCC and CLWR has a good relationship with each other but I have no idea if there are problems.
85. I would hope so.
86. I would truly hope so
87. I don't see how humanitarian aid can be uniquely Lutheran. And if it can't be uniquely Lutheran--that is, if humanitarian aid is given apart from Lutheran doctrine (feeding bellies only, not souls) then we don't need a "Lutheran" organization for it. I believe Lutheran humanitarian aide can be unique if we feed souls with the pure doctrine of the word while we feed bellies. If we do this, we cannot feed souls with other heterodox Lutheran bodies like the ELCIC because they preach a different gospel, and so this could not happen within the current CLWR. The LCC would need to have its own humanitarian organization that feeds bellies with bread while at the same time feeding souls with the bread of the pure Word.
88. On the one hand I love CLWR in that I have some kind of Lutheran agency to use to give symbolic gifts through at Christmas etc. (e.g. teacher training in developing nations on behalf of my kids' school teachers.) However, the partnership between LCC and ELCIC makes me uncomfortable. We are not in agreement with ELCIC on many important

theological issues, it is often confusing to laity that there are 2 Lutheran churches in town...I really feel we are adding to this confusion by linking ourselves with ELCIC. It would make way more sense for them to partner with their fellowship church, the Anglican church of Canada. Also, I assume the rationale between this partnership is that we can do humanitarian work but not evangelical work together, but I assume and hope CLWR is doing more than giving a cup of water in Jesus' name but actually teaching people about Jesus. I think we need to re-assess our relationship with ELCIC via CLWR. Also, I heard stories in the past from Lutherans involved with CLWR about CLWR doing less evangelical work in order to get matching grants from Canadian government etc., which would give money if religious outreach was involved (i.e. just the water, no Jesus at all.) There are tons of good humanitarian programs out there. If ours, CLWR, is not explicitly sharing the wonderful treasure of the pure Gospel that we are stewards of in the Lutheran church, what is the point?

89. What is the relationship
90. not sure about relationships
91. not sure what that relationship is but feel money is not spent frugally at CLWR
92. As far as I know
93. would like to think it is
94. Our congregation supports CLWR. I don't have enough knowledge regarding the Synod's relationship with CLWR to comment.
95. What is the relationship?
96. I really don't know one way or the other
97. Don't see a problem with the current relationship.
98. This seems like a strange question and I don't have a clue if it is or not. Our congregation has contributed to CLWR for decades so I should assume it is at least a reasonable relationship.
99. I appreciate the work of the CLWR. I think the relationship is healthy, from what I know.
100. I don't know. I would sincerely hope so.
101. Although I believe that the social concern and aid that CLWR provides is valuable, I am a little suspicious of being involved in CLWR. My understanding is that CLWR is mainly an ELCIC / Lutheran World Federation run organization. Since LCC is not in fellowship with the ELCIC over important doctrinal issues, is there not a possibility that giving money and resources to CLWR sends a conflicting message both to the ELCIC / LWF, as well as to our own parishioners? It could encourage the notion that the doctrinal differences between us are not really that important.
102. I do not know the exact state of the LCC and CLWR’s relationship but it appears to be good. CLWR does important work and a good relationship needs to be maintained.
103. I don't know anything about the relationship between the two bodies so I do not know whether or not it is healthy.
104. I don't know.
105. I do not know what that relationship is.
106. Not enough information
107. Don't know do not have any information on this question
108. No knowledge of problem areas
109. I certainly hope it is. I think it is essential to support Canadian Lutheran world relief
110. Having served on the board of CLWR I know that it has been but I do not know if it continues to be.
111. Unknown....

112. ELC has polluted the Mission component of CLWR with its secular 'Do Good' approach.
113. I don't know.
114. We certainly hope so as we support CLWR to the glory of God. We are thankful that LCC participates with other Christian denominations to help our brother and sisters in need.
115. I think
116. Haven't herd of any problems
117. I have a high level of respect for CLWR and the work they do but I have heard of negative comments from others.
118. As far as I know.
119. I don't know the details of the relationship.
120. No information regarding this is provided in French.
121. I have heard both positive and negative. I have personally supported some CLWR efforts but have heard that little Gospel goes with the social service. Our purpose as a church is to share the Gospel.
122. I hope so. If not what is the problem?
123. There are many questions!
124. Considered important that a 'healthy' relationship exists.
125. Don't know if they are/ aren't. Don't know anything about them.
126. Why is this pertinent to restructuring?
127. Again, what has this to do with restructuring of Synod and districts. Surely, restructuring would not include a reassessment of Synod's relationship with each individual entity. Besides, such a reassessment should be on-going even in the absence of restructuring.
128. LCC should have nothing to do with ELCIC.
129. I like the work that C.L.W.R. does
130. Appears to work well
131. Don't know
132. I presume so.
133. I have no idea. That is a question for insiders to answer.
134. The record of service shows this to be true.
135. I believe it is; I have no information giving me a different opinion.
136. The synodical head office's collaboration in resettling a refugee family is particularly inspiring, but I'm not entirely sure of the nature of the relationship between the two.
137. The relationship is ok, but I don't believe we promote or contribute enough to their outreach and mission.
138. While holding to the name Lutheran, I do not see in their material how they are fulfilling Matthew 28. They are feeding the world, but I do not hear how they are giving the Bread of Life.
139. The LSO's do not have any place in our current POWER structure (no vote- for reasons of doctrinal fellowship or lack thereof) and never should. Our work together should continue in our current relationships with each Listed Service Organization.
140. Thanks to World Relief's efforts not LCC.
141. Although the social aid that CLWR provides is beneficial for many, the overwhelming presence of liberal-leaning Lutherans on it has neutered its ability to bring the Gospel to a people lost and perishing without Christ. Based on the amount of money that goes towards CLWR, I would be very comfortable ceasing formal relations with CLWR, but still encouraging members to donate to it as they see fit.

142. I'm not versed well enough in the intricacies... I would worry about the ELCIC's sub-mission for women's ordination and same-sex relationship stuff overshadowing actual care work.
143. Please define "healthy."
144. Perhaps - BUT - no data to decide either way. Without data you are just polling people emotions and that is not good decision making
145. Unknown - but appears to work well
146. I hope it is
147. I don't know enough about the relationship. But it does sound good - e.g. joint refugee sponsorship with ELCIC and CLWR and LCC.
148. I think so, but I do not know for sure.
149. don't know.
150. CLWR has lost its "Lutheran" or even Christian identity. Could be a government agency
151. This organization reports solely in English, a language foreign to my congregation.
152. No experience to know.
153. Who determines "healthy"?
154. CLWR does good work, but they have experienced significant theological drift away from the Lutheran Confessions, so LCC needs to continue to watch that and call them to account as we have in the recent past.
155. Do not really know.
156. How would I know this? I personally appreciate and support CLWR.
157. Do not know
158. I have no idea. Not a question for a congregant.
159. LCC and ELCC are not in alter and pulpit fellowship. ELCC has more influence. Our voice is too small. ELCC may choose to support things that we many not feel comfortable with based on theology.
160. how would I know this?
161. Outside of it being an auxiliary we support I do not know what the relationship is between CLW and LCC.
162. I think that CLWR is much closer to ELCIC than to LCC. I feel quite distant from CLWR.
163. Necessary for work in the world.
164. I don't know. Kids could be made more aware of the programmes though. My daughter just participated in an organization "We Day" that encourages much of the principles of CLWR. Kids can be taught to care and why not within our church body.
165. I really have very little actual knowledge on this and fear anything could be unhealthy as it appears our church is.
166. In general, it can never be healthy as long as the theological directions of LCC and ELCIC continue to diverge; we may cooperate in externals, but what when that cooperation has a theological edge to it, as so often happens with CLWR work? I think the days of joint participation with ELCIC in any and all matters should be drawn to a close.
167. Don't know - haven't read or heard anything negative
168. I don't know if its healthy or not but I believe that it is a valuable relationship to have
169. Little news available on this topic
170. I have not heard that LCC and CLWR is anything but in a healthy relationship
171. As the ELCiC drifts further and further into heterodoxy it is important that we maintain doctrinal distance and association - unless there is repentance and restoration to orthodoxy among them. Perhaps a partnership with LCMS on world relief efforts might be possible?

172. I'm uncomfortable with CLWR, given where ELCiC is now coming from.
173. I would very much hope so.
174. I have no idea whether the relationship is healthy or not (how are we supposed to know this???), but I do believe CLWR is a valuable ministry, one I believe our church makes great efforts to support. I certainly hope the relationship is healthy. If not, measures should be taken to improve the relationship.
175. I don't know much about the relationship.
176. Our congregation is fully interested is looking inwardly, not looking outward to organizations like CLWR. Information about CLWR is very sparse.
177. So far as we know - It does good work. It is a good example of LCC working in co-operation with others.
178. Don't know
179. I don't know if it's healthy. I do know it exists.
180. To my limited knowledge it is.
181. Do not get enough info on this, but believe this is important
182. Have no direct information to agree or disagree, only that we are in fellowship with all other Lutherans in namesake only "Lutheran", while their theology has strayed far from LCC's more orthodox theology.
183. not aware of any problems.
184. Not sure if CLWR spreads the gospel
185. -why is CLWR singled out from all of the other LSOs? -if it is because CLWR is an inter-Lutheran organization, so are LAMP and LBT
186. They just jointly came together to sponsor a refugee family - I don't think they would/could do that if their relationship was not healthy.
187. Gosh, I hope it is! We donate to CLWR all the time.
188. I've received no information on this relationship.
189. With the financial hardships of the LCC, I wonder if it is time to sever our ties with Canadian Lutheran World Relief?
190. In most of the "No Opinion" questions, it's a case of not knowing. For instance, I really don't know anything about the relationship between LCC and CLWR.
191. I think LCC needs to support CLWR
192. What does this have to do with restructuring synod???
193. Do not have enough information to make an informed comment.
194. Not enough visibility into this
195. have no idea. There is no formal communication between both parties at the Congregational level.
196. CLWR goals are not always LCC goals and so the relationship should not be stronger.
197. I do not know if it is or not, but it appears to be.
198. What is healthy? We give money to help the world through CLWR. It seems to be working.
199. I do not know what the current relationship is.
200. CLWR considers itself a mission organization and advertises itself as such. Thus it's heterodoxy makes it unsuitable for partnership with LCC. If it were strictly a relief agency, that would be different
201. We cannot afford our own relief agency in LCC but we cannot continue to work with other synods who are so far removed from our doctrine and teachings. I need more information on

how we are presently working through CLWR as outreach and relief go hand in hand, therefore doctrine is critical.
202. I don't know.
203. Why is CLWR the only organization asked about by name? Aren't there others?
204. On the one hand, I think CLWR does fine work. But I'm not completely comfortable partnering with ELCIC. I wish we could partner with LCMS World Relief instead.
205. LCC could be doing more with CLWR.
206. Don't have sufficient information to comment.
207. We are always supporting world relief.
208. I seriously do not know. I would like to agree but think the ABC CEF situation has cast doubt on LCC too.
209. Appears to be at this time.
210. I think that there is a minimal relationship but I am unsure how it can be "healthy" if we have different theological stances.
211. Can not comment I do not have enough info
212. Seems to be.
213. I have no way of answering that without rampant speculation
214. Inadequate LCC representation. CLWR does not represent LCC well.
215. don't know
216. CLWR's relief efforts are wonderful, but there is a decided lack of Christian witness in their activities. That needs to change
217. On the whole perhaps, not necessarily individually
218. unsure of how much LCC is directly involved in CLWR
219. I am unsure of how much LCC is involved in the running of CLWR. It seems to be a well run organization that is necessary in the world.
220. Might be present but not may be strong
221. I don't know any more than what I see in the magazine or online. As an aside, why is CLWR the only LSO that's asked about specifically?
222. How would I know?
223. I donate to CLWR but have no information as to the relationship between CLWR and LCC. Is it healthy?
224. Some relief agencies may be more costly than they are worth.
225. Sometimes it seems like they are just the least offensive to me of all the other world relief agencies soliciting for money. Some of their communications in the past have the language and odor of Liberation theology. They should be reminded our true "liberation" is found in the Gospel of Jesus Christ and not in changing political structures.
226. Again no evidence has been provided as to the state of this relationships
227. What is the relationship? How is one supposed to know?
228. I do not have enough knowledge of this situation to make an informed decision that would be helpful.
229. No idea personal if it is good or bad.
230. As far as I know!
231. It is a relationship I am extremely proud of
232. I have no information.
233. From what I have seen it appears to be healthy.
234. How would congregations know this information?

235. only pastors would know or church leaders.
236. I think they are but maybe I do not know??
237. I am not clear on the relationship, but it seems that our voice in CLWR is shrinking. I have heard this from members of the board at CLWR. We co-operate in externals with ELCIC, but how long can that go on as the drift away from the Lutheran Confessions and Scripture.
238. Appears to be???
239. I would call our relationship with CLWR as being 'uncomfortable'. While we do need to develop and foster a stronger sense of mercy and compassion as a part of our ministry and outreach, the influence of the ELCiC does have a tendency to distort this away from any meaningful confessional content. We need to revisit our involvement and participation to find better ways to being a part of this ministry.
240. I have heard ongoing concerns from people who have dealt with members of the ELCIC within the sphere of CLWR as to how, quite frankly, less and less Christ-centred the ELCIC and how that affects the spirit of the work going on. As well, although they have been wonderful people to work with, the fact that non-Lutherans are holding key roles in the office staff in CLWR and bringing their theology to bear on the matter (though not out of any malice intent) is a concern for myself and causes me to wonder how much longer I will be able to support and promote CLWR, despite the emotional attachments I and my congregation have to them.
241. How would I know/
242. As far as I know
243. Don't know.
244. There needs to be better communication to lay persons on the impact that LCC and the CLWR have.
245. There seems to me to be very little of gospel motivation in CLWR
246. I have no basis to determine the health of this relationship.
247. CLWR is a valued entity - though the work may be done through our own separate body if doctrine is compromised in the work under CLWR's present structure.
248. It appears that such is the case, and many members of our congregation do support the work of the CLWR.
249. How would I know? I didn't know that my district's relationship to the church extension funds investors was parasitic...
250. If we are talking about 'secular humanitarian aid' then all is fine. But, according to everything I have heard or seen, the CLWR is not interested in proclaiming the Gospel.
251. it needs to become stronger
252. I have no idea.
253. No idea
254. Yes - both for the need and for the comradery that it possesses with such groups as LWML or Missions Board in individual congregations
255. "Healthy'?
256. this relationship should be encouraged both at congregational and synodical level. More members should be informed and invested in CLWR.
257. CLWR does a lot of great work. However, I question how long we can maintain a relationship with the ELCIC in this manner. How far into the "deep end" do they have to wander before we have to cut ties completely?

258. I think CLWR would serve LCC better if it had projects more connected to our LCC missions. No one wants more disasters but they are really good at doing this work. Wish other projects were closer aligned to the countries where LCC has its missionaries.
259. As far as I know.
260. How would I know?
261. As healthy as it can be. We need to be vigilant about the types of organizations/initiatives undertaken to sponsor when so many of these could be more closely linked to the types of positions that ELCIC espouses and about which I have grave concerns
262. CLWR should come from services and be added to Auxiliary
263. In addition to the support of the work of the CLWR this relationship provides at least one opportunity to acknowledge and value the existence and ministry of Canadian Lutherans beyond the LCC's structure.
264. I don't know how the relationship between LCC & CLWR. I have never heard one way or another.
265. I hope so
266. Little knowledge, however I don't think CLWR has the support from LCC that the other Synods give it.
267. I think so but am not sure.
268. How would we know?
269. I can only imagine that relations between ourselves and other Lutheran bodies are strained but our Participation in LWR provides an effective and efficient way for LCC to provide the Gospel and ministry to the World, and the Gospel is being able to be expressed appropriate through LWR, then I think we should continue.
270. I have not reason to think otherwise. Perhaps LCC and CLWR should be answering this Q.
271. The migration of LWF churches and affiliated organizations away from confessional Lutheranism has strained this relationship in my view.
272. We are not in theological agreement.
273. As healthy as it can be while having to work with the ELCIC
274. I don't know enough about that relationship
275. I would like to see it strengthen even more.
276. However, not all LCC pastors really support CLWR because of its pan-Lutheran nature.
277. CLWR seems to be quite ELCIC friendly/dominated...
278. Get Glen Schaeffer off the board and things might improve.
279. With the current leadership "yes," and "for now" ... but as CLWR is also influenced by ELCIC, I can see this vulnerable to becoming very unhealthy (as ELCIC participants lead CLWR away from the clear Word of God and mission of Christ's kingdom).
280. Don't know enough to answer. I did find out in this survey that we provide a million dollars to them. Didn't know that.
281. I strongly value CLWR but am not aware of how the relationship between LCC and CLWR works.
282. Why do we have a common ministry with heretical group? Luther refused joining forces with heretics (Calvinists) even for mutual self-defence
283. I appreciate all CLWR does, but why does this matter at this point?
284. We shouldn't be partnered in ministry with heretical pseudo church
285. Time to do our own thing or join LCMS's world relief with a Canadian office. This is worth putting money into

286. I don't know what the relationship is like but I feel that Lutheran World Relief shows the world the love of Christ more that most congregations in their church buildings.
287. Because CLWR is a pan Lutheran organization, our priorities don't always align. However, they are a valuable resource that is helping our churches to sponsor persecuted Christians.
288. The relationship is healthy yet CLWR is highly influence by their relationship with the ELCIC. On balance I would keep them as an LSO.
289. It is not as healthy as it should or might be, but without this level of cooperation with the ELCIC I seriously doubt that we would have any such means for this most important area of service.
290. Don't have enough information
291. ~ CLWR seems to be more concerned socially than Scripturally from my perspective

Section 7: Feedback on This Survey

56. This survey is a helpful part in the process of restructuring LCC.

1. I think it was more a general questionnaire about how much you know your own church and beliefs.
2. How would I know? There are too many questions that need clarification. This survey was done in haste.
3. I don't think it asks the right questions, like why are the main line churches closing, and why others are growing with our people.
4. Perhaps more information should have been given to LCC members before the survey was distributed.
5. The questions asked are at a church level I am not familiar with. Very difficult to give meaningful answers when not knowledgeable about the Synod and District Structure.
6. I think most lay members of LCC feel they are unsure of the questions making answers even more difficult and since we don't know in what direction you are taking other than creating a large body whose eyes - hands - feet are going to be improved!!
7. At our level of knowledge - probably not. Elected officials have that job - thus bring it to us before it is law.
8. It's a start.
9. It better be!
10. I hope so.
11. Our pastor says so. But I sure don't know.
12. Don't know.
13. I don't feel I know about what is happening now to be able to comment.
14. Provided the information given in this survey is listened to.
15. If these suggestions are adopted as the majority of those doing the survey suggest.
16. Always good to get input.
17. As long as comments are listened to and considered.
18. doubtful, given the surveys of past and not listened to.
19. If people feel there is some weakness or manipulation through or in this, they are looking too hard for bogeymen. My goodness, every question allows for written comment -- when was the last survey you filled out that gives that kind of opportunity to express opinion, and to give comment about the quality of each question? It is time for our people to learn to love each other and become that precious body of Christ: the Church
20. That remains to be seen.
21. Very unsure, given who is conducting it, can't print it and lack of professionals that are not pastors who are doing it. You don't want us to have a paper trail of what we send in by computer, just like no financials are given when we ask. Why are you so afraid of evidence and us having a paper trail?
22. I pray you get a good response rate since this is much more useful than idle side conversations.
23. The survey would have been stronger if there had been an educational component in the congregations and circuits that unfolded beforehand.

24. I would have liked to have had more information on what exactly they want to restructure and why
25. Remains to be seen! How on earth are all these results going to be co-ordinated and used? I'm not terribly optimistic about its usefulness.
26. I hope that this will be the case, but I'm skeptical. Overhauls like this typically face reluctance from leadership
27. I, for one, am not qualified to answer a number of these questions, but I did.
28. The process of restructuring LCC probably comes from very involved people - both professional church workers and l involved lay workers.
29. Only if the submitted ideas and comments are seriously considered.
30. Some (many!) of the questions are incapable of being answered.
31. Many questions seem irrelevant in restructuring LCC. Others are impossible to answer for an average member of congregation.
32. Depends on to who! and how it is taken.
33. I hope this survey will be helpful - LCC needs all the help they can get at this time.
34. It will give some socio-clerk categories to divide us all into. The young have no experience and the old are set in their ways. It will be as the committee wants it to be by picking the information.
35. Unclear/Biased
36. Not sure. I found some of the questions to be worded in such a way that I would have preferred to comment without choosing agree or disagree, because I found the wording of the questions themselves problematic and somewhat leading towards a certain outcome.
37. Dependent on the way these results are used, potentially. Dependent on who filled out this survey, potentially.
38. I hope it will be
39. feedback requested - however most are uninformed or knowledgeable.
40. It is if something comes of it.
41. Well done!
42. As congregations and individuals the more informed we are the better decisions we can make in moving forward to repair the damage and to grow our outreach as we strive to bring glory to God and share Him with all people.
43. I hope in my own small way I have helped give support to making our church strong and sturdy for the days ahead. A brainstorm of ideas is never a bad thing.
44. My first thoughts are that this survey assumes a status quo -- even though many of us barely know what that is. So, how can we evaluate it? That feeling led me to wonder, is it open enough to really permit open thinking or appraisal of needs and opportunities as required to establish a broader or new approach to restructuring LCC?
45. I agree if these comments will be heard. Otherwise no.
46. If the comments of the whole are taken into account and actually used to shape the outcome of the restructuring, then yes. I find the way that it was administered to congregations across the country has made it very difficult for many people to access, myself included, and I am a young, technologically adept person.
47. I don't feel I can make an informed decision when I am not fully involved in the inner workings of this organization.
48. I didn't find the questions themselves to be very good. However, I am very grateful for the opportunity to add comments.

49. The scope of the survey in terms of the type of structure being considered seems narrow.
50. I agree but I must state that the survey reflects a narrow scope of restructuring as opposed to being open to a completely new structure.
51. I hope that it is.
52. I don't think much effort was put into putting this survey...whether that was due to time restraints or whatever. A lot of redundant questions...i.e. asking a question in the positive and then turning around and asking the same question in the negative. What gives??
53. Sources should have been provided for additional background information for many of the questions. As a "less than 10 year" LCC member, and not knowing much of the existing organization and history, many of the questions could not be answered in an informed manner without additional background information.
54. Without the input here from all groups and people we can not move forward properly. Just in the fact of reading the answers can tell us whether the word is getting out properly. That being said, the diverse people that answer this survey can invariably help find solutions where most may have thought none existed. With our Lords help and our faith we will find the solutions we need to continue and to reach out to people and bring them the word.
55. It would be great if I knew more about every question that was asked. I wasn't knowledgeable enough to be able to give answers that would be helpful. The majority of my answers were Neither Agree or Disagree because the questions were too hard.
56. It's only helpful if you know the background behind all of the issues that the survey hints at with its questions. Lay people, and women in particular, will be largely ignorant of the administrative problems within the districts and the synod, and so shouldn't be asked to provide an opinion without being told what the background on each issue is. Also, having every question partnered with the same question asked backwards is highly redundant.
57. not sure who will be evaluating the responses, not sure what the "expected outcomes" were to begin with and some of the questions are so far from being important in the continuation of the church and its teachings that it seems the people doing the survey have lost touch with what REALLY matters - bringing and keeping people in CHRIST'S teachings
58. The questions are poorly phrased and are biased.
59. But I'm hopeful.
60. I don't know
61. I can only hope and pray that our input is valued.
62. It's a start but what is the process from now on?
63. I'm not sure. I don't think everything is "out on the table" when it comes to considering an ecclesiastical governance structure. I don't think everything is "out on the table" regarding personalities and opinions in our Church body over matters of Church and Ministry. This could greatly affect how helpful this survey is in the process of restructuring LCC.
64. I hope so, however there are so many questions I know so little about which will not go very far in contributing to any restructure and I know I am not alone!!!!
65. I hope so.
66. Please see attached sheet of comments. Most unhelpful survey because of its inherent inadequacies.
67. Unsure as this survey is weak.
68. Only if advice is accepted where reasonable.
69. Just felt not knowledgeable enough to make informed decisions in a log of cases.

70. Unfortunately, it is not known as to what the real problem is to make a change. Not enough people know our structure now.
71. I thought this survey would be about how to make the church more relevant today.
72. Only inasmuch as the information provided is a true reflection of what actually exists.
73. If it's acted upon
74. I certainly hope it is helpful
75. but limited - This survey is limited in its ability to gather meaningful information.
76. Only for people who are thoroughly familiar with the workings of the synod and districts, and all the relationships.
77. I hope that it will be.
78. only if the process is looked at completely and not white washed to direct information favorable to the to "old man's Club"
79. I hope so
80. I DON'T KNOW.
81. I would hope that the results of this survey would be useful.
82. impossible to answer this not knowing how the survey will be used, where or when
83. Appreciate chance to express opinion, whether helpful let's hope so!
84. That remains to be seen. Much of the survey seemed off topic or possibly pushing an agenda, with little or no context to provide clarity as to what was being asked.
85. Not sure congregational members are knowledgeable enough about all of this to make meaningful suggestions
86. I rather doubt it...first most people don't like to do surveys and if you are only expecting perhaps 2,000 surveys back from sending this to all the churches across Canada then your expectation is like maybe 2% Secondly the old boy's club won't listen that is why we are in this mess in the first place
87. I sure hope so, it is important that the organization realizes that congregations really don't know everything they should about LCC...I sure don't
88. Hope So!
89. I don't know.
90. -hope so -only you will know that
91. I hope!
92. I hope so... many question the average church goer has little knowledge of the structures.
93. ? # Returned May Make the Decisions
94. How else will you know what the individual member thinks or knows.
95. I believe this survey should have been done by a professional organization skilled in doing surveys so that the results would be valid.
96. It serves the purpose of people feeling heard. It also serves the purpose of misleading people and enraging people when their opinions are not taken into account.
97. To an extent I agree - at least the survey is giving people a voice. HOWEVER, you can only put value on the answers you receive if all individuals who complete the survey have enough background knowledge to make an informed decision. A four week, mandatory participation bible study should have been prepared and sent out to all congregations and a formal document detailing the current roles and structures should have accompanied it in order for individuals to be able to make informed decisions. Too many individuals in ABC district are still angry about the CEF crisis. This survey will be seen as a place to one, vent, and two,

finally be heard. If the survey does not yield any actual discussion, it will be throwing the people's opinions in their faces.

98. Sometimes the questions seemed "not quite cutting to the heart" of a matter - perhaps that was to be unbiased in delivery, yet if it doesn't really ask the "right" question then the answers given go with the flow laid out, but sometimes It feels vague so I am unsure how helpful it is.
99. Personally, I think it was a terrible waste of time and I wonder how much was paid for someone (or a group of people) to create it.
100. There needs to be a much input as possible when making changes such as these.
101. It has made me think about things, and research some things so that I had a better grasp of the status quo to answer the questions. I also thought, why do I not know how things are organized, or at least were to find this info readily. I was not able to attend the info session that was given, I'm sure it would have been of a great help to me.
102. I am glad that we have each had the opportunity to express our opinions and thoughts concerning these matters. After all it is our church that we are discussing and hopefully changing for the better. Though I do feel there were
103. You have to start somewhere. I wish it would have showed more focus on our walking together in doctrine. That is really why we come together as Synod.
104. It has allowed individual congregational member to understand and see some of the issues being faced by the church and given us the privilege of feeling that we are a part of the future.
105. I would guess that half of the church body (laymen) know nothing of a lot of the question.
106. Are we getting ideas or agendas?
107. It would be helpful if it was possible to survey those people who have left LCC congregations because they were frustrated with various aspects of the church and were not heard or valued
108. There is too much I as a layperson have very little knowledge of to give informed answers.
109. I don't the average person knows enough about the politics and organizational structure to provide valued input. I know I don't.
110. Hope it will.
111. Will objective lay members be involved in the discussion or will it be the lay yes men to the Pastors
112. Asks too many questions that the average person would not have enough knowledge to answer.
113. I suppose in theory it is but we won't know until the results are tabulated and if those results are actually used.
114. There should have been more information and discussion through circuit meetings so we the lay people could be more informed.
115. most lay people like myself have no clue about some of these questions some people give answers based on what they have been told by others e.g. pastor some congregations know nothing about this survey
116. I hope so.
117. I feel many of these questions will be difficult to answer for the average Layperson.
118. Should be
119. I sure hope so.
120. I hope so

121. Generally, I see that having 2000 people answer this survey, along with the countless hours you'll spend sifting through the responses and undoubtedly coming up with a bunch of pretty multi-coloured charts, is all a colossal waste of time. I think that question #21 touches on the main unanswered question: What are the underlying problems that restructuring is intended to rectify? It may be that the survey will elicit some input addressing this question, but a much shorter and better focused survey would yield more useful results.
122. I hope that some good comments in general can be used effectively for restructuring.
123. I pray that it will be. I hope that many congregations respond and that you are given good representation. If representation and response is poor, then the effectiveness of the survey will diminish greatly. Will the results truly lead to action? LCC seems to be mired and stalled by in action and halting performance.
124. Should have had more preparation and planning. "Town hall" meetings should have been held so that congregations can ask questions and became informed on the overall restructuring. The members deserve to hear about the CEF "fiasco" and participate in appropriate discussions. I have heard so many criticisms and an overall lack of confidence in the handling of this unfortunate problem.
125. Thank you for the opportunity to be part of this process.
126. I am not an expert in the organization in. LCC. Our membership is shrinking so we have to adjust accordingly although it saddens me. Christian organizations have given up so much influence on people at large and governments have taken over in many of those areas. Our western governments have a very different world view than Christianity.
127. I think so, it is a great way to invite all of the membership to take part and have a voice to this process.
128. I suppose it is, but 95% of congregants will not be able to understand it or know enough about district and synod to be able to confidently fill it out.
129. I hope that it will be helpful.
130. It is important to elicit feedback from the members of LCC and an unbiased survey without leading questions would be helpful. This survey appears to be biased and did ask leading questions. I am disappointed in the quality of the survey and I have concerns about how the information will be consolidated and used. This being said, some of the questions in the survey are good and do not have a strong bias, these questions can be used to make an informed decision about what the church wants. I believe it is very important that all of the results are shared publicly.
131. Too many questions were hard to answer because of the general nature of the question. In order to decide if something was to be better I need more details as to what that change looks like and how it would be practically carried out.
132. If people only fill in the checkboxes, I'm afraid the questions on this survey were too undefined to be statistically significant.
133. There is a bias in the way these questions were developed so I can't agree with the process.
134. I will leave my comments to the end.
135. I do not know how helpful my input may be without knowing the problem areas
136. I know that this survey is designed to talk about the structure of the church and I know those conversations need to happen but I feel we are missing the point. No matter how many districts we have or how we are structured, the question remains- how are we going to address the serious declining enrollment in our churches. We have to face the fact that our church as a body is dying and we had better do something about it. Maybe we need to ask

those churches that are thriving (and we have few of them in LCC including my own church) how they have been able to grow and we need to listen with openness to their answers. Too often the churches that are growing (i.e. Bethel Edmonton for example), face condemnation by the church body for not being "Lutheran" enough. Maybe we should set our pride aside ands see what is working in those congregations that are growing and be open to try new ways of sharing an ageless message.

137. Possibly.
138. It will be interesting to see how far this survey has influence in the end result!
139. Thank you for this opportunity. It is long overdue.
140. This survey could have been helpful if it had been prepared, analyzed and reported upon by INDEPENDENT Professionals outside of LCC. The survey could have been a useful tool in building TRUST -- unfortunately, as with CEF, pride and incompetence combined to produce a substandard product.
141. We hope so. The results will show if those heading it will follow the direction of the Lord.
142. It may be. I all depends if there is good participation in the survey. And also if there are no presuppositions by Commission members.
143. BUT ONLY IF IT RESULTS IN LIMITED RESTRUCTURING
144. in so far as knowing it is proposed
145. These sorts of surveys are too simplistic and assume that intelligent responses can be provided by circling a number. In addition, this survey is too long and requires a sophisticated knowledge of the church structure and organization that is beyond most people. As pointed out, some questions are ambiguous. THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM IS THAT THERE IS NO CONTEXT FOR THIS SURVEY -- WHY SHOULD WE RESTRUCTURE AND WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACHIEVE. Thus, respondents will be answering from different points of view, making it difficult to interpret the results meaningfully.
146. time will tell.
147. Seems to be weighted towards pre-conceived plan.
148. There is lots of uncertainty, confusing questions, don't know a lot of the information I believe many people will not answer this questionnaire for these reasons I believe some sort of study sessions in the congregation should have been made available
149. Hard to say at this point. Time shall tell.
150. but after all the information is complied and ready, before anything is done, let the information be shared with all members of synod.
151. However, I sometimes wonder if more meetings and more discussions are fruitful.
152. I have reservations about this survey. I am not opposed to having a survey, I simply feel this survey seems somewhat ad hoc. Some questions require particular knowledge that many if not most people might not possess. Other questions, particularly where one disagrees, could be for diametrically opposite reasons which could preclude a valid conclusion for the results.
153. Hopefully it will be a benefit
154. It is good that this section of questions is being asked. Answering the survey requires expertise in organizational design and knowledge of issues/problems facing LCC. Most congregational members will therefore have no informed opinions. It would be better to have some analysis of the problems provided as background material prior to completing the survey.

155. more than likely would have received more constructive input if presented to existing circuit forums for input from their own congregational members first with a detailed report from each existing circuit on the issue
156. Thank you for prayerfully putting it together.
157. The wording of this survey is difficult for many laypeople (and pastors/deacons, no doubt!) who will find the questions unclear or confusing.
158. This is a poorly designed, vague, and unclear survey. I don't have enough information to answer three quarters of it. Many of the questions would benefit from some background information so we could know what they're asking. Frankly, the majority of these questions are more relevant for the leadership anyway and beyond the knowledge of most lay people. Doing this survey was frustrating.
159. To answer some of these questions, it would be better if we had an idea of what ideas are being considered as the process of restructuring is being considered.
160. Hopefully there is enough interest in what happens in LCC as we journey forward.
161. I think it is good that it is open to all people of the church. I hope that there will be a strong response.
162. One would hope so.
163. Most of these questions require a knowledge of the LCC structure and how it operates that most of our members would not have. How can a person who is not completely familiar with the organization of the church understand the implications of his answers to these questions? Those of us who are interested enough will seek out assistance, but many of us do not have the time. Very few young working families in particular will be participating. Should their opinions be discounted? Before the questions went out, they should have been reviewed by a lay person who does not have an in depth knowledge of the church to see if they make sense to him. The participant needs to know what the question is driving at. The question must be crystal clear!
164. This survey is useless as there is not enough info to complete it.
165. Because our Pastor went over with us I learned some info.
166. Sounds as though restructuring is a foregone conclusion. Whether it is helpful depends primarily on two factors: 1) Turnout and 2) Weight given to responses in making decisions.
167. I pray so. No survey is perfect. - I wonder what is the difference between "Neither Agree (n)or Disagree" and "No Opinion". - The information package that was e-mailed is inappropriate. Any information necessary for answering the questions should be contained in the questions themselves. If members are not duly informed about LCC's current structure already, then reading a few pages of stats will not qualify us to give an informed opinion.
168. I think it is helpful to learn the parts of the LCC and helps in understanding different processes within the LCC.
169. Not all questions are clear. Some show distinctive biases and agendas. In the end, at least the CCMS will have some feedback and some written comments that may be of help.
170. Being an involved layman I have a general knowledge of the workings of Synod and District but to know changes needed for a smoother more efficient operation is unknown - thus the large number of no opinion.
171. The window should have been for a longer period of time and perhaps some thought could have been given with more communication to those not having a computer to be advised that a survey was coming out. Even seniors with computers sometimes are not able to do things online.

172. It helps the participant to sort out their own feelings on the matter. The expectation is that the survey results will have some weight in the decisions made and presented to the congregations.
173. It allowed my voice to be heard.
174. Allowed all of the members of LCC a voice.
175. Your survey reveals a very strong bias in favour of a Synod without Districts with direct spiritual and administrative control in the hands of people who may or may not have designs to turn us all into Anglicans.
176. It is too broad in scope -- the questions need more than a few minutes --- many areas of importance have been bypassed -- you have said that you wanted to hear from ALL the SYNOD but most of the Synod has no information because they don't understand the "Synod" structure, have never been informed by pastors of "their part", it is only mentioned at budget time AND EVEN THEN in a very cursory form -- sending the results back to the people will not accomplish anymore
177. It required an intimate knowledge of LCC's Constitution and By-Laws, something which most of our people do hot have.
178. Gathering this input is far more valuable than sending one delegate to a convention to perhaps represent my views. Perhaps we need a different approach to delegates going to a convention. Perhaps we need mass voting by electronic input such as I am doing now.
179. I'm very glad that as a non-office holding layperson, I had an opportunity to provide input into the process.
180. Maybe. I really pray it will be helpful. The number of redundant, or duplicate, questions was frustrating. A few told me they stopped filling it out because of these questions. I am also disappointed that there are only two real proposals in this survey. Were there not more ideas that came out of the Church workers conference in Calgary?
181. Yes, it is helpful in getting our congregation talking about needs and goals of District/Synod and the need for restructuring.
182. Maybe, sorry for my doubts but some questions seem to imply you've already made up your mind on some issues. The lack of explanations (i.e. unequal voting leading to clergy rule) will certainly skew the results. Some of my laity have expressed frustration at the questions (what are you getting at?) Have you stopped beating your wife yet?
183. Hopefully
184. This survey could have been a helpful part of restructuring. I was severely disappointed with the shallowness and narrowness of the questions. This was not a survey to take a serious look at our struggles as a synod, but a fishing exercise to see if the CCMS's opinions will be accepted by most LCC Lutherans.
185. I'm not sure. I care about our synod; I have strong opinions that I want our synod to stand, but I also believe that synod should stand on her theological and liturgical heritage and not become something else. The fancies of the world and pop-culture should not change us, but I fear that it has (see Concordia College-Edmonton).
186. Most lay people wouldn't know enough to properly answer.
187. Might have been better to debate various structural models produced by CCMS.
188. Without analyses and recommendations by those that have first hand knowledge that can explain what is now happening and how a change would improve a situation one cannot say if a change is required or not.

