

Christ Is Risen Indeed

2026 LCMS Convention Delegate Study Guide

Today's Business, Issue 1 - Proposed Resolutions and Omnibus Actions

Prepared as a source-grounded reading guide for pastors, lay delegates, congregational leaders, and interested LCMS members.

Primary source: Today's Business, Issue 1. Supporting inventory aid: the omnibus study packet. Later daily issues, substitute resolutions, floor amendments, and convention actions were not available to this guide unless named in the source.

This guide does not lobby for or against proposed business. It explains likely meaning, effects, questions, benefits, and tensions so delegates can deliberate faithfully, carefully, and charitably.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Table of Contents | 2 |
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| How to Use This Guide | 4 |
| Source and Method Notes | 4 |
| Major Themes Across the Resolutions | 4 |
| Master Inventory Table | 4 |
| Committee-by-Committee Analysis | 19 |
| National Witness | 20 |
| International Witness | 50 |
| Mercy | 61 |
| Life Together | 76 |
| Theology and Church Relations | 97 |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | 124 |
| University Education | 151 |
| Finance | 171 |
| Structure and Administration | 185 |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | 212 |
| Omnibus Analysis | 225 |
| Omnibus Resolution A | 226 |
| Omnibus Resolution B | 282 |
| Omnibus Resolution C | 295 |
| Cross-Cutting Themes | 299 |
| Gospel sending and witness | 299 |
| Doctrine and church relations | 299 |
| Governance and trust | 299 |
| Formation and workers | 299 |
| Local congregational life | 299 |
| Finance and stewardship | 299 |
| Local Congregation Impact Guide | 299 |
| Pastors and elders | 299 |
| Lay delegates and voters | 299 |
| Schools and universities | 299 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Congregations and circuits | 299 |
| Districts and Synod offices | 299 |
| Delegate Reading Plan | 299 |
| Coverage Check | 300 |

Executive Summary

This report covers 106 proposed resolutions across all ten floor committees and 70 omnibus items in Omnibus Resolutions A, B, and C. Each proposed item is treated as proposed business only.

Today's Business, Issue 1 states that it is the first of six issues and that later daily issues may include substitute or revised resolutions, proposed amendments, and other official announcements. Delegates should therefore read this guide beside the daily issues at convention.

Major themes across the proposed business include Gospel sending and witness, theological teaching, university and seminary governance, worker formation, financial transparency, recognized service organization standards, dispute resolution, ecclesiastical supervision, and local congregational practice.

The biggest items for close study are those that alter bylaws or the constitution, address pastoral formation, university governance, prior approval, church relations, doctrinal study, sexual misconduct response, legal and financial transparency, dispute resolution, and any omnibus item a delegate believes should receive separate consideration.

How to Use This Guide

Read the master inventory first, then study high-priority items by committee. Use the questions under each item to prepare circuit conversations and possible floor questions.

For omnibus items, remember that the omnibus action is the action being proposed. A delegate may consider whether any item should be pulled for separate consideration if it involves doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

For proposed resolutions, read the source page in Today's Business before relying on this guide. This report summarizes and interprets; it does not replace the official text.

Source and Method Notes

Source hierarchy: Today's Business, Issue 1 is controlling. The omnibus study packet was used only as a supporting inventory aid. The internal values lens was used privately to notice themes of Gospel sending, trust, humility, generosity, accountability, and congregational impact; it is not cited or named in this public-facing report.

Documents available for this guide included Today's Business, Issue 1, the omnibus study packet, the 2026 Convention Workbook, the 2023 LCMS Handbook, and other supporting theological and procedural resources. This PDF relies on Today's Business for the proposed action inventory and page citations.

Documents not available in this guide: later daily issues of Today's Business, substitute resolutions introduced after Issue 1, floor amendments, final convention minutes, and any adopted convention actions not printed in Issue 1.

Citation method: Each entry gives a source location with Today's Business, Issue 1 page numbers. Clauses are summarized, not reproduced wholesale. Where the report uses the phrase "Possible impact" or "Text-supported inference," it is offering a careful inference from the official text.

Major Themes Across the Resolutions

| Theme | Where it appears most clearly | Why delegates may study it |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Gospel sending and witness | Committees 1, 2, 4 | Congregations will ask whether Synod resources encourage outward-facing witness and local multiplication. |
| Doctrine and teaching | Committees 4, 5, 6, 10 | Several proposals ask for doctrinal statements, study, correction, or clarification. |
| Governance and structure | Committees 7, 8, 9, 10 | Many items change bylaws, reporting lines, boards, commissions, or oversight. |
| Worker formation and care | Committees 3, 6, 7, 10 | Pastoral formation, church worker recruitment, wellness, and misconduct response appear repeatedly. |
| Finance and transparency | Committees 8, 9, Omnibus A | Legal reporting, benefits, corporate entities, and stewardship require careful reading. |
| Congregational life | Committees 1, 3, 4, 6, 10 | Several proposals affect worship, family discipleship, schools, local practice, calls, and supervision. |

Master Inventory Table

Priority is a reading priority, not a voting recommendation. It is based on direct governance, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, formation, or congregational impact.