189. I feel however that most congregants do not have enough knowledge of the workings of District and Synod and how they relate to their home congregations to give truly helpful responses to the survey. This is why I have put neither agree or disagree for many of my answers because I simply don't have enough knowledge to have an opinion.
190. I have no faith that the politics of "the church" will understand the state that the parishes are in. All of the churches I know are on their last legs. the elders are dying, the numbers are falling, the attitude is one of "walling " themselves off from the world. They are having trouble keeping the church running - membership has become to small and too old to keep going, and yet they are afraid to try and join with a neighbouring church because the money they have sunk into the asset of the building and land "belongs" to the mother church - so they have nothing to take with them if they go to the neighbouring church. and yet there is a tipping point in parish numbers, where above it the church pays its heating bills, below it they don't
191. If people can take the time and can understand what is really happening here.
192. I'm hoping and praying. Trying to be optimistic.
193. That will depend entirely upon how it is used. However, it skillfully ignores one obvious problem, namely that the size of our districts makes them impossible to govern and lead. well.
194. The questionnaire is severely lacking. Many of the statements are misleading or misguided in their focus and direction. Some statements do not provide sufficient information to make a properly informed decision. Some statements are only evaluative that provide minimal clarification to the subject.
195. I feel that overall this survey was deeply flawed with vague and leading questions at times. I believe it will be very difficult to gather the appropriate information this survey was seeking to discover.
196. I hope so
197. Feed back I'm getting is that the survey is complex and hard for people to understand. Which may help us answer the question... Does LCC need to REFORM itself. I think we've answered the question... not minor changes in form but an overhaul which helps reflect our essence as a grace based, Jesus centered organization. Can people see it and understand that easily. Are we about helping our congregations thrive, and reach out with the love of Jesus? Let's get to the ESSENCE of what it means to be synod and then we'll be okay.
198. This is a very "initial" part of the process.
199. I am pleased that my and others opinions are deemed worthwhile. Thank you for allowing my input.
200. It seems to me that this is a survey which can only be comprehensively completed by someone with "inside" knowledge - pastors, administrators, directors of Synod or District boards, possibly by those who have served in senior positions on Board of Elders or as ED's. I am quite disappointed at the number of questions to which I am unable to offer ANY opinion.
201. That remains to be determined. I have some reservations, in that many of the members of LCC will not have the background information to respond to many of the questions in a knowledgeable manner.
202. Not sure anything will come of the survey. It appears a survey is being done for "survey's sake" LCC can say " we did a survey" Who is doing the tabulation and evaluation of the survey is it an unbiased third party?

203. There are a lot of lay people who just don't know what a lot of these questions are asking. It is dangerous to give an uniformed opinion. A lot of these questions can only be answered by pastors or those directly involved. Yet we need to have the input of lay people because they are impacted by the decisions made.
204. I sure would hope so
205. There are many questions that I have no background or knowledge to answer. Most lay people are the same. Why are we answering questions that we are unprepared for?
206. This survey had the potential to be helpful, but the poor, ambiguous, leading, and overgeneralizing questions of this survey leave me with serious doubt as to how helpful this survey will be.
207. insufficient background info given
208. Not sure if action will be taken.
209. -Hopefully it provides some insight, but I think there needs to be a different means for people to voice their opinions as well.
210. Hopefully it will be beneficial in making great decisions.
211. I would pray that it is
212. I feel it will not be useful in achieving a solution which will serve the whole church.
213. We will see.
214. The average parishioner does not have a strong understanding of the way LCC Synod and Districts relate to one another. The complexities and implications of the questions asked are difficult to grasp. More discussion would allow participants to offer better informed opinions. Caution is needed to not move too quickly to restructure.
215. The survey is too long and too generalized. Most people responding to this questionnaire have little knowledge of how the Synod, and the Districts and the circuits relate to one another. This survey also comes at time when some people are polarized and emotional by the CEF situation. It is never wise to make significant changes when people are emotional. We are moving too quickly in trying to develop a structure before the next LCC Convention. We need to discuss and come to an agreement of what is our mission as a church? We need to better understand the challenges facing our church workers and congregations and develop a structure that delivers the local support that is needed. If we are changing the structure to save some money, then we are doing it for the wrong reasons.
216. I wish the survey was a little more open ended...
217. Too bad so much effort is going into something as mundane as institutional structure. The real issues of the church are not being dealt with at all. The dwindling church, the aging church, how do we care for the homosexuals in our church and beyond, what affect does a rigid communion practice have on welcoming anyone into our church. . . There are so many more important issues we should be dealing with than restructuring!
218. I am disappointed with the ease of understanding of the questions. I understand about repeating questions in different focus for internal reliability but found it cumbersome and very time consuming - I have spent 1 1/2 hours completing this survey and several hours discussing some of the issues and trying to gather information. I hope that discussion with members of congregations, District and Synod leaders are a planned part of this process.
219. Would have been helpful to have Membership statistics.
220. I do not particularly believe it was well designed, and many of the topics and nuances contained in it are not well known by the lay people.

221. it isn't helping me - is it helping you, the restructuring team? sorry but this is kind of a silly question if you ask me
222. Hopefully.
223. Of limited value due to the lack of strong support and encouragement from pastors to the laity to complete the survey. Like many things some information stops at the pastor's desk. Requires improved communication through designated laity.
224. waste of money and time
225. In my opinion this survey will only provide meaningful input from a very small group of lay persons. Even though I have been a member of a LCC congregation for over 20 years I do not understand structure well enough to make meaningful comments. I would have preferred focus group sessions to solicit input rather than this questionnaire.
226. Let's wake up the church and make a new future for LCC I'm on fire! But scared to disrupt the traditional order boring church
227. I don't think so. Some questions are too similar, creating confusion, and almost seem like trick questions. I don't really know what you're looking for.
228. Please let's get our teeth into First Timothy, and perhaps we could consult with the churches of the Mission Province in Sweden, Finland, and Norway as they have had to do some fast thinking and acting in the throes of breaking with the apostate state churches of their countries.
229. It will depend on how many complete the survey and if you take into consideration the answers
230. *A* survey certainly would be helpful, although I'm dubious as to what kind of results will be collected from this particular survey.
231. Like a dog that returns to his vomit is a fool who repeats his folly. (Prov. 26:11) The tendency to over-analyze, and to re-hash the same ideas is not a helpful tradition in our Synod. There is no structure that will 'save' the LC-C. In many ways the CEF crisis in the ABC District and the move of CUE to leave LC-C are helpful for this process. They whittle down our prideful sense of self and help us to remember that not only do we not have any real money, we also don't have any big institutions. We are a small Church body full of small congregations, and we should approach this accordingly. This doesn't mean that our hopes, dreams, and faith are small; but that we govern ourselves as a small body.
232. We'll see - the questions are badly worded and assume much information that the respondent may not be privy to. This could result in a large body of pooled ignorance.
233. It provides education to me, as a lay person, as to the auxiliary organizations and LSOs which are part of the LCC.
234. Too general
235. It is too long - too many questions almost identical to other question. (My wife - a member refused to complete a survey - see my comments to this and question 57. She is more adamant)
236. I hope it will be.
237. Hope it will be, but unsure. The statements and questions are difficult for the average layman to respond to.
238. I guess I see the glass half empty. By now you should realize my answers do not always align with the way the questions posed [or how I think they were posed]. [http://www.solagratia.ca/2016/02/03/the-restructuring-survey-oh-wow/] I do not normally comment on any survey but with the statistical dog's breakfast that this survey is, I felt I

must and it took far too long. I am not opposed to restructuring but I do not think we should have a knee jerk reaction to the ABC issue. If it happens please do it with a well thought out plan. Please do it with Christian love, please do something for the hurting people in ABC and elsewhere.

239. Sola Gratia commissioned a review of the survey by private-sector professionals, and the response was: From http://www.solagratia.ca/2016/02/03/the-restructuring-survey-oh-wow/ One pollster started with, “I wish I could say something positive, but your survey is a mess. It’s a (dog’s breakfast) of biases, suggestive and leading questions, weak or invalid error checking. There is no meaningful security to protect against loading the deck with answers.” The “Dog’s breakfast” part is in brackets because the actual description was a bit more colourful. Again, these are people who design and analyze surveys for a living. ... The “information package” is highly unusual and biases respondents. ... Suffice to say, after getting back their initial feedback, I asked the experts what could be done to avoid the pitfalls and problems with the survey. Their answers were direct: let professionals to do it. ... I’ll give the final word to the two experts who gave freely of their time and expertise: “Oh wow, (this survey is) so bad.” “This is why you hire a professional insight agency.”
240. In most cases you are going to get best guesses from uniformed people myself included. I believe the questions could have been dumbed down a little more with better explanations. Seriously how do we know how the board of directors interact with LLC.
241. Grassroots feedback is always important. Looking forward to hearing what the responses are from my fellow church members.
242. The questions don't really make sense in terms of restructuring.
243. It won't be if the answers aren't taken seriously, the process so far is encouraging I will be very disappointed if major changes don't take place.
244. Questions cannot be answered by most lay people. They are not close enough to this.
245. Without surveying members how can a consensus be initiated?
246. wait for the outcome
247. Most people (including myself) cannot appreciate the complexity of what has emerged in terms of a "national church"
248. But only if it is actually used a reference and individuals involved do not just go with their personal bias's. I do not remember congregations having any input into the restructuring committee, so once again, we have a group "appointed" by someone, and no guarantees of any periodic on reports etc. Just more of the same attitude of arrogance.
249. The answers to questions 56 through 58 are expressions of faith. I do have faith that this survey WILL BE (rather than is) a helpful part of the process, I have faith that my comments will be taken seriously and time will tell if this was worth my time!
250. I don't know - I think it could be
251. This process is helpful if LCC is serious about some of the suggestions made and willing to make changes.
252. Thank-you to those with the courage to ask LCC members for their opinions.
253. I certainly hope it is helpful it is a big undertaking. I Pray that God will bless each one that represents us with wisdom, peace and grace as we work together to bringing people to the knowledge of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Times are difficult, but God is good he has never failed to be with us. He is our refuge and our strength.
254. This survey is helpful if the members completing the survey have adequate knowledge of the matters. I think that many members lack this knowledge, myself included.

255. but very difficult for lay people. Perhaps a separate survey should have been developed for lay people as many lack knowledge of the relationship between the synod and district
256. most lay people don't know a lot, we have to rely on our pastors and the magazine for any knowledge that we have, it appears that our sources were oblivious to the disaster of funds, however, some one must have known. I hope this survey will be helpful. God help us all.
257. Lay people have input with the hope that they are being heard and understood and valued.
258. most lay people don't know a lot, we have to rely on our pastors and the magazine for any knowledge that we have. It appears that our sources were oblivious to the disaster of funds, however, some one must have known. I hope this survey would be helpful. God help us all.
259. Some questions seemed redundant and others didn't give enough context
260. I suspect "of little value" will be the result
261. To early to tell
262. As I am not involved in the administration aspects of LCC or ABC District, I'm not able to make an informed decision on which areas actually need restructuring.
263. I'm hopeful even though I may not be as aware of the workings of LCC Synod and District.
264. I think I have been pretty clear that this survey was very poorly designed. I have some professional experience in this area, but do not consider myself an expert. I think it would have been wise to engage some actual professionals to gather some useful and actionable feedback. The questions were often leading, were generally unclear and in some cases appeared to be completely unrelated to the matter at hand - restructuring synod.
265. I am cautiously hopeful that it will be of some value. I know of some people who are not doing the survey because they feel it is not going to have any impact.
266. To a point. We can only hope. The length of this survey will deter many people from completing the survey.
267. The survey needs to start without an assumption that the church must be restructured. The survey needs to explain what led to such a radical call for total restructuring. The ones answering the survey need to have the Biblical and theological and historical teachings of the LCMS on church government. The survey should seek the answers of only those who are members to let the Body of Christ speak at the very least and at best of those who are spiritually mature. Finally, the survey should not be overtly asking for feelings.
268. I have little trust that Lutheran Lay persons (congregational members) have a voice that is heard by upper management of the ABC district or at the national Synod level.
269. Providing a voice for congregant members en masse is a well balanced approach to seeing input from church members across the country. I know it is challenging to get people engaged in such an enterprise but it also gives a personal channel to voice their opinion. I applaud your choosing to take this step and understand the difficulty you face in compiling these opinions into a larger document/report. May God bless your efforts.
270. Hopefully!!!
271. Depends on how you use it.
272. we will see....
273. Not enough education has preceded this.
274. the survey questions presume that the laity are very aware and informed
275. It appears to be, but that answer is dependent on a whole host of circumstances and answers to the survey.
276. It depends on how the results are utilized

277. Actually, this survey isn't as much help as it could be as it is not set up well. However, I am thankful for the time those put in to develop it and pray that God will use it for His purposes.
278. I hope so. At present the situation seems desperate.
279. There was not nearly enough information provided to the church for a proper survey to be taken and to be valuable. The questions were vague and congregations were not informed in an appropriate and timely fashion.
280. agree somewhat
281. It is inherently biased. As well, the Pastor or our congregation, who is also a District VP, "took the time" to go through the survey with a Bible Study group. While his intensions might have been to encourage responses and help clarify questions, the effect could also be that he influenced a great number of survey responses to his views and readings of the question.
282. Not sure many people can answer all questions adequately, as an IMMENSE amount of knowledge of the workings of the districts and synod are necessary to provide useful information.
283. I think this survey is so vague and biased (however unintentionally) as to be good merely for the gathering of comments. I would discourage reading anything into the numerical survey results - make that strongly discourage
284. It may be. Time will tell.
285. I hope
286. It is a necessary part of the procedure, but I fear that most of the congregation members do not sufficiently understand the structure to respond to most questions. Once we have dealt with restructuring and the seminaries, we must, in order to retain any claim to relevance in our society, revisit the question of female pastors.
287. Depends on participation
288. I laud the committee's willingness to ask opinions, but strong, bold steps are necessary regardless.
289. I really hope so.
290. other than comments about districts legal registration you have revealed little on restructuring as to how boards are to work.
291. We should be accountable & responsible in changes.
292. If anything, my responses are indicator of the level of understanding members have in areas such as relationship and structure.
293. I have to believe that it is. You are asking the people what they think, how they feel and what they want. What more can we ask?
294. With but a few exceptions - e.g. is the District/Synod meeting your needs - I would much prefer to have leaders who are actually working with the structure either affirm or point out the areas that impede ministry and submit proposals along with a narrative supporting it for response.
295. It also serves to inform and educate members on the structural format and operation of our church.
296. More effort in clarifying some the questions would have been most helpful. Also, a selection of "I don't know" instead of just "No Opinion" would have been most beneficial. Thank you for the opportunity to make comments for each question since there were so many concerns with the questions.

297. I hope it gives some insight into what people are thinking but if we are just pooling our own ignorance about this than I don't think it will accomplish much. I really hope that everyone who is looking at this restructuring will give a lot of research into what we tried in the past, what options are available to us from other bodies around us, and how we can adapt or rewrite anything that would be deemed good and appropriate. Lets not take something wholesale from elsewhere, but let's make good changes that fit our needs here in Canada.
298. It depends on how this information will be used.
299. I hope it will, but not sure, questions are somewhat confusing
300. There are some questions that don't seem to be important for the restructuring process.
301. That remains to be see will it???
302. I can't see much coming out of this survey except window dressing. What we need is spiritual restructuring. This tinkering with the structure won't change anything.
303. One does not know if that will be the case
304. Would be if the person taking the survey new more of what the district and region does. Most of the congregation is not informed as to what they do for the individual churches. I myself feel we are not informed about anything on what the district and/or regional do or offer.
305. It could be if done as a congregation to discuss and become aware of the organization than each person filling it out
306. Maybe if people are honest in opinions
307. It is hard to determine how this information will be used to restructure LCC.
308. Its a step in the right direction, we shall see what comes of it
309. It would be good to have this opportunity much more often. It's the first time anyone has asked my opinion. I have been thinking that if our church folds up I'll have to move to the Baptist church. The greatest strength of the LCC is the theology and training of the leaders, otherwise it is a sleepy organization. Our Baptist church is much more lively and growing fast - shame about the theology.
310. The idea of the survey is, and I hope the comments will be helpful. But many of the questions are phrased in such a way that it's going to be very difficult to ascertain real answers to, by just the agree/disagree answers.
311. I have no idea what your intentions are.
312. There needs to be grassroots input-lay and pastoral to have the best possible restructuring. Once a restructure has been implemented, there needs to be support from all areas for that structure. There will still be tweaks that will be necessary because of unforeseen issues. That though is normal.
313. I'm doubtful, as I don't believe you will take our comments to heart and really don't want to change.
314. As stated before, there are many terms/questions that will probably be confusing to the average LCC member.
315. I sure hope so... it took long enough.
316. Some of the questions are misleading and ask the same question a different way in order to get the response the committee wants. Some of the questions need a detailed knowledge of the structure of LCC and Districts which is something the average member does not have.
317. I think this survey is asking for support for decision the church has not yet made. Do you get surveys until one returns support for your plans? Is that why you asked the same question so

many times in this survey? Your people are intelligent. State your position. State your reasons. Ask your people for feedback. Don't be in a rush. God's time not our time.

318. No absolutely not. This is a poorly structured survey. I received no advance information as to the present state of many of these functions and relationships.
319. I think it will be. We are at an important crossroads in our history. It can be a scary time but we have an opportunity to forge a new path. Let's hope we learn from the ABC disaster. It still baffles me that things were set up in such a way that this could even happen.
320. We will wait and see
321. The survey will only be helpful if answers to questions and comments are valued and put into practice.
322. I am not sure how helpful it will be as I am assuming there are a lot of people like myself who do not have the knowledge to give helpful opinions. I pray the people who have this knowledge will have answered the survey as well and will give you what you are looking for
323. If they follow the requests of the those completing the survey
324. Hopefully!
325. feel free to do others!
326. Good basis if all comments are considered it will be useful
327. Hopefully it is helpful, but it is also confusing. It has brought up a lot of questions however as to how our church is actually governed.
328. It will be so if the responses and comments are taken into advisement and not tossed into the disregard bin.
329. Surveys can be helpful or not.
330. Certainly pray that is so
331. It has made us investigate our own current governance within our church.
332. it is helpful, but not specific enough. unless there is another survey coming, I believe the input from this survey is not enough to help the board move forward on restructuring. I had high expectations for the survey and am somewhat disappointed because the questions did not allow for enough information in helping me answer them.
333. All depends on how it is used...
334. But only if enough people participate. An online Survey is not manageable to most seniors and most of our members seem to be up there, especially in rural congregations. the length of time to complete this survey is also a problem.
335. I don't like all of the questions. Some should have been clearer. Ex: Seminary questions
336. This survey hasn't addressed the core needs. It would have been helpful to have a short form and long form survey. Congregational members will be overwhelmed with the scope of this survey, which will limit the responses.
337. Would have been nice if Membership statistics were included. Some questions do not appear to be relevant to the actual restructure.
338. See all of my complaining comments above!!!
339. Possibly
340. I hope it will be hopeful for you. My worry, however, is that you will receive only a broad spectrum of responses and end up without any clear direction on how to proceed.
341. LCC is its members - we have the responsibility to participate
342. As a long-time member of my congregation but someone who is not involved with church politics at all, I don't feel that I know enough or pretty much anything about these issues to offer a valuable opinion.

343. A variety of questions appear structured to result in a pre-determined direction
344. even though many people won't know how to answer these or be frustrated in what they don't understand of the current situation I still appreciate the chance to participate
345. It would be if the results were taken into consideration.
346. Hearing the voice of those who are being governed is crucial to a restructuring of the organization.
347. Please don't restructure for the sake of restructuring. Please always remember why we exist as a church, to serve, how to best disciple.... this should be the guide. Unlike the Catholic church, we are not a business. When we undertake this as a role, this is where gross errors in decision making occur.
348. Some people may find this to complicated while others may feel this is not detailed enough.
349. Many of the questions involve obscure parts of a bureaucracy we rarely see or have difficulty comprehending and so I was forced to decide based on less knowledge than would be ideal, especially since peoples' jobs are on the line.
350. You obviously have not employed summertime who knows how to build bias neutral surveys. You either have an idea of how you want things structured, or you can't imagine how alternatives would look so you can't ask the questions that need asking.
351. Good idea to get members of the church involved in the process.
352. With somewhat limited knowledge that I have.
353. Why could survey not have been created in house and distributed at lower cost? Remains to be seen when and how we hear the outcome of this survey and what actions if any, are implemented and when and by whom.
354. Thank you to those seeking the view of Christ's Church. And may the Lord make His will known through it.
355. Only if action is taken. Only if the action taken is transparent, positive, and just. Only then will this part of the process be helpful
356. Depends on how many people take the time to carefully complete this rather lengthy but most useful document
357. I answered the majority of the survey as No Opinion. I have absolutely no background information on the current structure, what is working, what is not working, what the outcomes are and whether or not the current structure is achieving those outcomes. I think that most people, if they are honest, have very little insight into what is happening at their individual congregational level, never mind, their district and national level. There were no definitions for the terminology. It is taken for granted that respondents will have the ability to decipher the different terms and make astute judgments about them.
358. Poorly worded with duplicates (i.e., asking the opposing question). Should have used statistical analysis professionals to help design, Survey too broad; needed to be more focused. Are you clear on what to do with the data and how to interpret it when complete?? Focus groups (facilitated by professionals) should have been used to develop the key target areas for the survey. If you have to provide as much background information at the beginning of the survey, that will be a clue that the survey is not well designed.
359. I doubt it very much as the majority of people don't understand a lot of things between one group and another....
360. The questions are based on someone who would have more than the average knowledge about the operation of LCC. Quite irrelevant answers will result.

361. thank you for this opportunity. I think the average layperson would struggle with most of these questions. Only those who have served on committees or board at any level, or in some way for the LSOs would be able to manage some of the questions.
362. This survey makes very general statements that I am either to agree with or not agree with without knowing what restructuring would look like, why it is felt restructuring is being considered, etc. I cannot make a decision without knowing what the rationale is. Adjoining questions are often leading and conflicting.
363. I'm not confident that this survey was well-designed. I am still not sure what you see as the difference between "neither agree or disagree" and "no opinion". Some questions were asking the same thing, just worded differently, some seemed quite leading, and most questions were not appropriate for a lay person who has not been on a district nor synod board. I am a regular church goer, consider myself fairly well-informed, post-graduate degree, professional - but I had to answer "no opinion" to over half of these questions. I cannot see how this will be a "helpful part in the process of restructuring LCC."
364. If it is used
365. I guess that depends on what LCC does with the gathered information. If they choose to ignore it, then it was a waste of everyone's time.
366. very complex, redundant, 2. all communication is electronic and few of our membership are electronically able to respond 3. The background and the survey would require illogical volumes of paper, and would still not suffice in explaining or understanding
367. I'm glad for the opportunity to share my ideas & feeling on this issue however I was shocked by some of the questions.
368. At least allows some outside opinions
369. As long as you do not touch Concordia!
370. Thanks Rev Ney.
371. It gets the views of the whole church body. As long as everyone participates. It also lets LCC know where more work needs to be done in general.
372. At least, it's a healthy start.
373. Depends if people participate. What is needed more is that God's people pray for and then act on our prayers to be
374. This survey should have been written by professionals.
375. Some of the questions can be difficult for me to answer as I do not have enough information to make an informed judgment. This is due, in part, to a lack of research on my part and the fact that I have only been a member of the LCC for less than a year.
376. How would I ever know if it was??
377. Another survey question could have been: "What else could the church have done with $50 million dollars to 'err on the side of ministry.'?"
378. We will have to wait and see what results. Will it turn out to be helpful? It is premature to answer this question. We can only hope and pray that it has been of value.
379. I guess the answer to this questions remains to be seen!
380. We shall see.
381. I have a little too little knowledge in most of these matters listed in this survey
382. I don't know enough about the structure to have an opinion
383. It is a great place to start

384. I hope that the end result hasn't been determined and that this is survey is simply being circulated so LCC can say they consulted congregations and members but in reality LCC already knows what it is going to do just as I see in my workplace regularly.
385. Absolutely, please as you work forward and drafts of different structures are created that you share them with the individual congregational leaders so that input can be given. Don't be afraid of this input. My experience with restructuring organizations is that take your time and continue to get feedback.
386. Not sure what you're going to do with all of the answers, so it is yet to be determined.
387. Remains to be seen
388. As mentioned previously, the survey is fine, but I question the competency of those entrusted to edit and compile the data collected.
389. Not that I was very helpful ha-ha... I don't know a lot about the issues...
390. Will restructuring even help in what ails the church, i.e., declining worship attendance, declining offerings, a general malaise in the shape of Christianity in Canada?
391. from my perspective, it wasn't the best survey... many repetitive questions - albeit slightly different perspectives. I pray you find the information your looking for from it.
392. It is only helpful if real change is implemented, which will not happen.
393. I would hope so
394. Insofar as people involved are concerned. As previously stated, my involvement is so minimal I'm not really sure that my opinion should be considered.
395. It is a hope and I truly believe the last chance to see it really happen. Miss this chance and I think we are destined to remain calcified in the current format.
396. It gives those with more awareness, thoughts, and opinions to express the same and thereby hopefully improve our governance.
397. The ABC taskforce should have major input considering the valuable work they are doing or will they be ignored "
398. It is really important to have thousands of responses. I pray that we have tens of thousands of responses to the survey. This is our church, and what we do has to reflect the desire and passion of its members!
399. Only if opinions of congregational members are taken seriously and given due consideration.
400. although emotional, rather than logical, replies to this survey are probably of little benefit.
401. Trouble with this survey for me is that I have never paid much attention to administrative structure of the Church and
402. I hope so
403. I have no idea what will be done with this data, so I cannot answer that question. Please make me feel like this was helpful. Please.
404. Will anyone really listen or is this just one more way to keep the status quo
405. ~ I hope so.

57. The thoughts and feelings that I share in my responses to this survey and also in my comments will be taken seriously.

1. with plenty of doubts
2. I truly pray that this is the case.
3. ? This is not a question for me to answer. Only you people know this when you do the evaluation.

4. 20 years ago or more there was a survey as we were losing 30% of our youth. My question or answers were ignored, now just about all my grand children and my relations are all going to other churches. They said it was the music, pastors didn't take an interest in the kids, no youth programs.
5. I pray they would.
6. I pray they will...this is not an easy survey to complete and I'm not sure how you'll tally the answers because the questions were a bit ambiguous. Definitely took longer than an hour!! We'll keep you in prayer.
7. I hope they are helpful.
8. I hope so! But there are areas where I don't have the expertise to offer much.
9. God be with you!
10. To create an accountable and responsible, well balanced restructure all info gathered requires prayerful consideration.
11. Do not know till after results seen
12. They need to be.
13. It's up to you to take it seriously.
14. No. I believe that there could be shopping bags full of objections and the minds of those in charge are fixed in stone.
15. I don't know yet. Waiting to see.
16. I pray that some good will be done according to the suggestions re the participants in this survey according to God's will.
17. I think, but pray otherwise, that the committee will look at what they want and do that. I do not have high hopes for a Biblical LCC run church.
18. Hope so
19. I am hopeful that LCC will make much needed corrections particularly in the area of church discipline, but also in the uncompromised teaching of doctrine. The recent trend in many of our churches to embrace so-called "contemporary worship" is appalling and misguided. The real reason why there are no children in our pews is painfully obvious: Lutherans aren't having any kids, and the kids they do have are raised just like the heathens raise their children - or near enough that, as is apparent, it makes no practical difference.
20. given Leader Ney was on ABC Bd, then restructuring of ABC bd and now on Fed LCC, very unlikely.
21. not given what we learned at town halls and lack of replies to our? Wasting our $ and time and shrinking faith is very fast at LCC
22. I hope so ... but they will be part of the aggregate.
23. I sure hope so but I have my doubts
24. I hope so-- but so does everyone else. And when everyone's opinion is equal, because we're all anonymous, what's the point of collecting all of our opinions? I wish you well, whoever you are, and pray the Lord will guide you in making something useful and insightful out of this incredible hash of "data"!
25. As with #56 I hope this is the case. ABC District performance unfortunately has left me a skeptic
26. I hope and pray they are resolved.
27. Hopefully!
28. Hope so. I do.
29. They will be looked at least.

30. I'm really hoping so!
31. I surely hope so.
32. Is this a question or a declaration?
33. A lot of the questions I am educated to answer. I do believe responses in the survey should be taken seriously however.
34. I feel and pray so - whether it will be beneficial is in God's hands.
35. I hope so.
36. I hope so.
37. Hopefully.
38. I hope so
39. I like to believe comments will be tabulated with other lay persons.
40. Here's Hoping
41. I have no doubt.
42. I certainly hope so
43. At least I hope so
44. I hope.
45. if not then my time is wasted
46. HOPEFULLY!!
47. I am positive that due diligence will be given to everyone's responses, and will help better ourselves.
48. I sincerely hope so!
49. My hope is they will.
50. If the leaders of synod are believers this is true.
51. One hopes so, but as long as those responsible for our current troubles are involved in restructuring efforts, the people's responses will not be taken as seriously as they need to be. As long as anyone in leadership has a vested interest in defending his actions, how can the laity's concerns be given the weight they deserve?
52. I would like to be surprised by the results of the restructuring, but I feel as if decisions for the direction the LCC will be heading in over the next several years have already been made, and this is a mere formality.
53. I would hope so!!! Otherwise it has been a waste of everyone's time!!!
54. I would hope so, what would be the point of the survey if you don't take something from it.
55. I hope they will be.
56. I pray they will be.
57. I am not sure if they will be or not. I have lost a lot of faith in the leadership over the past year so am hopeful that this survey will be beneficial. I am prayerfully optimistic.
58. Not sure even though our Pastor said it would be. I guess it is a "wait and see".
59. I hope some will be.
60. It seems the survey deals with multi issues and concerns within LCC with a major concern of using resources effectively. For those who have not thought of those multi issues, it would have been better if the current committee provided them with materials to discuss and contemplate in advance in order to make this survey much more effective and useful.
61. I would hope so but I'm afraid I have no confidence that they will.
62. I hope and pray that this is so
63. trust so

64. Your questions are phrased to suggest otherwise.
65. But, again, I'm hopeful.
66. I have no way of knowing if this is so. I hope and pray that any and all surveys including those from lay persons will be valued.
67. not likely
68. I'm hoping! Especially that strong responses won't be labelled "crackpot" or "overemotional" and discarded. Please pay attention to the comment boxes, and find a way to incorporate them into the survey results -- we don't just want a tabulation of fill-in-the-circle answers.
69. I don't know. How am I supposed to evaluate that?
70. I think they may except when 1/3 of the questions I have answered have to be a 3 it is not very reasonable for expecting good data so I am very disappointed with how this survey was prepared for us as ordinary members.
71. I would certainly hope so!
72. I hope so.
73. I really do not understand this question. By whom will they be taken seriously? What does "taken seriously" imply?
74. Hope so!
75. Is this a statement or question? if not taken seriously, why does the preamble make us aware that this is "for the next generation"? Confusing!
76. How would I know that? Don't know who is reading this response.
77. There is no point in a survey if advice is not even considered.
78. That is my hope!
79. Surveys are not normally created and distributed unless there is a desire to review the results seriously.
80. This is what I am told and pray is true. Past experience with surveys and their outcomes has led me to be very cynical that my input will impact the outcome. I have seen too many instances where the outcome was pre-determined and survey results were disregarded or shaped to fit that outcome.
81. hopefully
82. I hope so but am sceptical!!
83. It is my prayer that all feedback will be taken under the prayerful consideration of the committee.
84. I trust that they will be taken seriously.
85. I hope this is true.
86. only if forwarded info is not screened and blocked as in overtures held back at conventions
87. It would be in LCC's best interest that they do take these seriously.
88. I would hope that what I have shared would be looked at and taken seriously as I have tried to respond with careful consideration
89. of the questions to the best of my ability with the knowledge that I have regarding the questions asked in this survey.
90. is this a question or a promise?
91. This is a prediction: how do I know it will come true!? Again I hope my thoughts & feelings will be taken seriously! Pray so! But how do I know?
92. Again, it is my hope that this consultation process is sincerely being considered, but the answer to that remains to be seen.
93. That's up to you.

94. I hope they will be taken seriously but I won't ever know.
95. I truly hope so, but the proof is in the pudding, isn't it?
96. doubt it very much.... the church needs to change. They need to value women who make each church run, we are treated like second class citizens and not valued. Some ministers have recognized that fact and show it but the old school ones do not. You have two many ministers involved who think it is their right and that the church they are called to are theirs...however they are not! Churches are the people's church and he is only called to Shepherd, we are to run our church. Thirdly ministers hide behind the being "so called" You have ministers sitting in Churches 20 plus years and they can claim they haven't felt the call...in the mean time they are hurting the church...they NEED to move ON! Fourth....ministers are to be respected and treated according to their knowledge and being an ordained servant of God but that does not place them higher then their people. Too many things they are better and that needs to change
97. I trust that God is preparing us for a new journey to uphold his word and do his work.
98. Prayerfully hoping.
99. Great -
100. How do I know?
101. I hope so.
102. Really hope so!!
103. I hope so.
104. Otherwise why would we go through this process
105. Silly question. How do I know whether this will be taken seriously or whether any action will come about as a result?
106. I certainly hope so, or it will be time to look elsewhere. I have been a member for 69 years and feel we have been edging ourselves towards a "high" elitists church. We were once always referred to as the "layman's" church. We did not put on airs as we do now with all our trappings of the old style catholic church system. Also all the clergy want to do is chant through the service and that is not what I consider important in my life. The word of God delivered in its truth is what I come to hear and absorb, not the pageantry stuff that is now being pushed on us.
107. They had better be. If the survey does not yield any actual discussion, it will be throwing the people's opinions in their faces.
108. As Christians we need to forgive and focus on Christ.
109. I certainly hope so!
110. Hope so
111. I hope so. It took over an hour to complete this.
112. I hope so!
113. I don't know.
114. Given #56 comments, highly unlikely.
115. I hope so!
116. Since there was a severe caution against survey respondents identifying themselves, I feel that most negative comments will be dismissed as "hiding behind being anonymous" and the excuse from the LCC will be that, since respondents were not identified, that there was no way to personally communicate for clarification.
117. I hope that they will be taken seriously, but I don't feel confident that anyone really cares if I or my congregation continues to exist in our District or our Synod.

118. I know those at higher levels of our church are asking because they want to take our comments seriously and build LCC to a better and higher level yet to be seen.
119. I hope they are but I have no idea if they will be.
120. How do I know, but sincerely hope that every response will by recorded and evaluated, because of the time each one of us has devoted to the total process. May we, by the Grace of GOD continue to stand firm and proclaim the truth of the WORD until JESUS returns.
121. If they aren't this survey is a waste of time and money.
122. I would hope so
123. I am not sure, but I will answer in accord with the 8th commandment.
124. Does " taken seriously " mean some or all of them will be accepted and acted on?
125. Unlikely as it will likely be yes men who rubber stamp the pastors' words
126. I hope so.
127. I hope so.
128. I would hope so but who am I to say.
129. I certainly would hope so.
130. that doesn't mean decisions will be representative of the majority of LCC members
131. They aren't likely to fit the preconceptions in the survey.
132. I hope so, and pray for a reasonable outcome.
133. I hope so.
134. I hope so
135. There'll be so much data to process from your estimated 2000 respondents that you won't have the time, energy or resources to actually think about what's on their minds.
136. I pray that they will be taken with the weight and gravity that they deserve. My concern is that it will be largely pastors who fill it out, and that a good representation of lay people will not occur.
137. Sure hope so! After all, you asked for my opinion.
138. and you are in my prayers I thank God for your efforts
139. I hope so.
140. I trust so.
141. I have to hope that my responses will be taken seriously. I spent 4-5 hours on the survey and used reason and resources to answer questions. There is a general concern that the CCMS will not take the responses to the survey seriously if they do not align with the majority of committee member's opinions. This is something I pray is not the case.
142. Not sure
143. That will depend on those reading the survey and analyzing responses.
144. I'm praying so.
145. I can't help but think that the entire process is being rushed through for some reason. I only heard of the survey in February, only received it electronically last week - so really you're only giving us a short time for our considered opinion.
146. This remains to be seen.
147. I would hope so!
148. How would I know
149. I hope so. My husband and I were born and raised Lutheran and love this church and its teachings but we have seriously contemplated leaving this church many times because of the unwillingness of the "Church" as a whole, to embrace change.
150. Hope so! What is the point if NO changes are acted on? Same old.... same old!

151. I am likely too far out for the Lutheran Church, which is too bad, since the Lutheran Church is dying at an accelerating pace.
152. This is an abstract question. How do I know the thoughts and perceptions of the person/s involved in reading the responses to this process?
153. I hope so!
154. I pray that they are with the direction and help of our Lord and Saviour
155. I would hope so, but my experience is that opinions of pastors carry more weight in our church that the opinions of laity.
156. If they are in any way useful.
157. Hopefully...
158. I would sincerely hope so, otherwise there is no point in asking for or filling out a survey.
159. The 'Old Boys' will behave as they did at LCC's Spring Convention -- they will pretend to listen but shut down any communication which is uncomfortable for them.
160. We hope so!
161. I don't know.
162. SO I HOPE
163. Time will tell.
164. I would hope so
165. I hope
166. I pray that holds true of anyone taking time out of their schedules, because they love their God, and their church, and want to see it thrive and grow in His name.
167. I hope so.
168. Hopefully it will benefit and strengthen the LCC.
169. No evidence to think otherwise.
170. I hope so!
171. I have no way of knowing!
172. I hope so.
173. I hope!
174. Don't know if this will or won't. It's kind of a stupid question as I am not a mind reader.
175. I would not have taken the time to fill this in if I didn't think it would be taken seriously. I filled it in in all seriousness.
176. I have no way of knowing. I pray they are.
177. Yes, I do believe the CCMS is undertaking this process honestly and with genuine desire to give each LCC member a voice. Thank you.
178. that's up to you
179. Seriously? Maybe. But to take comments seriously doesn't quite mean listening to them or altering previous agendas or convictions.
180. I sure hope so.
181. I hope you value them.
182. Hopefully. I am not as knowledgeable as I could be on the structure of the District/ Synod but I did spend over 2 hours reflecting on the questions and my responses.
183. NO -- I don't know for sure -- but my confidence is lacking because I don't see leadership in this process -- the committee members have been "comfortable within the framework" of the present and have given no leadership in showing NEED for change; POSSIBILITIES of change in various areas; BENEFITS of changes in such areas; itemized things which will need to be on-going; and alluding to things which could have negative effects.