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|-------|-----------------------------|--|----------|---|
| National Witness | Res. 1-01 | To Celebrate and Encourage All Nations Ministry in North America | 57-58 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 1-01 (CW, 277) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-02 | To Proclaim 2029 the 500th Year of Luther's Catechisms | 58-59 | mixed action | Overtures 1-22-23, 29-30 (CW, 289, 291-92) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-03 | To Give Thanks to God for 150 Years of Black Ministry | 59-60 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 1-02-03 (CW, 277-78) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-04 | To Give Thanks for 130 Years of Deaf Ministry | 60 | commendation / thanksgiving | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:26) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-05 | To Prioritize Revitalization Work | 60-61 | mixed action | Overture 1-08 (CW, 281) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-06 | To Support Lutheran Congregations and Schools in Urban Contexts | 61 | mixed action | Overtures 1-9-10 (CW, 281-82) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-07 | To Increase Church Planting at the Parish Level | 61-62 | mixed action | Overture 1-06 (CW, 280) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-08 | To Educate Young People | 62-63 | mixed action | Overtures 1-10, 15, 17-19, 23 (CW, 282, 285-87, 289) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-09 | To Promote Ministry Among Youth and Young Adults | 63-64 | mixed action | Overtures 1-13, 21 (CW, 284, 288) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-10 | To Confront Increased Idolatry of Our Culture with Clear Confession of Love of Christ and Lutheran Resources in Christian Apologetics | 64-65 | mixed action | Overtures 1-12, 22 (CW, 283-84, 289) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-11 | To Confess God's Design for the Family | 65-66 | mixed action | Overtures 1-24-25, 1-32 (CW, 289-291, 293) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-12 | To Support Campus Ministry | 66-67 | mixed action | Overtures 1-04-05, 13, 21 (CW, 278-80, 284, 288) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-13 | To Strengthen the Synod's Digital Witness and Congregational Connections | 67 | mixed action | President's Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:26) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-14 | To Give Thanks for Lutheran Hour Ministries and Encourage Enhanced Collaboration | 67-68 | commendation / thanksgiving | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:26) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| National Witness | Res. 1-15 | To Respectfully Decline Overtures | 68-69 | declination | Overture 1-14 (CW, 284-85) | Medium | Declines overtures and may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| International Witness | Res. 2-01 | To Give Thanks for LCMS Ministry to the Armed Forces | 69 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 2-06 (CW, 296-97) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| International Witness | Res. 2-02 | To Direct Districts and Encourage Congregational Participation in Global Mission through Prayer, Partnership, and Support | 69-70 | encouragement | Overtures 2-01-02 (CW, 295) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| International Witness | Res. 2-03 | To Give Thanks to God for Missionary Care Provided by the Office of International Mission | 70-71 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 2-03 (CW, 295-96) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| International Witness | Res. 2-04 | To Amend Bylaws 1.7.3, 2.11.1, 3.8.3, 3.8.3.8, and 4.4.4-5 to Establish a Framework for Ecclesiastical Supervision and Pastoral Care for Independent International Congregations | 71-74 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 2-03 (CW 295-96) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| International Witness | Res. 2-05 | To Give Thanks to God for 125 Years of Gospel Ministry, Partner Churches, and Mission in the Latin America and Caribbean Region | 74-76 | commendation / thanksgiving | Report R1.2.2 (CW, 19-28) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Mercy | Res. 3-01 | To Commend and Encourage Life Ministry Efforts of Congregations, Schools, Districts, and Recognized Service Organizations | 76 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 3-02 (CW, 299) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|-------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------|---|
| Mercy | Res. 3-02 | To Promote Awareness of Christian Adoption and Fostering Needs | 76-77 | mixed action | Overture 3-01 (CW, 299) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Mercy | Res. 3-03 | To Thank God for Work of LCMS Disaster Response and Human Care Partners and To Require Districts to Appoint Disaster Response Coordinators | 77-78 | directive | Overtures 3-03-04 (CW, 299-300) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Mercy | Res. 3-04 | To Encourage Use of Counseling and Telehealth Services for Care and Retention of Church Workers | 78-79 | encouragement | Overture 3-07 (CW, 301-2) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------|--------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| Mercy | Res. 3-05 | To Commend Efforts to Serve Worker Wellness and Encourage Participation in Concordia Plan Services | 79-80 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 3-06 (CW, 301) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Mercy | Res. 3-06 | To Encourage Synod to Respond to the Growing Addiction Crisis | 80-81 | encouragement | Overture L3-09 (TB, 1:45-46) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Mercy | Res. 3-07 | To Give Thanks to God for Synod Congregations Engaging in Mercy Ministries | 81-82 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 3-04 (CW, 300) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-01 | To Establish Tell the Next Generation as Synod Mission and Ministry Emphasis | 82 | task force / structural action | Overtures 4-02-07, 09 (CW, 303-7) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-02 | To Amend Bylaws to Refine Process for Creating Triennial Mission and Ministry Emphases | 82-85 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 4-12 (CW, 307-9) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-03 | To Commend and Sunset Synod Mission Priorities | 85 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 4-01, 08, 10-11 (CW, 303, 306-07) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-04 | To Clarify Oversight and Revitalize Role of Registered Service Organizations | 85-86 | mixed action | Overtures 4-32-35 (CW, 319-22); President's Report, Part 2, (TB, 1:28); Overture L4-57 (TB, 1:46-48) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-05 | To Clarify Nomenclature for Chaplaincy and Institutional Care Work and To Amend Related Bylaws | 86-88 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 4-38-39 (CW, 323-24) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-06 | To Amend Bylaws to Reinstate Commission on Worship | 88-91 | structural / bylaw action | President of the Synod. Such a Commission on Worship is clearly desirable: to coordinate, guide, and instruct the Synod by efforts that faithfully carry forward the Lutheran heritage of worship in the present day; to assure broad input and knowledgeable expertise from the Synod's membership in... | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-07 | To Condemn Political Violence and Encourage Participation in Public Life | 91-92 | encouragement | Overtures 4-45, 47-48, 53-55 (CW, 327-28, 330-32) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-08 | To Direct the Commission on Theology and Church Relations to Examine Current Political and Social Issues | 92 | directive | Overtures 4-13-22 (CW, 309-14) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-09 | To Address Uses of Artificial Intelligence | 92-93 | mixed action | Overtures 4-51-52 (CW, 329-30) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Life Together | Res. 4-10 | To Celebrate Concordia Historical Institute Centenary and Renew the Synod's Commitment to Treasure and Trumpet Its Redeemed History | 93-95 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 4-56 (CW, 332-33) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-01 | To Recognize Altar and Pulpit Fellowship with Evangelical Lutheran Christian Church of Bolivia | 95-97 | church relations action | President Carlos Winterle signing an agreement of altar and pulpit fellowship with the ICEL in 2002. At this time, ICEL also began participating as an observer in regional meetings of the International Lutheran Council (ILC). There was also contact with and support from LCMS sister churches in... | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-02 | To Support and Encourage Recognition of Altar and Pulpit Fellowship with Lutheran Mission-Australia | 97-98 | encouragement | President Matthew Anker has stated: "The key issue that led to the establishment of LM -A was the undermining of the authority of the Word of God in the LCA's theology and life together. Even before women's ordination was introduced, we no longer shared the same confession and needed to be yoked..." | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------|--|--|----------|--|
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-03 | To Give Thanks for the Mission Province in Sweden | 98-99 | commendation / thanksgiving | President met in St. Louis with representatives of the Mission Province, including Dr. Bengt Birgersson (general secretary of the MPSF at the time), for the purpose of encouraging the cause of biblical, Lutheran-confession Lutheranism in the Nordic world. In subsequent years, informal discussions... | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-04 | To Address Concerns with Partner Churches | 99-101 | mixed action | Overtures 5-03-09 (CW, 337-41) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-05 | To Address Open Communion and Pastoral Exceptions in Extraordinary Circumstances | 101-102 | mixed action | Overtures 5-16-18 (CW, 345-347) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-06 | To Amend Bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b) | 102-103 | structural / bylaw action | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:30) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-07 | To Refer "Sister Church" Nomenclature Change to Commission on Handbook | 103-104 | referral | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:30) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-08 | To Reaffirm the Synod's Positions on Men and Women in the Church | 104-105 | doctrinal or theological clarification | Overtures 5-30-35 (CW, 354-57) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-09 | To Address the Public Reading of Scripture | 105-106 | mixed action | Overtures 5-26-29 (CW, 352-54) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-10 | To Request Commission on Theology and Church Relations Report on Human Organ Donation and Transplantation | 106 | church relations action | Overture 5-23 (CW, 350) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-11 | To Reaffirm Sanctity of Human Life Regarding Practice of In Vitro Fertilization | 106-107 | doctrinal or theological clarification | Overtures 5-19-21 (CW, 347-49) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------|--|---|----------|---|
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-12 | To Conclude Created Male and Female Task Force and Receive Its Recommendations | 107-108 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 4-36, 5-41 (CW, 322-23, 360-61) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-13 | To Give Thanks to God for 1700th Anniversary of First Council of Nicaea | 108-109 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 5-37, 5-44 (CW, 358-59, 362) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Theology and Church Relations | Res. 5-14 | To Respectfully Decline Overtures | 109-110 | declination | Overtures 5-11-12, 38-39 (CW, 342-44, 359-60) | Medium | Declines overtures and may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-01 | To Uphold a Deep and Broad Study of Holy Scripture and Book of Concord in Synod Seminaries | 110-111 | mixed action | Overtures 6-01-8 (CW, 363-66) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-02 | To Encourage Seminary Specialized Witness and Outreach Training | 111 | encouragement | Overture 6-58 (CW, 399) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-03 | To Give Thanks for the Office of the Holy Ministry and our Synod's Pastors | 111-112 | commendation / thanksgiving | Reports R13.1-2 (CW, 64-67) Preamble The foundational confession of the Lutheran Church was made before Emperor Charles V in 1530 at the Diet of Augsburg. The seven Lutheran princes made the Gospel the center of their Confession in Article IV: "Our churches teach that people cannot be justified..." | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-04 | To Support Residential Master of Divinity and Alternate Route Pastoral Formation for the Sake of the Flock | 112-114 | mixed action | Overtures 6-25-44 (CW, 379-91) Preamble The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) has repeatedly identified full-time, residential pastoral formation at its seminaries as the standard, preferred route for men preparing for a lifetime of ministry to the church (2016 Res. 6-03, "To Affirm the... | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-05 | To Reaffirm the Synod's Process for Training and Certification for Pastors | 114-115 | doctrinal or theological clarification | Overtures 6-14-24 (CW, 370-79) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-06 | To Affirm and Support Established Parameters of Specific Ministry Pastor Program | 115-116 | doctrinal or theological clarification | Overtures 6-46-63 (CW, 392-403) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-07 | To Encourage and Support Specific Ministry Pastors to Pursue General Pastor Certification | 116 | encouragement | Overtures 6-46-48 (CW, 392-94) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-08 | To Amend Bylaw 2.13.1 to Clarify Terminology for Specific Ministry Pastor Mentorship and Oversight | 116-118 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 6-09, 45 (CW, 366-67, 391-92) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-09 | To Implore Council of Presidents to Fulfill 2019 Resolution 6-03A re Oversight of Specific Ministry Pastors | 118 | mixed action | Overtures 6-54, 63 (CW, 397, 403) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-10 | To Amend Bylaws to Address Seminary Adjunct Faculty | 118-120 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 6-10, 73 (CW, 367, 408) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-11 | To Embed Church Work Formation and Recruitment in the Culture of the LCMS | 120-122 | mixed action | Overtures 6-76-78 (CW, 409-411) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-12 | To Amend Bylaws to Reinsert 2007 Pastoral Colloquy Bylaws from Policy Manual | 122-124 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 6-11-13 (CW, 367-70) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-13 | To Affirm that the Lord has Ordained that Those Who Preach the Gospel Should Make their Living from the Gospel | 124-125 | doctrinal or theological clarification | Overtures 6-79-80 (CW, 411-12) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------|-----------------------------|--|----------|---|
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | Res. 6-14 | To Respectfully Decline Overtures | 125-126 | declination | Overtures 6-72, 74, 84, 86-87 (CW, 408-09, 413, 414-15)27 | Medium | Declines overtures and may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| University Education | Res. 7-01 | To Commend the Concordia University System | 126 | commendation / thanksgiving | President's Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:33); Overture L7-30 (TB, 1:43) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| University Education | Res. 7-02 | To Amend Bylaw 3.10.6.2.2 | 126-127 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 7-10 (CW, 425) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| University Education | Res. 7-03 | To Amend Bylaw 3.6.6.1 | 127-128 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 7-09 (CW, 425) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| University Education | Res. 7-04 | To Clarify Prior Approval Protocols for University Theological Faculties | 128-129 | mixed action | Overtures 7-14-24 (CW, 428-33) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| University Education | Res. 7-05 | To Clarify Prior Approval Protocols for University Presidential Candidates | 129 | mixed action | Overtures 7-14-24 (CW, 428-33) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| University Education | Res. 7-06 | To Encourage University Worship Practices That Form Students to be Faithful to Scriptures and Lutheran Confessions | 129-131 | encouragement | Overture 7-06 (CW, 423-24) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| University Education | Res. 7-07 | To Clarify Lutheran Identity in Connection with the Concordia Universities | 131 | mixed action | Overtures 7-04-07 (CW, 422-24) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---|
| University Education | Res. 7-08 | To Study Synodwide Corporate Status of Concordia University System | 131-132 | mixed action | Overture L7-30 (TB, 1:43) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| University Education | Res. 7-09 | To Give Thanks for Work and Ministry of Concordia University Ann Arbor | 132 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overture 7-27 (CW, 435) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| University Education | Res. 7-10 | To Respectfully Decline Overtures | 132-133 | declination | Overtures 7-11, 13 (CW, 426-28) | Medium | Declines overtures and may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Finance | Res. 8-01 | To Encourage Transparency and Accountability in Legal Judgments and Settlements | 133 | encouragement | Overture 8-17 (CW, 445) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Finance | Res. 8-02 | To Amend Bylaw Section 3.7 to Clarify Additional Assigned Responsibilities and Provisions on the Board of Trustees-Concordia Plans / Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services | 133-136 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 8-01-02 (CW, 437-38) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Finance | Res. 8-03 | To Fund Our Synod's Seminaries | 136 | financial / stewardship action | Overture 8-15 (CW, 444) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Finance | Res. 8-04 | To Expand Access to the Lutheran Confessions | 136-137 | financial / stewardship action | Overtures 8-09-27 12 (CW, 441-43) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Finance | Res. 8-05 | To Give Thanks for Concordia Publishing House's Use of Bible Translations | 137 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 8-07-08 (CW, 440-41) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Finance | Res. 8-06 | To Commend Concordia Publishing House for Prioritizing Mission and Distribution | 137-138 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 8-13-14 (CW, 443-44) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Finance | Res. 8-07 | To Address Concordia Publishing House Shipping Charges | 138-139 | financial / stewardship action | Overture 8-06 (CW, 440) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-01 | To Amend Bylaws 1.5.3.2-4 and Add Bylaw 4.7.6 regarding Regulations for Committees | 139-141 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-01 (CW, 449-50) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-02 | To Amend Bylaws 1.5.1.2-1.5.2 to Clarify Service Expectations and Handling of Conflicts of Interest | 141-143 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-02 (CW, 450-51) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-03 | To Amend Bylaws regarding Doctrinal Review | 143-146 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-04 (CW, 452-54) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------|-----------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-04 | To Amend Various Bylaws for Purposes of Clarification or Improvement | 146-152 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-05 (CW, 454-58) Preamble The Commission on Handbook (COH), responding to a variety of observations from officers, agencies, and members of the Synod, has proposed amendments to bylaws that have given opportunity to confusion or required repeated or nonobvious interpretation by the... | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-05 | To Amend Bylaw 3.6.4.3 to Increase the Number of Lutheran Church Extension Fund Directors Elected by the Synod in Convention from Three to Four | 152 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-15 (CW, 474-75) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-06 | To Amend Bylaws 3.6.1.8 (c) and 3.6.4 (a) to Clarify that Two-Thirds Approval Requirements for Synodwide Corporate Entity and Lutheran Church Extension Fund Governing Document Amendments are Based on Members Actually Present at Meeting | 152-154 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 9-16, 46 (CW, 475, 490) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-07 | To Amend Bylaw 3.6.4.3 to Clarify That No More Than Two Lutheran Church Extension Fund Directors Can Be from the Same District | 154 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-47 (CW, 490) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-08 | To Amend Bylaws to Clarify and Streamline Responsibilities of Appointed Synod Officers | 154-157 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-09 (CW, 468-70) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-09 | To Amend Bylaws to Coordinate Responsibilities of Chief Mission Officer with Other Synod Officers | 157-159 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-10 (CW, 470-71) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-10 | To Revise the Membership of the Pastoral Formation Committee | 159-160 | mixed action | Overtures 6-64-71, 9-10 (CW, 403-8, 470-71) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-11 | To Amend Bylaw Section 1.5, etc., to Unify in the Bylaws and Revise Corporate Formation Requirements for Instrumental Entities of Corporate Synod and Agencies of the Synod | 160-173 | structural / bylaw action | Report LR63 (TB, 1:37-38) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-12 | To Amend Bylaws Exclusive to Lutheran Church Extension Fund to Clarify That It May Provide Real Estate Evaluation and Redevelopment Services in Support of Synod Mission and Ministry | 173-174 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-08 (CW, 467-68) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-13 | To Adopt Recommendations of 2023 Res. 9-06A Task Force on Electoral Circuit Parameters | 174-175 | commendation / thanksgiving | Overtures 9-19-20, 33 (CW, 476-77, 485) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-14 | To Amend Constitution Article XII 15 as to Call of Special District Conventions | 175-176 | structural / bylaw action | Overture 9-03 (CW, 451-52) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---|------------------------|---|---------|--------------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-15 | To Increase Congregation Participation in Election of Synod President | 176-177 | mixed action | Overtures 9-21-22 (CW, 477-80) | Low | Primarily thanks, encouragement, or nonbinding support. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-16 | To Direct Board of Directors, Board for National Mission, Board for International Mission, and Chief Mission Officer to Review Overture 9-11 | 177 | directive | Overture 9-11 (CW, 471-73) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Structure and Administration | Res. 9-17 | To Respectfully Decline Overtures | 177-180 | declination | Overtures 9-17, 23-32, 36-40, 44-45, 48, 52 (CW, 475-76, 480-95) | Medium | Declines overtures and may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-01 | To Seek Commission on Theology and Church Relations Opinion regarding Usage of Matthew 18:15-20 | 180 | church relations action | Overtures 10-10, 12 (CW, 505-7) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-02 | To Create a Task Force to Clarify Relationship Between Bylaw 1.10 and 2.14 and Consider Bylaw Changes for Dispute Resolution (Bylaw 1.10) and Expulsion of Congregations or Individuals from Membership in the Synod (Bylaw 2.14) | 180-181 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 10-06, 08, 12-17, 20-23 (CW, 503-4, 506-13) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-03 | To Respond to Sexual Misconduct by Rostered Workers and Make Provision for Spiritual Care of Those Affected | 181-183 | mixed action | Overtures 10-27-30 (CW, 515-18) | High | Direct governance, formation, supervision, finances, or institutional implications. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-04 | To Seek Unity and Peace in the Synod and to Establish a Practical Statement for God-Pleasing Use of Digital Communications | 183-184 | task force / structural action | Overtures 4-43-44, 49, 10-04-05 (CW, 326-28, 502-3) | Medium | Directs work, expense, study, or implementation beyond a simple commendation. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-05 | To Amend Bylaw 4.2.4 regarding Installation of District Presidents | 184 | structural / bylaw action | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:35) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-06 | To Amend Bylaw 2.11.2.2 (c) | 184-185 | structural / bylaw action | Overtures 10-38-39 (CW, 520-21) | High | Touches doctrine, church order, church relations, or the bylaws. |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | Res. 10-07 | To Respectfully Decline Overtures | 185-186 | declination | Overtures 10-07, 11, 18-19, 26, 33 (CW, 504, 506, 511, 514, 519)3 | Medium | Declines overtures and may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 1-07 | To Study, and To Make Recommendations to Stop and Reverse, Long Decline in Synod Membership | 51 | referral | Office of National Mission | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 1-16 | To Proactively Put in Place National Standards for Our Schools to Protect Students | 51 | referral | Synod Board of Directors | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 1-20 | To Include Homeschool Enrollment in Statistical Reports of the Synod | 51 | referral | LCMS Rosters, Statistics, and Research Services | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 1-27 | To Propose LCMS Men's Ministry Office of National Mission | 51 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 1-28 | To Study and Recommend Strategies to Advance Congregation-based Older Adult Ministries | 51 | referral | Office of National Mission | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 2-04 | To Promote Divine Call Opportunities for Ethnic Immigrant Institute of Theology Pastors | 51 | referral | Board for International Mission | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|------|-------------|---|----------|---|
| Omnibus A | Ov. 2-05 | To Amend Bylaws to Protect Divine Calls of Missionaries Commission on Theology | 51 | referral | and Church Relations | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 2-07 | To Thank God on the 60th Anniversary of the Inception of LCMS International Schools in Asia and Pray for God's Guidance in Advancing Their Ministry and Mission | 51 | referral | International Schools Task Force | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 3-05 | To Establish District Commission on Immigration and Immigration Resources | 51 | referral | Office of National Mission | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 3-08 | To Define Leadership and Its Priority for Worker Wellness Office of National Mission | 51 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 4-50 | To Encourage Production of Sunday School Material for Very Small Congregations | 51 | referral | Concordia Publishing House | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-13 | To Request Comprehensive Review When Call is Terminated or Self-Terminated | 51 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-14 | To Study How to Amend Practice of Issuing "Divine Calls" to Positions Not in Direct Service of Proclamation of Gospel and Administration of Sacraments | 51 | referral | Commission on Theology and Church Relations | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-15 | To Encourage and Promote Sound Teaching on Eschatology or Last Things | 51 | referral | Concordia Publishing House | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|------|-------------|---|----------|---|
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-22 | To Believe, Teach, and Confess Missio Dei Commission on Theology and Church Relations in consultation | 51 | referral | with Council of Presidents | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-24 | To Urge Church of Christ to Stay and Do Her Duty Office of President and Council of Presidents Page 2026 Today's Business, 1st Edition-Omnibus Resolutions | 51 | referral | Overture Title Board, Office, Individual, Commission | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-25 | To Publicly Acknowledge Theological and Ecclesial Errors in Church's Response to COVID-19 Pandemic | 52 | referral | Office of President and Council of Presidents | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-36 | To Affirm Inspiration and Authority of Mark 16:9-20 Seminary Faculties | 52 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-40 | To Address Release and Use of Luther's Large Catechism with Annotations and Contemporary Applications | 52 | referral | Commission on Theology and Church Relations | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-42 | To Amend Bylaw 3.3.1.1.2 (c) to Designate President's Director of Church Relations as His Primary Representative for Ecclesiastical Relations with Other Church Bodies | 52 | referral | Office of the President and Commission on Constitutional Matters | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 5-43 | To Refer Some Assignments from CTCR to Seminaries Commission on Theology and Church | 52 | referral | Relations | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 6-75 | To Encourage the Council of Presidents to Prioritize Assignment of Seminary Candidates to Sole Vacancies over Associate Positions | 52 | referral | Council of Presidents | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 6-81 | To Mandate Continuing Education for Parish Pastors Office of Pastoral Education | 52 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 6-82 | To Encourage Congregations to Establish Sabbatical Policy for Church Workers | 52 | referral | Office of National Mission | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 6-83 | To Encourage Ministry Sabbaticals for Church Workers Office of National Mission | 52 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 6-85 | To Standardize Vacancy Pastor Remuneration Guidelines Council of Presidents | 52 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 6-88 | To Affirm That Functions of Pastoral Office Belong to That Office | 52 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. L6-89 | | 52 | referral | Commission a Study to Support Ethnic Ministry Pastors and Commissioned Workers Office of National Mission | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 7-12 | To Encourage Licensed Counselors Serving Recognized Service Organizations to Complete Director of Family Life Ministry Colloquy Program Colloquy Committee for Commissioned Ministry, Concordia University System | 52 | referral | Board of Directors | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|------|-------------|---|----------|---|
| Omnibus A | Ov. 7-28 | To Conduct a Project Postmortem Examination of Concordia University Ann Arbor | 52 | referral | Synod Board of Directors; Concordia University System Board of Directors | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 7-29 | To Request Transparency from Concordia University Wisconsin- Ann Arbor | 52 | referral | Synod Board of Directors; Concordia University System Board of Directors | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 8-03 | To Affirm Concordia Plans and To Amend Bylaws to Require Annual ERISA-Comparable Transparency to Participants | 52 | referral | Board of Trustees-Concordia Plans / Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 8-04 | To Amend Bylaws to Ensure Sustainability of Concordia Plan Services by Its Working with Other Church Bodies | 52 | referral | Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services, Synod Board of Directors, and the Commission on Constitutional Matters | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 8-05 | To Stabilize the Cost of Benefits Offered by Concordia Plan Services | 52 | referral | Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services, Synod Board of Directors, and the Commission on Constitutional Matters | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 8-16 | To Encourage Synod Transparency and Unity regarding Concluded HotChalk Litigation | 52 | referral | Synod Board of Directors and Legal Counsel Page 2026 Today's Business, 1st Edition-Omnibus Resolutions Overture Title Board, Office, Individual, Commission | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 8-18 | To Encourage Transparency and Accountability in Legal Judgments and Settlements | 53 | referral | Synod Board of Directors and Legal Counsel | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. L8-19 | To Request Concordia Plans to Explore Cost-of-Living Increase Options for Concordia Retirement Plan | 53 | referral | Concordia Plan Services | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 9-12 | To Restructure Mission Boards Office of the President | 53 | referral | and Board of Directors | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|------|-------------|------------------------------|----------|---|
| Omnibus A | Ov. 9-13 | To Revisit 2010 Restructuring Office of the President | 53 | referral | and Synod Board of Directors | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 9-14 | To Revisit 2010 Restructuring Office of the President | 53 | referral | and Synod Board of Directors | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 9-18 | To Reclaim Beneficial Understanding of Our Synodical Union Office of the President | 53 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 9-41 | To Provide Clarity about Amendments to Resolutions Secretary of Synod | 53 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 9-49 | To Clarify Multipoint and Multicampus Parish Office of National Mission | 53 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-01 | To Encourage Visitation by Synod and District Council of Presidents | 53 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-02 | To Develop Guidelines for Ecclesiastical Supervision of Internet Accusations | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-03 | To Address Use of Named or Anonymous Social Media Accounts to Create Strife and Division Within the Church | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-09 | To Provide Pastoral Care for Congregations Affected by Major Disciplinary Actions | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-24 | To Request Council of Presidents to Clarify Circumstances of Called Worker Removal or Resignation | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-25 | To Request Council of Presidents to Clarify Circumstances of Called Worker Removal or Resignation from Roster | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-31 | To Certify Accuracy and Trustworthiness of Call Council of Presidents | 53 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-32 | To Allow Pastors to Opt Out of Pre-Call Interviews and/or Contact | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-34 | To More Directly Oversee Service of Ordained Ministers to Congregations to Which They Have No Formal Call | 53 | referral | Council of Presidents | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|------|---|---|----------|---|
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-35 | To Encourage Pastors to Honor Their Own Call Council of Presidents | 53 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-36 | To Call for Publication of Council of Presidents Manual Council of Presidents | 53 | referral | | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus A | Ov. 10-37 | To Provide Compensation for Circuit Visitors District boards of directors | 53 | referral | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 1-11 | To Inspire Training for Witness 2023 Res. 1-01A | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 1-26 | To Strengthen Christ Centered Homes Through Family Discipleship Work | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 2019 Res. 12-07B | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 4-37 | To Continue to Oppose Practice of Couples Living Together outside Marriage and To Support Pastors and Congregations Who Lovingly Call to Repentance, Give Absolution, and Help to Live in Harmony with God's Word | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 2023 Res. 5-11 | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 5-10 | To Encourage and Promote Biblical Teaching of Creation | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 1932 Report of Committee 20, adopted ("A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod"); 1967 Res. 2-31; 1973 Res. 3-01 ("A Statement of Scriptural and Lutheran-confession Principles"); 2004 Res. 2-08A; 2019 Res. 5-09A | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 7-08 | To Encourage Congregations to Include in Annual Mission Budgets Support for Regional University of Concordia University System | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 2023 Res.7-06B | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 7-25 | To Appeal for Recognized Ecclesiastical Relationship with Luther Classical College | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 2023 Res. 7-04B | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 9-34 | To Strengthen Convention Participation of Ministers of Religion-Commissioned | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | Bylaws 3.1.5, 3.1.3.1; 2023 Res. 9-08A | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |

| Committee / Omnibus | Resolution or Overture | Title or Subject | Page | Action type | Related overtures / reports | Priority | Reason |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|------|---|---|----------|---|
| Omnibus B | Ov. 9-35 | To Strengthen Nonvoting Advisory Role of Commissioned Ministers at Synod Conventions | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | Bylaws 3.1.5, 3.1.3.1; 2023 Res. 9-08A | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 9-42 | To Change to Four-Year Convention Cycle Declination of 2023 Res. 9-09A | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 9-43 | To Amend Const. Art. VIII A 1 to Change to Four-Year Convention Cycle | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | Declination of 2023 Res. 9-09A | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 9-50 | To Adopt Dual Title of Bishop and President for District Presidents | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 1981 Res. 3-19 | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus B | Ov. 9-51 | To Authorize Title Bishop for Synod President and District Presidents | 54 | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action | 1981 Res. 3-19 | Medium | Omnibus action may matter if delegates want separate consideration. |
| Omnibus C | Ov. 1-31 | To Give Thanks for and Offer Renewed Commitment to Work of Atlantic District | 55 | encouragement or gratitude | Thank God for 120 years of faithful Gospel service and mission work of the Atlantic District | Low | Expression of thanks or encouragement. |
| Omnibus C | Ov. 1-33 | To Commend Family Discipleship Work of Concordia Center for the Family (CCF) | 55 | encouragement or gratitude | Thank God for the continued blessing of the work of CCF including its leaders, especially Rev. Dr. Todd A. Biermann | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |
| Omnibus C | Ov. 7-26 | To Give Thanks for the Board of Regents of Concordia College-New York | 55 | encouragement or gratitude | Thanks for diligent, fair, and faithful work | High | Omnibus item touches governance, doctrine, supervision, finance, formation, or direct local practice. |

Committee-by-Committee Analysis

The following section analyzes every proposed resolution identified in Today's Business, Issue 1. Total proposed resolutions analyzed: 106.