184. I can only hope so.
185. I really pray this is the case. This is why I spent many hours encouraging others to fill it out and to go over it with them. I had one person ask me: "Has the decision already been made? Are they giving the grunts token input, but in the end will do whatever they want as everything has already been decided?"
186. Sure hope so
187. I hope so.
188. I expect them to be - along with all the others.
189. I hope so. I have told everyone in my congregation that you will be taking these responses seriously and I put in my time to answer seriously... I pray that it is helpful!
190. Because change is needed, am I qualified to speak about it, no....
191. hopefully prayerfully
192. I'm not sure which will be taken more seriously: the agree/disagree sections or the comments? Will the comments hold more weight with the CCMS than the bare data responses to the statements?
193. This survey was ill-conceived and with little thought given to what problems are at hand and how changes might improve our situation
194. I hope so
195. I hope so.
196. I have no faith that it will.
197. I expect so!!!
198. I hope so, and I pray so, but I've been around long enough to have serious doubts.
199. If they are not taken seriously, what's the point of the survey.
200. Remains to be seen doesn't it?
201. I hope so.
202. I certainly hope so.
203. I have faith in the members of the committee. This is a huge task.
204. I believe that the Commission will include my responses, but I am left feeling that I am not very important in the process, as an ordinary layman, because this is a survey for insiders. Two classes of people answering this survey.
205. I doubt it
206. I certainly hope so.
207. I highly doubt it.
208. I am worried the committee will proceed they way they want regardless of our input.
209. The quality of this survey leaves me with doubts as to the quality of the follow up and usage of the survey responses. I pray that it will be taken seriously- in that we have a new survey put out.
210. Depends on who interprets the results.
211. Yes, I hope you can take something positive out of this to strengthen LCC.
212. Hopefully the thoughts and opinions of all will be considered, weighed and implemented with sound judgement and divine intervention.
213. Prove me wrong.
214. I would hope so, given that your preamble stated they would be.
215. 'm not sure.
216. I am disappointed to say that I have a strong feeling that a plan is in place and the results of this survey will be dismissed because the results are equivocal. I have talked to members of

our congregation and others who were frustrated with the process and who are convinced that this was busy work. Please prove them wrong!

217. If it is expected that this survey will have 2000 responders, it is very unlikely that my comments and those of a great many others will be read. Comments will be sampled and very likely chosen to fit what the researchers want the survey to project.
218. I hope so!
219. I sincerely hope so!
220. I hope so or I would not complete this!
221. I hope so!
222. Well I hope so!!!
223. ...I wouldn't take the time if I thought they wouldn't
224. I would sincerely hope so. Otherwise this whole exercise has been a colossal waste of time, effort and resources.
225. Depends on the commission and the BoD!
226. How will I know if they have or haven't?
227. I'm sure that the intent of the board is to take them seriously - I have my doubts whether they will be.
228. I would hope so
229. I don't know but I doubt that my opinion as a single non-member will count for much.
230. I trust that they will be.
231. I hope so.
232. Feelings come and feelings go, but the Word of the Lord endures forever. Feelings are such a poor way to do a major restructuring.
233. From what I'm seeing, its the same-old-boys doing this instead of having a completely independent, competent committee commissioned to do an honest an objective review. I fully expect Bugbee to make some excuse or other why the failure of this process isn't his responsibility or his fault, and/or to maintain the status quo or some version of it.
234. You have to look at a survey like this with a grain of salt. You will probably have the old folks want no changes and the young folks want drastic change. Somewhere in the middle lies what has to be done. Also my suggestions on following the Catholic model will probably be met with derision because it is "Catholic".
235. I hope so.
236. Given the way things have gone in the past I can only wonder.
237. Time will tell
238. Do you mean do I hope my responses will be taken seriously by LCC, or that I am serious in my responses to LCC. It's not clear, very poor wording.
239. My opinions are routinely ignored and mean nothing.
240. Not based on past events but this survey is comprehensive and the efforts to have as many respond is commendable.
241. I assume so or this would be a waste of time
242. -that is my hope and prayer
243. I disagree because young people's voices don't get Heard like they should if they are the future of our church is if the young people lose faith in their churches they won't come back and that will mean the death of the church community and the family
244. I don't know.
245. I certainly hope so!

246. Sharing the input, and using it, will be key for moving forward with restructuring and trust building.
247. May God help you
248. I sure hope so, because the status quo is not acceptable and tinkering quite often is a waste of time.
249. May God help you.
250. one can only hope.
251. To early to tell
252. Unfortunately, I was not able to go back and read the first page which is why I have no opinion on many of these questions
253. I hope so.
254. I hope so.
255. I have little faith in the leadership taking this seriously. You don't have my confidence, period. Do I think you're bad people? Not at all. Look forward to being in heaven with you all one day. I just have little patience for navel gazing exercises that accomplish nothing. That's what this felt like.
256. I am cautiously hopeful that it will be of some value. I have not completely lost faith in LCC but it has been tested. Change is needed. May God be our guide.
257. My thoughts and feelings will be diluted and will be given equal wait with people who may not even be members of LCC congregations. My thoughts and feelings are not given the seriousness that Scripture, theology and historical teachings of the LCMS on church government would accord them.
258. I have no idea...I would sure hope so, but the trust I had with the District and national Synod has been completely destroyed.
259. I pray that it will be so.
260. I do not understand the entire structure or duties of the respective organizations, but this is the first time anyone has asked the congregations to openly participate and offer their opinions, thoughts and ideas. This alone, is a HUGE first step in getting to the root of things and figuring out what is going to be best for the future of the church. Hopefully the people respond. And for that, I thank you.
261. I would like to think so.
262. How will I know.
263. I believe there will be so many responses that it will hard to take them all seriously
264. I truly hope so.
265. I prayed that God would use my responses to help our Synod. I believe God will take that seriously.
266. What?
267. I know that it can be difficult to truly value and listen to opinions that are not in keeping with your own.
268. I hope and pray so, but have grave doubts- plus I can't even answer this question because my responses should not be taken seriously nor anyone else's due to the wording of the questions - on the other hand it is my hope that my comments will be taken seriously - so yet again I cannot answer this question
269. I pray so.
270. I hope so.

271. I wish to believe that this will be the case. It is hard for me to physically do this survey because of health concerns. I think it is important to put in the effort and I hope that this will be part of an on going process where our voices can be heard.
272. Sure HOPE so
273. I'm not sure how seriously each and every respondent's answers can be.

274. I have given them on the basis that they will be taken seriously.
275. I would hope so!
276. I hope so.
277. I can't say for certain, but would hope so.
278. As we are new to Canada and I have no clue how the system works. But LCC is doing a great job and will certainly get better with progressive leaders!
279. I'll take you at your word but I don't know how useful it is.
280. I expect so. Why else are we doing this? However, how will CCMS process and honor so large a number of potentially diverse opinions and perspectives, many of them (including my own) perhaps not well informed?
281. I believe that a plan is already in place that this this survey will be used to back up whatever CCMS and LCC has decided it will move forward with for restructuring. I believe that our leadership is too afraid to deal with the harsh realities needed to help our church at this time.
282. How on Earth would I know?
283. I would hope so otherwise why would you do the survey.
284. don't know if they will or not
285. will it????
286. There is no guarantee that any responses and comments provided with this survey will have any affect at all
287. I would be surprised if they went any further than the persons charged with gathering the survey
288. I would hope so and I have the trust that they will be!
289. I should hope so.
290. I hope so otherwise I would not be responding as I am... I would just ignore this since I am unaware of much of the goings on thinking no one really take the time to read comments ...it will simply be fed into another computer for analysis and that’s it
291. Not sure
292. It is up to those who evaluate the answers.
293. I am hoping that it will not be just numbers and percentages that can be explained, without really looking at what the needs are for increasing the desire of congregations to have a true relationship with Christ.
294. I would like to think there is an appetite for urgently needed change - otherwise we are finished!
295. Hopefully be taken seriously
296. I have no doubt the CCMS will take them seriously for what they are, but to take them truly seriously, there should be at least the opportunity for follow-up - what if someone makes a great comment or asks a great question but there needs to be follow-up? There's no way to do that since it's been mandated that the survey be answered anonymously.
297. I am of the understanding that they will be.
298. | hope so, otherwise this is a useless exercise.

299. I don’t believe you really care--one more stall tactic! More money spent for employees to tabulate all this information. Will change occur? If it doesn't we will go down. LCC will be no more. We must turn back to Jesus being Lord of all and not rely on ourselves and state empty words to keep people happy.
300. Can I have confidence in the committee to take these comments seriously? I pray so.
301. Hopefully.
302. I believe this survey was sent out with a sincere desire to hear from the members of LCC and that you will listen to our concerns and our encouragements.
303. That would be the normal expectation of such an undertaking
304. I would certainly hope so.
305. Will they?
306. I hope so
307. That's really up to the people reading it, not me.
308. I should hope so - I have taken the time to complete this survey. My comments should be taken seriously.
309. I appreciate the work and heart that is going on to evaluate our organizational structure.
310. Are you asking if I believe someone will actually read my responses and take them seriously? How am I supposed to answer this? Is it a test of my overall trust/faith in those who govern the district/synod? Or just those who will compile the results of this survey? I wouldn't be doing this survey if I thought my opinion would not be considered! Seems like a silly question ...
311. We will see.
312. I hope or I am wasting time and so are you.
313. My past experience in reports such as the seminary report would indicate the report is written prior to the results being analyzed; hence my concern about objectivity.
314. It is my hope that this will be so. The Church and the purpose it serves are too important to be presented as disorganized and in disarray.
315. That is certainly my hope.
316. If they are not given consideration, then what is the point of doing this exercise.
317. Absolutely.
318. probably, but I do not think the commission can really assess all these responses, and considering their lack of expertise, I don’t believe they will be able.
319. All depends on how it is used...
320. I am not sure given that this Commission is populated by the same old people we have seen in the leadership that had brought us to this need.
321. I Hope!
322. I hope so.
323. I don't know if this is true and I'm sure I will never know.
324. I believe this to be true.
325. Thank you to all involved. God's Blessings on your work
326. I have no idea if you will take me seriously or just do your own thing. I can't answer this. I can't agree that I will be taken seriously if you don't. I would like to be taken seriously. But seriously this question is asking me to be a fortune telling. Are you serious in wanting to restructure the synod?
327. I have little confidence that my comments will make much of a difference. Just being frank.
328. Perhaps if they agree with the majority.

329. initial conversations with survey people have led me to believe so
330. I admire what you are trying to do here but I don't believe that many of the survey respondents are equipped with enough information about these topics to provide useful input. Unless you are working closely with your church in one of these areas, you would be pretty clueless. I trust that the people who are currently involved and/or in charge will make the right decisions.
331. How would I know at this point, but I sure hope they are.
332. Another kind of a dumb question. Isn't the whole idea of this survey is to get peoples opinions and thoughts and to take each one seriously. If not, then why do the survey?
333. Come again. the church is like the government. It moves like molasses in winter.
334. I really don't know but I an confident they will
335. Many papers have been sent to you and never have received any acknowledgement.
336. I believe every person's comments and answers will be reviewed individually and taken seriously in this process.
337. I hope so.
338. I sure hope so
339. That's the assumption
340. I hope so -
341. A survey format doesn't do justice to the deep level of concern and forethought necessary for something as important as restructuring a church.
342. I sure hope so. The stability of the (Ontario) East District has sure helped greatly to stabilize this synod though these last few years of financial unrest.
343. Presumably!
344. Who reading this is willing to wash the feat? To stand tradition on its head to reach the lost? Who wasn't involved in thinking that spending a hundred million dollars on housing for people who already knew Christ was a valuable expenditure of time? Who would be willing to sell all they had for the risk of the gospel and penitence and showing true compassion? Who in authority is going to look at how our traditions in worship and church practice are impeding the reception of the gospel by the unchurched (isn't that who we should be must concerned about? The 99 sheep are safe!) and work to change the for-me-first culture by training and encouraging our new and existing pastors? I don't believe that it will make any difference and our synod will continue to see declines in attendance, membership, and giving.
345. I hope so ....
346. Hope so!
347. I sincerely hope so.
348. Will not know until process done. Cannot answer question now.
349. I must admit I have concerns that responses from a lay person will not really receive the same consideration as those from church workers.
350. Lack of trust in the entire LCC organization is a huge factor at stake here.
351. I certainly trust they will be. If there is not significant, positive change, soon there will be no Lutheran Church Canada. I have yet to hear or see a concrete plan to move forward from this mess. I have yet to hear an apology from our church, its, officers, or directors. Forget the legal ramifications, there are there regardless. What about the moral obligations? Or better yet the sin of omission, committed in their deceitful actions.
352. Hopefully!!

353. I would hope so!
354. I do not feel qualified to answer many of the statements as I am not well informed of the structure despite being an involved member and part of the church board.
355. I would hope so.
356. they need to be this is a crossroads for LCC and all our members need to be heard
357. Don't you already know what you want to do. The questions were written in such a way that the responses would be relatively useless. Focus on teaching the Word.
358. We have to continue trusting that God has placed the right people in the right time to review where we go. We need to reflect what our church will need over the next 50+ years. I really hope that involvement and opportunity for laypeople will increase. To be asked to serve is a real honour whether you can do it or not. There are many good people with skills for God's use that are not being tapped. Having a role on new committees with varying levels of time commitment would be helpful to engage laypeople.
359. This opinion may be a little optimistic.
360. I have no idea! I doubt very much credence will be given to my thoughts about the alienation and exclusion of women from meaningful roles and positions within this church.
361. Isn't that for you to determine?
362. I wonder
363. I hope they are.
364. I would hope the grassroots responses will be given reasonable consideration in the final analysis.
365. it is so desired and hoped
366. In the end the attack of Eastern Canada on Concordia will continue. I feel this survey is simply a way to justify taking
367. I certainly hope so.
368. ... as promised.
369. I believe decisions to restructure are already in process, and individual thoughts, etc. are not valued, nor will they have any effect upon the outcome. In other words, the outcome is already known.
370. I truly pray that it will be!
371. If not, why did you send this out? If not what kind of a game are we playing?
372. Even if the intent is good, this survey shows that professionals who understand how to use this information are not involved. So I don't think that this will do much of anything.
373. I'm skeptical.
374. We hope.
375. how do I know how seriously someone else is going to take my responses - very poorly worded question!
376. We can only hope and pray that is a true statement.
377. I hope so, or else this survey was a waste of everyone's time.
378. See above.
379. I certainly hope so!
380. I hope so
381. I certainly hope so but I can't speak for the Commission and others
382. This is a bit vague as I have no idea what the restructuring team will do. I might be able to answer this as updates come out and tabulated results are published for all to read.
383. I would hope so?

384. I pray they are.
385. I hope so.
386. Remains to be seen.
387. The "old boys" club of recycled personnel will do what they want to do regardless of what we disgruntled and apathetic people comment.
388. I hope.
389. I hope so.
390. will they? This really isn't a survey question, it's just a statement which you are hoping we agree with. It's a 'trial balloon'...
391. LCC ignores new voices, new ideas, etc., and is resistant to change.
392. Of course, that's why we're doing this, right?
393. Will have to wait and see what the result is.
394. I am hopeful that they will be.
395. That is not in my hands.
396. I hope so!
397. I hope so.
398. How will they, when it's been mandated that we be anonymous? How will the CCMS follow up on individual ideas?
399. ??? THIS IS NOT A FORMAT I WOULD APPLY TO A SURVEY OF THIS MAGNITUDE
400. I sincerely hope so!!
401. I don't hold out a lot of hope.
402. I have no reason to think otherwise.
403. I have to believe that or there is no truth in us.
404. I trust you.
405. That's up to you.
406. I hope so
407. As I mentioned earlier, my confidence in church leadership has been decimated, not just by recent events but by many things I have witnessed in the last 2 decades. I don't know if my input will be taken seriously.
408. ~ it depends what level of interest there is in being a strong Biblical and Confessional church.

58. Completing this survey was worth my time.

1. Many of these questions were unrelated to restructuring and I found myself frustrated, quite often. I thought the questions were leading me. Grace alone, Faith Alone, Word Alone. My opinions don’t factor in.
2. I really am not sure. I had expected a survey that was more thought through.
3. I thought the survey was going to be more about church growth, not administration.
4. It made me realize how little I know about accountability, duties of boards etc. I'm not sure what benefit my answers will have on the process at hand.
5. I realized how ill informed I am and that isn't good as I'm thought of as one who knows because I read all the handouts etc.
6. Yes! I believe so.
7. I hope so

8. Husband and I worked 2 hours on this. Having meaningful discussion re matters herein. We weighed pros and cons and didn't always agree but attempted to think in terms of the greater good.
9. Made me think about what synod is intended to be and do.
10. We (wife and I) took significant time and had meaningful conversation about the items herein.
11. hopefully
12. No!
13. Yes - I now realize how much I don't know about the operations of our Synod.
14. not mine
15. I have very little understanding of the relations of district and our congregation.
16. If any improvements are adopted that will serve Him more effectively.
- I believe it shows I am "walking together" with others as a synod - important for pastors to show the people
17. If I am taken seriously and God's Will is done, then the survey was worth my time.
18. Made me stop and think about how important an issue restructuring is.
19. only prayer will accomplish miracles,
20. Especially if the church follows what I think -- just kidding! Thank you for this opportunity
21. Somewhat cathartic in any case
22. not sure, very little faith left.
23. If it is taken seriously.
24. Only if it is taken seriously
25. I hope so? It remains to be seen, what good this all does. But I'm hopeful.
26. Refer to comments from #'s 56 & 57
27. But since the request was made for each person to answer, I did so, and am eagerly looking forward to the restructuring as it progresses.
28. ... If comments etc. are seriously considered.
29. Who knows?
30. We pray so.
31. I hope so.
32. Could have been better.
33. Certainly not sure. I not informed as I think most laypersons will be.
34. Most definitely.
35. It was the least I could to promote the health and well-being of my church and my brothers and sisters of the Lutheran faith.
36. Only if the laypeople are listened to.
37. I very much appreciate the opportunity.
38. I feel better having done it rather than had I not.
39. Only if my opinions are taken into consideration.
40. I thought a number of questions were poorly worded. Some questions seemed to have presuppositions that needed to be addressed, and that seemed inappropriate. Some questions, particularly concerning CEF, seemed to be guiding the survey user toward a desired outcome. While I realize this probably wasn't deliberate, I think people need to be mindful that people's trust in LCC leadership has been damaged, particularly in ABC. Let's be more sensitive on these matters. There were several questions that were the logical opposite of the previous question. This was frustrating for me at times because it felt like a mind game.

Also, I am unsure how the CCMS intends to interpret the results of those questions. That could have been communicated more thoroughly. What is the difference between "Neither Agree or Disagree" and "No opinion"? In my mind, they are logically the same. Hopefully, the results of those two categories will be added together; otherwise, the statistical result may be misleading.

41. Any opportunity to share and communicate is beneficial.
42. I think more time should have been given for church members to meet as a unit and thoroughly research these questions as some are totally beyond what I know as an individual member.
43. Our pastor spent 2 Bible Study periods going over this survey with us. It is way too long and complicated for lay people. I did some studying, but did not have enough time.
44. I want to be a part of the ministry and if by completing this survey I have helped bring the word of God to more people then what I have done is Gods work and not mine. I prayed for Gods help to complete this work and to make sure what I am saying is Gods. I pray I have been a faithful servant.
45. It's always nice to be asked for your opinion. :-)
46. I hope and pray that this is so
47. hope so
48. While I don't have confidence that my opinion will be included in decision making. I am thankful you gave me this opportunity to at least try to have my voice heard. For that, thank you. This is much better than you just going ahead with restructuring.
49. I'd like to think so. Time will tell.
50. I think it will be.
51. I hope
52. it has made me stop and reflect. It is important to me that my church is Bible based and therefore I felt compelled to spend this time.
53. If you will actually listen to the people
54. It has been worth the time only if my thoughts, feelings, and comments, plus those of other respondents, are given real consideration.
55. It's made me think through some of my opinions and thoughts on synodical governance. Perhaps it was an academic exercise!
56. Somewhat, however as in #57, I am strongly disappointed in the questions wording and content.
57. Since I don't know much about Synod, District etc. so I'm no sure my answers are educationally correct.
58. It was a very discouraging experience. So much time and money spent for NO value in most instances.
59. Hope so!
60. Very poorly constructed survey. Very disappointed!
61. Yes, duty bound... But not well constructed, took much discussion to work through!
62. Only if advice is accepted and assessed.
63. Showed me how much I don't know about our current structure.
64. It has really made me think about how our church is structured.
65. Input from membership is always worth it.
66. I have appreciated the opportunity to share my perceptions.
67. I pray so. "Lord give the committee open ears to you and your people".

68. we will see
69. I don't think any part of this survey will help spread the gospel. LCC to me is just like the government, lots of politics but not much result. LCC does a good job at what they do but is that job important to the lord.
70. This remains to be seen.
71. that is a question for you. Did I waste my time?
72. Given this is the opportunity and means given for me to voice my opinion, it was worth my time. Whether the responses and comments of 2000+ surveys that you hope to receive are fully considered, I have my doubts.
73. It's worth my time if my opinions are taken seriously.
74. Yeah probably because I seriously doubt anything will change
75. I pray this is true.
76. My opinion counts when serving God
77. Remains to be seen
78. I hope so!
79. I hope so.
80. How else will I be heard!!!
81. See comments in #57 and #56. However, it was good to have a place to enter all my concerns in the comments section
82. Yes, I have been given the opportunity to give my opinion whether others higher up like it or not.
83. But only if the information is used.
84. My prayer is that LCC can be strong and vibrant. As I see churches dying, I hope that we can figure out better ways
85. to be relevant to our changing culture while we continue to stay focused on our Saviour.
86. I personally found it to be very confusing. Not very friendly for us simpler folks. I just wonder how many people really understood how they were answering. I might be wrong but that's my thoughts.
87. I felt strongly about doing it but it took way more than said one hour to answer thoughtfully, for me anyway, and I feel I could have answered better and more efficiently in another format, much harder to score I realize, but questions like...What are your concerns about the future of the church? Are there ways you think synod/ district could better be meeting the needs of your parish? And would like more info about how church functions now, what its weaknesses are, i.e. why the change and some choices, i.e. a few suggested models of how church could be changed structurally would have helped me answer better.
88. Yes, but I am beginning to wonder if these questions will ever end. The time required will discourage many from completing.
89. see #56. Can’t print my record of the doc to even log what was said and see if it is in final outcome, or censored out. Sorry but this is the track record.
90. I sincerely hope so. It does provide an opportunity to give my opinions when I feel that I am otherwise invisible.
91. I value the comments I have submitted and though it did take a good amount of time to complete in my busy day, God's work is something that I feel we must put first and each of us must be accountable to this work and our Lord's church.
92. agree if it helps the process. If it doesn't it was a waste of time.

93. My computer kept on acting up, so if there should be words or sentences that show up where they do not seem to make any sense, please just ignore them. Thank you for the privilege of sharing my opinions. May the wisdom of GOD guide LCC into the future.
94. depends on what you do with it
95. But time will tell.
96. Not enough background to the structured questions is available to respond in a meaningful way to this survey.
97. Remains to be seen
98. Depends on what whether the results are used and useful.
99. That remains to be seen
100. at least for venting!
101. I don't think it was necessary to expect 80 years + members to complete this survey.
102. Time will tell.
103. much too complicated for a lay person
104. Remains to be seen
105. See my answer to questions #56 and #57.
106. The average lay person doesn't have much of an inside track in many of these issues, and just takes them for granted.
107. I desire to see LCC move forward and streamline itself. Too often it seems to be "all talk and no action". Canadians need what we offer, the gospel of our Lord Jesus.
108. Perhaps using the KISS principle would have helped here. I can't say my answers are worth anything. Perhaps that is a Comment in itself.
109. This survey has also helped me get better educated on various aspects of Lutheran Church Canada.
110. Definitely -we love our LCC! And we pray for God's best for our life in Synod.
111. Through the completion of this survey I was able to learn a little more about the church, which I think is valuable. I also think it is valuable to be able to share my opinions. However, the survey was onerous and many of the questions were not written very well. A less complicated survey would have been much better to elicit a significant response from general church members.
112. Not really
113. It gave me a chance to rant if nothing else. I love my church, I want it to survive, but I am worried about its future. That future is in God's hands but he gives us the opportunity to reflect on our service to Him and that is what this survey has done for me.
114. At least I got to vent, and express my opinion
115. That depends if the results of this survey is made available to every Church member and changes resulting because of this survey are discussed at all levels with a high level of transparency.
116. Time will tell. Our prayers are constant.
117. We are thankful for the opportunity to give input and pray for the Lord`s guidance for the leadership.
118. I hope so.
119. Time will tell here a well.
120. some insight into what is going on.
121. I believe completing it would have been worth my time if I could have given more informed responses

122. Overall, I think so. It gives me a platform to speak my opinion.
123. I don't have the background information or expertise to provide an opinion on most of the questions.
124. This survey is too long.
125. My limited knowledge of the workings of the Synod and Districts makes it difficult to answer the questions of this survey.
126. I don't think so. I don't have enough knowledge to be able to usefully comment on what should or shouldn't happen during the re-structuring process. You've asked things that are way beyond my information sphere. I have no business or leadership experience. My opinions on the majority of these things are not well-informed. I don't see how it will help you, and I don't feel heard because I couldn't answer most of the questions.
127. As long as someone listens
128. ...if only to see which way the preconceived conclusions are leaning.
129. I am just not sure.
130. It was a waste of time.
131. I would hope so.
132. First off, it took many, many hours to complete and even now I'm not satisfied with all my answers. However, it led me to re-think what it means to be part of a synod, a district, a congregation. All these are human organizations and as such have their strengths and weaknesses. This reassessment led me to be thankful, once again, that I belong to THE CHURCH, the Body of Christ and that I have a congregation carrying out Christ's mandate by actively being involved in serving Word and Sacraments to its members, reaching out to the community, meeting local social needs, as well as directly carrying out local and foreign mission work. The ABC District and Synod involvement affects this membership primarily by adding to or detracting from my congregation's mission.
133. Too long and some questions were very vague and I was unable to answer the questions due to the lack of knowledge.
134. The survey will give some over-all opinions - however with so many unknowns it may confuse the changes which are needed.
135. Not as complicated as I first thought it would be.
136. As a retired layperson I am not on top of areas of concern that need changes other than that reported in Synod and District news.
137. Only if I can be assured that you are ready to acknowledge the centralized bias from which this survey has been prepared.
138. Despite my answer to #57, we will have to wait and see. I feel that because of the time constraint imposed, the rush to get this done -- absence of a time for discussion and debate will not be given a chance .....
139. I guess that depends if we do something or just wait another 6 years and do another survey.
140. I feel embarrassed at how little I know about these things. I have gone along. minding my own business, with most things that happened at the local level. Joining in things that I like and doing outreach wherever. Trying to stay somewhat informed on global issues, but not worrying about who is doing what.
141. It made me study the LCC Handbook again.
142. I don't know, but I hope so.
143. If it is listened to.

144. It allowed me to share once again my concerns. Although in the past nothing much was done.
145. I feel I have learned why LCC is planning the restructuring of the synod and in the specific areas.
146. Yes
147. Although I feel that the survey was deeply flawed, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the future plans for our church body.
148. I sure hope so.
149. The CCMS will respond with a structure whether or not I like it or believe it will work. I'm not sure that my opinions will be that helpful.
150. You will have gained little incite by my responses because you provided no data with which I could reflect upon.
151. As long as my comments are read and utilized along with others' submissions, to consider 'above and beyond' the current restructuring decisions and plans. We need to be more cooperative with the local and national Christian community, going forward.
152. will wait and see.
153. I'm proud of being a Lutheran, our history and being bible based, it's the God's word and we have to turn to God's word for help and guidance.
154. Just wish I was more knowable about the structure to have been more helpful
155. I hope so but refer to #57
156. I guess if I live long enough I'll find out.
157. I don't really know whether my opinions and comments will be of value, but I value my church and my Christian family greatly and I hope that our family's comments and opinions will be valued. I think that our church is worth the great amount of effort required to create a God-pleasing entity so that we may band together to serve Him well.
158. Hopefully!
159. Not really, but we must make do with what we've been given.
160. I hope so.
161. You sure didn't make it easy. Why didn't you publish the link and password in the bulletins or put printed copies in each mailbox? You want feedback but I feel you don't really want it or you'd make easier for everyone (young and old) to complete.
162. Time will tell, I hope
163. Not sure much if anything will come of it.
164. Important to get our input but I feel that this was a very difficult survey to understand. Questions were often repeated. A lot of questions were difficult to answer for someone not directly involved in these boards/committees and district/synod office. Questions need to be worded with more clarity. I just hope my opinions are valued.
165. Completing this survey was worth my time in that restructuring LCC is worth my time. However, this survey was very disappointing and in itself was not worth my time.
166. Made me realize that the church structure needs revamping if we are to survive.
167. Time will tell!
168. It was worth my time because I got to vent my spleen. I hope that my concern about lack of communication at all levels. I am fortunate that our pastor has always provided information and has consistently encouraged us to ask questions and discuss issues if someone in our congregation presents them. I sincerely hope that all congregations are that fortunate but I do know that many are not so lucky.

169. that depends on if my comments are going to be taken seriously
170. Maybe pastors understand the terminology used, but the some of the terms don't make much sense to me as a lay person. I reiterate that, unless all responses are taken seriously and acted upon, this will have been a waste of time.
171. Thanks for the opportunity.
172. Not sure
173. I wish I could have provided more relevant and informed feedback.
174. I don't know enough to really give an informed answer. The information provided in advance didn't really give a clear picture as to what, if anything, is wrong with the organization and what needs to be fixed. Hence most of my answers are "on the fence" or "no opinion".
175. But it allowed me to get out a little bit of frustration.
176. It was good for me to reflect on these issues. I hope that out of these surveys the church can start to gain a sense of how to move forward.
177. I'm not sure!
178. This took 2 hours to complete! Difficult to answer at times! Hope overall that it is helpful, but unsure if it will be worth the time.
179. Time will tell
180. This survey will serve no objectively useful purpose, my only reason for doing this is that what I write may have some impact somewhere sometime down the line, and if I don't say anything then I'm contributing to maintaining the status quo.
181. It took a lot more than an hour but it did get me thinking so that is always worth while.
182. I believe it was. Partially because I feel it is important to provide guidance to the future and also I feel it is important that I give consideration to how things should look and increase my understanding of the issues and concerns of my fellow church members.
183. Time well spent if it brings results
184. My time is God's time, how is that worth it?
185. if you actually read it.
186. I didn't do it for me.
187. It will create a record of what the members of LCC expect. If it is ignored, the restructuring committee will do so at the peril of this synod. Our Faith in the Lord is unwavering, our faith in our leadership is stretched to the point of breaking.
188. As a member who just attends church but isn't a deacon or in ministry, I felt I did not have the knowledge to answer these questions.
189. No real information was imparted to make for informed decision making here.
190. It depends on if 57 occurs.
191. Was helpful for me in increasing my awareness of and interest in the many very important questions we are facing in LCC.
192. Completing this survey caused me consider why we are really on this earth, and how we as a church body have gotten caught up with the world and used so much time and energy in that course rather than the course that God would have us take.
193. To early to tell
194. If I did not try to be part of the solutions to the problems, then the time would have been wasted. Anything we do to try to help is not in vain.
195. Time will tell how much affect my survey will have.

196. My time is nothing...hopefully the time to analyze the survey and come up with results is worth while.
197. Again it all depends on how you use it. I hope I haven't wasted my time.
198. I am not sure that I have the knowledge to answer most of the questions so have chosen the neither agree or disagree.
199. We'll see.
200. I truly hope and pray that it was.
201. Again, it depends of my responses are valued or not
202. If the information is actually used, then yes. It is important to speak to this issue. The questions need to be changed and more information (and proper definitions) needs to be provided.
203. I am doing only my duty and am happy to share my observations and opinions but some of the questions aren't properly asked and will yield little value and insight to restructuring.
204. See comment for question #56
205. Sure, I think it is important to participate and have a voice.
206. Time will tell.
207. Time will tell. Results will show.
208. Again, it opened my eyes to my clear lack of knowledge about how synod and districts function and the need to become more informed.
209. I didn't feel a need to comment on the Synod's structure so responding didn't do anything for me. I can only hope that the committee that will dealing with all the responses will be able to make good use of them.
210. It helps one refocus on issues and matters in LCC which are easily taken for granted and/or ignored.
211. It has allowed me the opportunity to share my opinions.
212. Time will tell.
213. allows me to share my ideas and understandings
214. it was good that I thought about the situation that has caused so much grief.
215. One cannot determine that until one sees if any action is taken
216. I’m not informed enough to give a good opinion.
217. made me realize I don’t know much about the political/business goings on
218. depending on the overall results and action taken
219. It's the way we've been given to provide feedback, but poorly designed in the way that it was structured.
220. This survey made me realize the little I know about the structure of LCC.
221. I hope so!!!!
222. Well, I feel better now than I did before the survey. That's a good sign.
223. If you ask for, and get, strong opinions, then the members will expect some clear changes and decisions.
224. It helped me focus and think about my church body.
225. We will see,
226. It has shown me how detached I have been in knowing the organization I belong to.
227. I guess that remains to be seen ... :)
228. We will see.
229. ask the people you're ministering through. There's obviously a problem or more people would be coming to our Lutheran churches

230. It gave me a chance to state my opinions
231. I sincerely hope so.
232. Unsure.
233. I thought it looked long and cumbersome. After completing it I think it will be very helpful. It did take about an hour to complete.
234. Feel much more knowledgeable about our church governance.
235. I don’t what to seem harsh. yes, it was helpful to a point, but it just needed to be written better.
236. Again I Hope!
237. I hope so.
238. I hope it helps, I hope we are allowed further input but I don't have confidence that my answers or comments will actually matter.
239. I hope so.
240. can not see the future!
241. Again I will have no idea until the restricting is over. However, for all of your repeating and unanswerable questions then no.
242. This was a learning experience.
243. Yes, if you act on it.
244. Learning and having to clarify one’s thoughts is always worth while.
245. As a lay person we don't frequently get to voice our thoughts and so this is healthy for the whole organization.
246. I do not believe that the survey will ultimately be helpful in the structure of the Synod moving forward. The structure of Synod should not be cobbled together by the pooled ignorance gathered by the survey. It should rather be studied by people who have some knowledge and expertise in the area and then a proposal based upon such knowledge and expertise could be put forward to the members of Synod for consideration.
247. At least I was given a chance to air my very serious concerns for the true Christian Church in Canada. May our gracious Lord truly bless your deliberations.
248. I have never gotten involved (of my own choosing) in being a delegate to a convention or know that much about the district and synod structure so feel I cannot give an opinion on many of the questions.
249. It comments are considered.
250. Again, I hope so.
251. I wish that I could have provided more insight and ideas to support this review but I do not have enough information to understand the current system.
252. A more focused survey to a more focused target, would provide better results. Having a better customized survey would be better. Many members do not understand fully how the organization and the services all work together. Asking that question first and then using those results to tailor the follow-up questions would be more effective.
253. Whether or not any action is taken on some of the comments I have made is not important. What is important however, is the fact that basically you have asked for my opinion, and that I have freely given them.
254. shows how little I know in the workings of our district and synod
255. Sorry, I'm not very aware of what the responsibilities of all these LCC and Synod groups and organizations do specifically. And how their actions affect my congregation.

256. I don't know enough about the administration of the LCC to accurately answer the survey questions. I am not, nor have ever been involved with this side of the church (the background workings). I am involved just within my church body and not the politics surrounding it, so I do not have opinions on most of the questions asked.
257. I am not well informed on a lot of the issues...
258. In light of the way our economy has been going I am wondering if some of the foreign missions which require our monetary input could not be cautioned that pastors/evangelists of their own citizens be made aware they need to have their parishioners more supportive for the upkeep of their particular leader. The new pastors should not depend on only a salary/stipend given monthly from Canada.
259. Survey was much to long. It sounded like trick question to see if you remembered prior responses
260. See above. A waste of my time. The outcome has already been established.
261. Even if the intent is good, this survey shows that professionals who understand how to use this information are not involved. So I don't think that this will do much of anything.
262. I like surveys :)
263. Probably was a waste of my time.
264. Frustrating but very important.
265. I can only hope and pray that is a true statement.
266. This also remains to be seen by changes that are forthcoming in areas discussed in survey.
267. It is important to be a part of the decision making process and to have a voice
268. I would hope so!
269. Remains to be seen.
270. If it is taken seriously.
271. I was not very helpful but at least I learned more about the issues. Plus, I like taking surveys!
272. see above
273. I hope so but I seriously doubt it.
274. In many instances, I do not have the detailed information necessary to give a knowledgeable answer
275. I appreciate feeling "part of"...
276. At the very least it got it off my chest and I have done what I can to see things change.
277. Again, I am hopeful that my input will be considered and that I have not wasted my time.
278. Have no idea how the info will be used
279. Please value it!!
280. Don't know.
281. I feel that I was unable to answer many of these questions as I had no knowledge of the issues.
282. I'll see by the outcome of the changes that are made
283. If only to put some thoughts into words.
284. ~ yes, I got to share my thoughts and make them known!

59. I am comfortable with thinking of the 8 services of LCC as a description of the mission and ministry of LCC.

1. The mission as charged by Christ Himself, was to administer the sacraments and teach them all that He had given us. From within the church others were raised up to meet the physical needs, but not the church itself.
2. In theory - yes - practice?
3. Yes
4. Present the gospel without all the social judgements that we see now. Include also in instruction - how to manage people.
5. I think the ministry of church is the above and also preaching God's truth without being so judgmental. Letting Christ be the judge.
6. LCC mission should be word and sacrament, never social ministry.
7. I am not willing to see the Church Ext. Fund continue. It failed us as a result we lost our retirement and ability to tithe.
8. not the current LCC results
9. given the track record of ABC and LCC as saying they could not help, did not know etc. and the false def'n of ministry we were sold.
10. There may be other ways to consider the needs of the congregations that should be met at other levels beyond the local cluster and region.
11. Again - services and needs change periodically. Review is good.
12. The mission and ministry of LCC should be as described in the Book of Concord, AC V & VII. Id o not like the wording of the question.
13. Seems many pastors are taught to be too liturgical and restrictive not what I judge ministry to be.
14. What does "comfortable" mean?
15. Services s/b more focused and fewer in number (perhaps need to identify fewer and better goals).
16. Yes, these eight services are fine if we consider "LCC" as including local congregations. Many of the services like Outreach and Social Ministry should be done at the local level. The synod needs to focus on ecclesiastical supervision and training of new and current pastors.
17. Is it inspiring us to faithful and greater service? Seems practical for "status quo" adjustments or refining of doing whatever we already have been doing, but ho-hum for drawing growing interest from people not already in the know. -- for engaging new ideas for harnessing new interest and drive for the mission we are called to by our Lord. (Am I trying to push the scope of this to something more? I'm not sure what questions or focus I'm trying to find, but it felt like there is a bigger picture, a broader feedback or connection to be made with our people as followers of Jesus Christ (albeit - or should it be "and-be-it" we're Lutheran!)
18. I agree with this, but with one important provision: that we be precise in our terminology.
19. This requires further thought.
20. I need more time to consider that.
21. I would hope and pray that LCC is always open to additional mission and ministry.
22. I have no clue what you are talking about.
23. I don't understand this question.

24. The LWML have great idea's but do not have the money. Then you get the subtle hints that they want you to give more.
25. This question could have come earlier, when the eight services were listed. Online, I don't want to go back and risk losing all my answers. But I am sure there is much room in the list for improvement and restructuring.
26. I am unclear of the missions and social ministry so far and if there is overlap.
27. What does comfortable mean?
28. More work has to be done in communities so our LCC Synod is more visible and accepting of others.
29. I think they cover all the important services.
30. not comfortable with Financial Services
31. Thinking of eight services somewhat limiting.
32. the mission and ministry of LCC should be defined in a stand-alone format. the 8 (or however many) services should be derived from that definition. Not the other way round.
33. I would like to know more about the work of some of these ministries e.g. Building Community and Care for Members.
34. Except perhaps the financial ministry service may be pared back.
35. I would prefer to change this to 7 services and remove the one talking about CEF finances.
36. Serving the congregations. Not ruling them.
37. Children, Youth, Young Adults, Couples, Family are not mentioned as specific entities or in groupings where we, as a Synod focus our services. It seems though, that many churches need more "help" as Sunday School, Youth #s and other "group" #s decline
38. I am not against any of the services listed but I just don’t like the idea of the church as a mere service provider. a sum of its parts that needs to work and structure itself like any other business...
39. I am not sure what "building community" is supposed to mean
40. I believe that the 10 objectives are used for that purpose.
41. can't say very unfriendly survey format as difficult to get back there and print the 1st pages to reference accurately. Can’t recall all while scrolling back and forth. also see #60.
42. Why wasn't this question asked at a more appropriate time? Like right after the 8 services were listed?
43. This is a good mission and ministry of LCC. But good things can be made better and I would be open to any changes that are for the better and advancement of LCC.
44. They support the Word and Sacrament ministry of Synod.
45. #2 Building Community - realize how important it is to reach out in our communities - to donate our time, talents and money to worthwhile local projects (different emphasis on the word "community")3 #3 In our individual congregations "care for church members" should be an important part of each pastor's work. Members, both men and women, could be encouraged to help the pastor - to use their talents to visit, to drive to appointments, to shop, etc. (show that we care).
46. These services appear to be set up to do their own fund raising so would not necessarily need to be under the ministry of LCC.
47. I'm ashamed to admit that I don't know as much about them as I should. I believe synodical service organizations and auxiliaries are important. I only hope they are discernibly Lutheran in doctrine and practice. The synod should not be in the business of spreading a generic sort of Christianity.

48. The great Commission must be at the head of any description of mission and ministry
49. No they sound good but in fact Synod and Districts want money with no transparent accountability
50. I am not sure what is included in Social Ministry; I suspect it may be too broad.
51. I suppose these 8 categories are as good as any but there's a considerable degree of overlap, e.g. "Building Community" and "Care for Church Members".
52. We may need to focus on fewer than the eight as resources become more scarce. We might need to rank them. I may be better to do a few well rather than lots poorly.
53. A lot of lovely missions. What's missing in the one mission of the church.
54. If the synod believes that the 8 services fit in with the description of the mission and ministry of LCC, then so am I.
55. The 8 services appear to encompass what I believe to be an appropriate mission of a church administrative body.
56. Yes, but it concerns me that sometime certain elements are weighted more heavily than others and appear to be the foremost important parts of LCC's ministry.
57. After reviewing the accompanying materials, I still have not found where these eight services are listed.
58. Where is this question coming from? What does it even mean? The 8 services as written are so non-descript and content less - who could disagree with them? I don't have the LCC Objectives as I don't have a copy of the LCC Handbook (again, just a lay person) so I really can't comment. Yes, they seem fine.
59. I will agree with the hope that financial leadership is applied in a construct matter to ensure sustainability for the future of LCC
60. Our LCC Mission focus needs to have a much stronger focus on work in our local communities and not so much other countries. We need help with ideas and techniques that will help us be more effective locally
61. What services - name them
62. Our mission is the Great Commission. In that these eight services carry out the Great Commission, they are serving God. However, God's mission for his church is bigger than any collection of services or auxiliaries.
63. It is not evident to me that LCC discharges those services effectively and with good stewardship. Largely, LCC tends to be invisible.
64. I am unsure about having "Social Ministry" as a separate mission item. Can this not be a sub-category of "Canadian Missions" and "World Missions". If it cannot, then maybe could be re-worded to be "Community Missions" to pare it down to the local level, if that is what it means.
65. It`s time for LCC to examine itself. The practice of closed communion is sad. We deny believers the body and blood of Christ. The pastor makes the decision. Jesus who came, lived and died for ALL our sins. He said do this in remembrance of me. We shut them out. There they sit because they are not Lutherans. How tragic! Jesus said `believe in me, no one comes to the Father except through me. `` How sad! It makes me cry. We who claim to be servants and believers shut our fellow believers out. This is not scriptural.
66. Not enough emphasis or mention was given to the ongoing Christian education of our members, the work of encouraging congregations to be more mission minded, and encouraging the many struggling. congregations. There is an assumption that the support, mission and ministry of congregations and what they need from Synod and the Districts is

the same as in the past; but this is not so. We are a struggling church and more than ever need local, hands on assistance and encouragement. Restructuring to a more centralized model may be done at our peril.

67. Perhaps more then ever the concept of Canadian Missions needs to have more focus now then ever before. If LCC does not reach out with the Gospel in Canada. Who Will? There are fewer Christian Churches interested in Gospel outreach then before and our society wants to hear about Jesus, less and less.
68. they are valuable but more sharing of information and education is needed
69. Perhaps this should have been the first question.
70. I would have to research this: compare the 8 services to the LCC Constitution and understand the descriptions of the 8 services (the 8 services are jargon that need further descriptions).
71. It's one way of looking at it.
72. The mission and ministry of LCC should be stated/listed separately apart from the 8 services of LCC. The 8 services of LCC merely facilitate our mission and ministry to our members, our local communities, and to the world. Our mission and ministry is to reach all people with the good news of God's love, forgiveness, and salvation through JesInLCC should be in the business of reaching the lost and shepherding
73. All our work needs to focus on strengthening members (churches and individuals) in faith and understanding of the triune God and enabling them to share the word and work of God. I think these services should be reviewed to make sure they do that.
74. Not enough info to answer this. Looking at the 8 services would require a more complete information.
75. I don't know.
76. All except the "Supervision" part of No. 1. That needs definition and clarification. When the word "authority" is used in that context, even more clarification is needed.
77. I confess I haven't thought about it much. On the surface it seems accurate enough. I hesitate to say yea or nay.
78. The eight services of the LCC are good divisions however, sometimes people struggle with different areas.
79. This question is far to vague and broad to answer in any meaningful way.
80. This is not what the bible teaches.
81. They should be monitored and reviewed.
82. # 2 Building Community. Communication as I have alluded to in many of my comments is paramount to the members of LCC and hope that whatever is decided at the 2017 convention that more communication continues in just not sending it out but checking that it is provided to the congregational members.
83. a fuller description would have been more beneficial
84. I think there are many opportunities, many being missed by our LCC, so we should not be limited to the ones mentioned at the beginning of the survey.
85. I would say strongly agree, but I can't remember what they are. I'll just assume it has something to do with the sacraments and proclaiming Christ crucified.
86. More information is required as to what some of these services do e.g. Social Ministry and Care for Members
87. While the LSO's are supported by members out of Love for the Lord and the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, they are not considered "auxiliaries" for specific Biblical reasons

which affect our fellowship status. We need only consider the current situation at Concordia University College in Edmonton to witness the sad result of neglecting this important fellowship distinction. That being said, 8 of the LSO's have received my financial support. Still I am not comfortable in thinking of each LSO (and ALL the individuals who comprise them) as our synodical family. This deeply saddens me.

88. Feel very uninformed. Lay people get very little information.
89. I actually agree with what the 8 services are, but there needs to be a significant reordering of priorities. Local mission and evangelism should be our number one priority. Hands down.
90. Again, there is overlap in almost each one of these services between the districts and synod. If it is the mission and ministry of both districts and synod, why do we need both?
91. Are there reasons we should have more or less?
92. I wish that my parish thought of someone else their themselves - point in fact - they were unable to work with the Catholic church locally in sponsoring a refugee family - and yet, they could offer a couple hundred dollars to an outreach somewhere in the lower mainland - no vote for either decision - I am left feeling that I have no say - and that the outlook of this church is - " God loves and support Lutherans, and then there are those others." not nice if you ask me.
93. I do not know the 8 services.
94. This seems to me to be a case of 'Ready, Fire, Aim.' If we don't know where we are, and we don't know where we want to go, our chances of getting there are not very good.
95. I would have like to see questions ranking people's views on the importance of each one of those and seen where that took us. I believe that information would have been more valuable to the CCMS in determining what type of new structure is needed and what it would look like.
96. That is frankly too much for our synod to chew on. If we can't narrow it down to three things... I think we are doing too much. We are spread way to thin from an organizational stand point. We are going to spend all our energy trying to prop up these 8 areas and not really feel like we are succeeding.
97. With the exception of the financial services. We need to get out of financial services and let it be run by someone with financial training and experience.
98. May need to be combined and brought down to 4 or 5.
99. These are rich with words but LCC is poor on growth of membership - no gain in 25 years!
100. # 1 is un-necessary, as Scripture and Confessions are enough and bind us in unity; # 3, 5 & 7 are lacking or non-existent. How about, "The Lord's Work, Our Hands”?
101. The eight services were not described - some are fairly clear by the title but the first 2 need much more information to be included so that we could consult the information before completing the survey.
102. Not comfortable with the inclusion of financial services. Pension/benefits should be handled at arms length from Synod/district. Church workers could open a pension fund with a financial institution that Synod would match up to a certain amount.
103. With exception of CEF.
104. Looking at the graph 2014 Allocation of LCC Resources by Services I am left wondering "What Social Ministry?'.
105. That the first service includes "supervision" is somewhat disturbing. That is not a service that I believe is a good reflection of our first priority as LCC

106. n the past it was simply 3: Ecclesiastical and doctrinal oversight, Theological Education, and Missions.
107. While I appreciate trying to simplify the language of the Handbook, the ten points under Article III, page 8 more accurately describe the mission and ministry of LCC.
108. The prime focus of the mission of LCC should be to proclaim Christ and all of what He has done for us. If this is our focus, then ministry will follow. I also want to see our church body standing firm on God's Word and staying true to it. I Would like to see more emphasis placed on local outreach to the unchurched and on social ministry.
109. They have great value as arms of LCC.
110. Ok with the 8 services of LCC as a description of the mission and ministry but not comfortable with the management of the CEF regarding the performance in the past.
111. #3 not being done well enough #8 needs a review from a proper outside source.
112. Some are more important than others. Some have to be re-evaluated and perhaps altered or dropped all together.
113. Overkill! Structure too big!
114. Synod has 8 services?
115. I would like to explore this one...is this all, or should it be broader? Or maybe I am thinking of a vision statement or mission statement?
116. I am not sure of their core connection to the gospel in all cases.
117. What services might we be missing? What services do we have that should be dropped? What services need revision?
118. This is a new way of thinking for me but I do like it. We should publicize these!
119. I think the 8 services should be reduced... 1. Ecclesiastical Supervision of Doctrine and Practice - including interim ministry, vacancies, calling process. This includes also Church Relations. 2. Building Community (communications, publications, church worker conferences, circuit forums, planning conferences) 3. Care for Church Members (Congregations, Pastors, Deacons, Other Professional Workers) 4. Training Church Workers (Pastors and Deacons) 5. Social Ministry. 6.. Financial Services (Pension and Benefits only)
120. I don't think of them as a description of the mission and ministry of LCC, more as a reflection of it. Our mission is primarily sharing the gospel, both the good news of what Christ has done for us, and the sharing of his love. The service organizations are not the mission and ministry of LCC, rather they are our way of carrying that out in our world.
121. I would take this one step further with #2 'Building Community' to include the community around us and that is to love and care for the person in the pew with us and next door to us as Christ loved and cared for each of us.
122. I would be more comfortable in saying that whatever Word is sent out there through these services will be strictly only as originally taught in the Holy Scriptures and by our original teachings in Lutheran Church Missouri Synod.
123. The statement that " The Bible is our only authority for faith and practice " must be at the head of every document od action that we produce and the full wording of the great commission (Matt 28: 18 - 20) must be at the head of every statement of mission that we produce.
124. #8 can be dicey. If these financial services are also the operating budget, they need to be divided out as soon as possible.
125. No. The mission is to reach out to the lost. Period. That is our guiding principle. Mission. Ministry.

126. Can't remember what they were.
127. Somewhat agree
128. No -- I believe they are incomplete and only take in the national LCC point of view
129. I really do not know what you are planning.
130. I was left with the impression that this was some kind of summary of Article 3 of the synod constitution, but looking at it, that is not the case. Those are better stated than the 8 services description at the beginning of this survey. I would suggest that the restructuring committee examines Article 3 again. Apart from the pension plan, the mission and ministry of LCC is not financial as defined by the CEF and the Foundation. Nor is the mission and ministry of LCC defined by building community. What happened to conserving and defending confessional unity in the true faith? What happened to encouraging congregations to strive for uniformity in practice? Furthermore, what happened to the first objective in Article 3, that is promoting the unity of the faith in the bond of peace? On the other hand, I agree that elementary and secondary schools are a dead issue.
131. I think it would be better to provide a mission statement that guides all of LCC.
132. I would suggest number 7, and to some extent, 2 and 5, would be better off being seen more as the work of local districts/circuits/divisions, strongly encouraged by LCC, but with the feet on the ground being a local responsibility.
133. if I said it makes me all warm and fuzzy, is that what is meant? What does our constitution say? that's what defines us.
134. Requires more thought.
135. There is a noticeable lack of the mention of God in these statements. There is a lack of mention of faith and real purpose. Before you can progress perhaps these priorities should be iterated.
136. While I am comfortable with the 8 services of LCC as listed, they are not necessarily sacrosanct and are open for review from time to time.
137. Perhaps these need to revisited to understand the purpose of congregations and the synod. But not to the detriment of the administrative restructuring.
138. I am comfortable with the first seven.
139. My opinion should be honored.
140. And what where they? Would have been nice if you listed them.
141. Perhaps there needs to be greater emphasis on missions and outreach.
142. This question should have been asked just after the 8 services of LCC were listed.
143. What are the 8 services of LCC?
144. Keep an open mind based on LCC's long term goals and agenda -then evaluate the 8 against the long range plan -without periodic reviews the 8 may or may not become obsolete to our ministry - As Christ says 'you will always have the poor' -- --- but are your reaching your neighbour with HIS Word?
145. Somewhat...with reservation
146. We need all the help we can get to pass the Word of God onward.
147. Even these need to be under discussion - our restructuring needs to go right down to the "ground floor". *Nothing* should be presumed going forward (including the need for LCC to exist as a formal organization at all - I've seen no questions about that).
148. All are important aspects of our role as LCC.
149. The 8 services are fine in themselves--but how are they really administrated? We must rethink what we are doing.

150. I believe the main reason for a Synod is the training and supervision of it's pastors and teachers. This should be the main priority. All the other functions are of secondary importance. If you have good pastors and healthy congregations, all the other functions will follow. Put an emphasis on training and supervising pastors and teachers.
151. Subject to annual review.
152. I do not agree with the Financial services being focused on lending money for personal gain instead of donations to ministry or even lending to the ministries without interest.
153. ?
154. Service of Church growth and service to help to the local parishioner and our communities in family, addiction and spiritual matters could be better. We tend to hide ourselves from these much needed issues.
155. I did not like the vision laid out in preamble and find it not similar to new testament or early church history.
156. They are functions, not mission... We need to start with mission as a church... here is what I believe our mission as congregations is (and the church body needs to support congregations and help us do together what we can't do alone) ... Our mission is to: connect people to God through worship and study of God's Word (Word and Sacrament), connect believers to one another, forming a community of faith, and connect with our broader community through service and witness. 1. Connecting people to God through worship and study of God's Word: a. Worship - meaningful, rich, relevant, celebratory, Bible-centred (people use their Bibles), sacramental, interactive, relational, accessible to all (including visitors), intergenerational, thematically planned b. Bible Study - meaningful, rich, relevant, Biblical and/or Topical (but always going back to the Word), interactive, relational, accessible to all (including visitors), equips for lives of faith, varied in topic and opportunity, a balance of inclusive opportunities and targeting opportunities (favouring inclusive) c. Note: both worship and study build into #2 2. Connecting believers to one another, forming a community of faith: a. Community: caring, grace-filled, invitational, responsive, relational, real, safe b. Recognizing the gifts of the members of the congregation and welcoming, encouraging and facilitating their contribution to the work and mission of the church – always room for more to join! c. Caring for and supporting one another in times of joy and sorrow and struggle d. Fellowship Activities that allow people to interact and share life together (forming a Village of care) e. Joining together in meaningful projects that help/serve others, both in and out of the congregation (linking to #3) 3. Connecting with our broader community through service and witness: a. Joining together as a faith community to serve individuals and other organizations/institutions in the broader community. b. Planning events that meet community needs and build connections and relationships between congregational members and guests, giving opportunities to both share their faith personally and invite others to worship and/or Bible Study (linking to #1)
157. Appears to be a good distribution.
158. Can we ever do enough?
159. I hope and pray LCC will always be above and beyond what can be described
160. That is way too complicated a way to describe the mission of LCC. We should be able to make it much simpler than that so that everyone can understand.
161. woops! I forgot them and can't go back to refresh my memory
162. But we should still craft a mission statement that not only encompasses the 8 services we participate in, but also future services that we take on.

163. I should very much like the LCC to develop these 8 services.
164. I'm wondering about the number of 8?
165. Financial services needs to be abandoned.
166. I have no idea what this question is asking
167. UGH
168. But this is not a blanket endorsement of how we are doing in each area
169. agree with mission statement - how do we make it happen
170. 8. Financial Services concerns me. I believe LCC should Foundation and Pension and Benefits for Pastors and Church Workers but not Church Extension Funds.
171. This implies, without listing them again, that all of us know or care what they are.
172. God's gift of money is not shared equally.
173. The Great Commission needs to be LCC's mission and ministry focus. If it can achieve this through these 8 services, then great. If not, then these should be reviewed.
174. They seem to encompass all the important aspects of mission and ministry for LCC
175. I have a short memory after all the questions so it would help if they were summarized with the question.
176. Outreach/evangelism is minimized under Canadian missions.
177. Could be much firmer on the fact that we exist to make God's name known in every aspect of who we are and what we do. All the rest are just details.
178. LCC should focus on the ministry of word and sacrament; stop trying to pander to all fads
179. We need to start from scratch, including our whole purpose as a Synod.
180. LCC should primarily focus on the ministry of word and sacrament, and all the rest should be pushed to the second place
181. #8, the Financial Services fails miserably! Contract Financial Services out to a capable organization - save $$$, increase integrity and efficiency, removes a hiding place for ineptitude.
182. We need to keep these services before the members of the church, and use them as individual topics of discussion for future planned circuit Forums by the leadership of LCC.
183. I've never heard of interim ministry. I do know about vacancy pastors and called pastors. I'd need to know what that is about before I could answer.
184. It is always good to think. I am also comfortable with the services as stated.
185. I think so. I think the more important decisions come from deciding which of the 8 we occasionally ignore or willfully refuse to support effectively.

60. I am comfortable with thinking of the synodical family as including all the Auxiliaries and Listed Service Organizations which receive contributions from our congregations and their members in order to be a part of the mission and ministry of LCC.

1. On some of the listed services I have info!
2. At this time, I am not quite sure about this.
3. I don't understand.
4. I don't understand.
5. Should be doctrinal, pulpit fellowship to be part. Aiding for outreach wonderful but mission and ministry LCC has to be looked at seriously doctrinally all to God's glory!
6. We are blessed to have such dedicated workers.

7. Lutherwood/LBT/CLWR/LAMP may not teach salvation by grace through faith.
8. Those we know and understand.
9. Even if we are able to continue with Good Samaritan we have a responsibility to the outreach in the community.
10. Telling people they just want life sugar coated shows no help.
11. Not all auxiliaries and organizations believe in grace alone, faith alone, word alone. They use "works" alone. "The reformation rested upon" the 3 principles. See pg. 21 of Lutheranism 101.
12. All except CEF - unless this tangle is solved and people receive all their investments.
13. only if we have a real use of what we understand to be real missions.
14. I am ambivalent toward the auxiliaries and LSOs. They operate outside of the church and do their own thing. In some ways that fists the Congregationalist anarchy of the democratic west. But I can't help feeling it does not contribute to the unity of purpose and walking together as synod.
15. too global without financial accountability.
16. Yes, as long as we all share the same common mission and vision and goals.
17. As above: I wouldn't miss it one bit if all of these groups ceased their independent existence and were brought right into the structure of Synod. I really think that our identity and mission would flourish, if we stopped "out-sourcing" so many of these ministries to independent, struggling, largely unsupervised and uncoordinated groups.
18. I feel that list can be shortened.
19. The Listed Service Organizations have many that are unfamiliar except in certain provinces.
20. With reviews as time changes. Perhaps it is no longer financially viable (or needed). In some cases.
21. This is a meaningless or negative run-on sentence.
22. Yes. We are all Synod and Church together. This is a very biblical understanding of Church to consist of more than merely a congregational understanding of Church.
23. I like the arms of ministry - otherwise we as members can become self centered.
24. What does "comfortable" mean?
25. Everything that does not support ecclesiastical supervision or pastoral training should be seriously considered for elimination or transfer to local congregations.
26. Not all. CREW Ministries, for example, shouldn't be part of the synodical family.
27. Lumped together, I agree. The Auxiliaries I fully agree with. For various LSO's, individually, I'd rate them of varying affinity; nevertheless, I do not know enough of some to really have an opinion. I think it's important that the clear focus of the ministry of the Gospel be the guide for all of them.
28. where is Lutherans for Life??? I thought Synod voted that organization as a listed service organization. If so, this is a big mistake to leave them out - explain???
29. I'm clicking "Disagree" here because it's not precise enough. I do agree that supporting the synodical family is part of the mission and ministry of LCC, but we need to be precise in our terminology. The mission and ministry of LCC (the synod organization) is to do things that support the mission and ministry of local congregations (the church on earth). Let's not confuse these two things.
30. As part of the synodical family they should be considered as part of the restructuring as well.
31. They are part of the synodical family and as such should be considered in the restructuring process as well.

32. Do not know enough about them all.
33. must be clear differences between auxiliary's relationship with lack, much closer, than orgs, much less
34. How does a person in the pew know what's going on in the circuit, district, or synod? We have no information to form an opinion. Questions are stated to confuse a person.
35. But my pastor does not promote any of these missions how sad.
36. Survey not completed. Do the books get audited each year?
37. Not every current Auxiliary and LSO should be a part of LCC's mission and ministry. And, perhaps, some groups that are not LSOs now should be added.
38. This statement is not entirely clear. The last part, "in order to be a part of the mission and ministry of LCC", seems to confuse the statement. Are the Auxiliaries and LSOs a part of the mission and ministry of LCC (the synodical family) because they receive contributions from LCC (or LCC parishes)? Do those contributions constitute their "synodical family" membership? Should they not be a part of the synodical family because we have agreed in convention to walk in partnership with these organizations as they carry out their ministry and mission activities/objectives?
39. Again somewhat as this may need to be evaluated to ensure benefit to each organization.
40. I am not comfortable at this time - but what does this mean. So imprecise.
41. I assumed that they were considered as a part of the synodical family.
42. There could be a review of Auxiliaries and the Listed Service Organizations with respect to their relevance and cost.
43. as above - does this limit our thinking in doing God's Work?
44. I think this should be re-evaluated. I think perhaps some should not receive contributions or should receive less.
45. Again, we should regularly revisit our relationship with the auxiliaries and LSO's.
46. We don't want to spread ourselves too thin but make sure these Organizations really represent our goals and ideals.
47. In most cases they are doing a good job, but some of them can be merged into less categories.
48. excuse me but - what??
49. Nope as I need to be able to review all financial statements of all entities to know that, given the lesson of CEF and DIL. Certainly not, otherwise I have failed as resp. steward to answer this and say yes. Given I can't get the info of even my District financials with many requests for it, doubt that comfort can be obtained. also see #59. Mission and ministry def'n needs to be clarified given CEF and DIL fiasco and their defn.
50. I would be comfortable with a clear communication of whether or not they are actually included and/or their relationship to each other somehow.
51. I like the way it is now, but would be open to changes put forward.
52. These particular organizations have always been a strong support for our missions in various places in the world. We can only hope that instead of diminishing them that we pour more support into these Service Organizations even if they appear to be waxing. It was Christ who gave us the commission of going out into all the world to preach the gospel, even though it might be thru bread and water, bandages, quilts, clothing, and other services that we as a synod still supply. We don't know how the Lord will work in someone's heart to be grateful for such services and come to believe in Christ.

53. As stated above. I agree that all social ministry is a vital part of our church but the can and would function on their own. They do their own fund raising as well.
54. I'm ashamed to admit that I don't know as much about them as I should. I think synodical service organizations and auxiliaries are important. I only hope they are discernibly Lutheran in doctrine and practice. The synod should not be in the business of spreading a generic sort of Christianity.
55. this is a repeat of 59 above
56. Proper administration of the funds and activities needs to be monitored carefully
57. Needs careful evaluation of each Auxiliary and LSO to ensure value and no needless duplication.
58. Agree, more or less, except if you're thinking about the whole synodical family at the same time as contemplating restructuring of LCC, the results are apt to be somewhat unfocused.
59. Agree - if you remove Lutherwood from the list
60. General comments A NEW FINANCIAL GOLD FUND RBG INTERNATIONAL gold platinum silver fund outside the Banking System for actual bullion so when banks implode money is protected and raise $ 100 million to repay lost investors 3 years ago Contact London investment groups that are using the strategy quickly before the banks legally take bank cash like they are doing in Greece and Harper acknowledged the Canadian govt will not bail the banks out when they need you cash
61. This question is confusing and not written well. I take it to be asking if I consider all auxiliaries and LSOs as members of the synodical family and that they contribute to the mission and ministry of the LCC. I do believe this to be true. I do not think that these organisations should fall under direct control of Synod.
62. Auxiliaries and listed service organizations are external entities. And while some of them may have originated through the efforts of Lutherans, it is not an exhaustive list of the wonderful organizations that do ministry in similar capacities. So I see LCC as endorsing these organizations but they are not the ministry of LCC.
63. Thank you for your willingness to serve and my prayers are for wisdom and success in your undertaking.
64. No, some of them I am not comfortable with. I think they should all be re-examined.
65. The Auxiliaries are not a problem as they can be merged and nationalized. Some of the Listed Service Organizations are regional-based priorities of service that have been developed by a region specific to a need identified within their region. The continuation of any or all of these need to be put on the table and negotiated within a national budget. If a service is deemed to not fit the agenda and budget of the overall National Synod, then it will need to be addressed by a regional synod within the National for funding by that region, over and above its national obligations. Same thing as contributions to the Federal Government for some items and Provincial Governments for other items. Local congregations have to work with their own budgets and although they will have commitments to the National Synod, they can also have commitments to their Regional Synod or local service as they chose. They are responsible for developing their own budgets based on their own resources.
66. Couldn't find any information on Philoxenia Hospitality Ministry.
67. Detailed review and update may be useful at this time.
68. Not part of synod admin or voting
69. However, I don't know what this has to do with restructuring.
70. I can think of these agencies as service providers for LCC.

71. Some of the non-church organizations stray from teaching that Jesus Christ is our only Saviour from sin. Treating drug addicts and building retirement communities are better handled by other agencies.
72. I am comfortable of thinking of the district family in the same fashion.
73. I am basically comfortable with this but as I said earlier, I don't know what all of these are. I wonder if they should be listed if they are extremely local in service. Then again maybe that is a good thing.
74. Don't know enough about them but looking at the list I don't think some are needed at all.
75. No. The listed service organization are not well known.
76. I hesitate to give an answer. This question seems random.
77. -not sure about all services.
78. Approval of all service organizations should overseen by Synod and that it is properly administered by board or organization in charge
79. Cut the 'family' line, if you will - especially in your heading "Synod is a Family Walking Together". 'Synod' means 'walking together'. That's close enough - no need to schmooze.
80. Somehow these last two questions appear to be self-serving on behalf of the people who put the survey together.
81. as long as they keep and fulfill their agreed upon and recognized role
82. While the LSO's are supported by members out of Love for the Lord and the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, they are not considered "auxiliaries" for specific Biblical reasons which affect our fellowship status. We need only consider the current situation at Concordia University College in Edmonton to witness the sad result of neglecting this important fellowship distinction. That being said, 8 of the LSO's have received my financial support. Still I am not comfortable in thinking of each LSO (and ALL the individuals who comprise them) as our synodical family. This deeply saddens me.
83. Providing we get more understandable information.
84. I am comfortable abandoning this model if that is in the best interest of proclaiming Christ.
85. Perhaps there are too many.
86. These entities are what they are. Any LCC restructuring cannot restructure them. I see them as valued "cousins"--close but not essential to the mission of LCC.
87. The value of these organizations should be regularly reviewed. How many Baptisms do these ministries produce?
88. I know that the auxiliaries and LSO's receive some contribution from LCC, and also are expected to self-fund. This is reasonable.
89. My congregation could form some opinion, pro or con, concerning these organizations were we supplied with information in a language we could read.
90. Particularly LAMP and CLWR, which do some very good work, but are joint efforts with non-LCC Lutherans that can lead to conflicts.
91. I think this question muddies the issue... they are all independent organizations from us... yes, we partner with them... but it has nothing to do with the task at hand which is reforming synod.
92. I would have appreciated more of a financial breakdown as to where the allocation of resources comes from and what it exactly goes to.
93. No accountability or transparency of the financial records of these organizations - why do we need to support them all? It dilutes our efforts and we overlap with so many other service organizations who receive government funding (i.e., taxpayer money) already

94. See my response to question #54. The number of LSO's needs to be reduced.
95. I was not even aware of most of them and am a member of 40+ years. I may have heard some of the names before but I don't know what they do. If they are not viable or if they are not explicitly Lutheran I don't think they should be included. Many of these organizations have changed in scope since they were first started. We need to re-examine if what they are currently doing is in line with our theology.
96. Again, it is unfair to lump all together. Each are unique and have unique pros and cons.
97. Please simplify this question.
98. We must set priorities when things get tough and I see it soon.
99. Perhaps we don't have the member numbers to support all of these since we are shrinking.
100. Fewer people are attending our churches and becoming part of our congregations - we need a strong focus on Outreach - any group that can help us is vital.
101. this is really awkwardly worded so I don't know how to answer - I read this through several times and I'm still confused
102. Too few in the church actually know the work of the mission and ministry. Also few understand where money goes and why, there seems to be a reluctance to speak openly among Pastors and members
103. except for Wagner Hills Farms.
104. As long as they, like congregations, are willing to be subject to ecclesiastical supervision in areas of doctrine and practice.
105. However, my "comfort with thinking of" them needs to be based on financial accountability regarding the funds provided by LCC.
106. Overkill!!
107. If I remember Concordia of Edmonton might be in there but everything else is ok
108. I do get a little concerned that some groups may never be able to stand on their own two feet. However, I am prepared to support them in their efforts knowing that this is a possibility.
109. Synod is the churches and auxiliaries are just that, auxiliaries.
110. I wish things were more decentralized and localized.
111. We should be adding more service organizations to the list as creative forms of outreach.
112. Many of the organizations listed, such as Wagner Hills Farms, Malabar Mission Society, Bethany Pioneer Village, are unknown to me. As a result, I do not know if they add value to LCC.
113. Expand the list
114. ...with the possible exception of some of the listed service organizations about which I know little or nothing.
115. Why does my comfort level matter? Sure, be listed as part of the family. Does it help any of us accomplish the goal of reaching the lost? The answer to that question will tell you whether they should be listed or not.
116. not sure what the question is getting at.
117. As a woman I don't feel I have the right to decisions such as this but I have made a few choices in the survey and hope I haven't overstepped the mark set out in the Bible. Trust God, ask "What would the Master say?", and spread the Gospel!
118. What is this question asking?
119. Why not? If they were to subscribe to the confessions, they should be given full status as members of the Synod and a vote at conventions.
120. Some of these may have to be discontinued.

121. While I think it's helpful to recognize in some manner organizations that spring up apart from the synod and who seek to help her achieve her objectives in a particular area, I do not that that they are essential to the mission and ministry of LCC.
122. Don't know what's behind this question, in light of questions 53 and 54. Is there an intent to limit any autonomy on the part of auxiliaries and LSO's and make them simply fund-raising departments of the synod?
123. What if congregations wish to change, add or delete in time this list?
124. Some of the LSOs are too far removed from LCC's values and mission.
125. now that makes me feel icky inside so ....
126. This question doesn't make sense to me.
127. For some, for sure, many I do, and some I definitely do not!
128. Hmmmm, not sure how I feel about this.
129. I was not aware of all these services. I do not know of their value.
130. not familiar with all of the organizations listed or the scope of their ministry
131. The valued organizations seem to be doing things that the synod should be doing, but can't because of lack of funds or administrative will. As a unified synod, we need to examine these and incorporate those that fit with the vision of the synod, to avoid duplicated use of resources. The other ones should be scrapped.
132. I think an assessment of the strategic value of the Auxiliaries and LSOs need to be conducted, and perhaps some need to lose their status with LCC.
133. Everyone needs some financial support.
134. Not sure about some of the LSOs. Nothing against any of them but how are they, especially some of them, part of the "strategic" plan for carrying out the synod's service to the church? Some of them are no doubt worthwhile "special projects" but that's not the same as being part of a strategic mission plan.
135. I would expect that many who fill out this survey are not well enough informed (perhaps misinformed) on the working aspects of our church in order to render opinions that will be helpful and/or useful to the CCMS in its quest to restructure LCC. Most likely have not considered the need for a restructuring to occur. Several hours of time are required to complete the survey in a manner that will hopefully prove helpful to the CCMS.
136. to me this statement makes no sense
137. same
138. The mission needs a big re-think.
139. While these are valuable organizations, it all goes back to the purpose of LCC in the first place. Until we answer that, I'm not sure about whether they should all be considered part of the "family".
140. The Auxiliaries and Listed Service Organizations provide an important role in bringing Jesus to all.
141. Not comfortable. We have forgotten what our mission and purpose is. Has self service and glory for ourselves, (wow we are LCC) become more important than being servants and spreading the word of God and Jesus are our Savior to all nations.
142. This is the only way we can reach out beyond ourselves.
143. I am unfamiliar with some of them so cannot adequately answer this.
144. It might be better if each organization received it funding from individuals. It would move away from the attitude of "there, I gave my dollar".
145. Too many exist and some are no longer needed or dilute the focus of the church.

146. this is a loaded question. I am not sure what we are getting at. I wish I had some context. why wouldn't someone be comfortable with this? and if they aren't, I assume they would have a good reason and I would like to know it. many of the easy questions of this survey seem to raise that same question in my mind.
147. In a broad way, but not in a narrow way.
148. All/some require review. Do they serve the purpose and goal they were set up to accomplish?
149. Although on the other hand I wouldn't know if you are leaving anything out.
150. By this time, I have forgotten exactly which ones they were.
151. Because we were not totally aware of them.
152. If in agreement with LCC doctrine and practice, yes
153. I am not well versed on all of the service organizations.
154. These are important pieces of LCC.
155. I'm not sure where this question is going?
156. A priority of which groups receive funding should be made and monies allocated as such. There may be cases in which some groups may not be deemed viable if funds are not available.
157. Let them sink or swim on their own. If they cannot support themselves, then they aren't generating the interest needed for their mission and are likely not serving the needs of their communities
158. Their work should be harmonized with synod's.
159. UGH
160. The Concordia Mission Society takes away from the Synod being responsible how our mission contributions are used. It takes away from one entity being responsible for LCC missions. CMS should cease to exist.
161. It gives a wonderful opportunity to congregations with a special love to act.
162. I am hesitant to say since I have little personal experience with many of these
163. Why is CLWR at the end of the list?
164. I think an evaluation of these auxiliaries and service organizations should be done from time to time, to ensure they still are a value to LCC and are not in contradiction with our doctrine.
165. This implies, without listing them again, that all of us know or care what they are.
166. As long as these auxiliaries and listed service organizations adhere to the doctrine of our church.
167. Let Districts support their own missions when closer can use time and talents and money.
168. Luke warm on this one because some of listed organizations work with churches that we are not in fellowship with, and thus thinking of them as part of the synodical family is challenging.
169. I do already
170. Family is a good term, because it doesn't imply good or bad or healthy or dysfunctional. Church or ecclesia on the other hand is clearly those called into a living relationship by their Lord.
171. As long as they proclaim HIS name.
172. Annual audits for all units in the Districts Synod needs to review to ensure financial control exists This financial control responsibility of Synod needs to be added at least as a complimentary stewardship service

173. The Christian Church is growing immensely in the third world and this is where these organizations are active. I do not have faith that our Church fathers can halt the decline here in LCC. I fear they are more likely to take a " Luther stance " of "here I stand, I can do no other."
174. I am unfamiliar with all of the LSOs, so I am not sure.