National Witness

Resolution 1-01: To Celebrate and Encourage All Nations Ministry in North America

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 57-58 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 1-01 (CW, 277) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns celebrate and encourage all nations ministry in north america (TB1, p. 57).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That congregations commemorate these milestone anniversaries by highlighting the encouraging news in various ways that the Synod is a church of every nation, of all peoples, tribes, and languages (Rev. 7:9); and be it further" (TB1, p. 57).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ gave His Great Commission: "Make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19) and He gave the Holy Spirit so that His disciples would be "witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth" (Acts 1:8) (TB1, p. 57).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Church Triumphant in Revelation 7 is shown to be a great multitude from every nation, tribe, people, and language, redeemed and gathered in praise before God on His throne, and these passages have inspired Synod mission efforts in North America and around... (TB1, p. 57).

Text-supported rationale point 3: God's Word calls us "to stir up one another to love and good works, not neglecting to meet together, as is the habit of some, but encouraging one another, and all the more as you see the Day drawing near" (Heb. 10:24 -25) (TB1, p. 57).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In this triennium, milestone anniversaries of mission in North America includes 90 years of Chinese ministry and 100 years of Hispanic ministry in 2026; 150 years of Black ministry in 2027; and 50 years of Hmong ministry in 2028; and these milestones serve as... (TB1, p. 57).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address celebrate and encourage all nations ministry in north america through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 57).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That congregations commemorate these milestone anniversaries by highlighting the encouraging news in various ways that the Synod is a church of every nation, of all peoples, tribes, and languages (Rev. 7:9); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That congregations provide information to members about the Synod's resources that make known the Law-36 Gospel faithfulness of Christ for all peoples and the Synod's condemnation of racism and that provide guidance for outreach and witness to people who are not yet part of the church; and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That LCMS Communications regularly spotlight the practical ways that congregations and districts are witnessing across ethnic and language boundaries, especially in their own communities; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks for the work of Lutheran Heritage Foundation for the many catechetical materials provided to support ministry among multiethnic communities and their work on the recent production of Himnario Luterano (resources.lcms.org/general/himnario-luterano-spanish-lutheran-hymnal); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (O NM) work with Concordia Publishing House (CPH) to prepare materials to facilitate congregational and family ministry among people of many languages and cultures in the U.S., to include exploring the potential of CPH worship material of its Spanish, Chinese, French, and other language hymnals being made available in digital format through Lutheran Service Builder or... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM work with CPH to explore the potential of adding theologically -sound materials in English that originated in Black/African American, Chinese, Hispanic, Hmong, and other traditions to the materials available in digital format through Lutheran Service Builder or another platform; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod,

commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention lift our hearts in gratitude and praise to God, standing to sing the doxology in celebration of His mission in North America among people of all ethnicities and languages, giving thanks for the many individuals who have served in these ministries. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 57-58).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 57-58.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 57).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 1-02: To Proclaim 2029 the 500th Year of Luther's Catechisms

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 58-59 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-22-23, 29-30 (CW, 289, 291-92) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns proclaim 2029 the 500th year of luther's catechisms (TB1, p. 58).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, schools, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention proclaim 2029 the 500th Anniversary Year of Luther's Small and Large Catechisms; and be it further" (TB1, p. 58).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The year 2029 marks the 500th anniversary of the publication of Martin Luther's Small and Large Catechisms (TB1, p. 58).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Luther's catechisms remain among the most significant and enduring treasures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, faithfully summarizing and teaching the doctrine of Holy Scripture for Christians of every age (TB1, p. 58).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Luther's catechisms have served for five centuries as foundational resources for evangelism, discipleship, Christian vocation, prayer, mercy, and instruction in the Christian faith (TB1, p. 58).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Small Catechism continues to serve as a valuable resource for pastors, congregations, schools, and heads of households in teaching the faith to children and adults (TB1, p. 58).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 58-59).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address proclaim 2029 the 500th year of luther's catechisms through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 58).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention proclaim 2029 the 500th Anniversary Year of Luther's Small and Large Catechisms; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 58-59).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the President of the Synod be encouraged to establish a Catechism500 initiative and invite CPH, the seminaries, the universities, Lutheran Hour Ministries, Lutheran Heritage Foundation, LCMS Communications, the Office of National Mission, the Office of International Mission, districts, congregations, schools, and other appropriate entities to participate in planning and promoting a coordinated... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 58-59).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Catechism500 initiative be encouraged to promote renewed catechesis throughout the Synod and develop resources and opportunities that highlight the enduring value of Luther's catechisms for the Church's mission of making disciples; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 58-59).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That congregations, schools, districts, campus ministries, recognized service organizations, and other entities of the Synod be encouraged to celebrate this anniversary and participate in Catechism500 activities and initiatives; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 58-59).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention rise and sing "Lord, Help Us Ever to Retain" (LSB 865) in thanksgiving to God for the gift of Luther's catechisms and in prayer that He would use them to strengthen the faith of future generations: Lord, help us ever to retain The Catechism's doctrine plain As Luther taught the Word of truth In simple style to tender youth. Help us Your holy Law to learn, To mourn our sin and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 58-59).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 58-59.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 58).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-03: To Give Thanks to God for 150 Years of Black Ministry

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 59-60 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-02-03 (CW, 277-78) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks to god for 150 years of black ministry (TB1, p. 59).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, Synod offices, congregations, schools.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod lament past failures to meet the scriptural standards of love for one another and reaffirm the scriptural condemnation of racism in all its forms; and be it further" (TB1, p. 59).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Christ our Lord commissioned His Church to make disciples of all nations (Matt. 28:19 -20) (TB1, p. 59).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Revelation 5:9, 13:7, and 14:6 speak of salvation freely offered and the proclamation of the Gospel to "every nation and tribe and language and people" (TB1, p. 59).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Many other passages of Holy Scripture testify to God's love for all people and our obligation to likewise love our neighbors regardless of ethnic, geographic, or social background (TB1, p. 59).

Text-supported rationale point 4: 2027 marks the 150th anniversary of LCMS Black Ministry with its establishment at Emmanuel Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., at the 1877 convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America (TB1, p. 59).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 59-60).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks to god for 150 years of black ministry through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 59).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod lament past failures to meet the scriptural standards of love for one another and reaffirm the scriptural condemnation of racism in all its forms; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 59-60).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod remember with thanksgiving the legacy of faithful servants of the Gospel in LCMS Black Ministry, celebrate those presently serving, and pray that the Lord of the harvest would raise up countless more; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 59-60).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod promote and support the 150th anniversary celebration of LCMS Black Ministry, scheduled to be held in Charlotte, N.C., July 7-10, 2027. To Give Thanks for 130 Years of Deaf Ministry Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 59-60).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 59-60.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 59).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?

- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 1-04: To Give Thanks for 130 Years of Deaf Ministry

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 60 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:26) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for 130 years of deaf ministry (TB1, p. 60).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, districts, congregations, pastors, laypeople.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to Almighty God for 130 years of deaf ministry and for the faithful servants through whom He has blessed His Church; and be it further" (TB1, p. 60).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod has been engaged in organized ministry among deaf individuals and communities since the nineteenth century, and the Synod formally adopted "Deaf Missions" as an official mission program in 1896 (TB1, p. 60).

Text-supported rationale point 2: For approximately 130 years, the Gospel of Jesus Christ has been proclaimed among deaf individuals through preaching, teaching, catechesis, mercy, Lutheran education, and the administration of the Means of Grace (TB1, p. 60).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Synod gives thanks for the faithful service of pastors, teachers, deaconesses, interpreters, congregations, missionaries, recognized service organizations (RSOs), and lay leaders who have served deaf individuals and communities throughout these years (TB1, p. 60).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Lutheran Deaf Mission Society and other ministry partners continue to support evangelism, catechesis, leadership development, church worker formation, and congregational outreach among deaf individuals and their families (TB1, p. 60).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 60-60).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for 130 years of deaf ministry through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 60).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to Almighty God for 130 years of deaf ministry and for the faithful servants through whom He has blessed His Church; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 60-60).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That congregations, districts, R SOs, and other ministry partners be encouraged to support and strengthen ongoing deaf ministry efforts throughout the Synod; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 60-60).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention recognize with thanksgiving the faithful witness of deaf Christians, pastors, church workers, congregations, R SOs, and other ministry partners who have served and continue to serve among deaf communities. To Prioritize Revitalization Work Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 60-60).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 60-60.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 60).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?

- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 1-05: To Prioritize Revitalization Work

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 60-61 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 1-08 (CW, 281) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns prioritize revitalization work (TB1, p. 60).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts, circuits, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention pray to almighty God for those congregations in need of revitalization and give thanks for the ongoing revitalization efforts across the Synod; and be it further" (TB1, p. 60).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod has prioritized revitalization of its congregations (TB1, p. 60).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Many existing Synod congregations have plateaued or are declining in membership or worship attendance (TB1, p. 60).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Congregational revitalization is centered in the new life that is found in God's Word being proclaimed in purity and His Sacraments being rightly administered; and Page | WHEREAS, The 2013 and 2016 Synod conventions approved the increased focus on... (TB1, p. 60).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Congregations are encouraged to make use of revitalization resources as these are made available (TB1, p. 60).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address prioritize revitalization work through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 60).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention pray to almighty God for those congregations in need of revitalization and give thanks for the ongoing revitalization efforts across the Synod; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 60-61).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the ONM to collaborate with district personnel to review and expand the revitalization resources and strategies available for congregations and circuits; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 60-61).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That congregations be encouraged regularly at the district and circuit levels to engage in biblically based, in a way faithful to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions faithful best practices concerning planning for the future, outreach to the community, caring for inactive members and intentionally incorporating current members into the life of the church (Matt. 28:19 -20; 1 Cor. 3:6; 14:40). To Support... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 60-61).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 60-61.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 60).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-06: To Support Lutheran Congregations and Schools in Urban Contexts

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 61 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-9-10 (CW, 281-82) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns support lutheran congregations and schools in urban contexts (TB1, p. 61).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations, schools.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks for congregations and schools in urban contexts; and be it further" (TB1, p. 61).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Throughout its history, the Synod has had congregations and schools in urban contexts. Many of these congregations and schools have ceased operations or have greatly curtailed ministries due to shifts in demographics, even as more people live in urban contexts in the United States. Unfortunately, the urban congregations that exist tend to be small and... (TB1, p. 61).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address support lutheran congregations and schools in urban contexts through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 61).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks for congregations and schools in urban contexts; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-61).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (ONM) work with districts to enhance networking for congregations, schools, and workers in urban contexts throughout the Synod for the sake of sharing resources and best practices and grant opportunities; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-61).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM work with districts to collaborate on ways to provide congregations and schools in urban contexts with administrative assistance for governance that could include payroll services, sharing a bookkeeper, insurance recommendations, strategic planning, and the like; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-61).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That demographic resources from the ONM ; LCMS Rosters, Statistics, and Research Services; Lutheran Church Extension Fund ; Lutheran Hour Ministries ; Concordia Plan Services ; and other data -collecting entities be encouraged to share with congregations, schools, and workers in urban contexts so that plans for outreach to people in urban contexts may be developed locally. The Chief Financial Officer and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-61).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 61-61.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 61).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-07: To Increase Church Planting at the Parish Level

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 61-62 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 1-06 (CW, 280) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns increase church planting at the parish level (TB1, p. 61).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod encourage districts, circuits, and congregations to plant churches through preaching stations supported by existing congregations and their pastors; and be it further" (TB1, p. 61).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ wants all people to be saved (1 Tim. 2:4) and has commanded His Church to make disciples of all nations by baptizing and teaching (Matt. 28:19); and Page | WHEREAS, Acts 2:42 shows that the Church of baptized believers gathered around... (TB1, p. 61).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The early Christians, having been gathered around Word and Sacrament, were sent into the world and established new churches as they went (TB1, p. 61).