Section 8: General Comments

Please use this section to add any thoughts and insights that may not have been covered in the survey or any extended comments to any of the 60 survey statements where you have additional thoughts.

1. Why did no one at district level had the will or power or courage to pull the brake. You want membership and church grow... but I belong to a congregation which district went into insolvency - what do you expect. And then I hear from board members it did happen like the TITANIC, NO signs where up for a long time and with "ignorance" the Board went along. Did not Christ, he himself cleansed the temple court---.
2. Though I think I have made my personal thoughts rather clear on most subjects herein, I must say that I was sorely disappointed that not once was scripture noted to explain, the confessions were never cited to clarify nor was Jesus Christ ever, even mentioned in any of these questions. Whose synod is this? Whose ministry are we doing? Whose example should we be looking to? Please spend more time in the word of God and in the confessions and less time in the "non profit organization structures" section of chapters.
3. At the beginning there should have been a detailed explanation on why a restructuring of the whole LCC is seemingly needed. The survey questions were compiled in haste and some do not make sense. If you rush something like this it is senseless and will lead to problems so what if there is no finished, detailed plan for the 2017 convention?! Then postpone it! Who cares! It has to be done right!!!
4. I am very glad restructuring is happening and I hope and pray that God grants wisdom to those making decisions. Thank you for allowing LCC members to have a voice! This should happen more often!
5. Pray for God's guidance in this matter.
6. I find it too bad that all congregations were given an update on this from our pastors or delegate or circuit counsellors. Just found out Feb 24 2016.
7. Not unhappy with things. Been an elder for many years. Just not familiar with the synod, district, congregation structure and responsibilities.
8. In the past 28 years we have had a lack of communication in all levels of districts and synod and congregations including committees and services.
9. Although the "glossary" was helpful, still a lot of info and not always useful for answering questions. - When the survey discussed at our church - many members unaware of the boards etc. so difficult for them to have views. - I think it would have been helpful to have structure LCC as is listed in a diagram/table; Most members have never been to a convention district or national; What they are most concerned about is their local parish; outreach to the community. If you want people to be involved, they truly need to know what their options are; why the change?? what will it look like. Bigger is not always better; Jesus was always up close and personal, let us not lose that!! Our focus must always be "Jesus centred" He has done it all for us; let us not lose sight of that!! To God be the Glory!!
10. I'd like to see more use of lay people - 1/2 time pastors (working pastors) affordable to small congregations - keep then current (in touch with working people). Pastors training should (must) include shepherding not Greek, Hebrew preachers only. Nearly everyone I talk to here or other congregations lament that pastors don't visit like the "old time" ones did. There was a time when congregations knew each other. Now they do their thing - we do ours. We

haven't get a clue as to their needs strengths. Yes, its our fault too but we really haven't gotten much encouragement. We could benefit from observing Mennonite and Outreach Reformed denominations. They seem to have kept up with the times but not sacrificed their doctrine. They have modernized their delivery and services. I'm proud to be a Lutheran Christian but for sometime we are "slipping" because (I think) we haven't kept up with changes. Good thing 0 the PAT where lay people are given training. This could be simplified and used in rural areas especially if we have working pastors. This sounds mean but its not meant to be. Most pastors are under worked - many are burdened with countless meetings and sermons rather than service, visiting, volunteering, counseling etc.

11. I would have liked to have questions on our Missions in the world. I strongly support them. It is key to the life of the church to have strong mission support. CEF in ABC district has shaken the church greatly. I seem to be asked every week about it. There are not any happy campers out there.
12. As I mentioned at the beginning a lot of information that comes is not of interest to many members of our congregation. Only a very few had money in the CEF. Most would still not know what the CEF is/was. Very few of our members use computers, as most are elderly. We're hoping for a revitalization of our impact of the community - that will take time. Right now it's mainly seniors, few families with children. Thanks!
13. Restructure job descriptions for Synod and District personnel. Give more authority to Dist. Presidents.
14. Thank you for asking me! I care a great deal about LCC, our present situation, our necessary change and our growth.
15. One Synod. No districts. Multiple zones. If we retain "districts" will retain separate "empires".
16. There needs to be some changes made in the overall synodical process, so that issues like the CEF in the ABC district, is over seen by all areas of LCC and not just the single district.
17. This has nothing to do with the survey but I wish we had continued our traditional hymns with the same wording as long ago - so much comfort in the old ways and words.
18. I believe all Lutheran churches should join together. Our numbers are dropping fast (I'm referring to Ohio, Missouri, etc.)
19. Joining the districts as one should have been done 35 years ago. BC and Alta. need their fingers slapped. Make it all one and get on with it. Our synod needs a complete overhaul.
20. I wish we could build bridges than differences. I like that the new ministers out of seminary hold firm to the bible's teachings. I sure do wish we could leave the taking of communion to those other Christians who are not of our faith. It makes me feel that we think we are the only denomination who know the truth.
21. This survey was barely mentioned in our announcements. There was really no attempt by our pastor to distribute it and it wouldn't have been mentioned in church services if someone had not spoken up. Perhaps it doesn't matter much, it’s quite complicated, and was not really made for us uninformed people. We rarely hear anything about LCC or our District. Where is a copy of the Synodical Handbook 2014? Is there a breakdown of how all these monies are spent in each of the auxiliaries and organizations? I think we need to know.
22. We need to get rid of the St. Catherines Seminary before it destroys the whole East District. Lay people need more say in the operation of the Church. Pastors focus on the spiritual needs of the Church.

23. In completing this survey, I find I'm very ignorant of the policing of the church and its doings. More information should be given to the congregations to complete this survey truthfully.
24. Communion should be open to everyone!
25. May God's will be done as we grow stronger in numbers and faith in Him.
26. I am not able to write in words so I have not done so. I know there needs to be a change to strengthen and renew the LCC.
27. Some of the questions were very hard to comprehend and may be more than most lay people like me to understand and make a viable decision.
28. You have overstepped your bounds in this survey, you asked leading questions, repeated questions, you asked questions to which convention has already voted which has no bearing on restructuring. The Bible clearly states how the church is to be run, social ministry is not part of Word and Sacrament. We should go back to what Jesus himself said to do. While social ministry is good, it is not church ministry. Clothing and feeding someone today does not give them everlasting life. LCC's focus should be found in the Bible and the book of Concord, not what the Devil, world and our sinful selves think we should focus on.
29. Interesting timing for this restructuring process. 2017 will be 500th Anniversary of the Reformation! Maybe its time to take Reformation to another level!! God is now providing us with vast tools and opportunity for change and growth!!
30. I could not answer all the questions however there is one or two comments of mine: The LCC needs to open the doors to bring more people with families to attend our church. Closed communion has divided many families. All believers whether Lutheran or another Bible teaching congregation should not be denied communion. As it is now people - families go to another Church (e.g. Easter) to commune together.
31. Do Lutherans believe that children are a gift/heritage from the Lord? Do they believe that it is God that opens and closes the womb? Do they trust that God provides for them? Does it matter? Are Lutherans teaching their children God's Word at home or are their kids filling their minds with the television shows of this crooked and twisted generation? Are they neglecting to meet together as is the habit of some in favour of hockey practice? Does it matter?
32. Elderly, humble immigrant Lutherans who invested all their savings, don't use computer, and are forced to use others to share their ideas. We have not gotten the expanse of info from LCC that others have, because we don't use computer. Yet our funds were taken to use for things we don’t believe in and have resulted in the CEF crisis. VERY UPSET< NO COUNSEL TO DEAL WITH OUR LOSS AND our PAIN. Will be dead by time you deal with restructuring.
33. Lord have mercy on us and our beloved Synod. May the Lord be with you.
34. I am very upset., that we are forced to use computers to communicate and receive info vs. getting exactly what others get on computers to the ones who can’t use computers like me. We are the ones who built, saved and still mostly fund our churches. Yet our needs are not met and we are discounted, ignored when we ask for communications that others say go get help with a computer from someone. VERY BIG ISSUE> do I say go to someone who has a computer to fund us?
35. I am praying that this results in a stronger LCC ...
36. It is even more clear to me now that there is a lot of information that I am not aware of, and that I could benefit from a clearer way to receive this information about the synod and its

workings. I feel that the best way to be sure that congregations have access to an explanation of these operations is to require more of the congregations. As in many things now, it's too easy to 'pass the buck' to the lay delegate in our circuit - an individual who most of us have not even met. I apologize if my answers are not much help, but I cannot agree or disagree with a statement that I do not understand the impact of.

37. As LCC downsizes, it is important to revisit our structure and how it helps or hinders our mission. I do believe there are more pressing issues that were not captured in the survey. DPs should be pastors serving a congregation, as District offices are expensive and IMO inefficient. Finally, no structure will help if we lose our purpose, to bring God's means of grace to a dying world. We need to catechize our people, beginning with our pastors, or we will become endangered species in Canada.
38. My beloved LCC and her districts and this whole process are in my prayers and the prayers of my congregation.
39. I wonder why non-members have been invited to participate in a survey of such importance and scope, especially considering the insights required in a task so specific in principles and execution. I believe it is inappropriate at best, and hazardous at worst.
40. We are too rigid. That's not to say we should veer from our Scriptural teaching; but we are not relevant in today's society. I know there are many who appreciate a liturgical service (I don't mind it, although there are times it can be a little much...); however, I know many (many!!) people who have decided to find other denominations that pray more openly (not via the already printed prayers), serve one another (without being on a Commission to do so), are involved in big issues that are affecting us as Christians, and are on fire for the LORD. We are in desperate need of practical teaching. We're missing the mark. The Catholic church speaks out on issues and are in the news; we are silent- other than in the Canadian Lutheran or LCC Digest. I am a lifelong Lutheran and am looking for more. We need to learn what we believe and stand firm on this!!! We need to be a voice in Canada- not just in our publications, but in the media. We need to know that our Synod and Districts are one with their Catholic/Baptist/Anglican brothers and sisters. Pastor Bugbee is a phenomenal (and godly) man, and I feel incredibly blessed to have him as our president. I don't want (only him) to be held responsible for something we should all be doing; but we do need to be a larger voice on issues. In Alberta, Bishop Fred Henry speaks out on major issues; our District is silent (other than in publications or emails). Let's be a voice for the LORD!! I am trying to be proactive by contacting government officials on different matters; but the church as a whole, is silent. I feel alone in dealing with issues; especially when I have to go to Bishop Henry with concerns. Please... let's be relevant and deal with practical issues head on!
41. I do not think that the service organizations listed should be a part of the structure of the LCC. They are organizations unto themselves and need be supported outside the structure of LCC. I am not familiar with the structure of CLWR but it should also be an individual entity and as I understand it run by ELCIC and LCC.
42. Our Synod seems to pride itself with the fact that the majority of our churches are served by graduates of our Canadian Seminaries. This fact is more problematic than a blessing as these men (especially graduates of St. Catharines) who graduate with a "High Church" "Catholic", "ceremonial" approach to ministry... with little or NO feeling for outreach. Therefore, close the above mentioned seminary!!!... and if this does not happen, then start graduating more "real Pastors" and not just preachers.

43. Things are working, don't change them.
44. Thank you for this opportunity.
45. I am very disappointed in what LCC has allowed to have happened in the CEF situation in the B.C. ALTA district.
46. I feel this survey is dedicated to pastors and more educated members. Most lay people myself included do not have the knowledge to answer well. We pray things will work out to God's glory - that is our main goal!! We need some very strong, educated people in charge!!!
47. Most lay people do not understand the relationship and obligations of the "District" and "Synod" elected officials.
48. To spread the Gospel (the Great Commission) throughout the world - is my prayer for LCC - in loving ways... may our Lord Jesus be exalted.
49. Open questions could have been better. Also-initial statements weren't always clear relating to the questions which followed.
50. Please look at already existing ecclesiastical and biblical models of church governance such as the SELK, Germany and the Confessional Mission Provences in Scandinavia. Please avoid any business model types of church governance that use buzz words like "strategic plan", etc.
51. Most members of a congregation are not concerned with District or Synodical business. They just want things to run smoothly.
52. Seems many pastors are caught up in liturgical practises including chanting to the extreme. When many appreciate a quieter and sincere repeating carefully chosen words - statements - from our hymn book.
53. The restructuring of LCC is fraught with the problems of theology, polity, and culture; and that’s only the factors that are complimentary to the church’s continued existence! The preponderance of ethnicity has been broken by the membership of most congregations but a certain leaning in favour of Teutonic attitudes and approaches to cultural perspective persistently reappears in publications, in decision-making, and in pot-lucks at congregational meetings; outside the synod, onlookers still refer to the church body as the German “misery-synod.” The LCC is no longer, if it was ever hoped to be, seen as a joyful fountain of refreshing absolution. The Lutheran wars of the 50s & 60s contribute a major impact to the directions LCC has taken and continue to impact the culture of the synod. LCC was born in the smouldering ashes of that American religious tragedy. Repeated ambivalence, apathy, or just plain purposeful ignorance about the destruction of the Synod in the seventies has allowed the attitudes of politics and theological inquisition to continue making a negative contribution to LCC as well. The disenfranchisement from the Synod, even from the Christian church began in the fifties as sporadic or mild discontent with LCMS, at least as it was evident in western Canada. The foment of youth in the American sixties spilled into Canada within years as the opportunity to escape from parental control and join the secularizing culture of seventies Canada. Already in the late 60s youth were showing tiredness with the repeated calls for social action. Maybe unique to Canada and the quick growth of the apathy was the state sanctioned roles of the Roman Catholic, the Anglican, and the United churches. The American dream of a peaceable kingdom was interrupted in Canada by the religious imprimatur of the Queen and her representatives in the Houses of Commons and Senate. Easily until the early 70s and arguably to the present, Canadians viewed their political and religious leaders as divinely inspired and called (albeit justifiably vulnerable to criticisms of laity and unbelievers). The solution to the current debacle in ABC

District leadership and the growing suspicions in leadership in the other districts must be a publicized return to the singularity of the Gospel message. This Synod has advertised repeatedly that it is not a neo-Evangelical Protestant group. It prides itself in the unique stand of solely biblical truth (in spite of its clearly political and rationalistic praxis) but the baggage it willingly inherits from LCMS, from its own past, and by its on-going and current administrative malpractices proclaims to its church people the dissonance between laity and leadership. Given the climate of old-boys network, the publication of suspicion and prohibition, and the retreat from dialogue that is meaningful to the disenfranchised laity, pole have sought other institutions to heal their wounds, gather-in profound life directions, or encounter rejuvenating emotional or charismatic energy poured out upon them by the Holy Spirit. A proposal for re-structure: LCC and its mother synod, LCMS, were able to build a powerful confessional (previously orthodox) body of believers by their unwavering assent to the scriptural predominance of their adherence to the Lutheran Confession, i.e., the Book of Concord, and the stalwart confessions of their ancestors who also confessed its truths. That power has repeatedly been obfuscated by abrasive or misguided personalities of leaders who unknowingly or sometimes wickedly chose the paths of the Synod and its congregations. The power placed by the convention in the hands of its Presidents had not served LCMS or LCC well too many times. Something along the lines of a republican system in place would serve better to provide the triumvirate style of balance of power (yes, even in a Christian organization) to the Presidency, the College of pastors, and the membership of congregations. Three autonomous leaders would guide the Synod in its actions, perhaps with an advisory role of the current Council of Presidents. Collectively, the group meeting at convention would hammer out the dissatisfactions that would arise between conventions, presuming that congregationally or clerically proposed motions and overtures are not over enthusiastically vetted. If we want to build a “biblical” body, we can do no more than start a movement; Jesus deliberately rejected the notion of an earthly kingdom for His followers, with good reason! If the Synod wants to be biblical, in that sense, it must realize that we would do better to encourage each of our extant pastors to get out on the road and call followers to accompany them on their roads to the cross. God has ordained that!

54. Two things:1. The seminary situation continues to need to be evaluated. 2. Whatever the structural changes are it is likely important that some local (regional) contact is maintained between synod and congregations. Thanks!
55. I pray that God would bless the work of the Commission on Constitutional Matters. I pray the work they do will ensure we prevent future financial disasters which have had a severe impact on members as individuals and our church body as a whole. I pray that the work of restructure would serve to provide the needed structure to run the LCC at synodical and district levels. I pray that this work would be fruitful in helping LCC congregations in carrying out our Mission given by God "to make disciples of all nations". Amen.
56. I don't know who sends out the Canadian Lutheran but our congregation receives more than they need - they just end up in the recycle. Reduce costs by having congregations choose how many they want to receive.
57. The foundation of the Christian Church is the confession of Christ Jesus as Lord. The basic structure of the Christian Church is found in God's Word - Christ the head, Christians the body. This survey was too detailed for many people with the knowledge of many in LCC as to the working of the current structure. It is a difficult task that needs the working of the Holy Spirit in God's Word, not apart from God's Word. 1 Corinthians 12: 12-31

58. S/B more focused on being a spiritual ministry vs a social ministry in nature and use of resources.
59. in my opinion each pastor and congregation should not be in competition with each other - we are a Bible based church therefore we should be in the Word - keep our eyes and hands on the back door losses - encourage and care for the members we fellowship with - always Pray, Praise, and Give Thanks to our GOD.
60. The average lay person has no idea of how these things affect their individual church. Most people have little or no idea of how the hierarchy of the church works. It was very difficult to answer some of these questions.
61. Thank you for this survey. It is very helpful in terms of thinking through some of the issues that we will face in restructuring. May God bless and guide those who are leading the restructuring process and may their work be a
62. It is of my opinion that our faith will, at best, be facing apathy and at worst outright hostility in the days ahead. Gone are the days where North America unified in Christian brotherhood and each and every one of us must be prepared for the struggles ahead. Militant Islam will show us no quarter, and continues to spread in formerly Christian lands, so we must always be strengthening ourselves, spreading our message, and defending our own.
63. I think this survey should have been done by Pastors only as they are so much more knowledgeable.
64. I think the survey could have been constructed better. In many ways I think the average lay person like me does not have a clear understanding of the current workings of synod and the districts. This in itself is a testament of poor communication. The fault does not lay specifically with synod or district as it is also the responsibility of the lay person to learn however I think as a result, some of the questions were way to vague to provide any useful feedback.
65. From a lay point of view, I heard others saying there's so much they really don't have an inkling about. So much of the survey seemed to be focused like a microscope on our own small world, rather than on the broader world and challenges and opportunities before us as the body of Christ addressing the needs in this world. What new ministry thrusts / ideas might be brought forward? What priorities of need are our people ready to undertake, and feel called to address? -- I pray for the Lord's blessing and guidance in this process, that He open our minds and hearts with renewed clarity for a structure that supports and focuses more of us in the ministry we have together in Christ.
66. LCC and LCMS for that matter are headed for the wrong direction. If we all call ourselves believers, then we ALL need to act on what we say we believe not just say it. With so many problems with various churches and pastors what has been done? NOTHING! Too many pastors and presidents are turning a blind eye. You know there are problems but it's easier to just do nothing than to do what is right. Can you call yourself a believer as a pastor or a president or a parishioner when you sit idly by and do and say nothing? Are these just paid jobs like any other or are they divine? We are definitely headed for a 21st century reformation the way our synod is going!
67. My greatest hope for the restructuring is for our church to root out its corrupt elements, make recompense to those who have been hurt by the CEF fiasco, and to care for the pastors, deacons, and laypeople whose congregations have been and will be affected. I hope the restructuring burns the chaff and keeps the wheat. No matter what form synod takes in the

future, let's protect those who have been victim to the unethical actions of others and move forward with unity and repentance.

68. REPENTANCE: As Pres. Bugbee beautifully wrote in a recent Canadian Lutheran article, we as a church have forgotten how to repent. I fear that our pastors and district officials have lost their way on this too. When we screw up, we need to be humble, confess our sins, and acknowledge the real hurt that we can cause each other. When people you've wounded stand before you, it is wrong to say in a generic way "oh yes, my sins are nailed to the cross," while still not apologizing for real hurts you've done to them. It is a further injury to then demand complete forgiveness from those you've wronged, as if your generic acknowledgement of sin entitles you to it. I have been on the receiving end of such treatment from some clergy. And, based on what I've learned so far from the ABC debacle, I think such behaviour has been happening there also. This kind of action grieves the church. In order for LCC to heal, there must be real confession and absolution. May God bring us this restoration that we need. WHAT IS THE CHURCH? WHAT IS THE HOLY MINISTRY? LCC suffers from imprecise terminology; people sometimes are walking around with completely different understandings to the same words. This may seem like a petty thing to bring up in a survey, but I believe it actually is at the root of many conflicts in our synod. What is the office of the Holy Ministry? What is the role of a deacon, and what is their relation to a pastor? What is "ministry"? (Some people say that some activities should be considered "ministry" while others do not.) What is the Divine Service? I think we need to do some study on these matters as a church. Let's hammer these things out, and get everyone on the same page. OTHER THOUGHTS I am very thankful for the faithful service of Pres. Rev. Bugbee to our synod. I am also thankful for the many faithful pastors of our church who are servants for Jesus' sake. God help us all in these days! Thank you for your time and attention.
69. I answered "no opinion" to many of these questions because I lack the competency and/or experience to give an opinion. This is a badly designed survey.
70. Administration of payroll functions for individual congregations could be handled by district offices so as to relieve some acute shortages of volunteers. 2. Better retention of graduated confirmands to be followers of Christ and remain in church.
71. I find it strange that LWML is also wanting to basically the same thing...i.e. take things out of the hands of Zones/Districts and give it all to National. Food for thought!!!
72. It's time for duplication of services to end & for the church to look at ways to bring in new members. Our hymnals are outdated (it was a step backward with the new hymnals) & there is no attempt to step into the 21st century with the type of service that is currently being used. We're still singing hymns that are over 500 years old. Where are the new worship songs or is no one writing any? LCC is so stuck in liturgical dogma that there is no progress with moving forward & connecting with young people. There needs to be social media involved & that isn't happening in our area. We are close to having to close our doors due to the CEF collapse & will be looking at selling the church building in a year's time. Maybe it was a good thing that the CEF collapsed because it has made us look at what we are doing & I don't feel we're providing a meaningful service in the community.
73. Please accept my prayers for support of your restructuring efforts. Godspeed.
74. I had a very hard time comprehending the question because I lack the knowledge in knowing the history behind each of the questions asked. For me this survey was a waste of time. Sorry.

75. you have not addressed the role of women in the church - as a "kid" - women were to be seen and silent. they gradually were allowed to vote at the congregational level and then to be chair of a congratulation. there are FAR more women than men attending service, bringing children to church and serving at various levels of the church life. it is time to have EQUITY of women and men - ordain women. embrace the new realities of the world and introduce IT within the service, create upbeat, energetic, enthusiastic and loving leaders within our church. make it a place where people WANT to be rather than a place they "should be" my God is a joyful Lord - has created magnificent things that should be marveled and has forgiven my sins - we should be glad and rejoice!
76. abc district needs to dissolved, this should have happened already, its continuation is an affront to many faithful members of LCC in district
77. Please keep in mind that we are all members of the priesthood, with pastors answering a special call to serve congregations. Presidents, pastors, lay people are all equal in the eyes of God. Those with greater responsibility do require greater authority, but you must remember that this authority does not in any way make someone more divine than anyone else. I will pray for the Lord to grant you guidance when making your decisions regarding these important issues. God bless you.
78. We need to re-look at "the Call". Some Pastors seem to feel that they "work for God" rather than that they work for their Congregation. From a Congregational perspective, this does not work, since the Pastors push back regarding goals and objectives, results, etc. We need to re-visit the Ordination of Women. We need to re-examine Infant Baptism. (The Small Catechism uses "Suffer the little children to come unto Me" in support of Infant Baptism. Perhaps the verse could be used, instead, to support youngsters receiving Holy Communion ... and we could point to the several "Believe and be baptised" verses to suggest that "believing" comes before "baptism"). We need to look anew at our heavy emphasis on "Lutheran" in all our identification. Perhaps "Luther" has become a stumbling block. Several local Congregations (none were formerly Lutheran; most seem to have Mennonite or Baptist or Pentecostal roots) have become non-denominational "Community" Churches, and many are flourishing. We need to have some thoughtful, adult conversation about all of these issues ... and many more, besides. My thanks to you for reading this. God bless!
79. I did not feel adequately knowledgeable about the Lutheran church structure to answer a large portion of the questions. Therefore, I used the "no opinion" answer a lot.
80. More communication between district office and individual congregations whether large or small
81. As a lay person in the pew, I don't feel qualified/informed enough to make some of the important comments wisely. In
82. As a lay person and only a member of a Lutheran Church, I feel that I'm not knowledgeable enough of the functions and responsibilities of synod and district, to be able to make or give a constructive opinion of what is required. What is wrong with what we teach now? Nothing
83. It is of utmost importance that my church is a Bible based loving place for me and by brothers and sisters in Christ to worship and be spiritually fed. It is also important that we have a loving, welcoming, accepting program and are loving, welcoming, accepting environment for members and visitors alike. There have been changes in LCC which give me grave concern and for that reason I felt compelled to participate in this survey. The areas of greatest concern for me are training of pastors, the role of women and most important the stand on Holy Communion. There needs to be a better way to evaluate and train future

pastors. At this point the "finished product" demonstrate more of a 'judge' attitude and little or no SERVANT, SHEPHERD, qualities. Is this because of what they are currently taught or is the character of the people admitted into the program? An even greater concern for me is the exclusionary practice in regards to Holy Communion as well as the role of women in the church. I am not convinced that this is biblical. Holy Communion is the LORD'S Banquet. If he invites, we have no right to refuse. The Bible tells us that each man should examine himself. Only God can judge, so what right does LCC have in excluding even members of other Lutheran Synods. This practise must be stopped. As for women, God created us equal, and Jesus certainly treated women as such. Why does LCC have such a problem with allowing women in leadership roles. Many of our churches and our programs would not survive without our women assuming leadership roles. This exclusionary practice does not create a loving welcoming atmosphere for our visitors who are potential members. I fear that this practice will continue to contribute to the decline in membership and ultimately the destruction/failure of LCC. Encouraging people to produce more children to grow our membership as suggested in a Canadian Lutheran publication, will not correct the problem. Change of attitude and adherence to God's teachings will. LOVE GOD and LOVE THY NEIGHBOUR.

84. This reminds me of UAW-CAW now does not exist because of the lack of clout they had. Maybe we should be looking at rejoining the Missouri Synod again. Also maybe cut down on some relief work in the world till we get our act together.
85. 2 last categories were not completed I feel more information was needed can not give an honest answer when we do not know what was and what changes they would like to see
86. Many of the questions posed were difficult for lay persons to answer, especially for those of us who have not been involved in any governance issues.
87. This survey is really poor, not only in the questions but also you cannot go back once you have left a page. How do you go back and check to make sure all the questions were answered or what if you want to change an answer to a question? I feel this entire process is a waste of time and resources. There are no suggestions for changes only a bunch of questions that I would suggest a good number of people have no idea what you are talking about. I think the three districts should be eliminated and there should be one head office for administration.
88. This survey is not entirely well thought out.
89. I guess a survey is one tool, however, I would hope as members we get much more input, i.e. forums in each circuit, education so I can actually have opinions on my 20+ questions where I answered #3. I feel I can quite representative of an average, church member, many of whom will look at the survey and just not complete it as we are not well enough informed. Thank you for the, attempt to gather info.
90. LCC has done a great job in the past but in all organizations there comes a time when it needs to have a look at itself. It may need to do some restructuring to be more effective in today's world as well as to be fiscally viable. Change is uncomfortable at first as we don't know what the outcome will be but in the end, in this world, change is inevitable.
91. Prayers for you in this challenging project
92. I am not qualified to answer a lot of these questions.
93. Some general concerns arose for me when I first read this questionnaire in preparation to complete it. When I read it again and again I became very concerned with the integrity of this instrument and with any suggestion as to its usefulness. It seems likely that faulty

assumptions were made about "in house" competencies in the creation of this testing instrument. This unfortunate circumstance, it would appear, was in place at the very outset of the formulation of questions, the response options provided, and with the questionnaire preamble to provide helpful and unbiased background. These factors greatly disqualify many of the questions in yielding meaningful, accurate interpretation of respondents' answers. Three major criteria in the preparation and statistical analyses of questionnaire administration are reliability, validity and generalizability - all are lacking to some extent in this questionnaire. Too often questions lack clarity and seem to be trying to impose a quantitative analysis to questions that are qualitative in nature and therefore lacking response precision and meaningful interpretation. Much of this questionnaire is woefully lacking in item construction and it would be a travesty if it were used to play an "important role in shaping the structure of Lutheran Church Canada for the next generation," as mentioned in the test preamble. I appreciate the great need in LCC at this time to assemble meaningful input and data to bring about meaningful and honest change to LCC. But, in fact, use of answers to too many of the questions in this questionnaire would be unwise, particularly if they were used as a basis to formulate policy or structural change. At least in part, this questionnaire also speaks to the general lack of academic rigor in the training of many of our pastors. However, in this regard, it is so gratifying to have LC leaders with the dedication, training and devotion of Pastor Leonardo Neitzel. His commitment and personal and professional ethics is much needed, particularly in these challenging times. It is regrettable that so much time and resources were spent on this poorly constructed questionnaire. True expertise and competence is required, and not assumptions of it residing within what we have. The CEF in the ABC District should have taught us this painful lesson. Many of "us" are increasingly discouraged by such actions and decisions and it is beginning to undermine confidence in LCC. God bless our beloved LCC and may He guide us through this challenging time.

94. Expected a better survey, too short a time to schedule with parishioners. Please let all LCC know the compiled statistical and question results WITH commentaries - something of a word/cloud/cluster.
95. This survey is too long and not exactly for
96. There are general negative comments made in various congregations on "Closed Communion". It contradicts what the Pastor is saying and inviting sinners to come for forgiveness and then excludes them from communing because they are not LCC members. Stigmatized, unfriendly, excluding, judgemental, dominating, powerful, controlling, unforgiving, not included. Contradicts Bible. Closed Communion is a direct contradiction of what the Bible teaches on forgiveness and inclusiveness
97. Because many churches cannot afford deacons is there not some way of sharing them by circuit, or having them as a resource on line by district, for help with planning VBS, Youth events, workshops, etc.
98. Some questions included assume the person answering has information necessary to make their opinion known. Information exchange about the performance of boards of directors (for example) and the relationship between boards and synod is not readily available or commonly known.
99. The introductory information was very helpful. Godspeed to those who analyze or review the results. Any changes to structure should be reviewed with an eye towards the affect on individual members as well as the ability of the administration to carry out its objectives.

100. I have devoted well over an hour in the prayerful preparation of my responses. I leave all in our Lord's hand as the process continues and continue to pray for those who undertake it.
101. Please - no top heavy District or National Offices. That was the demise of ABC District Office. Let’s have information shared with congregation. Congregations were left in limbo, especially when CEF collapsed. Last to know were us.
102. Again I refer to the mess of CEF. The decisions that were made, in my opinion, were not only illegal. But certainly well outside of the original mandate. In any other secular organization, they would probably be sued!!!
103. Do not understand what all the agencies did so difficult to answer all questions. Do not have a good understanding what many of the commissions/departments/orgs in the Synod do so difficult to answer all questions. Perhaps there is more work to be done with communications to members of our congregations.
104. As I have mentioned previously, MANY parts of this survey were near impossible for me to answer as a lay person. I am an individual who grew up in an LCC congregation, attended our University College, have worked with an LCC service organization and express a general interest and knowledge of our Church, yet I feel very unqualified to answer a large portion of this survey. I have no knowledge of the inner-workings of our Church and therefore cannot answer questions regarding such things. I can honestly say that of the members of my congregation, less than 10% would have the knowledge of LCC both at district and synodical levels to answer most of this survey. A final frustration would be the many times that consecutive questions were asked to address the same question, one suggesting agreeing with a particular point, and the other suggesting disagreeing with the same point. If anything, the wording is bound to confuse people and nullify the answers. The survey could be 2/3 this length if these double questions were left out. In light of the restructuring, it is my hope that the focus of our Church remain on spreading the Gospel of Christ. Our church body is small in number, it would be better seeing our money going directly to the work of spreading the Gospel through congregations and missions than being tied up in administrative offices and seminaries that are costing us more than they are putting out.
105. As a lay person although a regular attendee and active in my local church, I really know very little of District and National administration. In this time of shrinking church membership, administration needs to be downsized. I also think that training Deacons is very important to help with the work of The Church as there are few new pastors and many pastors retiring.
106. May God bless the efforts of the commission as the struggle to serve God and the LCC
107. It is my hope and prayer that our Synod will work more closely with each other. I pray that our Synod would focus more strongly on Mission work in Canada.
108. This survey may be well-intended and, to a degree, useful for answering questions of governance and mission but I expect it eludes 90% of church membership.
109. Thank you for this survey but we do need more information to complete and answer all questions!
110. I would like to see a major reform of the LCC governing body. Simply put I would like the Districts to vanish with the entire country being divided up into equal areas, each of those having a Pastor in charge of spiritual leadership. This should be a paid position though probably not full time. It may prove to be a good fit with some Churches that can not afford a full time Pastor but could a half time one. These positions would simply be monitors and exercise control over non Doctrinal matters. Efforts would be made to use technology, i.e.

Skype etc. to squeeze their operating costs to a minimum. These pastors would report to a Bishop or President that would also control everything but Doctrinal issues. Likely this main office would consist of some sub ordinates of some kind with an effort to keep managerial cost to a minimum. All serious matters of Doctrine would be reviewed and ruled upon by the Seminary. It seems to me our educational facility should be the most familiar with proper Doctrine and a council of profs should provide the most accurate and effective solution to tough questions. It also would be beneficial for the Seminary as they would from time to time have real world issues to deal with which they could in turn better prepare new Pastors with. To be honest I see the current system as a waste of resources particularly the District offices/ buildings. This survey is a good start; I hope they go far enough with the changes.

111. Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of this survey and to have input through my opinions.
112. Now that it is March 2, you may want to remove this survey as per your Feb 29 deadline to fill it out.
113. Good luck for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ and what He has entrusted to us. Its highly improbable that true reform will come from within.
114. Regrettably, I lack the knowledge and information, through my own disinterest, to give valid opinions. I trust those who have an understanding of the issues will make the right decisions.
115. Perhaps a little more freedom and less formal worship services to attract younger people while at the same time still preaching to true gospel.
116. My thanks and prayers are with you all.
117. This is a badly designed survey
118. In hoping to receive 2000 plus surveys, it is obvious that you are seeking input, yet perhaps it would have been wiser to start consultations with members of the BOD's of District and Synod and the Circuit Counselors. I have heard a great number of complaints about the survey from my members and other pastors. Traditionally we have strived to equally consider the responses of the laity and those with theological training. I hope that is considered in looking at the demographics of those responding. Further, many of the questions of this survey are so vague that many of the laity wouldn't have enough information available to make an informed response. Lastly, I hope and pray that the governance model is not considered and its author is not engaged as a consultant throughout the process as it may unduly skew the process.
119. We need the presidents of districts and synod to do their job! Too many of them seem to be afraid to speak the truth and stand up for what's right instead of trying to be popular and not offend someone. If we as a synod truly believe what we say we believe we need these leaders to be 100% honest with themselves and be 100% Lutheran! Otherwise maybe there should be another Reformation!!!
120. We need to continue to love each other, forgiving sins knowing there will be consequences for those sins, encouraging each other in the Lord and always to be financially prudent, disclose all expenses, be accountable, and do all for the synod as we would for the Lord.
121. Not sure ordinary members are qualified to answer some of these statements. It seems everyone has endless opinions about everything even though they know nothing about the subject and may actually be the result of ignorance. Opinions can be dangerous to their owners because they can be emotionally charged triggers for dissent, strife, argument, etc. In my opinion, this questionnaire was not a good thing to send to all members. I found myself becoming emotionally charged while working on it.

122. Once again.... a mess has been made, hard earned money given in trust has been lost, because you let ministers make decisions just simply because they are ministers.... stop and begin getting the expertise of laymen who work in these fields and hold the same Christian values.....STOP having an OLD BOYS CLUB
123. Although each member of a congregation may not need to know everything about LCC, I think there should be some kind of information package for those of us interested in how the synod works and performs for our faith
124. I feel that the average lay person doesn't know enough and, or isn't informed enough about many of the questions and so in my opinion, this survey cannot be a very helpful questionnaire.
125. Sadly, church growth is failing. The worldly ways (Satan) have intruded where lifestyle or society dictate. Governments have fallen short. We are becoming a minority. With a Sunday School numbering 85 children in the 1950s and 60's to none in 2016. Apathy on all parts. We are all responsible, God forgive us.
126. not a single mention of music or organists - as church #'s dwindle, no questions on revitalization - right now it feels like every congregation is on its own. It would be great to see big ideas come from the top-down to bring the community back into LCC churches - therefore every church does not have to do all the heavy lifting.
127. We can only go by what we read in the reports given. The average person does not get enough information on the matter. We do not know what the people were thinking that made up this survey.
128. In my world someone who was NOT a member of an LCC congregation was also NOT an active participant in one, so what does this statement actually mean? Just as you would not consider an outsider coming in to tell you how to run your household, I do not wish to have a non LCC member telling LCC or me, how to restructure my Synod. 2. I left many questions unanswered and have to question the integrity of the questions posed to the common layman. If one does not actually know the structure and workings of District and Synod, but has a preconceived idea of what is happening in both cases, how is one to intelligently reply to many of the questions. I'm pretty sure that I am not the only layperson questioning the validity of my answer should I choose to answer many of the questions. 3. Some questions were not clearly stated. My husband and I had different ideas of what was meant!
129. Regarding membership in L.C.C. Should non-members have a say in the Restructuring of L.C.C. P. 2 #1 - not a member but a participant?
130. The main statement at the time of reformation was: Holy Scripture is superior and important at any occasion!
131. My main concern with this survey is that I don't believe the average lay person has enough detailed knowledge of
132. I think this was really worth while and that I was forced to look at what we do under the name of L.C.C. which I have
133. We need to train our pastors to be more focused on mission and outreach; less on chanting. I do NOT mean we need rock-star church services. I like hymns. But we need more simple services like the Service of Prayer and Preaching. We are driving people away by living in the past. I am one of the few adults under 45 in my church. Simplify the services. The Lord's Prayer, the Apostles Creed, the Words of Institution (when there is communion). Prayers that come from the Pastor's heart (as long as they are Biblical, of course.) Less collects. Less chanting. Reading (i.e. speaking) a Psalm is good. One Bible reading is good (the three OT,

Epistle, and Gospel are NOT really necessary; people just zone out and then remember NONE of what was read. Choose the text and read the passage that features this text.) Thank-you.

134. I would like to thank those who have prepared this survey and appreciate the time and effort that they have not only put into it developing but the time also required to perform the analysis. May God continue to shower is good grace on us and pray that His will be done.
135. I wish this survey would have had a better planning committee that chose to help inform people before asking them poorly worded questions that were written by somebody who does not understand our Lutheran church and its structure. Most importantly, Scripture should have been a larger part of this survey and it was not. Let us all pray that God's will be done in all of this and not our own. May this survey help to serve at least some small purpose for the good of the church.
136. I pray that God grants you, and all those involved in deciding the future of LCC, wisdom, patience, and understanding. I pray that you prayerfully go about deciphering, analyzing, and using the information this survey has collected. I ask God that any personal vendettas may be ignored and that business transactions are not the focus; rather, that furthering the Gospel of our Lord is our duty, first and foremost. May God bless us all as we work together to further His church! Amen.
137. I feel the need for "more workers for the harvest field". Thank you for putting this together and looking for feedback. I think there are big differences between the needs of rural and urban congregations/communities no matter what District they are in. Our society is changing so rapidly!! God bless you and thank you for being steadfast in prayer.
138. I would like to know how this survey went. It would be nice to know how many people answered each question...i.e. Agree, No opinion, etc.
139. the survey seems to be based on a model of retaining or slightly adjusting the current structure. I really had hoped the process would start with a clean slate and ask 1.) what is it that we as LCC should be doing? 2.) what would be the best structure and method for achieving that?
140. I feel as a lay person it is very difficult to answer most of these questions, as information is not relayed to the average person in the congregation. Most of us don't really know what is going on at the administrative level. It is difficult to understand.
141. Some questions are difficult to answer as our District office has changed so much in a short time.
142. Some of the questions were repetitive, I suppose to ensure consistent answers. It added to the length of the survey and is not necessary. That said I get the feeling in going through this survey that LCC may be making the problems seem greater than they are. Especially the question re starting all over. Let's just make what we have work better.
143. I pray a heartfelt hope that somehow this matter will be restructured using LAY people with expertise as ABC district asked for. NOT with Pastors with multiple overlapping conflicts. Also pray that this then will be accomplished much faster as the hands will be out of the cookie jar.
144. I pray that the LCC is working within the Lord's Will be Done on Earth as it is in Heaven.
145. The survey questions could have come with a bit better background info relating to a more detailed explanation of our current structure and its problems and successes. A survey at a congregational level would help as well since it would promote discussion and explanation as part of answering the questions. I think our LCC church could do a much better job of its

acceptance of other denominations that are a part of the kingdom and has a lot of work to do within to change some of the views and mindsets we currently have when we are speaking of or viewing other Christians. This is not some sort of corporate Lutheran brand we are a part of. We are all in the Church together & share together the mission to carry the gospel in love, which starts with love for each other. God bless you as you work to improve our church synod.

146. I think it is in appropriate to insist that people take their time to respond to this and discourage them from identifying themselves. Therefore, I am going to share who I am and where I am from as I, for one, feel it is only right and fair for me to do so.
147. I'm sorry that I can't be more helpful but many of the questions seem geared toward somebody with extensive working knowledge of the inner workings of our church. As a lay person, I feel sadness and some anger around the supervision and oversight of CEF management. Yes, an investment fund "failed". It's awful and it's isolated so why are we intent on restructuring our church. Is it just because of CEF or was it happening anyway? I hope it was happening anyway.
148. I would support the ordination of women Pastors in our Synod as it is quite obvious we are in dire need for a younger and more ambitious clergy.
149. The only thing that I can add, is that we should try very hard not to have any duplication of services, or office matters that would waste time and money. As strict as businesses in this world are run, we should try to imitate their efficiency, but not their worldly goals. Perhaps, that might mean incorporating some business men from our congregations as advisers in financial matters and in some instances, organizational matters as well. Shouldn't we try to use all the talents that the Lord has given us in our churches to expedite such matters?
150. We have absolutely no faith in ABC District & B.O.D. They encouraged us to invest our retirement savings in C.E.F. and D.I.L. even when they knew there was a problem where they invested the money. They should be held accountable and why did Synod allow this to continue.
151. I think church members, both men and women, should be encouraged to use their talents during church service by being an usher, reading Scripture, or serving Communion.
152. I have probably said too much but I am now willing to put all questionnaires into the hands of our almighty GOD and may the Wisdom of the HOLY SPIRIT guide the decision makers. Amen.
153. The real question - should we have three districts with administrative staff plus LCC with administrative staff or one LCC and zero districts.
154. It seems to me that a lot of the questions can only be answered intelligently by those who are involved in the areas of concern. I would like to thank all those involved in this structuring process and will keep you in my prayers. Thank you and God bless and guide you in this endeavor.
155. there should have been a pre information seminar for people to learn all about the issues you are asking so we can make more informed decisions
156. I pray that you will have the wisdom to set aside traditions that are no longer useful and retain those that are.
157. There is too much I don't know which makes my contribution negligible or even invalid. I thought I knew the ABC District well until the CEF/DIL matters came up. This could indicate the Districts/Synod are too cumbersome and complicated or they are too remote for

the average layperson to know about them. I agree the structure needs to be simplified but have no idea of how that would work as I have no expertise in this area.

158. We have to do something at the local church level, consolidation, growth, or we as a Christian Community will evaporate into the abyss. The church is the body of people not the structure of the politics. I feel that this survey has nothing to people and everything to with politics.
159. Pastors are to teach, preach, & administer the Sacraments and visit Pastors are not counsellors. Pastors are not CEOs. Pastors have to be accountable to congregations. Nepotism hiring in LCC must stop
160. The LCC is insolvent due to the pension plan liability, due to the composition of the Board of Pensions and BOD which are composed of direct beneficiaries of the pension plan. Congregations will either close their doors or leave the LCC when the magnitude of the pension liability becomes apparent. The current pension plan pays members 2.5X the benefit of the Alberta Teachers, this is outrageous. 2. The current structure of clergy controlling the District and Synod (through the 50% convention voting rights and 50% of all committees and 100% of all executive level positions) is corrupt (e.g. CEF and Pension Plan liability). 3. The primary purpose of District and Synod is to insure that pastors receive excellent compensation from both direct salaries and pension benefits. 4. The LCC is dying due in part to the concentration of power in the clergy. Disenfranchisement of laity is not scriptural and does not agree with the model presented in the Book of Concord. 5. Massive restructuring is required to engage the laity in the church. The new structure should reduce clergy control of conventions to 10% of the votes. 6. The survey is not designed to engage the members of the church since, a.) website does not function, b.) the time to complete the survey is too short (3 weeks) and c.) questions are designed to give the answers that the pastors want (e.g. see the question regarding pension plans, this question makes no mention of the issue of the massive liability that is coming for congregations). This survey appears to me to be a public relations exercise rather than an attempt to determine the views of church members
161. As a 'lay person' my first thoughts when I read this survey were "why ask me" and "I'm the wrong person to ask" since I have so little understanding of the workings of the synod and districts and the other organizations, how they interact, how necessary they are, how efficiently they operate etc. My only comment can be "if it ain't broke don't fix it" but I don't have a clue how it works or if it needs fixing. I would much rather have heard comments or discussions from those who do know (presidents, pastors, deacons etc.) before I expressed any opinions and it should be obvious that's the reason that by far the majority of my responses were 'no opinion'.
162. I found some of the statements hard to answer as they were confusing.
163. It was helpful to have someone try to explain the fuzziness of so much "in" bureaucratic jargon. Do you really know what you're saying?
164. Many congregations are struggling to survive and it is important that limited resources are well used. I see the most essential element of Synod is doctrinal and ecclesiastical oversight and the proper and through training of pastors (most important) and other church workers. Pastors provide Word and Sacrament to their congregants who are equipped by the Holy Spirit to tell the good news of Christ's atoning work and to serve their neighbours.
165. Where is our youth? our future. We need to remember, Pastors included, that we believe in Father, Son and Holy Spirit, not Father, Son and Technique.
166. God bless you in doing His work.

167. Most questions I am not knowledgeable enough to give good answers
168. The concept of district within LCC has become obsolete with the computer and other forms of communication now in effect. The money and manpower wasted on operating a district office is unacceptable. 21st century technology and thinking must be put into action as soon as possible or we will find ourselves so far outdated that we would never catch up. We need young minds to keep up and old minds to advise. Don't jump off the wagon of progress at some point-this is an ongoing thing-be ready for change.
169. I pray for the pastors and leaders who are keeping our church going!
170. If the congregations don't have fairly frequent business meetings, then the churches lose contact with each other and the chance of rogue ideas can develop according to each pastor's own beliefs. The upper church body should still be influenced by the congregations.
171. This survey confirms how little I know about the business side of the church. I do appreciate the "No Opinion" option as this enables me to void my responses to questions that I have too little information to form an educated opinion of, thus preventing an artificial skewing of results.
172. My answers to questions #56-60 are probably a pretty good summary of my overall feelings about this survey.
173. One of the weaknesses of LCC is the way congregations operate completely independently of each other. For example, there are 17 congregations in Metro Edmonton but there is very little communication or joint efforts among them. Synod should be the leader in uniting the congregations.
174. Our structure is not immutable. We can not be afraid of change or do things the same way just because that's how we've always done it. Could our current structure be suffocating our ministry? Do we unfairly expect Pastors to have "business and administrative" training and abilities? Our structure should be as simple as possible, while still being effective. God bless your work. May God guide this effort and glorify Him.
175. As a lay person my direct knowledge of the workings of the synod and the districts is not as deep as those who are more directly involved. My noted comments should be read with that in mind. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. God bless.
176. I have concern about the high and mighty attitude of some of our clergy. Some seem to be lone shepherds leading their flock on a different path. Are they accountable to no one? There appear to be giant chasms between our clergy. They waste energy bickering with one another. How is this helping to further the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ?
177. God bless our dear church body
178. I hope and pray that you get some helpful suggestions from people who are more in the know. I've been a member of the Lutheran Church for almost 75 years, and the synod and district stuff other than missions has never made an impression on me. Individual pastors and members have. God bless them. I know one needs administration (too bad, eh?). God be with you all as you try to untangle this skein of wool. This questionnaire, though meant for the lay people was totally inappropriate for them, and discouraging.
179. The survey is pretty long and some questions must be reviewed because they have the same meaning but ask in different otherwise.
180. Please, I think that the survey must be reviewed i.e. most of the question in the survey are redundant.
181. The Districts and Synod will only work if the right people are in charge and each one knows their own responsibilities. Many lay people do not know what is happening. Pastors do not

inform. Even this survey was not available to any without on-line access. Many people are elderly. They had no say. The lay people support the Church financially. Pastors, District and Synod should keep people informed. No one should be in charge of anything they are unqualified to deal with. Prayfully examine yourself.

182. There are many questions for which I do not have the answers for due to lack of information leading up to this survey.
183. I understand and believe that the purpose and role of the Pastoral Office is that of a servant. As Christ makes abundantly clear, it is not for lording over our brothers and sisters in Christ, but for the building up of the Body of Christ in humble service. I say this first because I do not want to be misinterpreted. Perhaps it is just the military mind in me, but from an organizational perspective I think a more streamlined and perhaps more hierarchical (please do not read hierarchical as "abusively lording it over laity") structure would be beneficial to LCC. I only say hierarchical, because at least at the parish level, there seems to be an inordinate amount of voting and administrative procedure that takes place which seems to make it difficult to accomplish even small tasks. Anyhow, administration is really not my area of expertise. Despite my inexperience, thank you for the opportunity to fill out this survey, and thank you for taking the time to read the opinions of the members of LCC. I trust, and will pray, that God will give the leadership of Lutheran Church Canada wisdom in proceeding with restructuring efforts. That His will be done on earth as it is in heaven.
184. Financial investors TROUBLE WITH COMPUTER AGAIN FREE CONDO AT DISNEY FOR 8 MINISTERS FOR FREE GOLF AND DISNEY SKY EVERY YEAR IN JANUARY FOR NOTHING BY DONATION FROM RCI and 3 ministers not interested because it was not on their radar
185. We live in area which tends to make it very difficult to remain "walking together" as synod. The consumer culture mentality, the expectation of being entertained, and the persuasive atmosphere of relativism seem to frustrate building a unity of doctrine and practice. God help our leadership as we continue our pilgrimage here below.
186. This survey was not well executed. It was too complicated for the average Lutheran to understand and it dealt with questions that only very active members or clergy (and not all clergy) would be able to answer in a properly informed manner. The average LCC member does not interact closely enough with District or Synod to know the inter-relationships between them. On top of that some questions lead to conclusions about the church which were untrue or not yet decided upon. These kind of questions lead informed individuals to suspect that the questions were being asked to coax an answer from people to fit an agenda. This is very poor survey practice. With all of that being said, do not take it to mean that I or my fellow church members do not want a say in the direction of the church. I am passionate about these issues as are others. We fear that changes to the church will catastrophically alter its course and put it in a place where we do not wish to follow, and likely won’t. Thus we do want our opinions to be heard but in order to do it most effectively the survey needs to be simple and shorter. It should deal with the basics that people understand but sophisticated enough to garner meaning and direction from it. We want our church to become stronger, communication and accountability to be transparent, and the church body to operate efficiently; however, not at the expense of the theology and doctrine we hold dear. A doctrine that reflects biblical understanding, the Book of Concord, and the origins of the North American Lutheran church.

187. Just a prayer that the Lord continues to bless and guide you with the decisions with LCC restructuring. Thank you for allowing the opportunity to participate in putting forth my views. I know that the outcomes determined will have been made for the good.
188. In our congregation there was no preliminary discussion or information on the issues in this survey. Many of these issues needed more information for ordinary non-council members of congregations.
189. Our church need to become more modern in its ways. There are no young people sticking with the Lutheran church after they graduate. Its not that our message is wrong its that our services are too old fashioned. The music is old and a lot of it is depressing. These changes should have happened 30 years ago. it will be difficult to do it now because the older people like it the way it is and there are no young families. The younger Christians in our town are gravitating to the Baptist, and catholic churches. They have a more modern format. My wife and I are in our mid 40s and we are the youngest in our congregation that attend regularly. My kids don't like the music and we fear that after high school they won't continue to attend. I realize that some of this falls on us but I wonder sometimes if we would have been better off changing denominations when the kids were small so they would have a better chance of sticking with it when they are older. Overall We do think the message the Lutheran church teaches is the best. We find the sermons very positive and the message hopeful and that’s why we have stuck with it. We just need to "tweak" some things. Thanks
190. I am concerned about the attitude about some of our pastors with regards to the role of the laity. How can we expand as a church if we do not give ourselves freedom to make mistakes, to say the wrong things, so instead we say nothing? When a pastor wont even allow laity to read the word, or lead a home bible study, how can we grow? When Luther wrote of church in good order, I don't think he meant that church of the 50's is the only way to do church. What about circuit rider pastors with lay lead home churches that worship each week together and receive the sacraments when the pastor comes? Is this not also part of our history? Laity want to learn, to lead, to serve. Please free up our pastors to love and trust their laity.
191. I believe change is needed, but with out an intimate knowledge of relationships and accountability channels, I cannot be certain what changes would produce the optimum results.
192. These questions are biased to achieve a certain result. The authority should remain with the congregations.
193. There is inadequate information to answer these questions with a feel good feeling.
194. Thank you for tackling this very difficult area of restructuring in our Church. We must operate and preach and reach out with the Gospel in the most effective and efficient manner. People's eternal lives depend on it.
195. Dear brothers and sisters, I want to thank you for all the time you have put in, and will put in, on thinking about, creating, and disseminating this survey. I am thankful for those of you who generously donate your time and talent to this effort. I wish I could be more positive about this survey, but in the end I am left confused and disappointed. I don't think I have enough information about the possibilities for restructuring that are options for us as a church body. We have had some communications through the Canadian Lutheran about the situation, but I'm also not sure I really know all the problems that face us as a synod to make a reasoned judgement. I also don't really understand the potential implications of the answers to some of these questions - for example, voting rights for Deacons, and so on. I have spent a

lot of time on these issues already and would be willing to invest more, but that doesn't seem to be an option. I think that restructuring a national church body is and should be a long process with lots of discussion among congregational members. I don't think we are getting that. Perhaps you may think that members are not interested in this, and you may be right. I think that I am right in assuming most lay people know little about church polity and the associated doctrinal issues that go along with it, and so I question how valuable the answers you will receive to this survey will be. I think it would have been good to have a little more discussion and historical background, at the very least. What are the different options available to us, e.g. dioceses, deaneries? What do other church bodies do who we are in fellowship with? I am disappointed that we get so little time to really respond to this. One-month maximum? This is one reason why I am not confident that our concerns really matter - despite this survey opportunity. If it is such a great opportunity for our voices to be heard, why so little time for us to reflect on the possibilities and give our thoughts. With respect to you, I think this survey is problematic. It would have been helpful for a layperson such as myself to have received some background on the issues before us. For example, what does it mean to "walk as a synod?" You jump right into the "challenge" at the beginning - to restructure LCC to deliver the 8 services - but is that really our challenge? Are there other deeper issues that we should be considering? As an adult convert to the Lutheran Church, one who actually wants to be a Lutheran, I'm concerned that there is little consideration or mention of the Gospel or our Lutheran Confessions. Shouldn't those be utmost in our minds as we consider restructuring our church body? Thank you for reading these comments and for your consideration. Again, thank you for your service to this committee, to our church body, and to our risen Lord and Saviour.

196. Information should be provided on problem areas, otherwise it was like doing a questionnaire in a vacuum. The value of the responses is of questionable worthiness.
197. We need to be looking beyond just the structuring of our church; we need to be looking toward our practices. Are we allowing the Holy Spirit to use us to reach out to a hurting world or are we content to do things the same old way because "that is how we have always do it?” Those are the words of a dying church. I pray it is not so for us.
198. I truly pray for insight into what changes are necessary.... try for once.... Use an open mind Its amazing what God Can Do!!
199. Praying for you all as you review these surveys!
200. Timely, clear communication online or in print will help members stay informed. Took a bit of effort to find LCC Constitution (under Handbook). What is difference between congregations listed in blue and those listed in black on LCC website? Is there information on Congregations by address (number of actual properties), membership, staff, etc.? This would give a clearer picture of where LCC Is at present. Some consulting / auditing from outside LCC may be helpful in administrative / financial areas. Encouragement from Synod / District to Congregations to have updated constitutions would be nice. Current demographics in our congregation don't allow church council to comply with outdated constitution. PLEASE note I completed this survey yesterday but had a system error while submitting it. I couldn't get back to the site and had no indication it had been received. I have assumed it was not received and did it as new today.
201. This survey is based on LCC structure, suggest to issue a second survey for church members only, allowing their input on where they see Lutheran Church Canada is headed, changes they would like to see, improvements for the future of our youth, future of LCC.

202. My Prayer is that the information received is most helpful! Thanks be to God for his guidance as you tabulate the results. His will be done.
203. As a life long member on LCMS & LCC, I grieve over the reality that participation of younger people in our church is declining. In some instances, we are sustaining to many buildings with very low active membership, which means that most of our giving is consumed by building maintenance rather than vibrant outreach ministry.
204. There is always room for improvement if we are doing it for the right reasons.
205. I realize that I rally do not know how my church structure is set up and functions....
206. God will ensure that His Church continues, however, the current Lutheran Church Canada will not survive if the 'Old Boy' leadership continues.
207. Our prayer is that Lord`s guidance and blessings be on the church and those who make the decisions. It`s time for a Reformation! All praise and glory be to God!
208. It might have been helpful to have had some in-services before to learn specifics about some areas Appreciate the work that gone into preparing this
209. If Districts remain as they now exist could District Conventions be held less often to save costs. Instead of every third year have the Convention every fifth year. Circuit forums could be held more often.
210. I realized I need to know more about certain aspects of LCC mission and ministry and relationships with other Auxiliaries and Listed Service Organizations
211. This process is being done too quickly and without proper thought. Step one should have been an analysis of what is wrong, if anything, with the current structure and what restructuring should accomplish. There should be fundamental agreement over this before doing anything else. Then in step 2 one can talk intelligently about what sort of restructuring is needed to accomplish what was agreed upon as the goals of restructuring. The current process is blind restructuring for the sake of restructuring without any clearly stated goals. Because of this I fear that the responses will not be properly interpreted and may lead to false conclusions. I suspect that there is nothing wrong with the current structure except that we can't afford it. If this is the case, then let's come out and say this and say that the point of restructuring is to find a cheaper way to operate. Maybe there is an assumption that everybody already knows this. On the other hand, maybe there are other concerns about the current structure -- but what are they? I don't think this survey will provide you good answers to that question.
212. We are praying for you as you work through this important task.
213. Feeling pressured to respond without sufficient data.
214. Would have been beneficial to have more time to research/discuss this before filling it in. I didn't know it was happening
215. I wish you could have touched on one very important subject which is the relationship between pastor and congregation I strongly believe an overhaul is needed to the call system and serious thought to giving congregations options when the pastor is not at all meeting the needs of the congregation
216. First, I thank God that the leadership of Lutheran Church-Canada believes its members to be valuable enough to put a survey out there, risking criticism and unsavory feedback, in an effort to move forward in a God-pleasing way. This is a big and important thing. I don't know if other churches do such a thing. I don't know if I can possibly add much more to my thoughts and beliefs, other than to reiterate my hope and prayer that we, as members of Lutheran Church-Canada take our commission to be disciples of all nations seriously. As I

see it, that means standing beside other churches that we might not see eye-to-eye on in the adiaphora issues (even ones we as Lutherans hold dear, such as [infant] baptism and communion.) The church is under attack. Satan is having a field day, rallying all his troops against us. How else could radical Islam, the gay agenda, pro-choice advocates, evolutionary scientists, and liberal secular humanists all rally as one voice against us? They only have one thing in common. They hate the name of Jesus, and want to destroy us. We can't afford the luxury of standing divided on petty differences in doctrine. This is no easy task, I realize. This may well happen one Godly member at a time, reaching across the aisle to their Baptist, Pentecostal, Anglican, Presbyterian, or Catholic neighbor. So Lutherans don't like what John Calvin taught. Big deal. I don't like all the things Martin Luther taught. I don't like the attitude he took towards Ulrich Zwingli when debating him. I don't like that the Lutherans speak nothing of Luther's failings, while elevating his virtues (thus, nearly deifying him.) These differences are petty. They create dissensions and factions that Satan loves, and laughs at. I am not innocent in this matter either. I say this as much to remind myself, as I do to my Lutheran brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus. I believe the insular nature of our church to be the single biggest stumbling block in us going forward as an important player in faithfully building God's Kingdom here on earth. This is not a criticism of the individual pastor or church-goer, but our church synod as a whole. May God's kingdom come on earth, as it is in Heaven! Amen! And may we say to God as Isaiah did, "Here am I. Send me." May it be so. Come, Lord Jesus. Amen.

217. I am not as well informed on the working of Lutheran Church Canada as I am with our LWML, but certainly realize that some changes are necessary as our attendance ?? our wonderful country is so large. Thank you for this opportunity and it is my own fault that I do not know all the working that you all do.
218. Lord have mercy upon us. Amen
219. The degree of accuracy of this survey will be reflected 'only' by those who are well informed regarding all of the issues presented. Uninformed participants will cause this survey to be counter-productive.
220. It is very important to ensure the promotion of church growth in all your restructuring decisions.
221. Over my life in the church, I have been expecting LCC and District leadership to be developing effective outreach. Given the shrinking membership in LCC, this hasn't happened. If hope restructuring produces effective outreach as an outcome. Otherwise, it seems like re-arranging the chairs on the Titanic.
222. unless respondents have experienced positions on circuit forums, district or synod boards or delegates to either district or synod conventions, their insight to the administrative structure of the church is limited and the responses to this survey will be less than accurate, fair and helpful to you
223. Thank you for the opportunity to offer my opinion.
224. This survey clouded the issue thoroughly. It was hard to sift through the questions and figure out what kind of information was wanted. It was hard to think through the issues at hand because of the obfuscation. I would need a lot more information about how things are currently in order to be able to comment on how they should be following restructuring.
225. There is no explanation as to why LCC feels it needs to be restructured. When restructuring is being considered, that usually means that there is a concern with the current situation. Knowing these concerns, or the inadequacy of the current situation, would have helped the

individuals answering your questions, do so, in a fashion that may have helped you with a solution. Perhaps changes are needed within the current structure; not necessarily restructuring. As I went through the questions, it sounded as if the decision to restructure has already been made. It will be interesting to see how the results of this survey will be used. Will participants in this survey be informed as to how the responses will be evaluated, along with the overall results of the survey.

226. The archives situation in LCC also needs to be addressed. Not sure how this fits into restructuring, but it should be taken into account somewhere.
227. Survey should have had less duplicate (pro, then con) questions, and more questions on the effectiveness of LCC ministry, such as care for congregants, training, Canadian missions, etc...
228. There is some presumption that one has a working knowledge of the information being questioned.
229. thank you for this opportunity to participate
230. I think this survey should have been sent out in several short bursts divided perhaps by the existing headings. Each burst should have been preceded by a short pithy explanation of what the issue is and what we're trying to resolve. I believe this would have resulted in a broader better informed participation.
231. I believe we were set up as a congregational church and have fallen into being a hierarchical church. Let's reduce the hierarchy so we are in better touch. Synod supports and guides; it does not rule.

232. This is the most useless survey I have ever done. There is NO information to give any answer at all. And these 6 types of answers are the most foolish types of surveys. If you would let women be elders we would know more about what's going on in the church. And maybe could answer some of these questions.
233. Certification and Demographic Profile - How does this pertain to restructuring LLC. I am praying that the people in charge of this daunting task are considering all of this process with God's love and guidance. We need people with theological basis weighing our best options. Gods blessings on this process.
234. It would have been easier to fill out this survey if the objectives for restructuring would have been spelled out: Why is being undertaken now? What are the deficiencies of the present structure and governance? What changes in structure and governance would address these deficiencies? I pray for the Lord's guidance and wisdom for the committee responsible for making recommendations on the basis of their research and this survey and for the Synod and districts for making the final decisions.
235. The LCC should re-consider the role of women in the church. We are missing out on a lot of great people because of this out-dated notion.
236. As a lay person, I don't feel I have the knowledge of the workings of Synod to answer a lot of these questions
237. This survey is too long and not clear enough for myself as a member of the church.
238. Canada is made up of many diverse regions, which could cause problems with restructuring. However, God's word is the same wherever it is proclaimed. Therefor restructuring should be carried out with prayer and the knowledge that God will be with us as we move on.
239. I am a layperson and life long Lutheran but more importantly a Christian. I don't know the functions of Synod and Districts any where near as well as many people but have been

involved in some functions in detail and most from a distance. Business matters of Synod and Districts could be best accomplished by management/business people who have tremendous knowledge and experience and legal status such as lawyers, accountants and strong business leaders. pastors have tremendous knowledge and experience in ministering, let them do that. suggest segregate the two functions. you can certainly call me if this survey goes to the next step of taking action.

240. Synod & District Presidents, staff & all board members should be asked to individually think outside the box as to ways their area could be changed for a smooth more efficient system- Those doing the task are most familiar with areas were change would be beneficial
241. I see the position of deacon as being vital to the outreach efforts of a church. Our experience with having a Director of Parish Services was great. I appreciate having the opportunity to be a preschool teacher in a Lutheran Preschool.
242. 2 seminaries why?
243. All changes to structure and operation of Synod and Districts should be based on strengthening the out reach of God Word and work! We pray for you.
244. I think the LCC, for its size, is administration and governance heavy. I look forward to a simpler governance model. Thank you for considering making changes and valuing individuals' opinions. God bless you in this task.
245. I think we should be looking at one LCC seminary in Canada. Thank you for launching this survey. Our church is very important to us.
246. Further to the questions on the Seminaries, should we be looking at one seminary in Canada?
247. I am very concerned that the doctrine of the autonomy of congregations is being threatened. There should be theological discussions that clarify whether or not we still believe that the Holy Spirit works through congregations and that the pulpit is a higher calling than the Synod President's position. We are avoiding the need to confront deep doctrinal divisions by focussing on structure instead.
248. I have filled it out as requested. However, thinking 2000 replies will get you what you say it will is dreaming "a big dream". Just a thought: the age of LAY delegates or the fact they are retired individuals is not taken into consideration -- they are permitted to serve the Synod on boards, department & committees BUT retired pastors or deacons are not so considered!! Why? There are talents and abilities which they have which could help the church (and yes, they would still have to be elected even if nominated). How many lay delegates at the last Synod convention helped make decisions for the Synod by serving in that important capacity -- and they were retired!! JUST another thought: -- you wanted no identifying comments added BUT you could certainly gain a lot toward that end by the setting forth of questions 2-7.
249. Again-I am woefully ignorant on how these things affect me and my congregation. I am a snowbird, so am absent for several months of the year and attend other churches, not necessarily Lutheran. and have little idea how they relate to their larger bodies. Thanks for the opportunity to raise my awareness. I will try to pay more attention!
250. I think a large number of our LCC members were not qualified to answer the survey questions because of their lack of knowledge of Synod's Constitution and Bylaws.
251. I truly believe that excluding women from the ministry is not in the best interest of our ministry to the multitudes of non-believers. This continues to be a very significant stumbling block to encouraging people to become LCC members. Of course I realize LCC and LCMS don't want to hear the truth.

252. I would like to add my thoughts on the Seminary/University. It seems to me we are pulling East vs. West in this situation. I believe we need a very strong Seminary and a Christian University where Lutheran teachers, Deacons, DPS and all Church workers are trained. It could possibly include 1st year pastors. (that was an afterthought) We pray for all working
253. on this survey and the outcome, I for one, am confident that we will come out of this a much better and stronger LCC.
254. MOST PEOPLE DON'T UNDERSTAND THE INNER WORKINGS OF THEIR OWN LOCAL CHURCH, LET ALONE THE INNER WORKINGS OF THE SYNOD. THIS SURVEY WILL BE JUST A GUESSING GAME, THE QUESTIONS ARE WAY TOO INTENSE. IT IS LIKE A GRADE 4 STUDENT ANSWERING GRADE 12 QUESTIONS. TRUST ME, I KNOW AS I AM THE PRESIDENT OF ONE CONGREGATION.
255. As mentioned in the survey, there were many redundant and duplicate questions. Another point is many of the lay people do not have much understanding of how LCC operates and many of the questions dealing with such is confusing. Questions #48 and #49 were the substance of the survey and are inadequate. I know there were more ideas recorded at the Church Workers Conference in Calgary, yet those results have not been released, even after the promise to release them. We need some real change in LCC with: the level of administration; ecclesiastical oversight; and how we proclaim the Gospel in unity across LCC. There were many superficial questions, not so many on substance.
256. Too many questions the average person in the pew doesn't know about. District president should visit every (at least larger) rural congregations - not just the city ones. I am a regular attender and contributor.
257. Committee Members: Thank you for the hours of work you have spent and will spend in this arduous task on behalf of us all. May the Holy Spirit continue to bless and keep you. Your brother in Christ.
258. Please don't suggest changes to the fundamentals like equal clergy/lay representation. I'm selfish. I want a strong and vibrant LCC for my children and grandchildren and current trends seem to say that may not be the case.
259. The Lutheran Church as whole should strive for unification and move away from fractioning. We are all followers of Martin Luther, why be divided into "power blocks". The organizational and doctrinal structures are not in tune with the present day situation of the church as a whole. Look at the Catholics - one spiritual leader!
260. I appreciate being asked for the opinions from all members of LCC.
261. We need someone to come & explain to us what's happening more use for Lay people. Better trained Bible School for our lay people and for our kids. Don't want a bunch of paper filled with gobbley gook.
262. I encourage the Commission to take all the submissions and comments seriously and to go forward to propose the changes that will help our Synod and its work for the Lord's Kingdom.
263. The Church of Christ is about pastor and people together in receiving Christ in Word and Sacrament. All our work should be about supporting this throughout the country and throughout the world.
264. Know that when the dust settles, we need to support our clergy.....care for the care givers!
265. It would seem more constructive if the LCC should do some self reflection and analysis of their programs and processes and recommend changes if needed or state why the status quo is the best course. Then ask for feedback.

266. In my opinion it is the auxiliary and service organizations connected to LCC do much of the outreach of our church as a whole and it would be detrimental to discontinue them. District and Synod are responsible for administering what goes on within congregations moreover, and perhaps there are ways that this can be done more efficiently. It is very important to me that the church continue to be vigilant in ensuring that doctrine is being followed and that the word of God is being correctly presented / taught in congregations. As long as this is accomplished I am happy with cutting back wherever possible without compromise to this very vital characteristic of our church.
267. the conventions are very costly. they need trimming. churches need to be more self sufficient
268. Thank you for this opportunity.
269. I wish this parish lived by the moto of "love thy neighbour as thyself" You say that this survey is about the way the synod and districts are run - BUT I suspect that this same moto might just work there too.
270. I pray that we "all" will support each other spiritually and worldly. ABC District and the synod has its challenges and I pray that we will come out stronger and smarter! There needs to be forgiveness and this cannot be a power grab! As Martin Luther instructed us to do, the people have the say. We need to listen to God's word so we can move forward so we can do what Jesus instructed us to do - to go out and spread God's word to the world!!
271. We need to reach for our youth to keep our churches growing
272. We have to give the governance of the Synod back to the people in the autonomous congregations and remove the governance from the hands of the clergy. It appears the survey questions are full of biases, suggestive and leading questions. I'm not sure this survey will be effective and coming from the grass roots. I believe the CCMS has already decided what the restructuring will look like and the survey is just a Public Relations stunt.
273. I believe our new structure should be smaller, with leaders in more general roles, elected for shorter terms and given clearer direction from congregations regarding their mandate as synodical leaders. We have a small church family and the task of leading and serving the synod is simpler than our structure makes it out to be. If we focussed the leaders' efforts on the care, support, and continuing education of pastors and their families, and also provided some support for congregations with resource guides, conflict resolution, and provision for ministry between pastors, I think we would have covered the essentials.
274. This survey is too long, at least according to a trusted friend with graduate training in statistics under her belt. It missed the point. Trying to lead a church using our present size of districts and circuits approaches (or, given the sad experience of our brothers and sisters in the ABC District, has reached) the impossible. Limiting circuits to 5-7 congregations would allow the people in the circuit to know one another better and to better assist one another. Limiting Districts to no more than 7 circuits would allow the District Presidents to visit every congregation in their district and speak with every person who had a concern. It would at least temporarily, solve the problem of LCC being (un)officially solely Anglophone by allowing the creation of a non-geographic francophone district. If the LCC choses to decline to provide French language communications with its francophone membership, it may well be to the benefit of those French congregations to seek peaceable release from LCC to allow them to become an overseas district of Eglise Evangelique Lutherienne Synode de France. Periodic meeting of the District Presidents with the synodical President would get the flow of information both up and down the ladder moving faster. Too, it would allow the synodical president to respond quickly and personally to the concerns of a single congregation or

person. Would the changes suggest increase the flow of power of the various district and synodical offices? No, they probably would not. On the other hand, what is lost in prestige would be more than gained in better pastoral care in synod from top to bottom. Given what our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, says about feeding His lambs and His sheep, a gain in good pastoral care might not be such a bad thing, even if it does cost a little prestige here and there.