Text-supported rationale point 3: This historic pattern of Word and Sacrament expansion allows the local congregation (uniquely suited as the front-line mission outpost) to be the driving force in church planting (TB1, p. 61).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Through the generous support of private foundations (such as the Bolick Foundation) the Office of National Mission (ONM) is able to support church planting across the Synod through training, networking, and church planting grants of up to \$100,000 (TB1, p. 61).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address increase church planting at the parish level through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 61).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod encourage districts, circuits, and congregations to plant churches through preaching stations supported by existing congregations and their pastors; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod direct the ONM to continue to partner with districts to identify locations at the parish level and support the planting of Synod congregations; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM continue to work with districts to establish a numerical goal for planting new congregations over the coming triennium; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage districts to continue to fund the planting of new congregations in a way that multiplies the impact of the grant from the ONM; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That special attention be given to planting congregations in regions where people do not have access to the pure teaching of the Gospel and right administration of the Sacraments (AC VII); and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend the LCMS Church Planting process as a faithful approach to fulfilling Christ's command to make disciples of all nations, while respecting the role of districts to use models that are beneficial to their local contexts. To Educate Young People Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 61-62).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 61-62.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 61).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-08: To Educate Young People

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 62-63 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-10, 15, 17-19, 23 (CW, 282, 285-87, 289) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns educate young people (TB1, p. 62).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, schools.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod affirm the God-given vocation of parents as the primary educators of their children; and be it further" (TB1, p. 62).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The LORD commands us to teach our children the Word of God diligently (Deuteronomy 6) (TB1, p. 62).

Text-supported rationale point 2: the Large Catechism states, "... if we wish to have excellent and able persons both for civil and Church leadership, we must spare no diligence, time, or cost in teaching and educating our children, so that they may serve God and the world" (LC I 172-73) (TB1, p. 62).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Christian parents are to raise their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord so that their children may live as faithful, responsible, and God-fearing citizens in the world; and Page | WHEREAS, Lutheran schools in urban, suburban, and rural contexts,... (TB1, p. 62).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Synod has more than 1,700 schools (LCMS.org/school-ministry, accessed May 30, 2026) with curricula informed by the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions (see lutheranschools.org), served by thousands of educators who go above and beyond in nurturing... (TB1, p. 62).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address educate young people through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 62).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod affirm the God-given vocation of parents as the primary educators of their children; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 62-63).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod thank God for Lutheran schools and homeschools, and for those who learn and work in them, and encourage them as they use doctrinally-sound curricula and books; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 62-63).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (ONM) work with districts to foster networking for congregations, schools, and workers, especially in urban and rural contexts, to maintain robust ministry presence; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 62-63).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM work with districts to identify and provide resources to plant new congregations and schools in areas that are underserved. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no incremental costs as this activity is covered in the current budget and scope of the Office of National Mission (estimate required by... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 62-63).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 62-63.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 62).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from

preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-09: To Promote Ministry Among Youth and Young Adults

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 63-64 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-13, 21 (CW, 284, 288) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns promote ministry among youth and young adults (TB1, p. 63).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks and praise to God for the young men and women in the church and cherish them as among those who are carrying on the saving faith on earth; and be it further" (TB1, p. 63).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ has commanded His Church to make disciples of all nations by baptizing and teaching the baptized (Matt. 28:19-20), and to raise up successive generations in the faith (TB1, p. 63).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Church has the responsibility to understand and live out the variety of gifts given to the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:4-31) (TB1, p. 63).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Even in the face of many challenges, the Lord assures His Church that "faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ" (Rom. 10:17), and that "[God] desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4) (TB1, p. 63).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Synod, through the Office of National Mission (ONM) (LCMS Youth Ministry in particular), has conducted research to help congregations better understand and retain Millennials, notably publishing Relationships Count: Engaging & Retaining Millennials... (TB1, p. 63).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 63-64).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address promote ministry among youth and young adults through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 63).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks and praise to God for the young men and women in the church and cherish them as among those who are carrying on the saving faith on earth; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 63-64).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the faithful service of pastors, teachers, other church workers, youth workers, congregational leaders, and volunteers throughout the Synod, and commend to the church's continued prayer and support those who labor to bring the Gospel to our young people and to form them in the life of the church; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 63-64).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the work of Synod districts, LCMS Youth Ministry, Synod camps, CPH, Higher Things, and other entities serving young men and women; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 63-64).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod direct the ONM, through LCMS Youth Ministry and in cooperation with LCMS Rosters, Statistics, and Research Services, Synod's congregations, schools, families and assisted by applicable partners and RSOs, to undertake or commission a focused, methodologically rigorous study of the Millennials, Generation Z, and Generation Alpha that identifies (1) patterns of religious identity and practice.... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 63-64).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM then publicize a summary of findings, along with a set of practical resources and concrete strategies that prioritize catechesis, regular worship participation, Lutheran doctrine and practice, parental support, and joyful involvement in the life of the Body of Christ, so that congregations and schools of all sizes may apply the findings in local ministry contexts. The Chief Financial Officer... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 63-64).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 63-64.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 63).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-10: To Confront Increased Idolatry of Our Culture with Clear Confession of Love of Christ and Lutheran Resources in Christian Apologetics

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 64-65 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-12, 22 (CW, 283-84, 289) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns confront increased idolatry of our culture with clear confession of love of christ and lutheran resources in christian apologetics (TB1, p. 64).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (ONM) survey the details of the forms of idolatry common in the American landscape and identify and promote resources and expertise already available for use within our fellowship; and be it..." (TB1, p. 64).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Ten Commandments begin with, "You shall have no other gods before me" (Ex. 20:3; Deut. 5:7) (TB1, p. 64).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The sinful nature leads people to the deceptions of self -sufficiency and relativism as described in Judges 21:25: "Everyone did what was right in his own eyes"; and thus, people become like the idols they trust (Ps alm 115:8) (TB1, p. 64).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Church is commanded by our Lord Jesus Christ to conduct both evangelism and apologetics , to give an answer or defense, and to contend for the faith (1 Peter 3:15; Jude 3) (TB1, p. 64).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Christian apologetics properly employed by the Church serves the saving Gospel, especially when it is used to demonstrate the futility of worldviews contrary to the Gospel and the importance of rejecting false faiths on the one hand, and when it supports the... (TB1, p. 64).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 64-65).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address confront increased idolatry of our culture with clear confession of love of christ and lutheran resources in christian apologetics through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 64).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (ONM) survey the details of the forms of idolatry common in the American landscape and identify and promote resources and expertise already available for use within our fellowship; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 64-65).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM work with Concordia Publishing House, our seminaries and universities, Lutheran Hour Ministries, and our recognized service organizations to develop resources in Christian apologetics, as appropriate to their purviews, for alerting the Church to cultural idols confronting Christians in this century so that congregations, schools, and individuals in the Synod may use these resources to witness... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 64-65).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the seminaries and universities of the Synod take up the issue of apologetics whenever possible; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 64-65).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention urge all pastors, commissioned ministers, and congregations of the Synod to pray for the Church as she is confronted by the cultural idols of our day, that she discern what these idols are, and how the Word of Christ supplies all we need to be alerted to, protected from, and equipped for facing our cultural idols. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 64-65).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 64-65.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 64).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-11: To Confess God's Design for the Family

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 65-66 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-24-25, 1-32 (CW, 289-291, 293) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns confess god's design for the family (TB1, p. 65).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, schools, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention plainly state our religious objection to government interference in Christian parents' duty to raise their children in the faith and life of the Christian confession; and be it further" (TB1, p. 65).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod upholds the scriptural mandate for families and the church to nurture faith in the home: "These commandments that I give you today are to be on your hearts. Impress them on your children. Talk about them when you sit at..." (TB1, p. 65).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Luther declares, "let everyone know that it is his duty, on peril of losing the divine favor, to bring up his children in the fear and knowledge of God above all things [Proverbs 1:7]" (LC I [Fourth Commandment] 174) (TB1, p. 65).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Fourth Commandment, as explained in the Large Catechism, places all authority over a child on the parents of that child, so that we confess, "For all authority flows and is born from the authority of parents. Where a father is unable alone to educate his..." (TB1, p. 65).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Office of National Mission (ONM) and organizations that support those seeking to live according to God's design for the family, such as Concordia Center for the Family, are great blessings to this work in the church (TB1, p. 65).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 65-66).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address confess god's design for the family through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 65).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention plainly state our religious objection to government interference in Christian parents' duty to raise their children in the faith and life of the Christian confession; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, schools, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 65-66).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage all Synod congregations, pastors, commissioned workers, and lay leaders to make use of training and resources (such as those from the Family Ministry Office and Concordia Center for the Family); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, schools, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 65-66).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM be prepared to inform congregations about public resources (such as the Alliance Defending Freedom) available to support their biblical convictions; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, schools, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 65-66).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we urge our congregations and schools boldly to confess and witness to the truth in the public square. To Support Campus Ministry Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, schools, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 65-66).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 65-66.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 65).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-12: To Support Campus Ministry

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 66-67 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 1-04-05, 13, 21 (CW, 278-80, 284, 288) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns support campus ministry (TB1, p. 66).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, universities, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to almighty God for the faithful church workers, congregations, LCMS U chapters, and others engaged in campus ministry throughout the Synod; and be it further" (TB1, p. 66).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Young men and women continue attending colleges and universities throughout the nation in significant numbers, and these campuses are to be regarded as mission fields for the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ (TB1, p. 66).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod (LCMS) has a long and faithful tradition of campus ministry through congregations, Lutheran Student Fellowship, LCMS U chapters, and other ministries that connect students and scholars with Word and Sacrament ministry (TB1, p. 66).

Text-supported rationale point 3: There are currently 165 LCMS U chapters (lcms.org/how-we-serve/national/campus-ministry/lcms-u-24 chapter-map) and many congregations engaged in some form of campus ministry throughout the Synod (TB1, p. 66).

Text-supported rationale point 4: 95 percent of the Synod's congregations are located within a 45 -minute drive of a college or university campus (LCMS Youth Ministry, youthesource.com/2021/09/starting-a-campus-ministry/) (TB1, p. 66).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 66-67).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address support campus ministry through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 66).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to almighty God for the faithful church workers, congregations, LCMS U chapters, and others engaged in campus ministry throughout the Synod; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, universities, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 66-67).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage continued investment in campus ministry as a significant mission priority and that the Synod Board of Directors reinstate, through the Office of National Mission, a full-time staff position for supporting campus ministry. Page | The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate an annual cost of... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, universities, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 66-67).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 66-67.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 66).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?

- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-13: To Strengthen the Synod's Digital Witness and Congregational Connections

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 67 |
| Related overtures/reports: | President's Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:26) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns strengthen the synod's digital witness and congregational connections (TB1, p. 67).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention encourage the Office of National Mission (ONM) and LCMS Communications to develop a coordinated strategy to strengthen our Synod's online witness to assist those seeking a Lutheran church in locating..." (TB1, p. 67).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ has commanded His Church to make disciples of all nations through the proclamation of the Gospel (Matt. 28:19-20) (TB1, p. 67).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Since the days when Martin Luther employed the printing press to spread the message of the Reformation, Lutherans have sought to use available means of communication in service to Christ 's command to make disciples of all nations (TB1, p. 67).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod (LCMS) has continued this tradition through publications, radio broadcasting, and digital communications, including such ministries as The Lutheran Witness , KFUE Radio, Synod 's online resources, and auxiliaries such as... (TB1, p. 67).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Church receives such technologies as useful tools that may serve the proclamation of God 's Word while recognizing that these tools must remain servants of the Church's mission and never replace the gathering of God's people around Word and Sacrament (TB1, p. 67).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 67-67).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address strengthen the synod's digital witness and congregational connections through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 67).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention encourage the Office of National Mission (ONM) and LCMS Communications to develop a coordinated strategy to strengthen our Synod's online witness to assist those seeking a Lutheran church in locating nearby congregations of the Synod; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 67-67).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM and LCMS Communications be encouraged to coordinate their efforts in support of evangelism, outreach, and connection to local congregations; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 67-67).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM and LCMS Communications report their progress to the Council of Presidents during the 2026-2029 triennium. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no incremental costs as this work is already underway to strengthen lcms.org (estimate required by Bylaw 3.1.7 [g]). To Give Thanks for Lutheran Hour... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 67-67).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 67-67.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 67).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 1-14: To Give Thanks for Lutheran Hour Ministries and Encourage Enhanced Collaboration

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 67-68 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:26) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for lutheran hour ministries and encourage enhanced collaboration (TB1, p. 67).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations, laypeople.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to almighty God for the more than 100 years of faithful witness and service of LHM and commend its ongoing work of proclaiming Christ to the world; and be it further" (TB1, p. 67).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Lutheran Hour Ministries (The International Lutheran Laymen's League, [LHM]) has served for more than a century and is recognized as a valued auxiliary of The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod (LCMS) (TB1, p. 67).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Through God's blessing, LHM has shared the Gospel with millions of people throughout the world and has served alongside congregations, districts, and Synod ministries under the mission of "Bringing Christ to the Nations®-40 and the Nations to the Church" (TB1, p. 67).

Text-supported rationale point 3: LHM and the Synod share a common commitment to proclaiming Christ crucified and risen, making disciples, and bringing the hope of the Gospel to a world in need; and Page | WHEREAS, Continued cooperation between LHM and the Synod provides opportunities to... (TB1, p. 67).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for lutheran hour ministries and encourage enhanced collaboration through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 67).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to almighty God for the more than 100 years of faithful witness and service of LHM and commend its ongoing work of proclaiming Christ to the world; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 67-68).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod request LHM and the Chief Mission Officer of the Synod to identify opportunities for strategic collaboration and to work towards enhanced partnership for the faithful stewardship of resources in support of their shared mission. To Respectfully Decline Overtures Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 67-68).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 67-68.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 67).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 1-15: To Respectfully Decline Overtures

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | National Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 68-69 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 1-14 (CW, 284-85) |
| Proposed action type: | declination |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respectfully decline overtures (TB1, p. 68).

The proposal would decline one or more overtures and give the committee reason for doing so. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, schools.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 1-14 To Encourage Armed Security at All Synod Schools The Synod does not have this authority; it is the responsibility of..." (TB1, p. 68).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The floor committee has considered all overtures assigned to it and has concluded, for various reasons, that certain overtures should be declined (TB1, p. 68).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respectfully decline overtures through a declination approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 68).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (declination): Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 1-14 To Encourage Armed Security at All Synod Schools The Synod does not have this authority; it is the responsibility of schools and congregations to develop appropriate security policies Page | To Give Thanks for LCMS Ministry to the Armed Forces Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 68-69).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: the Synod would not take the action requested by the listed overture unless the item is amended, substituted, or pulled into separate consideration. Source basis: TB1, pp. 68-69.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations that submitted or supported the declined overture may need to decide whether to ask delegates to seek separate consideration or amendment. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 68).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the committee preserving convention time and directing attention to matters the Synod can actually address. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether any declined item raises a doctrinal, supervisory, or congregational concern that deserves separate consideration.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the committee reason for declining the overture satisfy the concern, or should a delegate consider separate treatment?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: declining an overture can prevent the convention from acting beyond its authority or duplicating existing work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: a legitimate pastoral, doctrinal, or governance concern may be left unresolved if the reason for decline is too thin.

International Witness

Resolution 2-01: To Give Thanks for LCMS Ministry to the Armed Forces

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | International Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 69 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 2-06 (CW, 296-97) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for lcms ministry to the armed forces (TB1, p. 69).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, congregations, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod encourage its congregations to intentionally recognize and care for current and former military members, veterans, and family members in their midst by joining the network of care provided through Operation..." (TB1, p. 69).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: From the Civil War through both World Wars, Korea, Vietnam, and more recent areas of conflict, Synod pastors, serving honorably and with distinction as military chaplains, bring the Good News of Jesus Christ to those protecting our great nation (TB1, p. 69).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Some chaplains serve on forward bases in harm's way; others, onboard ships maintaining vigilant watch over the seven seas; yet others walk the flight line on isolated air bases, engaging airmen on matters of faith and family as they load fighter aircraft for... (TB1, p. 69).

Text-supported rationale point 3: These "pastors in uniform" provide Word and Sacrament ministry while enduring hardship, constant peril, and danger (TB1, p. 69).

Text-supported rationale point 4: These chaplains meet the needs of military personnel and their families stationed around the world and provide a vital link to home (TB1, p. 69).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 69-69).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for lcms ministry to the armed forces through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 69).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod encourage its congregations to intentionally recognize and care for current and former military members, veterans, and family members in their midst by joining the network of care provided through Operation Barnabas; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-69).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for MAF, Operation Barnabas, and MAF leadership, including its director, the Rev. Craig Muehler, and assistant director, the Rev. Dr. Steven Hokana. To Direct Districts and Encourage Congregational Participation in Global Mission through Prayer, Partnership, and Support Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-69).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 69-69.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 69).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 2-02: To Direct Districts and Encourage Congregational Participation in Global Mission through Prayer, Partnership, and Support

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | International Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 69-70 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 2-01-02 (CW, 295) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns direct districts and encourage congregational participation in global mission through prayer, partnership, and support (TB1, p. 69).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the many blessings that have come forth from the FOROs in Honduras, Panama, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Chile, Belize, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay,..." (TB1, p. 69).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ has commanded His Church to "make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19) (TB1, p. 69).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Lord exhorts His people to "pray earnestly to the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into His harvest" (Matt. 9:38), and assures His Church that He "is able to do far more abundantly than all that we ask or think" (Eph. 3:20) (TB1, p. 69).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Church is called to be "eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3), including fellowship and cooperation in the work of the Gospel across nations and cultures (TB1, p. 69).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) has long carried out this mission through the sending of missionaries and the support of partner churches throughout the world; and Page | WHEREAS, The Synod presently carries out its support of missionaries through... (TB1, p. 69).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address direct districts and encourage congregational participation in global mission through prayer, partnership, and support through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 69).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the many blessings that have come forth from the FOROs in Honduras, Panama, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Chile, Belize, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, Bolivia, Cuba, Germany, Spain, South Africa, Malawi, Eritrea, Rwanda, and the Philippines, with more in development; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Synod in convention direct each district to assess the feasibility of adopting a FORO partnership and present it for consideration at their next district convention; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the congregations of the Synod be encouraged to include regular prayers in corporate worship and in their life together for the Lord's mission, for His Church throughout the world, and for the raising up and sustaining of faithful workers in the harvest; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all Synod congregations be encouraged to actively participate in LCMS international mission through the FORO model, as faithful stewards of the Gospel and all of God's gifts; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That congregations be encouraged, where possible, to adopt and support one or more missionaries of the Synod through the NSM model, committing themselves especially to faithful prayer and, as they are able, to financial support; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the OIM continue to expand opportunities for congregations to be connected meaningfully to mission work-whether through missionary support, FORO partnerships, or other faithful means; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That these opportunities be commended to all congregations of the Synod for prayerful consideration, that they may participate more fully in the Lord's work of gathering His Church from all nations. To Give Thanks to God for Missionary Care Provided by the Office of International Mission Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 69-70).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 69-70.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 69).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 2-03: To Give Thanks to God for Missionary Care Provided by the Office of International Mission

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | International Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 70-71 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 2-03 (CW, 295-96) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks to god for missionary care provided by the office of international mission (TB1, p. 70).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks and praise to God for the faithful and compassionate care provided to missionaries and their families through the OIM; and be it further" (TB1, p. 70).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ commands His Church to make disciples of all nations (Matt. 28:19 -20), and the Synod carries out this work through the sending of missionaries around the world (TB1, p. 70).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Office of International Mission (OIM) strives to deploy and sustain physically, emotionally, and spiritually healthy missionary families for faithful, enduring service in the spreading of the Gospel, the planting of Lutheran churches, and the showing of... (TB1, p. 70).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The OIM begins its comprehensive approach to missionary care already in recruitment and discernment, carefully evaluating the suitability of missionary households and seeking appropriate placement for their well -being and effective service; and Page |... (TB1, p. 70).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The OIM continues its care on the mission fields through regionally -based care circles, pastoral support, regular care conversations, language and cultural training, appropriate housing, educational benefits for children, healthcare, opportunities for rest... (TB1, p. 70).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 70-71).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks to god for missionary care provided by the office of international mission through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 70).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks and praise to God for the faithful and compassionate care provided to missionaries and their families through the OIM; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 70-71).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend and support the OIM's ongoing efforts to care for missionaries holistically, so that they may serve with endurance, faithfulness, and joy; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 70-71).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the OIM establish a full-time chaplaincy in each region by the 2029 Synod convention to expand our pastoral care for our missionaries; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 70-71).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the congregations, districts, and all members of the Synod be encouraged to pray for the Synod's missionaries and their families, to engage with them in mutual encouragement, and to support the mission of the Gospel ; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 70-71).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod rejoice that through the faithful service of missionaries, supported by the OIM, the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ is proclaimed to the ends of the earth. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate the annual cost to be \$800,000, including adding a chaplain in each region and associated costs.... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 70-71).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 70-71.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 70).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 2-04: To Amend Bylaws 1.7.3, 2.11.1, 3.8.3, 3.8.3.8, and 4.4.4-5 to Establish a Framework for Ecclesiastical Supervision and Pastoral Care for Independent International Congregations

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | International Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 71-74 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 2-03 (CW 295-96) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws 1.7.3, 2.11.1, 3.8.3, 3.8.3.8, and 4.4.4-5 to establish a framework for ecclesiastical supervision and pastoral care for independent international congregations (TB1, p. 71).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, districts, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 1.7.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.7 Agreements ... 1.7.3 The Synod expects congregations that have not been received into membership, but are served by Synod, and whose ministers of religion,..." (TB1, p. 71).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod (LCMS) has had a long history of working with independent Lutheran congregations located in international areas and served by member clergy of the LCMS (TB1, p. 71).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The provision of ecclesiastical supervision is an essential part of carrying out the task of sending and providing proper care for our members serving in international context (TB1, p. 71).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The 2023 Synod convention adopted Resolutions 2-03 and 2-06A (Proceedings, 124-26), which addressed matters related to ecclesiastical supervision and pastoral care of missionaries and Synod membership for international congregations (TB1, p. 71).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Board for International Mission (BIM) was tasked to work in consultation with the Council of Presidents to study the Synod's relationship with independent Lutheran congregations in international areas; and Page | WHEREAS, The BIM has already invested... (TB1, p. 71).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 71-74).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws 1.7.3, 2.11.1, 3.8.3, 3.8.3.8, and 4.4.4-5 to establish a framework for ecclesiastical supervision and pastoral care for independent international congregations through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 71).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 1.7.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.7 Agreements ... 1.7.3 The Synod expects congregations that have not been received into membership, but are served by Synod, and whose ministers of religion, ordained and commissioned, hold membership in the Synod, to honor its rules, and regulations confession, Constitution, Bylaws, and resolutions of Synod in convention . Individual members... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 71-74).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 2.11.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Active Members 2.11.1 To remain on the roster of the Synod as an active member, an ordained or commissioned minister of religion must be a communicant member of a congregation which is a member of the Synod (except as provided in paragraph [c] below) and be regularly performing the duties of one of the following: ... (c) A n ordained or... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 71-74).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaws 3.8.3 and 3.8.3.8 be amended as follows: Page | PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Board for International Mission 3.8.3 The Board for International Mission is charged with developing and determining policies in support of mission and ministry in foreign countries for the office of International Mission (Bylaw 1.2.1[n]). These policies shall embrace and apply the mission and ministry emphases adopted by... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 71-74).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaws 4.4.4-5 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 4.4.4 The district president shall, in accordance with the Constitution of the Synod, in his ministry of ecclesiastical supervision visit the congregations of the district. ... (f) The jurisdiction of the district president shall include non -member congregations whose pastors are members of the Synod within his district . However, for the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 71-74).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Board for International Mission and Council of Presidents jointly develop and implement the necessary policies and procedures in coordination with the Office of International Mission and report them to the 2029 Synod Convention. To Give Thanks to God for 125 Years of Gospel Ministry, Partner Churches, and Mission in the Latin America and Caribbean Region Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 71-74).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 71-74.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 71).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 2-05: To Give Thanks to God for 125 Years of Gospel Ministry, Partner Churches, and Mission in the Latin America and Caribbean Region