275. I value my church highly and think it is worth the effort to re-structure to make it a more workable, valuable entity. The Word of God is paramount. How we gift that to our communities is very important. We need to adjust our ways of doing things. We need to change. We have a wonderful gift in the church. We need to work hard to make it viable. We have become too comfortable in our little corner of the world. Let us work to create a church that loves our community enough to give and give so that many may learn to know our amazing God. Let's get rid of the stuff that doesn't work. Let's be ready for change. Let's do the best we can with the CEF debacle, and then move on. I have learned to mistrust the church through the CEF experience. The good thing about that is that it is completely obvious that things were mishandled in this area. So probably we've mishandle things in other areas too. It's a difficult experience, but one that was needed to make us better. Let's learn from what we have experienced. Let's benefit from the fact that now we KNOW we blew it, that we aren't as wonderful as we thought we were. The humility that is imposed on us through all of this is valuable. Let's learn and pray for wisdom in nurturing this treasure which is the Gospel!! To you who are working so hard, thank you! May God give you courage, strength and a sense of humour as you work through this monumental task! God bless you!!
276. Restructuring the Synod should be in response to the changes in function. This survey appears to be in response to struggles/difficulties in various parts of the church. There also appears to be a desire for greater power and authority by the Synod over the districts, auxiliaries and LSO's. "The congregation is the basic unit in the Synod" seems to receive minimal recognition.
277. I appreciate the time and effort it must have taken to create this survey, but I don't feel that it was very scientific and I am skeptical as to how good the information will be that we will receive as a result. However, I will pray for the work of the CCMS as they continue to move forward with this momentous task.
278. 1 The church is too top heavy, to many chiefs and not enough Indians 2 Have one seminary 3 Have the college be Christians again and run by the Synod
279. The pastors should be appointed by the Synod also the Synod should remove pastors that do not fit for some congregation. This is to avoid the conflict in a congregation’s that part of the congregation want removed and other do not - causing a split in the church congregation.
280. We are a church on life support. I love our church. I will continue to serve in this church body as long as I can. Christ's love compels me in my calling...that is for sure. Because of this church body, I thankfully can say that there has not been one moment in my life where I didn't know God's love. I've always known the Good News of the Gospel. This is certainly not the average Canadian's experience these days. Many of my kids' friends do not know what Christmas and Easter is... we wouldn't even expect to see them in worship once or twice a year to experience those moments that encapsulate the good news. The church still operating in an old mindset of "come and get it" rather than "Go!" as Jesus commanded, enabled, and equipped us to do. My observation is that with a few exceptions where LCC

churches are thriving and growing, by and large, LCC is aging and shrinking and the laity and some pastors are stuck in grief and fear. Our synod has not kept up with the fast moving changes of society and has not adjusted the way it trains pastoral leaders to serve and lead within this culture where the organized church has less and less influence and voice. In some ways, we are so guarded and defensive that I can't tell we are an evangelical church. Our theology should be setting us free! But we get stuck on the issue of authority. We've got nothing to lose friends... Jesus has given us authority to make disciples so let's make substantial synodical change that reflects the desire to reach out in love to our neighbours... a structure that will be light on its feet, adaptable, and have at its heart the Gospel. A structure that will encourage our laity which is 99% of the church body to make a meaningful difference in the local community. The old way of doing things is not working. Our structure is clumsy, complicated, and demanding. And EXPENSIVE. And not getting the results it was designed for. Maybe our synod needs to die to itself so that something new can be re-born... and if it's God's will, I'd be okay with that. I would get over the pain and discomfort. I am thankful for all our leaders, all their heart and soul effort they've put in over the years. Thanks for allowing us to dream new dreams. Thanks for doing some of this heavy lifting. God grant you strength and energy and vision on how to move our synod forward. Philippians 3:13 "No, dear brothers and sisters, I have not achieved it, but I focus on this one thing: Forgetting the past and looking forward to what lies ahead..."

281. As a lay person, I found it difficult to intelligently choose on a number of questions. My prayer is that we remain focused on declaring Christ's saving grace and not become bogged down on complicated structures.
282. I joined LCC because of a profound need to reconnect with God and the practice of faith following a 10-year hiatus, after I left the Anglican Church. In the LCC I found a church which is caring, accepting, warm in its welcome and supportive of my efforts to rediscover my faith. My parish has been extraordinary and is blessed with two extraordinary Pastors, great staff and sound administration, teaching and worship. The crisis in the ABC District which gave rise this survey in no way diminishes my commitment to the church or to my faith. But I see a need for very real change which anticipates the next generation of needs and does not just react to a crisis. I will pray for the Church, the Commission and all those in authority to make decisions which come from the Holy Spirit, are courageous and faithful to our mission as a church in society.
283. Very, very disappointed and disillusioned by the LCC and district response to the CEF financial crisis in the AB-BC district. Very little comment, no information and no sympathy for investors have led to a lot of soul searching about whether to continue to support the district and the Synod - this from someone who's been with the church for almost 50 years. I think people in positions of authority in those areas need to show compassion like Jesus did - they appear to be the same as uncaring government bureaucrats out to get all they can from the people who contribute. Shame, shame on you.
284. With the financial fiasco that has enveloped the ABC District I do not see how Winnipeg (the President & BOD) can from a fiduciary perspective not have some accountability since Synod accepts funds from the District.
285. I don't think that individuals involved with the A/BC CEF or those employed by A/BC district office (past or current) should be involved in the CCMS
286. 1 Have the College run by the Synod and make it a Christian college again. 2 Have one seminary. WHY DO WE NOT KEEP THE 4th COMMANDMENT ON THE 7th DAY OF

THE WEEK INSTEAD OF THE 1st DAY OF THE WEEK 3 The church is too top heavy, too many chiefs that are not needed

287. It is very disheartening that this is the primary means we have to give feedback for restructuring. There is much at stake and in need of feedback and yet this survey was not adequately designed in its questioning to allow that to happen. I do pray that from this we can restructure in a positive and beneficial way, but I do have doubts.
288. I hope this information comments and thoughts will be interpreted correctly and we don't lose our direction. The church has to change to survive.
289. I am grateful for the opportunity to take part in this survey. I have participated to the best of my ability as a regular Lutheran layman. I care about our Synod, and I have great hope in Christ for its future.
290. Very important to ensure the promotion of church growth in all your restructuring decision making.
291. I think things are running well in the East District and should continue as they have been.
292. I am a Growth Pastor, retired but helping with growth of a small rural church. We are growing intentionally with God's guidance and love the work of being Christ in the community.
293. The Pastoral Call process needs to be re-vamped. The list of eligible pastors should only contain those that have indicated a willingness to be called. In addition, the salary structure & compensation package should be better outlined to the Congregation.
294. I pray it is not too late to help shape the future. Let's preserve life and ministry and not just try to fearfully delay death.
295. Our pastors need spiritual care themselves. We depend on our pastors and they also need care. The synod should make sure all pastors are cared for. They must also have a care team in each congregation that is separate from any other group.
296. Please consider simply eliminating the Districts and combining circuits to a total of 4 per current District for 12 nationally as one option for the restructuring of Synod.
297. I question whether we need two seminaries for so few students. I also feel that our Canadian students don't have enough variety of professors and thus all get taught by a limited number of teachers with a limited amount of experience, thoughts, mentors. Would it be so bad for our seminary students to spend one or two years at a large seminary in the U.S. so they get exposed to more professors and mentors as well as more fellow students.
298. I pray to God that the committee that has commissioned this survey is going to use a variety of sources to get information and carefully consider the information before making recommendations. We all need to work together to bring as many people to Christ as we can. We should take pride in our history, be confident in the Walther's Theses as a strong basis for our Synod's constitution and consider carefully the many different gifts the Lord has given our congregations. I am terrified that we are going to become like the Catholic and Anglican Church in structure and that we will lose the very reason for our structure to support our faith as Luther taught us. I pray that God gives all participants in this process love, joy and confidence in what we have and the wisdom, perseverance and commitment to make changes to further the work in His kingdom.
299. Need an overall plan for LCC. Focus on Missions and Outreach is required. Reduce the current Administrative costs of LCC
300. I think it is helpful to allow parish members to participate in the restructuring process

301. Many of the survey questions were poorly worded or the intention unclear. Also - why a "neither agree or disagree" and also a "No opinion"? is this not redundant? If any restructuring is going to take place, then I would hope that there will be future opportunities for input and discussions around what the restructuring committee proposes will be options for the new structure. The questions in this survey seemed prejudiced toward ideals that may already be in consideration. More clarity of intent is needed.
302. LCC missions and district add to confusion at lay level. One mission group with regular updating needed.
303. As the church shrinks so should the administration e.g. one Spiritual leader and one Business leader for LCC.
304. I am so very thankful that the Synod has made this survey available to each member for their input; I see it as a good start to revitalize LCC and open their/our vision to the future of our Synod.
305. with our human nature, we can think that restructuring of the LCC is the answer to solve especially some money issues, or to be more efficient. But is this really what the Lord wants for LCC? We should seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness.
306. Should not God give us directions on the way this synod goes rather than a survey of human opinions?
307. Central church admin. needs to provide more leadership and assistance to circuits and individual congregations that are struggling with declining membership and lack of finances.
308. I just want to restate my concern about this process. Had the resolutions from the Districts come about organically, rather than as a result of the CEF Crisis, our discussions would be slightly different. I think the questions on this survey would be very similar. But, the truth is, we panicked with the CEF crisis. And any changes made as a result of these Resolutions are much like a Shot Gun Wedding. We asked for change. We will get change. But what we have to ask, is what is the change that will most glorify God. And, I believe that 3 years is not enough time to make the changes that may be necessary. We are just over two years away from the Convention that will determine our course. That is too quick. This survey is a good starting point. But, if this is my only input, then it would appear to be only a symbolic gesture suggestion my input is valued. There needs to be much more discussion on a District and Synodical level by more than just the BoD and CoP
309. I found a number of the questions to be leading or misleading, and I found that some of the question disparaged the work of recent synodical conventions disregarding decisions made at convention. It's hard to find this pleasing.
310. Let's save the future of LCC. Bless all of you, Praise the Lord!
311. I want our church body to continue to strongly preach and teach Jesus Christ crucified and risen, and make this the primary goal of its reason for being.
312. I wish everyone who has to read, decipher and interpret these surveys God's strength, patience and guidance. Thank-you for undertaking this valuable task.
313. Treat your "church school" teachers (who are members of LCC) as a group rather than as individuals in a congregation.
314. It was a comprehensive survey. Hopefully our lay people will not find it to overwhelming. Thank you for your dedicated work on this project.
315. My primary concern in the restructuring of LCC is that people's faith and financial security never be shattered as they have recently. I pray for the work of those taking on this crucial task.

316. When this is being done do it to God's glory with a lot of prayer. May the Lord be with the group. WE will keep you in prayer.
317. CONVENTIONS: 1 synod convention every four years. Each congregation sends a pastor and lay delegate (and dps if appropriate). Those congregations in a vacancy should be cared for at a circuit meeting to help their lay delegate at the convention. Immediately following the synod convention take a full day or two for districts to caucus. For the district meetings...just have clergy and deacons. Eliminate district convention all together. Since you already have everyone there. Take another day to meet for the business of a district, which shouldn't be a whole lot anyway. Take that time to discuss the needs and concerns within district. In between conventions have 1 entire synod church workers conference. A chance for church workers to grow in skills. This could also be a time for panel discussions to check the pulse of synod. IE have it open and honest. Transparency. Since no resolutions are being brought forward it could allow a time for church workers to hear and plan for good overtures. A panel discussion with strong moderator could include 1) LCC BOD VPs - allow for questions and answers on synod matters 2) Seminary panel to allow for q and on seminary related matters 3) District Pres to allow for same. SEMINARY Restructure vicarage program to be a place for learning and not cheap help and labor. Find good solid congregations that would make for good vicarage situations. Allow for proper funding for a good congregation that may not have the funds. We want good quality pastors and the church at large needs to know we will do that best at giving them those pastors. Therefore, we will find good educational places for their vicarages. Consider congregations and good pastors who will mentor these students. The vicarage should be a two-year internship allowing for that solid training and confidence and mentorship.
318. Might be helpful to know if "purpose statement" is being re-worded!
319. There is a void between Clergy & Laymen and an even wider void between LCC and the community. One example is the Clergy's insistence on being addressed as "Pastor" while other clergy in the community are called by their given names - e.g. Tom, Dick, or Harry, in most informal conversations.
320. Thank-you for issuing this survey & all the work you all do to collect & analyze these surveys & improving the way LCC is structured.
321. I realize that it is almost impossible for this to happen but I think that it would be better to be able to have face to face encounters. Also as far as I'm concerned TOO many clergy & perhaps ex clergy are responsible for this survey. I believe Pastors should stay in there calling which they have been trained to do & not get involved in administrative functions.
322. Very few members have a good understanding of the organization and governance that apples to our congregations. Suggest that printed material be available within each congregation, or better yet that annual sessions take place, perhaps on a circuit basis, be made available, and that members, particularly congregational leaders, be strongly urged to attend. Individually, more of us need to know more about our structure.
323. Back to grass roots! 2. LCC is too insular, closed communion very difficult. 3. Youth do not always stay; adult children don't come anymore. 4. My wife & I worked on this survey together.
324. I would like to see more information on the possible re-structuring options/alternatives.
325. Just a comment: The Synod handled many things poorly in my opinion. The University and the High School should have been priorities in terms of Education. If King's College in Edmonton can thrive as a Christian entity so can Concordia. However, that is over. I am also

saddened with the lack of support for the District Officers and the Board Members in Alberta/BC. If fact the letter from the LCC President was appalling. There was no ministry to our servants in District and the hurt continues. The legal suits and the hateful comments should have been acted upon. Where is our leadership in all of this turmoil? I was hoping for better.

326. I am very concerned with lack of biblical authority applied to various individuals. It is business as usual in ABC; and that means Pastors that ignore their parishioners that are hurting, blame the investors, time to get over it etc. I have wanted to assist the parishioners in ABC but with the current leadership; I cannot in good conscience sent good monies after bad. What have the LCC leadership done to alleviate the various millstones that these unrepentant leaders have saddled thousands of parishioners? I have no confidence in ABC and beginning to doubt LCC. Where to go, that is the question. I am very concerned that this survey is leading us to a predetermined end of which I will not be satisfied with. I am troubled that we react and do not act. That we fail to take a stand even if it is painful.
327. Thank you for your hard work! I imagine putting this together and then analyzing the data is a hard, time-consuming job, and I'm glad you're willing to do it. God bless your efforts.
328. in my opinion: power and authority should reside at the lowest level necessary to get the job done and have as many local people as possible involved in doing the job. However, I also like the idea that central power and authority is in place to protect from abuse occurring at the local level. It would be nice if these values can be achieved easily and administered capably within constitutional and policy guidelines. Further, to not have to duplicate resources at the local, regional or national level in achieving our objectives and goals.
329. As a pastor I have had many lay people say they are not completing this survey because they cannot understand the questions so I cannot think the results can be valid.
330. This made me realize that I do not/did not know enough about the workings of our synod and relationship to our districts. But, we are not a huge church body and I do not think we need a two tiered structure. Dividing the Presidents job into 2 parts - a CEO and spiritual leader would allow each person to function in an area expertise.
331. I have been a member of a 3 different congregations/denominations, now with Hope Lutheran in Port Coquitlam for almost 20 years. My first criteria for selecting a church home for our family when we moved was that it must be in our local community, because that is where our relationships are Monday - Saturday, the people we interact with daily, this is who we should be engaging in our evangelism and ministry. The Christians we interact with daily these are our brothers/sisters as well not just our church members. Denominations tend to divide the greater Christian church, and have us looking inward. Yes, don't compromise on the essentials of the Christian faith, but create local ministry partnerships and live out your faith locally.
332. East district, from what I see, and have been involved with, provide a terrific source. I assume changes would be made for cost effective reasons, but one must be careful, to not lose the Spiritual value and Blessings they provide, which cannot be quantified in dollars.
333. We should seriously go back to a previous structure before LCC and re-establish a business relationship (not only fellowship) with LCMS. Canada will always be a mission, and will always need strong oversight by the USA body (sad to say, but true).
334. I am more concerned with my local church and pastor- I would like pastors to speak God's message more plainly and simply so that all can understand how much God loves us -- THAT is the message. I do not like old fashioned words like Kyrie, Introit, Salutation,

gradual and collect--these words mean nothing to me. Plain words prayer, blessing, thanksgiving, Gods love and compassion--these words can lead to more people coming to know God. I would also like less old fashioned, difficult music and more simple come to God music. I feel that a pastor should be able to learn his sermon by heart and speak from his heart and not read a formal sermon. God will help him to speak from his heart and to pray from his heart rather than read every prayer. We are losing our young people to the Baptist Church

335. Time to acknowledge that men and women are equal in this day and age. Anything less than that smacks of misogyny.
336. We need a revival around the word of God, repentance and a deepened commitment to the principles in scripture.
337. Pastors teach and Preach and they continually validate our faith in them to do just that. But there is far too little financial and operational accountability. Be aware, your lay people are Lawyers, Accountants, CEOs, small business people, operations managers, and Project Managers. They know bad business and lack of accountability when they see it.
338. Current administration needs overhaul. Pastors are not trained administrators or accountants. Current worship services require modernization- traditional is not working or appealing to younger members. We do not promote our message very well - members seem to be embarrassed to share their faith and do not seem to be motivated to share or lead. Closed communion does not seem to be effective or welcoming. We are losing our youth, young families and many others because we seem to resent new persons coming into "my church". I think we are seen as an "OLD Peoples Club". Most congregation ARE DEFINITELY NOT WELCOMING PLACES.
339. I would like to thank editor Mathew Block and his staff for the information that has been provided in The Canadian Lutheran magazine regarding the survey. I have received more information from TCL than I have from my own congregation leadership. This I attribute to the lack of communication within our congregation.
340. If restructuring does not lead to a more relevant church, the church will continue to see declining membership and closures
341. I found that of the 60 questions in the survey, many were redundant and asked the same thing in two questions (5 & 6, 15 & 16, 33 & 34, 35 & 36, 38 & 39, 44 & 45, 51 & 52). Perhaps instead of doing this, other original questions could have been asked. Also, some questions dealt with issues unrelated to synodical restructuring (e.g. seminary education restructuring) and should not have been included at all.
342. Maybe our Pastors could be trained as part of LCMS and do away with both Canadian seminaries. LCC could pay for Pastors training in the states, rather then trying to run two seminaries for a small number of people.
343. Thank you for providing this survey opportunity. I applaud your efforts! I attended the 1988 founding convention of LCC, and do not recall a process, including this survey, being done before. It is critical that we keep this kind of process going as a guide in terms of how congregations work together in our mutual journey of living the Gospel. The points below speak to this concept. There are and will continue to be a challenges on the language - is it too heavily contextualized? Seek & refine for greater clarity by using simple language. Connect directly with those who are receiving this info, and ask, how well did you understand it? How could we have made it clearer? This comment is made as a guide for how communication might improve in future discussions. 1. Please refer to page 1, 3rd

paragraph, first line-"The results of this survey and your comments will be read by thousands of members of LCC congregations and will from the basis of the discussions across LCC in the coming year." How is this to occur? What are the time lines? How are the changes going to be incorporated? 2. In the next sentence, recommendations are mentioned. Will a draft of the recommendations be available to members? How will further changes, & fine tuning be possible from input provided by members? 3. In the longer term, this process or something like it needs to continue so that members are aware of the progress towards goals. Plus, opportunities for members to provide input on an ongoing basis must continue. 4. Congregational structure was not included. When will that be opened up for a survey, further discussion, and possible reshaping? 5. Questions or discussion regarding doctrine were not included. What will be the forum available for members in which they may participate? How will members be able to participate in shaping the forum? 6, Synod should be servant to the Districts. Moving from a Synod & 3 Districts to one body may result in over centralization, with the best if intentions. Please ensure that District activity is well supported & resourced.

344. I love the Lutheran liturgy and the Lutheran congregation that feel like family. Wonderful pastors as well.... but I look at other Protestant churches and see the LCC behind in excluding women. Very sad.
345. it is difficult to a lay member to assess all the questions diligently.
346. Thank you for the opportunity to do this survey
347. I agree that more creative forms of outreach beginning at the local church level should be discussed.
348. Pastor's should be employees of the Synod/District. Congregations should pay a portion of their income to Synod/District. This would allow for Non-Calling congregations to receive a pastor and allow for the wealthier congregations to help the one's which are in need of assistance.
349. thank you for asking my opinion
350. thank you for making the congregation part of this process, this can be an exciting time as we move forward.
351. I very much support the work of LCC National with Rev. Bugbee communicating with other Christian organizations. It is becoming quite evident that Christians are being "pushed aside". It is important that Christian groups support each other. Finally, it may be time to explore the potential of allowing women into the Ministry of Lutheran Church Canada.
352. Comments made as above.
353. Thanks be to God for the faith of our fathers. I pray for the members of the Commission; that they are provided the wisdom to restructure LCC so that it will be around for my children, grandchildren and more generations to come!
354. There are lots of issues facing the LCC. Decisions must be made that will ensure the survival of the LCC in a secular society.
355. Working together in harmony is of the utmost need to deliver the best results of any change, together in Christ it can be accomplished. This is my Prayer!
356. I pray that our LCC family would exhibit love and care for our fellow members, and treating them with the same concern that Christ has for us.
357. There are times that we can profit from looking back at the traditions of the Christian church to inform our decision making and times when we have to literally ignore some of the

traditions and chart a new course in these post Christian times. I pray for wisdom for you and all others so that all of us may know the difference and act boldly.

358. Some time ago, I was a member of an organization that regularly surveyed its membership in order to set priorities and policy. The questions were always accompanied by two concise paragraphs - one pro and one con. Some members of LC-C will be well versed in the issues. Others, like myself, would benefit from hearing the pros and cons. I've answered as best I can but, acknowledge that my opinion might change given the opportunity to hear arguments from both sides.
359. Most churches work as individuals and not as a team. We need a leadership role from the LCC to survive as a growing Lutheran faith.
360. May God bless this process, and guide and direct His servants in accomplishing this important task.
361. in spite of having prepared my responses in advance using the PDF file, the web page expired before this version was completed but returned after "refresh".
362. LCC is way too conservative and not willing to explore new ideas particularly in the area of outreach and worship. Young people and families are looking for more modern ways to worship and our Pastors do not seem open to this. "We must maintain tradition" is often heard, while our tradition is important and relevant it should not restrict our future. Sadly, I do not want to invite guests to my congregation and family members I have brought have been turned off. One area of difficulty is closed communion. Our church is dying and unless we change and encourage more young people we will not be around much longer. As a Lutheran by marriage I am surprised that our church does not collaborate with other churches in the community, I get the sense that we feel we are better than them, but am not sure why I feel this way. I look forward to positive change coming out of this survey - we need it. In God's love.
363. I pray for the Lord's guidance to the committee for restructuring that His will be done. Blessings
364. Creativity is VERY important!
365. I feel that the layers and separate Districts has not been beneficial in the ABC District Crisis. It has been a very real separation. LCC and the other Districts have stepped away and it feels like not an attitude of not my problem instead of compassion and unity. (Not financial but spiritual.) Money can`t fix a wounded heart or the feeling of abandonment by the other Districts or LCC. if you want people to participate a survey of 10 - 15 minutes would probably have better results. One hour turns people off before they get started.
366. For some answers. I do not have all the facts to evaluate an issue.
367. This survey used questions that were unclear and wordy. It would have been better if the questions used simpler
368. The survey should not presume that the church needs to be totally restructured. 2. The survey takers should be grounded in biblical, theological, and LCMS historical principles of church government. 3. There should be a call for prayer. 4. The survey should give precedence to those of spiritual maturity and to the congregations and pastors. 5. The survey should not ask for feelings. 6. The survey should state the problem that gave rise to the request to restructure and look for a solution to a narrower question. 7. The church is people gathered around the ministry of the Word and sacraments and as such we need to keep the administration close to the congregations and pastors. Removing Districts will make the connection to congregations and pastors to the administration more distant. 8. The synod

should be seen as representing the congregations and pastors and districts in truth, not controlling the congregations and pastors. 9. The term "bishop" is a title for the congregational leader in the New Testament and as such should not be used exclusively by the president of a district or a synod. 10. When the title of "bishop" has been used for the synodical leader synods/church bodies have become Episcopalian and derive their existence from the leader rather than the synod/church body deriving its existence from the congregations where word and sacrament ministry happen. 10. Having districts insulates the whole church from any one leader's errors and adds to collective wisdom and to creative solutions. 11. The chart that groups LSOs income with LCC income can mislead people into thinking that LSO income and ministry can be redistributed by the LCC.

369. What has taken place has happened because of the sin of man: arrogance, thievery, dishonesty, and a lack of empathy. Everything the Church should not be, but is expected from big business. Shame on all of you.
370. I think the Synod and the districts should provide more communication to the members of the congregations.
371. My thoughts and prayers are with those involved in this process. This is not an easy task and thanks be to God for His wisdom.
372. LCC Synod should affect a SMALL amount of "modernizing" in our church service's singing of praises. While continuing with our "old" hymns, the congregations should add the singing of meaningful (and theologically sound) newer 21st century hymns of praise; and be allowed to "raise our hands to our God" when Holy Spirit moves us to do so. There are myriads of excellent "old" hymns, but there are also myriads of "new" hymns that can be just as inspiring when touching our hearts.
373. God grant us the peace and understanding to do His Will! With Him all things are possible!
374. I am not familiar enough with some of the relationships/ topics questioned, thus 'No opinion" was answered. Accountability and capability are things that need to be addressed when considering the future organization. The case for CEF is known, but in the case of ABC district and the manner in which CEF was managed, the people responsible for making the decisions were probably not qualified to do so.
375. I have responded as an opted out one. When one is given a prep book of 26 pages to read in advance of answering, research has shown a high degree of parroting back the desired response
376. I strongly believe that to sustain and grow the church, we must be in more in-depth Bible studies. We all must know God's Word. We should be fed as though in university. Young people fall away because they hear the same things over and over when there is so very, very much in the Bible. I do not understand why we are on a three-year cycle of the same passages over and over again (all of which are precious and useful) but we need to feed more fully on His whole Word and especially the full New Testament. LCC hold to God's Word and does not deviate, which is good and right and pleasing to God. But why is our focus only on this three year repeated plan? We crave more...please feed us more on His Holy Word. Thank you for this opportunity to give feedback and for all that you do in faithful service to our Lord.
377. Praying we seek the LORDS will as we go forward rejoicing because we have Jesus and we know the glorious end of the story.
378. A church body of our size should have only one seminary.

379. Please, please do not just do nothing. We will not survive as a Synod and national Church if we stick our heads in the sand and pretend that it will all go away or work itself out. We continue to pray that God will use us to His glory as we pray for the CCMS, the CTCR, Synods and Districts.
380. At both synodical and district levels, elected directors MUST remain at 'arms length' from decisions involving salaries/compensation, the management of financial investments and development of church properties. Elected directors MUST focus on matters related to their spiritual training, leaving financial management decisions to persons properly trained in those fields.
381. This crisis etc. has had no effect on my faith-my personal relationship with Jesus. This crisis has caused disillusions and disappointment in the men that are supposed to be leaders in this church.
382. We as a church body are one in the Spirit and one church body. I feel we tend to get into the church politics a bit too much. We have synod, districts, circuits, regions and then an awful lot of meetings--are these all cost effective? Can more be done through the internet?
383. I'm not as fully aware of the functions of various church bodies as I would have preferred to before I filled in this survey.
384. I think making this one organization will strengthen us all.
385. We have noticed a distinct change in attitude of our last three ministers, dogmatic, sense of "omniscient", rather than inter-personal skills of love compassion and respect. Is this something LCC can help with?
386. You should have hired professionals to write a meaningful survey. How will you correct this blunder or will you acknowledge this lapse of judgement?
387. Comments pertaining to questions 22-27: It is a disgraced that deacons are automatically lumped into some poorly-understood "not clergy, not lay" category and banned from voting. There are various ways this could be worked, fixing some of the other issues identified as well: 1) Keep congregation-based voting, but allow congregations to send an advisory pastor who is a congregation member as their pastoral delegate, and a deacon who is a congregation if they want as their lay delegate. This keeps the pastor to non-pastor equality that we have now. 2) Allow congregations to send one active pastor and one other "congregational" delegate, who could be an advisory pastor of deacon if they choose. Some would worry this could lead to a glut of pastors "dictating" to the sheep, but the second delegate is there to represent the congregation and would be there by the congregation's will and choice. I also think we have too strong of a shepherd vs. sheep mentality, rather than seeing preachers and hearers walking together. 3) Go to a synod-membership-based voting system, with pastoral, diaconal, and congregational voting delegates. It could be possible to restrict pastoral and diaconal delegates to those currently serving calls, which would open up a possibility of allowing congregations to elect a retired pastor/deacon or candidate as their congregational vote, should such a concept be found acceptable. All of these possibilities (and there are certainly more!) have their benefits and drawbacks, but our current system smacks of a leftover Pastor Vs. People concept that is too oppositional to be healthy, and that has never figured out where a retired pastor, candidate, or deacon fits in to such an overly simple, dualistic system. Regarding questions 30-32: We simply can't afford full congregational (or member) voting at both district and synod levels. If we make the choice to keep both levels of organization as things stand now, synodical representation should be reduced to circuit or district-based representation. If we decide to rework the districts, perhaps we could have

smaller ones with more local participation that don't require the infrastructure and bureaucracy we currently have Regarding questions 33-34: This choice should be made depending on the size of the national synodical structure when it's determined. there's no need to split the Executive and Ecclesiastical functions between different people if one person can do the job. Whether it is one position with two functions, or two positions, each with one function, it is important for them to work together smoothly, not in opposition, but with the understanding that the executive function MUST SERVE the ecclesiastical one, NOT vice-versa. Regarding questions 35-36: There is nothing wrong with the President(/Bishop?) having a vote on the BoD, IF he is "accountable" to some other committee or commission of the synod. I'm not sure there's a need to explore such options though. Regarding questions 46-50: Nobody agrees on how Districts and Synod relate to one another now, and we operate in violation of how things are on paper. We should have ONE national body overseeing doctrine/vision/goal, and seriously need to rethink how things happen at the local level UNDER synod, not against it. There is no need for full-time national and regional presidents in so small a church body. Regarding questions 51-52: I don't care, as long as synodical officials don't use the "separate corporate entity" excuse to avoid dealing with problems in districts. Thank you all for taking the time to put this survey together and continuing to work on restructuring our Synod.

388. I offer this quote I came across as I attempted to find the online survey through google: The Restructuring Survey: “Oh Wow…” February 3, 2016 by Andreas Schwabe 11 Comments11 Comments Editor’s note: In the rush to post the article, I omitted a short paragraph. That paragraph has been returned to its rightful place in the article. Synod’s Restructuring survey is online – synod hopes to gather a whopping 2000 responses to inform its next move with restructuring. I don’t know much about polling. During my career I’ve commissioned polls, been briefed on results, and made to make strategic decisions based on the insights gained from the survey. As varied as my career is, I’m not adept enough at surveys or hard statistical and probability analysis to really know with any amount of certainty what’s valid and helpful, and what’s not. The Synod’s restructuring survey raised a few flags for me, but quite a few more for the experts. Instead of writing my own moderately informed critique of the Synodical Restructuring Survey (lead by the CTCR – the Commission on Theology and Church Relations), I decided to ask two polling experts to go through it. The two pollsters are people I’ve known through journalism work. They both work with large, established, reputable polling firms – one in Edmonton, one in Ottawa. The experts expressly requested not to be personally or professionally identified – they did their analysis as a favour. So while some folks may argue the anonymity negates the comments (fair enough), I think we ignore their insights at our peril. Their critiques of the survey agreed as much as you’ll ever get two experts to agree. A lot of their observations are also pretty self-evident. I sent the link and info package to the experts with a request to evaluate the quality of the survey and the quality and reliability of the answers. One pollster started with, “I wish I could say something positive, but your survey is a mess. It’s a (dog’s breakfast) of biases, suggestive and leading questions, weak or invalid error checking. There is no meaningful security to protect against loading the deck with answers.” The “Dog’s breakfast” part is in brackets because the actual description was a bit more colourful. Again, these are people who design and analyze surveys for a living. 1) The “information package” is highly unusual and biases respondents. Neither pollster approved of the information package to begin with. Professionally prepared surveys have a very short preamble along the lines of, “This survey

seeks to gauge the parishioner's mood on various issues within Synod." That's all. Instead there are pages of content outlining everything from structure, to spending. The experts believe the preamble taints the survey because it provides information, introduces bias, and guidance. Rather than getting a real snapshot of what people think without external input, they've been provided detailed information about synod. Which is to say that you can't know what people's perception of the current structure of synod if you tell them what it is beforehand. Both pollsters thought the two preambles (the info package, the survey preamble, and a second info page within the survey) were enough bias and guidance to render the results invalid. There was no hedging on this. 2) Many of the questions pose an alternative, but don't actually ask for a meaningful answer (a bit like asking, "Is it farther to Red Deer or by bus?" The experts said the results for these questions were invalid because the queries are vague or don't ask for a meaningful answer. One example is question #2: "The Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) has the right amount of authority in matters of doctrine and practice." Does agreeing mean it has a small but appropriate amount of power or a large but appropriate amount of power? Does disagreeing mean it needs more or less authority? The survey only asks if it's an appropriate amount of authority – it doesn't try to discover if it's too much or too little. The question is so vague that the answer is meaningless. There are several questions in the survey with this problem. Another example is "Pastors and Deacons receive the appropriate quality of spiritual care from LCC." Again, if you agree does that mean it's a little, but enough, or a lot, and enough. Or if you disagree does it mean you think there's too much or too little? The question seems to ask a question, but the answers result is statistical gibberish. 3) Jargon is an issue the experts flagged as being of minor to moderate concern. This is where things take a turn for the ironic. The info package and preambles provide so much information that the experts believe it skews the survey results, but jargon gets no explanation or definition, which also skews results unpredictably. When asking about "ecclesiastical supervision," there may be a large number of people who don't know what ecclesiastical supervision means. Heck, the definition probably varies between clergy, let alone being a technical term rarely used by lay people. Jargon requires a brief definition so everyone is on the same page. Without common definitions and understanding, the answers will be less reliable than they could be. 4) Error checking is clumsy or non-existent. Both experts flagged certain pairs of questions (like #5 and #6) as invalid error checking. "Church extension funds should be discontinued" is a neutral yes or not statement. It provides a clear answer. Question 6 is an error check, but adds bias; "CEF are still needed and should be continued." The "still needed" presupposes that CEFs were needed in the first place. Question 6 can't be error checking for 5: they pose two different questions – one direct, one is a value statement. They cannot be used to validate each other. So, the error checking is either clumsy, or non-existent. The experts didn't find any standard survey error checking methods in the survey, and where they did, the results are suspect because of these (and other smaller) problems. The strongest reaction came at question #35: "The synodical President should be a voting member of the Board of Directors, even though he is accountable to the Board between Conventions." Both experts asked why anyone would even entertain a question which expresses a clear conflict of interest. Even if respondents said they were fine with it, it would still constitute a conflict of interest and be unacceptable. Both thought it was an inappropriate and unnecessary question. Even if someone believes the conflict of interest is acceptable, it's still ethically not unacceptable. One pollster was baffled, the other mildly

alarmed. I asked the baffled pollster how they would characterize question #35: "Exceptionally weird," was the answer. The pollsters pointed out several other problems, but they're harder to understand, let alone explain. Suffice to say, after getting back their initial feedback, I asked the experts what could be done to avoid the pitfalls and problems with the survey. Their answers were direct: let professionals to do it. Now, that might seem predictable since that's their livelihood, but these professionals who have been in the survey and intelligence field for decades (each). These people know their business – so do countless political parties, governments at all levels, and large corporations. Since the ABC District collapse, Synod has had to tighten its belt. Still, you'd think they would find a few dollars to have a professional survey to dig for insights into how the church pictures its future. I suppose if you don't want that insight, then a nearly-free SurveyMonkey survey is all you need. I don't believe that's what happening here, but the result is about the same. I'll give the final word to the two experts who gave freely of their time and expertise: "Oh wow, (this survey is) so bad." "This is why you hire a professional insight agency."

389. I think it is time for restructuring LCC, particularly in regards of: outreach - making LCC known for the Canadian population in general, mission - increase efforts in taking the Gospel outside our church's walls Youth and kids - we are missing and losing our church of tomorrow: youth and kids. Efforts to encourage youth to enter the Seminary should be taken, as well as re-think kids/youth ministry in our congregations. Deacons and spiritual leaders should receive proper support and training for this age group, and also have alternative Sunday services/activities to make them appealing for youth. Thanks for this opportunity and God bless!
390. I would like to have seen more questions about the role of one or two seminaries for LCC.
391. LCC is a strange animal in that it is not hierarchal but functions within constraints and restraints us in order to maintain the one true faith. It is necessary for function and appreciated in mission co-operation of our congregations. The danger is always who is leading (Christ) meaning how faithful a servant and all those who serve the church at large. God preserve us to eternity!
392. will seminary students be able to complete this survey?
393. I hope that this is not an isolated opportunity for us to have input. I am unable to attend many meetings at my church, but I am interested and I like to be included. I have not felt before that I have had a voice. I wish all those who are working for the church at this time then strength to make difficult decisions, and the humility to look outside the familiar faces in the organization for fresh opinions and insights.
394. Good Luck!! I will think of you as I sit on the beach at Maui.
395. Survey was TOO long and the too many questions were "questionable".
396. Remember that ministry is, by definition, Word and Sacrament, and thus should be at the forefront of all that we do.
397. As a lay person who has not been to a convention for some years, I found it very hard to make a good opinion on some of these questions. I wish my church would have had time to have a work shop to discuss the working of the church body
398. bigger is not better God is our refuge and strength. Actions speak louder than words. Sharing, caring and giving is best.
399. I think the role of women in the church needs to be reviewed and revised. I think there is a place for female elders in some congregations. We need to bring the "joy" of our salvation back into our church.

400. Remember....Communication is essential.
401. I wasn't too sure how to answer a few of the questions. The survey was vague in some ways. I've attended both Synodical and District conventions as a Lay delegate so am "kind of" familiar with the processes of each.
402. Thanks to all who were instrumental in formatting this survey and for the hard work the Synod board put forth to bring it to the church. May God bless this exercise to His glory and the betterment of His church.
403. Canada is to large to have one centralized governance. (The LWMLC is making a wrong turn by illuminating local supervisors & leaders) Synod should be a two-tiered organization with a revised and changed Constitution & bylaws.
404. God guide and bless you in your work!
405. It seems that LCC/ABC District take its best pastors and promotes them to head office where they become unavailable to communicant members because of administrative duties. If pastors have a strength of preaching the word, they should remain in their congregation instead it seems like all of the good preachers end up in head office while congregations they should be servicing are left to flounder and even die. Head office then gets a reputation of "the Old Boys Club".
406. I am very happy to be a member of St. Matthew Lutheran in Calgary; we have a wonderful Pastor.
407. Calling process needs tweaking to better assist congregations in the calling process. Otherwise, we should just draw a name from a hat as they did in New Testament times!!! God bless all those in LCC who were instrumental in formulating this survey. May the results aid LCC in achieving the greater good of the Church and to the Glory of God on our temporal journey here together on earth.
408. I'll say it one more time. I think we have failed to make use of our leaders by not asking them to assess the pros and cons of the current structure and submitting either their endorsement for the status quo or offering their carefully considered recommendations and rationale. But what do I know! One or two seminary question has been kicked around a long time. My guess is that it's too touchy a decision for anyone to make. It will probably be decided by the availability of finances.
409. Unrelated matters: Visitation of sick and shut-ins is a pastoral work ethic that is suffering these days, often it seems, in favor of time spent on computers. Also, the practice of chanting the liturgy, done by an increasing number of younger pastors, is not well received by many congregational members.
410. I don't know if I have enough knowledge to complete this survey. It would be good if this could have been done with the congregation as a whole with someone in charge to answer questions or clarify matters. With regard to the Church Extension Fund crash in the ABC District, will there ever be full disclosure??? Maybe if the Synod oversaw the District, the crash would not have happened. Also, why have two seminaries if LCC can't afford them. Also, why build "new" churches, when there are many church buildings (even if buildings of other denominations) sitting empty. As well, there are many LCC congregations where there are very few communicants. Fill these up first.
411. The church need to plan for the future because only elders was there...and the service always is the same...equal catholic
412. thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my thoughts may God bless you in your work

413. Duplication should be changed. World Mission to 3rd world countries should be increased. Canadian Mission Outreach to young should be increased.
414. I think this survey will show just how little our members know about our structure to begin with. When this is the case it is difficult to know where it should go when most don't know where we are right now. I think there is more to look at than just whether there should be Districts or if everything should be under Synod. I think as a whole we have bigger problems in LCC than just who governs it. The attendance in our churches is dropping and many congregations are hurting financially and I believe spiritually, this all needs to be looked at not just the structure.
415. This is an important opportunity for LCC. It has been discussed for a long time and the recent ABC financial crisis just heightens the need. With the Lord's help, we can come up with the next iteration of Synod governance that makes sense for today's day and age.
416. I do feel that ABC District made bad decisions then hid behind Spiritual Leadership as an excuse. At each meeting I became more aware of being misled. I feel sorry for those that have lost. I realize that not all pastors even knew what was going on. What the CEF was for, building churches was good. How can educated people take something so good and waste it on risky ventures that already had bad loans.
417. LCC has a spiritual problem that far outweighs the structural problems and unless we address that... unless we see some repentance and forgiveness none of the restructuring matters. It is simply reshuffling the deck chairs on the Titanic. It will take a strong, spiritual emphasis to begin turning this ship around.
418. The church has slowly grown to a point where the Pastoral Leadership has gone beyond the financial capabilities of small rural congregations (communities less than 6000 persons). After a lifetime of participation in the church I am offended that the leadership feels that they are so indispensable that small congregation such as ours no longer can afford to reimburse a Pastor and subsequently will slowly die away from the lack of leadership. If the church has a challenge this is one that must be faced and effectively dealt with. Small congregations have a difficult time being able to generate a budget of over $100K. Barely enough to pay at a minimum salary/benefit package and keep the heat on.
419. It is unfortunate that troubling and hugely impactful circumstances seem to have brought about the need for this restructuring. It is a good reminder that we need to be diligent in ensuring that we don't keep on doing the same things the same way just because we have. In large organizations, so many things just become assimilated into the overall working, sometimes without complete thought on the overall impact. We tend to get comfortable with how things are. Part of being a synod should be a diligence in self-evaluation and questioning of why we are doing what we are doing and why we are doing it in certain ways. All in all, the man-made organizational structure should serve to streamline and encourage the mission of the church, which is the mission of God's saving love needing to be spread to all because He made them and loves them and wants them to know His love eternally.
420. CEF could be incorporated as one totally separate charitable organization which serves all LCC districts within Canada
421. Again, Congregation should have a paper copy to discuss the Questions and be informed of the workings so they can answer as an informed person...certainly will be asking more??? I know there are some of us this applies to and perhaps that has been a fault.... trusting that others know and do what is best for all

422. God Bless each of you as you work through these surveys and work at making our earthly ministry productive and efficient for the sake of the gospel and the good of God's people.
423. The Christian Church in general is losing. Satan is powerful. What we can do in using modern methods of communications, we should do. Emphasis needs to be placed on "a house-going pastor makes for a church going people" (Dr. Fritz). Pastors get out there and do calling.
424. Dear Friends, What I would like to address here may seem somewhat unrelated to the scope of the survey, but I feel the need to bring it out. I first came to the Lutheran Church some 30+ years ago after and Anglican childhood and some Pentecostal church experience. It was, to say the least, and eye-opener to read through the LCMS Doctrinal Confessions (Dr. Bohlman) and especially the Book of Concord back then. These things solidified my confidence that the truth of the Scriptures were being upheld in the LCMS, and consequently LCC. I actually had the privilege of attending our LCC founding convention many years ago now. Lately however, it becomes noticeably clear tome that Satan has made his inroads into our fellowship in very subtle ways. I would begin by noting the widespread use of the NIV Bible. Without going into a huge theological discussion on its so-called merits, I would only say that the church at large flourished much better with old standby, the K.J.V. Sure, the language is a bit odd in places, but certainly easily understood and accurate. We need to return to it. But now, what troubles me the most is our reluctance to point out publicly the positively sinister plans that are being proposed by the ones who steer the New World Order. More than 25 years ago, the Agenda 21 Forum took place and the noose has been tightening around our necks ever since, to the point now that this country, and others like us, are at the very point of becoming a virtual police state - yet the pulpits are silent in pointing it out. Just tell me why you are silent in pointing it out? Just tell me what you think Jesus would have to say to today's money changers - and right to their faces too. This fear of publicly denouncing evil rulers, bankers and war mongers cheats our own people out of a chance to prepare for troubling times, does it not? Yes, the Lord Christ is our only salvation, ultimately, and yet He is the very One who gave us the warning to watch for. But from the pulpits? Dead silence on the whole matter of it all. Depopulation, crop seed monopoly, mandatory vaccination, geo-engineering... you name it. This belief in political correctness is killing us, step by step. Surely, of all people, the church ought to be able to recognize Satan in our midst. If mainstream won't print it, then let's create our own newspaper, TV station. "Warn the Unruly." Cheers.
425. While restructuring LCC based on the guidelines that were provided, nothing has been mentioned about whether the guidelines and mission statement is God pleasing and God's will. Perhaps this survey may reveal a need to revisit what God's plan and will is for LCC. That is sadly missing from this survey. LCC is missing the openness in our churches to reach all people. LCC does not seem to encourage our congregations to "have a relationship with our Lord". The Liturgical Service, although it has meaning and depth of scripture, doesn't reach a new comer. There is an appearance to new comers that we don't participate in worship, the pastor performs the service. I admit that this may differ from church to church, yet if that is the case there should be more focus on this during training of pastors and deacons.
426. Individuals should be held accountable for their part in the CEF disaster. Being politically correct and pretending that it was an accident or unpreventable creates distrust. Critical review and communication about where things fell apart and how this could have been

prevented need to come out. Lies, misrepresentations, lack of reporting, excuses, etc. only do harm.

427. We have the best theology in town. We are also the church that is most likely to close. Why? The vibrancy and power of the Holy Spirit is missing. Yes, the scripture is important, but we need to experience and know the living God, otherwise what is the point?
428. From the questions presented, I'm concerned that all options are not truly on the table. There seems to be a heavy bias towards our existing basic structure of synod + districts, and some big presumptions required to answer many of the questions. As well, many questions are ambiguous and can only really be answered in the comments. I sincerely hope this ends up being a helpful exercise and I look forward to reading all the comments. But I have to say I have my doubts about how it can be fruitful, given the bias, presumptions, and ambiguity in it. Overall, I think our overriding question must be, "if we were starting from scratch, what would we do that would fit our 21st-century Canadian context?". We have to be willing to let go of everything that's come before if it might hinder the faithful proclamation of the Gospel among us and out from us in the future. That's not to recognize that what has come before was wrong or not valuable. But we don't live in the USA of the 1850s nor even in the Canada of the 1980s. You've said above that the church is a family. That's a great Biblical description, and the more we can use the family as our dominant metaphor for structure over against that of a corporation, the better.
429. I have heard nothing but complaints about lack of support from synod concerning financial procedures.
430. It is my hope that the teaching of pastors is the same in both seminaries and that all pastors are the same in dealing with all members.
431. Survey was difficult. Hard to follow and understand. For many older people impossible. Would like to know age group that completed this (%).
432. Looking at the listing of expenditures and the economic reality in the church, steps and cancellations of some programs should be reduced or severely adjusted. Time for a new change and era
433. We live in a changing society and culture. The church will need to adapt in the years ahead. However, I don't think simply changing the structure of Synod will solve some of the problems and challenges ahead. Perhaps the LORD will reveal this to us in ways we don't imagine nor envision. Proverbs 16:9 says: "In his heart a man plans his course, but the LORD determines his steps."
434. The committee is discussing changes without the members knowing why or what these changes are.
435. Sorry I couldn't be more help. My history with LCC (LCMS) only goes back to 1973 when I was married. Prior to that I had been an apostate Canada Synod Lutheran.
436. The CEF crisis in the A BC district reminds us that continual review in the face of a changing world is important. Leadership must always be accountable and in REAL communication with members using multiple methods. A new structure must specifically address this need.
437. God bless you with wisdom and strength. Look to His guidance with humility and faith as you take on this very daunting task.
438. This is a poorly structured survey. I received no advance information as to the present state of many of these functions and relationships that this survey has asked me to comment on.

As a charter and founding member of LCC I am truly disappointed that LCC has approved this survey.

439. Survey is far too long. The questions are ambiguous and not at the understanding of the level of the majority of the people in our congregations. Too many questions expressing the negative and the positive for the same thing. How much of the total budget is spent on administration?
440. I answered "neither agree or disagree" and "no opinion" to a large number of the questions here because I simply do not have enough information to make any strong statement. In order to get that information, I would actually need to be actively researching district and synodical practice as well as attend conventions because as far as I know there is no adequate supply of information available to make strong statements aside from comments attendees make to the congregation. I would also consider many questions here to be incredibly redundant.
441. I am very concerned about the lack of unity between the seminaries and furthermore that pastors are not trained to be missionary pastors in a time of rapid secularization.
442. Have to re-structure to attract and grow youth back into LCC congregations! LCC is dying! Status quo is not an answer. Must involve more females in the structure at important positions to gain respect and be more in tune with the times and other denominations. Good luck! May God help and guide us!
443. I consider myself to be a fairly intelligent individual, but I along with probably 80% of the Lay people know little or nothing re 60% of these questions.
444. I think it would be beneficial to have occasional "town hall" meetings in congregations to inform members of the function and operation of various boards and their relationship to the service organization of LCC. It would be good to be more informed as to the workings of our Synod.
445. Please consider the women's roll in LCC as we go forward. The church needs to include women more and value their education and the importance of what they bring to the modern day church going forward.
446. It seems like more congregations and organizations feel they need to restructure to be more effective. I believe we have been given our structure, by our Lord, but yet we think we can do it better somehow. This doesn't negate the fact that we may have to adapt from time to time in areas of communication and the like, but this undertaking is a major change. If this re-structuring is being done because our original structure was faulty, then that's another thing, but if it is to become better in a worldly way, then I would disagree with it.
447. I feel it would be valuable for the committee to review the paper done by Pastor Elmer Mushumanski. He was business man prior to his entry into the ministry. He has ideas that I support.
448. More information flow between local elected church councils and the district.
449. QUIT excluding groups and be much more inclusive of people--divisions prompted by narrow theological understanding of Gods word are very unchristian
450. I believe it was pastor heavy and lay people would have a hard time answering this. I wish there was more context provided. it intended on being grass roots, but once again, it seems to lack transparency of the bigger issue. I am still unclear what the question is that we are trying to answer here. I just wish that it was more inclusive for some of us who don't know too much about how our church synod works and is structured.

451. I felt our LCC was doing just as good as other bodies except those running Church Extension, I am sorry they really miss-judged what they were doing
452. I am excited by the possibility of restructuring and the opportunity to establish something sustainable. Obviously this is a difficult task. You, the CCMS, are in my prayers as you work through this process. I thank God for you and your dedication to this task. I hope that we are able to come up with something that will free us up from expensive bureaucracy and allow us to continue in ministry as a synod for a long time. I don't know what the best model is, but I pray that answers would arise out of this process. We know the gates of hell will not prevail against the Church of Christ and in that we take comfort. This does not mean, however, that LCC is bullet proof and will stand forever. The benefits of walking together as a Synod of Confessional Lutherans in Canada are tremendous. To maintain those benefits, we need to think long and hard right now about what is the best way for us to go forward. May the Lord grant all of us wisdom and courage as we face these days and struggle with these questions.
453. As I mentioned earlier, my three children (all in their 20s) have stopped attending church because they feel it is completely out of date and unwelcoming. This is made worse by the fact that most of the other young people have stopped coming to church as well. While I think synodical restructuring is an important issue, if we don't find a way to get young people back into our church our rescinded may be irrelevant. One of their areas of chief concern is the 600-year-old music or hymns which we use while refusing to permit any newer music into the church. Is it really impossible that some of our Young Christian artists are unable to provide music that would inspire and enrich the lives of our younger people just like the hymns of our old hymnals have done for older generations? I know this is a touchy subject, but the decline in our churches must be addressed or were all just wasting our time.
454. I believe we must move ahead not remain old fashioned in our thinking and theology. If we don't this is a wasted exercise as we are an aging church and society the needs new thinking and ideas or we will cease to exist as a church.
455. many areas, most of us have limited knowledge and are only now made aware.
456. LCC needs to focus on Missions and Outreach. The Lord has commanded, "Go and make Disciples" not "Go and purchase property" Membership has declined. Need a Plan for growth. Small parishes need to be consolidated. Ensure women and younger members have opportunity to be involved and take on administrative roles. Communication is a key. Many congregations do very little advertising.
457. I really don't see how this survey can be used for restricting purposes. It was poorly put together, and I fear the results. There was not enough information given to properly answer all of the questions asked. In the word of Tim
458. Item #57 - Frequently results of surveys are not taken seriously nor acted on results.
459. PLEASE CONSIDER CLOSED COMMUNION IS ADDRESSED.
460. We need to be more active in our communities as a church body, not just sitting in our churches among Lutherans.
461. Most of the congregations in LCC are spiritual sick and dying a slow death. This means LCC is predominately sick and dying a slow death. The number one priority in LCC needs to be providing spiritual care that will bring healing and health to local congregations so that they can both reach out and bring healing to their communities and to their members. If this is not done, then restructuring a sick church will make little difference.

462. While polity is a matter of adiaphora, please don't try to reinvent the wheel from scratch just to be creatively hip. We are a confessional and historical movement within the church catholic. Let's draw insight and wisdom - and yes, terminology for our spiritual leaders (bishops & archbishop) - from what has worked in the past and what is universally understood & understandable. We shouldn't have to be interpreting the church polity to the world when we talk about who we are. The focus should be on communicating the Gospel.
463. I believe there are many other church members like myself, have never really thought too much about how our LCC runs or operates. This has been an eye-opener. I thank God for all the people who have done so much for our Synod in the years before and now.
464. May God give wisdom and the gift of leadership to the Lutheran branch of His church and may we effectively take our place in unity with the Body of Christ through love and good relationships.
465. if anyone is happy with the status quo of the church they need their head examined. Leaders lead, they make the tough decisions. If we are wasting money, let's not any more. If we are producing annual pastors, lets not any more. If we are so governed by fear of making a mistake, lets not any more be fearful. Let’s help those with the good ideas make the necessary and godly changes. I have no doubt that God's going to protect us from false doctrine so we need to worry less about that and more about the salvation of souls, unless we've all become universalists. God bless your efforts. let us know when you are meeting so the church can pray for effective change.
466. More surveys at different times would help congregations to better understand how everything works. Maybe annually.
467. I believe there should be one governing Synod with Conventions every three years. Every congregation should have equal representation, namely pastor & lay delegate. There are convention halls that can accommodate this amount of delegates and this would be a far better stewardship of the various congregation monies that are spent in placing delegates to district as well as Synodical conventions as is now the case. Trim the top end and get many pastors that are in management to go back into the churches where we need them. The money that could possibly be saved could go to churches that are having a difficult time paying their pastor. Possibly a soft subsidy such as matching or half matching donations. God bless all of you as you deliberate on the restructuring.
468. I found some of the statements not pertaining to me or not of my knowledge. I actually was very uncomfortable answering as I felt as if I didn't know much about LCC and the whole organization (which doesn't say much about me being Lutheran). I think the statements pertained more towards ministers than parishioners.
469. Thank you and God's blessings on this process.
470. God be with all involved in this work and may the Holy Spirit guide you all
471. LCC, along with most Christian churches, is 'greying and declining - becoming lean and focused is very necessary. Outreach - spreading the gospel - must be a priority. WE must plant seeds so that God can make them grow.
472. There are 2 things that desperately need to be addressed: 1. the lack of "reach" to LCC's communication to the average lay person (the information is there but its not filtering down and reaching people) 2. The "Lutheran" stereotype that the younger generation has. I think a digital communications specialist should be hired and focus on creating digital content that is: -broken down into bite sizes pieces and explained in laymen's terms (no fancy theological terminologies) -delivered in multiple marketing channels (social media, digital curated

content i.e. YouTube, an app, etc.) -focus on communication that unites the 300 congregations in our Synod (an app would be beneficial for this) -partner with other digitally active churches to better spread God's word in the digital space I would love to help flesh out a position like this for LCC as its something that is desperately needed to move the Lutheran church into the 21st century. I'd love to discuss this further so please fell free to email me at philipcorson@live.ca to further elaborate on this, or find me on LinkedIn, Twitter, or Facebook! Thanks for setting up this survey, I think it's moving LCC in the right direction but there is a long way to go!

473. Why is it necessary to have contradicting positive and negative questions follow each other or even both be included if the one question provides the answer?
474. Eph 2:20 "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone." Hymn # 644 - The Church's One Foundation
475. ME & MY HUSBAND ARE STILL VERY UNHAPPY ABOUT OUR ONCE TRUSTED ABC DISTRICT. BUT GOD IS OUR GUIDE & LIGHT. I WISH YOU WELL WITH RESTRUCTURE & HEALING OF LCC.
476. With the difficulties experienced in ABC District, it is extremely important that this restructuring is done in such a way the people in ABC feel they are a valued part of, and belong to the "new" LCC.
477. Disappointed that over the years our Lutheran believes have fallen prey to society wishes and not following what the Bible ordained. We are slowly letting outside influences creep in. One very evident one is the role women now have in the church. Holding council positions, voting etc. I am a woman and have noticed that most couples vote the same anyway and how since we now have more authority meetings are more controversial. Also women taking part in worship service, elders etc. trouble me.
478. Before we do any kind of restructuring, we need to step back and seriously consider and reflect upon the Objectives of our synod as mentioned in the Constitution. For instance, do we (pastors and congregations) really agree with these? In this regard, presentations on the doctrine of the church and the ministry would be in order. More specifically, C.W.W. Walther's essay entitled "Duties of an Evangelical Lutheran Synod" would be a good place to start.
479. What happens to LHI (Lutheran Historical Society/Institute in all of this? (archives?)
480. I am missing any reference to whether elected officials are full-time staff. Part of the problem in ABC was that the President was wearing too many hats - some of them creating conflict of interest. Will restructuring solve this problem? No recognition of Archives (LHI) and preserving records of the past. #47-#49 appear to be the heart of the survey's concern. But I sense that the person who drew up the survey has run out of steam.
481. 1. In the case of Nicaragua, why do we assign and experienced Pastor and Deaconess (wife) to head the Mission and then limit them to 30% of the job demands? 2.Why do we not allow the Pastor in Nicaragua (an American) to access the US congregations to help support the CLMS projects that have been identified for 2017? 3.Over the past 5-8 years a Mirofinance Plan ($21,000.00 US), Health Plan ($5,000.00 US) and sewing centre construction ($10,000,00 US) were provided to the ILSN (Nicaragua). As of today with no proper administration all 3 have fallen in disarray. 4.Congregational efforts from Canada need to be better coordinated here, since individual support for a specific Nicaraguan congregation can result in certain congregations receiving little or nothing. We can only surmise what the results will be!

482. I have been a LCMS/LCC Lutheran since I was born. I have three pastors in my family of origin, and studied for a time at seminary. Yet, I have come to realise that I am first a Christian. I believe that the Lutheran theology we have in LCC/LCMS is the most correct interpretation of God's word. Yet, the non-biblical structures and strictures that we are so fervent to protect are what I believe are preventing us from really being a beacon in this dark world. Sadly, I fear that I will have to leave the Lutheran Church to find a place where they really want to be a church that can attract the lost, because the pastors and leadership aren't willing or able to change in this changing world. I'm not interested in the phylacteries that look good but hide an unwillingness to be a servant to those who do not know Christ.
483. God's grace and peace be upon each of you.
484. Having served on the executive of our Parish Planning Council for the past few years, I have become adamantly opposed to the policy of barring women from serving in certain positions in the executive. Each year, we have great difficulty in nominating and electing capable and willing members of our congregation to serve our small and aging congregation. By eliminating the possibility of women filling these positions, we reduce the number of potential leaders. We are now in the 21st Century! It is time to get past this ridiculous barrier that serves no purpose.
485. Make sure that LCC no longer gets into investment areas of business! The church is for God's work. Pastors are not qualified to make investment decisions!!!
486. Please make sure that qualified people are assigned to every area of responsibility. There should be qualification guidelines enshrined for areas of responsibility. Proper liability insurance needs to be a pre-requisite for holding office.
487. I am in ABC District. We need to take measures to ensure the same mishandling of money does not take place in other districts or at LCC head office.
488. Perhaps some discussion take place among all Canadian Lutherans becoming united into one Synod (incl ELCIC). Also, the stewardship of property management; far too many church buildings could be better utilized. I know the urban population in our area could be downsized and four or five congregations could be amalgamated into two congregations or does the concentration have to be on "Outreach" programs or a combination of both??
489. Peace be with you.
490. Praise God that He is in charge and not LCC
491. One matter which is nowhere discussed, but critical to how members perceive LCC is responsiveness. Too many letters or messages to synod and district go unacknowledged, creating feelings of indifference and mistrust in the senders. It should be possible to reply to all communications within 3 business days, even if only to thank them for their interest. I realize it would be difficult to put this in a constitution, but it would serve as a statement of good intentions.
492. Wagner farms does deserve our financial and human resource support.
493. Until I read and completed this survey it has never occurred to me just how complicated our Lutheran Church has become, so many entities that are similar to the legs of an octopus. These again are difficult times that require changes to continuously glorify our Lord's Kingdom, may God bless and guide you as you are faced with all the decisions that may do just that in truth and love.
494. God bless your efforts in serving His will in Synod and District. I pray that all your people are given His wisdom and love in all your decisions.

495. I really believe that using a statistical analysis professional would have been more helpful in the design of this survey.
496. We need to find a way to train missionaries and evangelists in our church body. Pastors are being trained to serve dying churches. How about training men and women for evangelism outreach and mission outreach within and outside of Canada. How about our focus on being a mission church and outreach church? That will not happen if we insist on close communion every Sunday. Perhaps close communion services should happen mid-week and leave Sunday open to reaching out to the unchurched or those who have been alienated from church especially while we still have a weekend that still has a Sunday. Time will come when that too will disappear and each day will be the same with no one day or two days of weekend.
497. Thank you for asking for members their participation.
498. I really would very much like to see the concept of a Lutheran Trust company take hold. This would not only help the church, but also help individuals with estate management. This is what the General Conference Mennonites have done many years ago and has helped prevent many bad situations from getting totally out of hand.
499. I have found this very, very difficult to do as I am not aware of many, many things in different areas of this survey. I don't think that my completing this survey will serve well in restructuring the LCC. I have to put no opinion in many, many places.
500. Something creative needs to be done to strengthen our congregations. The young people are drifting away. Need to get dynamic pastors and deacons out into our communities.
501. Better luck next time with writing the survey questions. Let our Pastors preach the Word to us. Focus on Jesus.
502. Thankyou for this survey, it is a sign that the leadership of LCC, at many levels, is willing to listen to members and act on the results of the survey.
503. It was hard to answer some questions, as lay people, we don't know the relationship between synod and district - what communication there is.
504. Part of the re-structuring needs to be that Ecclesiastical Leaders like District Presidents and Synod President should be called to a church in their area. Whether or not they are paid, they should be attached to a congregation and should preach and preside at least occasionally.
505. I have little knowledge in many areas of this survey, therefore I had to answer #3 several times because I really didn't know.
506. Pray for all who serve the Church.
507. Thanks for this opportunity. While these thought are mine, I pray that the Holy Spirit continues to work within each and every one of us, and particularly though our Synod and Districts as we continue in His service. Grace, peace, wisdom and mercy to all. Amen.
508. The biggest, most important change that needs to be made is the realization that women are equal partners. Christ did not consider them lesser, and neither should His church. The constitution should be changed to reflect women elders, teachers, etc. I am not even speaking of something so radical as women pastors; I am speaking of inclusion of women in all other roles.
509. I truly worry about the future of the Lutheran Church of Canada. There is much being done across our country and the world by LCC that is worth being celebrated. The members I have met across the District are what make the Lutheran church great. However, I question the vision of where we are headed as Lutherans. Martin Luther was a reformer, one who saw the problems of the antiquated Catholic church and sought to bring about change that would

connect with the modern world in which he lived. He challenged some of the traditional teachings of the times and brought the Bible into the language of the people. This modern approach is lacking in the present Lutheran church. It is time to address issues such as homosexuality and sexism. Would Christ spurn homosexuals who wanted to learn more about him? Would Christ deny women who wanted to serve in his church? And how can we modernize our teachings and services so that we can connect with 21st century people? The world is in need of more Christians, and it is our duty to recognize the crisis that is declining membership in church, and come up with a vision and action plan that are radically different from the ones in place today. What are the needs in today's society, and how can the Lutheran Church creatively meet those needs?

510. Please consider eliminating one of our 2 seminaries to reduce costs. Having 2 seminaries is unconscionable in a small church body such as the LCC. It would be like having one seminary for each district of the LCMS - Not at all realistic! Having 2 seminaries is simply placating theological egos.
511. women should be able to be leaders in the LCC as many are qualified and not enough men want to take on leadership roles. That’s why parishes fail in my opinion
512. Unfairly prejudiced against those that would and those that can't answer this survey. 2. Very long, complex, cumbersome
513. Overall I am generally quite ignorant concerning the overall structure and function of the hierarchy of the church. Even though I have been around the church for many years. This is largely my fault however I do not think I am alone in this ignorance.
514. Leave Concordia alone already. It is a great Seminary, and is Needed! If anything shut down Eastern Canada's seminary!
515. Dearest CCMS: Your work is not glamorous. It can be thankless. There are other things you could be doing but you are availing your time to this. Thank you.
516. I think synod should consider centralized payroll for workers. Many churches have treasurers who are not payroll clerks. Normal bills for the church are fine, but payroll and T4's can be daunting. I also think the recommended pay should be the same across LCC. A worker should not see a decrease (or increase) in pay just because they take a call to a different district. If the congregation wants to pay more, fine but there shouldn't be a difference for time in service suggested pay from one district to another. I also think it would be good to let folks know who they synod staff and such are. Yes, we can find your name on the synod website, but to be more approachable and personal would be great. Perhaps a getting to know you section in the Canadian Lutheran or something. I think people care more when they know who and what they are caring for. Just a thought. Thanks for all the work you folks do. You are doing a great job and thanks for this survey asking us yokels what's on our minds. :-)
517. There needs to be a greater representation of young lay people (18 - 30yrs) in the restructuring process. The current demographic of the districts & synod is not representative of the future. Active congregational membership has been drastically declining. Ministry for the next generation is being compromised. It would therefore be beneficial to have the involvement and input of young lay people in the restructuring process.
518. This survey has not answered the underlying problems of the LCC, which is why they are losing members, we need to understand why people are not attending church and what can be done with it.

519. To summarize my thoughts about the restructuring of the Synod, I trust those in who have been appointed the task of spearheading this project have the best interests of the synod in mind. Whatever decision is made, I am confident that the LCC will continue to proclaim the Gospel to sinners with its Word and Sacrament ministry. One point that I would like to highlight in the survey was related to outreach within Canada. I will reiterate what I stated earlier. I believe that there is huge opportunity in Canada to make people aware that Confessional Lutheranism exists. Personally, I come from an Evangelical background and my (and my entire family's) move to the LCC is a direct result of outreach resources like Worldview Everlasting and Issues etc. I believe that Canadians, especially Canadian youth who are in evangelical/non-demon churches have a need to be exposed to Lutheran Theology and to be directed to faithful Lutheran congregations. I personally have met a number of individuals who are simply tired of the works-based, hyper-emotional, aspect of the churches they are in, but they simply don't know what alternative there is. They believe that this is simply what Christianity is supposed to be (a constant and tiring pursuit of God within their hearts). I hope that this helps!
520. LCC should reconsider certain philosophies especially those regarding the participation of women in the church. The current position is outdated and may affect the attitude of women joining the church. Many other Christian denominations have already addressed this with women playing a more significant role.
521. I believe that in some way the financial costs of holding synodical and district conventions have to be reduced.
522. History will judge whether or not the current leadership of LCC was/is serious about doing the Lord's work vs. extending their own egos.
523. re: "LCC Income by Organization" chart - every Organization/Entity/Synod/District/Auxiliary/LSO which receives contributions & donations should designate 10% of same annually for distribution to our church family members & congregations who have suffered loss at the hands of the church as a result of the ABC D CEF/DIL "sufficient cash shortage".
524. My prayer is that God continues to use His people in this restructuring process to bring Him Glory
525. Too many diabolical questions.
526. Thanks!
527. Funding of auxiliaries and also should be direct from congregations not through District. Not thru Synod can suggest. Give all administration to Districts to look after their congregations.
528. Here are some ideas I support: 1. Increase the number of districts, perhaps to what we call circuits. 2. All district presidents are part-time, elected by their districts. They would replace circuit counsellors. They would provide care to the pastors in the district/circuit. They also would serve their own congregation. 3. District conventions every year, one day only - mostly business. Every congregation sends a pastor and a layman. They each have one vote. 4. Synodical Convention every 5 years - mostly business. Every congregation sends a pastor and a layman. They each have one vote.
529. During the restructuring of the training of LCC pastors, the LCC should reopen the issue of Women's Ordination. The banning of women from the pulpit and from any position of authority in the church is not biblically sound and is hurting the church. The church is losing devoted members and passionate women who feel God's call to the pulpit because of this decision. Several pastors are advocates for women's ordination while several are staunch

opponents. This indecision is confusing congregations and forcing them to take sides, often times dividing a once united congregation and parish.

530. The organization is known as "Lutheran Women's Missionary League-Canada".
531. I believe we are in need of a major structural overhaul. I believe that basing our church structure on a corporate model is not only unhelpful, but demonstrates a lack of faith in the divinely instituted structure of the church upon the Gospel and the office of the ministry which the Lord of the Church has established.
532. Pastors should have a full time job. And shouldn't get salary from tithing. All offering should go towards relief funds and rents (mortgages). Not the salary.
533. I pray God's guidance for the CCMS as you move forward with this monumental task.
534. I hope there will be major changes. The current structure has never worked well, achieves little for outreach and ministry and provides little to know support to local congregations where the mission and ministry stem from. It is known that no one new structure will be perfect and there will be pros and cons. Remember the current structure about transfer of information but we live in the information age with far more efficient options for communicating without having to have caring members sit on multiple committees/boards/forums to pass on information then achieve nothing because there is no time left to actually SERVE.
535. I feel it is very important for us as Christians to be very aware of the challenge of Islam. It is here and more is coming and they are determined to wipe out Christianity. AND... they ARE NOT a religion of peace!! ONWARD CHRISTIAN SOLDIERS ...!!!
536. Thank you for all your efforts in this matter. God Bless you and be with you as you move forward.
537. Hopefully, the new structure will improve ministry, eliminate duplication, be of more help & blessings to the NB work of ministry than has been previously experienced. The new structure needs to be a demonstration/commitment of a renewed spirit under God's guidance.
538. Restructure from the top and then downwards right to the congregational council.
539. Cut down districts, use part time officers. Spend money on missions instead.
540. District offices should be part time and, in this age of the internet and low cost communications, much more should be done centrally. District administration is almost irrelevant to congregations.
541. lol I don't know anything about this stuff
542. I am aware that some structural changes of synod and districts are needed. I would caution that we not throw out the baby with the bathwater by alienating our members because the size and scope of circuits or whatever the new divisions of synod might look like is so big that we lose the contact and fellowship we now enjoy. I know that in a country the size of ours it is very hard to develop reasonable sized divisions that are workable. I perceive this task as the most difficult in whatever changes might be made.
543. Thank you for taking the time to read these thoughts. Prayers are with you.
544. I believe the ABC District should be abolished. The independence of the Central District needed to be re-established as he cannot be independent if he is Winnipeg.
545. Has the survey taken into consideration the likely fact that the eastern district is more stable and therefore more resistant to change? More options for the two western districts could have been presented.
546. Thank you for asking.
547. Keeping the process in prayer....

548. Prayer (and even fasting!) should be encouraged during this time of monumental change. 'Unless the Lord builds the house ...."
549. Look at the process for calling our Pastors, ours was called twice this past year within a matter of 2 months, he turned the first one down why offer the second call within such a short period of time?
550. Please stop blending the pastoral and administrative roles of our structure. It's a bad practice. There's a reason that this is never done in the congregation, why the pastor is never the chairman, or executive director, but that position is always filled by a layman. It ignores our doctrine and no pastor is trained to work in the areas of business, administration, and finance.
551. I would be shocked if anything changes. Why do congregations with no Pastor not pay into the pension and benefits plan? They say they are part of LCC but do not want to put their money where their mouths are. This is very frustrating and infuriating.
552. I believe this to be a very poor Survey to present to the congregations and to the lay people and will in no way assist in your decision making. If you are going to present a survey, you might as well have an informed decision. It requires explanation of the options. The average member will have no idea what you are talking about in this survey. I have been a board member and chairman of our congregation for many years and I cannot give an informed answer to at least 80% of your questions. I believe before you can ask these questions and base any credibility to the answers information of pros and cons must be presented. Your timeline does not allow for this. I will not encourage other members of the household to complete this survey.
553. We need to be one governed unit, meeting together once every four years, with regional conferences held concurrently during the gathering. The regional areas should be governed by a Pastor who works part time as a parish pastor and part time as the area representative. All the 'mission offerings', which really aren't all currently mission used, should go to missions. The operating budget for the synodical office and positions should be split on a communicant basis and invoiced to all congregations, calling and non-calling, in other words, every member congregation of synod.
554. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. I pray that God will bless this process.
555. Consolidate CEF into 1 fund in Winnipeg. Separate Theological and Admin. roles of President. Reduce the number of Committees across LCC. Develop better financially accountability for Overseas Missions and explore greater financial support from the US congregations. (e.g. Nicaragua) in undertaking education and training of Church Staffs.
556. I am concerned that the idea to get general input is flawed. The restructuring should be done with the ecclesiology taking primary position; keeping in mind what the primary role of the church is. I also think that the church structure that worked for centuries should be considered, rather than the organizational theory and other inventions like that
557. *APATHY* is so prevalent in our LCC. One recent example (of many) shows that 30% of LCC congregations do not provide the annual report required by synod! It's all very nice to make lame excuses in matters such as this but the failure of a pastor to shepherd his congregation is one serious, obvious cause for our apathetic state. An Authority from the top (Synod) should cause a congregation to see that someone does care and that this request is not frivolous. This Authority would have to be applied carefully. of course, but that is one of the reasons we elect people to fill these positions. I say the following because of a serious concern I have for our well-being.....the lack of accountability is more and more prevalent

as some of our pastors greedily care for their perceived personal needs before the needs of the congregants they have been called to shepherd. *AUTHORITY*. The popular thought seems that authority flow upward from the congregation. I feel this is the opposite of what it should be to ensure accountability and stability in the application of practises which might be open to interpretation, i.e.: closed or open Holy Communion; Holy Baptism'; marriage; membership through profession of faith.....and a host of others. I hope you see why I suggest this is a poor format for the task of opinion on restructuring our LCC.

558. Annual audits for all parts of organization
559. The question should not be do we need change. Change is upon us, how do we make the best choices...careful deliberation, good communication and lets not forget prayer.
560. We Lutherans claim to be a Church body which is the purest in Church doctrine and true to the word of God. This simply is not so. We are spirit deficient and anemic. If one looks at 1st Cor. 12 and tallies up our gifts of the Spirit, we flunk miserably, perhaps 3 out of 9 is the best we can hope for. Healing is one of the gifts which can be tilted in our favour and "can be taught. " Ultimately, it is God's ways which rule the day, but we can tilt things in our favour. The organization " Order of St. Luke " seeks to address this problem and give healing it's rightful place in our Lord's ministry. Our Lord had a one tow punch, may your sins be forgiven and be ye healed. We ignore the latter. Mention this to one of our Pastors and you get that glazed look of a drug user or an Alzheimer patient despite the fact that the bible teaches that they (and we) have the authority over sickness. Addressing this issue would fix many of our problems of declining attendance, money matters etc. This would have to start at the Seminary level, but I doubt that they would bring any teachers in for any courses. They would claim there is not time in our curriculum for such matters. We do not worship the triune God, but are surely Spirit deficient. Perhaps 2 and 1/2 is much closer to reality. We are not as pure as we think!
561. I have total confidence in both the current ABC District President and current Synodical President.
562. Good luck! We are praying for you!
563. It's important to remember that if the St. Catharines seminary were to be closed, the Synod would get no money for the building we have built and maintained. We don't own the land. Brock University would get the building for nothing so there would be no immediate financial proceeds generated by closing the St. Catharines seminary. It's also important to know that the St. Catharines Seminary has a 99-year, Hong Kong-type lease on the land and after the 99 years are over Brock gets the building for free. In 2016 we are 40 years into that lease. In any restructuring we should end the practice of having separate confirmand, youth and young adult groups. In our sister church in Brazil youth of the church are not segregated into different age groups. By keeping youth together up to young adult age (until they are married) all in one group the young have older Lutheran peers to look up to and copy. The Brazilian model is the way to go.
564. God bless your work with his wisdom and love.
565. With electronic means to communicate it is much easier to have cost effective meetings with people from all over the country. This was not the case when our church body was set up. As long as there is still a way to maintain the sensitivity to the different areas of our country. I have lived in 4 of our provinces and they are definitely not the same.
566. LCC needs to look at leadership. We have not really had visionary leadership over the past decade. We need to step out and become more than just a few Lutheran congregations

valiantly holding onto the past. We have good doctrine but not much good practice. We need to care for our workers and our congregations and less about our bureaucracy

567. May GOD govern us all in the decision making to do his will.