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | International Witness |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 74-76 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report R1.2.2 (CW, 19-28) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks to god for 125 years of gospel ministry, partner churches, and mission in the latin america and caribbean region (TB1, p. 74).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the 125 years of faithful work being carried out in Brazil and among Hispanic populations through the OIM, offering highest praise for the continuous growth of the Gospel across..." (TB1, p. 74).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Office of International Mission (OIM) carries out the Church's Christ-given task to spread the Gospel, plant Lutheran churches, and show mercy among the nations, grounded in Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions (TB1, p. 74).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The year 2025 marked the historic milestone of 125 years since The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod (LCMS) began its vital mission work in Brazil, establishing a long legacy of planting the Gospel seed across the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region (TB1, p. 74).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Through the power of the Holy Spirit, missionary church planting has led to recognized fellowship with ten church bodies across the LAC region, specifically Iglesia Evangélica Luterana Argentina (Argentina), Iglesia Cristiana Evangélica Luterana de Bolivia... (TB1, p. 74).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Our missionaries directly and indirectly support church planting across ten countries, prioritizing the faithful preparation of local pastors to gather believers around Word and Sacrament where Jesus promises to give His life-29 giving forgiveness (TB1, p. 74).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks to god for 125 years of gospel ministry, partner churches, and mission in the latin america and caribbean region through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 74).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the 125 years of faithful work being carried out in Brazil and among Hispanic populations through the OIM, offering highest praise for the continuous growth of the Gospel across the LAC region; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod formally express its deep gratitude for our ten partner churches in LAC; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod express its profound thanks to the Lord of the harvest for the dedicated alliance missionaries and their families, who faithfully serve under our supervision and support; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend and encourage continued expansion of Spanish -language theological resources, pastoral formation programs, and church planting efforts in Hispanic contexts; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That districts, congregations, recognized service organizations, and individual members be encouraged to support the LAC mission fields and international Hispanic ministry through fervent prayer, financial contributions, stewardship, short-term teams, and participation in FORO partnerships; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod reaffirm its commitment to planting and strengthening faithful Lutheran churches among Hispanic populations worldwide, so that the pure Gospel may be preached, the Sacraments rightly administered, and Christ confessed among all nations; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all glory be given to God for the continued spread of the Gospel and the life-giving signs and gifts of Christ shared throughout the region, trusting that His Word will not return empty but accomplish His saving purpose. Page | To Commend and Encourage Life Ministry Efforts of Congregations, Schools, Districts, and Recognized Service Organizations Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 74-76).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 74-76.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 74).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Mercy

Resolution 3-01: To Commend and Encourage Life Ministry Efforts of Congregations, Schools, Districts, and Recognized Service Organizations

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 76 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 3-02 (CW, 299) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns commend and encourage life ministry efforts of congregations, schools, districts, and recognized service organizations (TB1, p. 76).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations, schools.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the ongoing and increasing witness to the sanctity and dignity of every human life by Synod congregations, schools, districts, recognized service organizations (RSO), and by..." (TB1, p. 76).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: God has created every human life (Job 10:9-11; Psalm 139:13-16; Jer. 1:5), and people are taught by Holy Scripture to love those in need in every stage of life, from conception to death, with not only our words but also our actions (1 John 3:16-18; James... (TB1, p. 76).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Increasing numbers of Lutherans are planning and participating in pro -life marches (such as the National March for Life), and other advocacy events across the United States (TB1, p. 76).

Text-supported rationale point 3: LCMS Life Ministry has awarded Million Dollar Life Match grants to Synod congregations and districts to support and expand beginning -of-life care projects, sanctity of life education and pro -life advocacy work that upholds the value of all human life,... (TB1, p. 76).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Through the Million Dollar Life Match initiative, LCMS congregations and districts have dedicated \$500,496.75 toward life-affirming ministries, which has been matched by \$618,083.12 from the LCMS Office of National Mission (ONM), resulting in a total... (TB1, p. 76).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 76-76).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address commend and encourage life ministry efforts of congregations, schools, districts, and recognized service organizations through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 76).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the ongoing and increasing witness to the sanctity and dignity of every human life by Synod congregations, schools, districts, recognized service organizations (RSO), and by LCMS Life Ministry; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-76).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That LCMS Life Ministry, the ONM, the Office of the President, and district staff members be encouraged to participate in not only Synod efforts, but also other peaceful and law-abiding ecumenical and civic pro-life organizations and events, when and where appropriate; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-76).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That LCMS Life Ministry continue to create resources, offer educational events such as conferences and webinars, and advise congregations, schools, districts, and RSOs in their pro -life work; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-76).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That congregations, schools, and districts of the Synod, as well as RSOs, continue to promote and encourage both church workers and congregation members to be involved in pro -life efforts, such as advocating state and federal lawmakers to protect and defend human life from conception until natural death, educating congregation members and school families about the God-given sanctity and dignity of human... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-76).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 76-76.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 76).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 3-02: To Promote Awareness of Christian Adoption and Fostering Needs

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 76-77 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 3-01 (CW, 299) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns promote awareness of christian adoption and fostering needs (TB1, p. 76).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention, in grateful response to our own baptismal adoption as children of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, affirm our Christian privilege and responsibility to advocate and undertake protecting and..." (TB1, p. 76).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Adoption figures prominently in Holy Scripture (Gal. 4:5) and the baptismal theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (TB1, p. 76).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Christians have a n historical legacy of enacting this Gospel by undertaking and coordinating care for "orphans and widows in their affliction" (James 1:27); and Page | WHEREAS, In the United States, The Synod, her congregations, and recognized service... (TB1, p. 76).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Some 117,000 children nationwide are awaiting families and homes through adoption this year (www.adoptuskids.org/meet-the-children/children-in-foster-care/about-the-children, accessed May 30, 2026) (TB1, p. 76).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In many jurisdictions, state involvement in adoption imposes restrictions that result in a significant proportion of these children receiving placements in situations contrary to the heavenly Father's design and intention for sexuality and marriage and... (TB1, p. 76).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 76-77).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address promote awareness of christian adoption and fostering needs through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 76).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention, in grateful response to our own baptismal adoption as children of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, affirm our Christian privilege and responsibility to advocate and undertake protecting and providing for children awaiting adoption and fostering, particularly that they might enter His kingdom by Baptism and belief in His saving name; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-77).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we recognize and commend RSOs engaged in these services with our prayers, our advocacy, and our contributions to further their labors among us and on our behalf; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-77).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention encourage our Synod and district leaders and congregations to promote awareness of Christian adoption and its Christ-pleasing benefits and promote awareness of Christian adoption and fostering needs, agencies, and opportunities; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-77).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention recognize and commend the RSOs engaged in these services with our prayers, our advocacy, and our contributions to further their labors among us and on our behalf. To Thank God for Work of LCMS Disaster Response and Human Care Partners and To Require Districts to Appoint Disaster Response Coordinators Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 76-77).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 76-77.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 76).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 3-03: To Thank God for Work of LCMS Disaster Response and Human Care Partners and To Require Districts to Appoint Disaster Response Coordinators

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 77-78 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 3-03-04 (CW, 299-300) |
| Proposed action type: | directive |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns thank god for work of lcms disaster response and human care partners and to require districts to appoint disaster response coordinators (TB1, p. 77).

The proposal would direct a board, office, commission, district, or other entity to take specified action. The affected parties named or implied by the text include districts, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks and praise to God for His mercy and provision through the ongoing work of LCMS Disaster Response and its human care partners, especially for the witness and service offered through LERT..." (TB1, p. 77).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture teaches us to "Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2) and to love our neighbors as ourselves (Mark 12:31), and the Lord calls His Church to works of mercy that flow from His mercy given to us in Christ Jesus (TB1, p. 77).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Since its current organizational structure was established in 2005, LCMS Disaster Response has faithfully equipped the church for acts of mercy in times of crisis, trained and coordinated Lutheran Early Response Team (LERT) volunteers, trained leaders, and... (TB1, p. 77).

Text-supported rationale point 3: LCMS Disaster Response currently works through 104 key leaders across 35 districts and six recognized service organizations (RSO), supporting a network of more than 9,200 trained LERT volunteers and more than 80 pieces of specialized disaster equipment,... (TB1, p. 77).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In the past triennium, LCMS Disaster Response provided \$3,427,748 in national disaster relief grants, mobilized 6,630 LCMS responders who collectively contributed 77,350 hours of service across training and deployment, with 4,755 LCMS responders completing... (TB1, p. 77).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address thank god for work of lcms disaster response and human care partners and to require districts to appoint disaster response coordinators through a directive approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 77).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (directive): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks and praise to God for His mercy and provision through the ongoing work of LCMS Disaster Response and its human care partners, especially for the witness and service offered through LERT volunteers, districts, and RSOs; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage continued support and prayer for those affected by natural disasters, and for legal immigrants, refugees, and other vulnerable neighbors, and for those who serve faithfully in times of crisis; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That each district appoint a district disaster response coordinator to work directly with LCMS Disaster Response and offer LERT training modules in the district; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend LCMS Disaster Response, its staff, leaders, and volunteers, to the Lord's continued care, asking Him to strengthen their work in mercy and to bless their proclamation of the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ in word and deed; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks for these efforts and seek additional ways to extend Christ's mercy to those in need, so that the church at large may continue to bear witness to the love of Christ through acts of mercy and service; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod joyfully confess that every act of mercy flows from Christ Himself, "who comforts us in all our affliction, so that we may be able to comfort those who are in any affliction" (2 Cor. 1:4), to the glory of God and the comfort of His people. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no significant... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 77-78).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 77-78.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 77).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 3-04: To Encourage Use of Counseling and Telehealth Services for Care and Retention of Church Workers

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 78-79 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 3-07 (CW, 301-2) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns encourage use of counseling and telehealth services for care and retention of church workers (TB1, p. 78).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention encourage its workers to view the use of professional counseling services as faithful stewardship of the gifts of body and mind entrusted to them by God; and be it further" (TB1, p. 78).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Church workers of the Synod experience unique vocational stressors inherent to ecclesial callings, including isolation, heavy workloads, public scrutiny, financial strain, and relational pressures (TB1, p. 78).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Research within and outside the Synod demonstrates increasing rates of burnout, depression, anxiety, suicidality, marital distress, loneliness, financial uncertainty, and certain addictive behaviors among pastors and other church workers (TB1, p. 78).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Professional counseling, including counseling delivered via telehealth, has demonstrated efficacy in treating burnout, depression, anxiety disorders, trauma -related distress, marital and family conflict, financial stress, and certain addictive behaviors (TB1, p. 78).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Church workers of the Synod will benefit from Christ -centered, clinically competent counseling services that are in a way faithful to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions aligned with the doctrine and practice of the Synod and are well positioned to serve... (TB1, p. 78).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address encourage use of counseling and telehealth services for care and retention of church workers through an encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 78).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention encourage its workers to view the use of professional counseling services as faithful stewardship of the gifts of body and mind entrusted to them by God; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 78-79).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend telehealth counseling services as trusted resources for addressing burnout, depression, anxiety, suicidality, marital and family distress, financial stress, and certain addictive behaviors among church workers; and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 78-79).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That districts, congregations, schools, and recognized service organizations be encouraged to become familiar with existing and available counseling and telehealth services that are in a way faithful to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions aligned with the doctrine and practice of the Synod and to share such information as part of a culture of care and support for church workers; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 78-79).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod affirm that timely access to counseling services may assist church workers in remaining in their calls and continuing faithful service to Christ's Church through the proclamation of the Gospel; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 78-79).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod and districts be encouraged in the upcoming triennium to consider how to address the acute and growing need for more capacity in counseling and telehealth services that are in a way faithful to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and doctrinally aligned with the Synod in light of future advancements in telehealth services and the growing acceptance of these counseling services as... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 78-79).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Office of National Mission, in cooperation with Concordia Plan Services and other appropriate Synod entities, be directed to study the feasibility of establishing a synodwide telehealth counseling network staffed by licensed mental health professionals who are in a way faithful to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions committed to the doctrine and practice of the Synod, with particular attention...

Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 78-79).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 78-79.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 78).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 3-05: To Commend Efforts to Serve Worker Wellness and Encourage Participation in Concordia Plan Services

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 79-80 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 3-06 (CW, 301) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns commend efforts to serve worker wellness and encourage participation in concordia plan services (TB1, p. 79).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, districts, congregations, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the COP, LCMS Worker Wellness, and CPS be commended and thanked for their work to provide leadership and a strategic plan, and for their collaboration on Soldiers of the Cross and Veterans of the Cross grant programs; and be..." (TB1, p. 79).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: It is a mission priority of the Synod to promote and nurture the spiritual, emotional, and physical well-being of pastors and professional church workers (TB1, p. 79).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Council of Presidents (COP), LCMS Worker Wellness, and Concordia Plan Services (CPS) have collaborated to create a strategic plan that has been disseminated to district presidents and established by district boards of directors pursuant to 2023 Resolution... (TB1, p. 79).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The strategies involve the efforts of both professional church workers and the congregational lay leaders and ministry leaders (TB1, p. 79).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Soldiers of the Cross has provided \$241,705 of financial assistance to 98 rostered church workers this past triennium, and Veterans of the Cross has provided \$717,751 to 30 recipients in the same period, demonstrating both the generosity of the church and the... (TB1, p. 79).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 79-80).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address commend efforts to serve worker wellness and encourage participation in concordia plan services through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 79).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the COP, LCMS Worker Wellness, and CPS be commended and thanked for their work to provide leadership and a strategic plan, and for their collaboration on Soldiers of the Cross and Veterans of the Cross grant programs; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 79-80).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That districts, congregations, schools and ministries not enrolled in a CPS health plan be encouraged to annually consider and compare their current health plan with those available through CPS; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 79-80).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the lay leaders of Synod congregations, schools, and recognized service organizations be advised and encouraged to make use of resources, programs, and plans created by the districts, CPS, and LCMS Worker Wellness, and endeavor to form the local culture to be supportive of and caring for the holistic well-being of church workers, members, and visitors. To Encourage Synod to Respond to the Growing... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 79-80).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 79-80.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 79).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 3-06: To Encourage Synod to Respond to the Growing Addiction Crisis

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 80-81 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture L3-09 (TB, 1:45-46) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns encourage synod to respond to the growing addiction crisis (TB1, p. 80).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (ONM) investigate ways churches and recognized service organizations can support restoring the hope of Christ to those impacted by addiction (Heb. 6:19 -20). The ONM shall make recommendations..." (TB1, p. 80).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Addiction started with the original sin and the continuing temptation by Satan: "For God knows that when you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:5 NIV; see also Prov. 25:28, Matt. 26:41, Heb. 4:14-16) (TB1, p. 80).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The apostle Paul warns not to sin against one's body (1 Cor. 6:12 -20), Christians are called to obey civil law, including not purchasing or using illegal drugs (Rom. 13:1 -7, 1 Peter 2:13-17), and this warning was also given by James: "So whoever knows the... (TB1, p. 80).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Deaths related to drug overdoses totaled almost 80,000 people in the U.S. in 2024, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. At least two -thirds of drug overdose deaths were linked to opioids (CDC,... (TB1, p. 80).

Text-supported rationale point 4: More Americans died in 2024 due to opioid-related overdoses than the highest number of Americans killed in a single year (CDC, [cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/releases/20250514.html](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/releases/20250514.html)): * by gun violence (48,830 in 2021 [CDC,... (TB1, p. 80).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 80-81).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address encourage synod to respond to the growing addiction crisis through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 80).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That the Office of National Mission (ONM) investigate ways churches and recognized service organizations can support restoring the hope of Christ to those impacted by addiction (Heb. 6:19 -20). The ONM shall make recommendations based on its investigation and report to the 2029 Synod convention; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 80-81).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the ONM encourage each district to establish at least one new partnership with a faith -based care ministry for those suffering from addiction by the 2029 Synod convention; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 80-81).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention pray for those suffering from substance abuse and addiction (Rom. 12:11 -8 12; Phil. 4:13). To Give Thanks to God for Synod Congregations Engaging in Mercy Ministries Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 80-81).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 80-81.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 80).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 3-07: To Give Thanks to God for Synod Congregations Engaging in Mercy Ministries

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Mercy |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 81-82 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 3-04 (CW, 300) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks to god for synod congregations engaging in mercy ministries (TB1, p. 81).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for congregations that intentionally send members into their vocations to extend God's mercy to their neighbors; and be it further" (TB1, p. 81).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: God the Father has extended His great mercy to all people through the death and resurrection of His Son, Jesus Christ (Titus 3:4-5; Eph. 2:4-5) (TB1, p. 81).

Text-supported rationale point 2: God the Holy Spirit leads us to respond to God's mercy by extending mercy to our neighbor (Luke 6:36; 2 Cor. 1:3-4) (TB1, p. 81).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Holy Scripture describes such mercy as Christians serving in their vocations, meeting their neighbors' bodily and spiritual needs (Matt. 25:31-40; Gal. 6:2; 1 Tim. 2:4) (TB1, p. 81).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Synod congregations corporately carry out works of mercy in their communities through such services as women's shelters, food pantries, counseling and prison ministries, wellness ministries, and disaster response (TB1, p. 81).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 81-82).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks to god for synod congregations engaging in mercy ministries through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 81).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for congregations that intentionally send members into their vocations to extend God's mercy to their neighbors; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 81-82).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we praise our heavenly Father for all Synod congregations that corporately engage in mercy ministries in their communities; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 81-82).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to the Office of National Mission and its various ministries for providing invaluable inspiration and support for congregational mercy ministries; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 81-82).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give all honor and praise and glory to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit for cultivating within Synod congregations the desire to extend mercy to one another and to their neighbor. Page | To Establish Tell the Next Generation as Synod Mission and Ministry Emphasis Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 81-82).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 81-82.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 81).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Life Together

Resolution 4-01: To Establish Tell the Next Generation as Synod Mission and Ministry Emphasis

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 82 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-02-07, 09 (CW, 303-7) |
| Proposed action type: | task force / structural action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns establish tell the next generation as synod mission and ministry emphasis (TB1, p. 82).

The proposal would create or use a study or task-force process to develop further recommendations. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod adopt Tell the Next Generation as her mission and ministry emphasis for the 2026 -2029 triennium. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance..." (TB1, p. 82).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod in convention (2023 Res. 4-02, "To Affirm and Continue Making Disciples for Life as Mission and Ministry Emphasis for 2023 -2026 Triennium") instructed the Board for National Mission and the Board for International Mission to recommend a new mission... (TB1, p. 82).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The two mission boards have consulted with the district presidents, the Office of National Mission, and the Office of International Mission in an extensive series of fraternal discussions toward seeking input for the development of the triennial mission and... (TB1, p. 82).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The two mission boards, in collaboration with the President of the Synod, have unanimously agreed to recommend to the Synod in convention a triennial mission and ministry emphasis that captures the desire to spread the Gospel and the full counsel of God's... (TB1, p. 82).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The theme for the 2026 -2029 National Offering has been established as "Christ Is Risen! Tell the Next Generation," reflecting this desire to spread the Gospel and the full counsel of God's Word to those who do not know Christ and to the generations to come (TB1, p. 82).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address establish tell the next generation as synod mission and ministry emphasis through a task force / structural action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 82).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (task force / structural action): Resolved, That the Synod adopt Tell the Next Generation as her mission and ministry emphasis for the 2026 -2029 triennium. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no significant incremental costs to the Synod except for the development of new promotional materials, etc., as may be occasioned, which are anticipated to be... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-82).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 82-82.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 82).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 4-02: To Amend Bylaws to Refine Process for Creating Triennial Mission and Ministry Emphases

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 82-85 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 4-12 (CW, 307-9) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws to refine process for creating triennial mission and ministry emphases (TB1, p. 82).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, districts, circuits, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the two mission boards, in collaboration with the President of the Synod, and in continued fraternal dialogue with the districts, be charged with recommending to the Synod in convention triennial mission and ministry..." (TB1, p. 82).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod in convention (2023 Res. 4-02, "To Affirm and Continue Making Disciples for Life as Mission and Ministry Emphasis for 2023-26 Triennium") instructed the Board for National Mission and the Board for International Mission to offer a recommendation to... (TB1, p. 82).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Bylaws require the Synod in convention to approve triennial mission and ministry emphases with a process that requires input from every circuit and district of the Synod (Bylaws 3.8.2.2, 3.8.3.2; 4.2.1 [b, d]; 5.2.3 [g], 5.3.1 [a][5]) (TB1, p. 82).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The mission boards of the Synod conducted extensive fraternal discussions with every district of the Synod over the past triennium about the work of the Synod and the triennial mission and ministry emphasis, including the procedure for developing triennial... (TB1, p. 82).

Text-supported rationale point 4: These fraternal discussions with the districts concluded that the current procedure for developing triennial mission and ministry emphases has proven to be cumbersome and unworkable (TB1, p. 82).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws to refine process for creating triennial mission and ministry emphases through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 82).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That the two mission boards, in collaboration with the President of the Synod, and in continued fraternal dialogue with the districts, be charged with recommending to the Synod in convention triennial mission and ministry emphases for adoption; and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.3.1.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Powers and Duties - Ecclesiastical and Administrative 3.3.1.3 The President shall have responsibilities and duties that are both ecclesiastical and administrative. ... (q) He shall collaborate with the Board for National Mission and the Board for International Mission in assessing and evaluating the effectiveness of the Synod's triennial... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaws 3.8.2 and 3.8.2.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Board for National Mission 3.8.2 The Board for National Mission is charged with developing and determining policies for the coordination of and in support of district ministries which support congregations and schools (Bylaw 1.2.1 [n]). These policies shall embrace and apply the mission and ministry emphases adopted by the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.8.3 and 3.8.3.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Board for International Mission 3.8.3 The Board for International Mission is charged with developing and determining policies in support of mission and ministry in foreign countries for the Office of International Mission (Bylaw 1.2.1 [n]). These policies shall embrace and apply the mission and ministry emphases adopted by the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 4.2.1 be amended as follows: Page | PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 4.2 District Conventions 4.2.1 Conventions of the districts shall afford opportunities for worship, nurture, inspiration, fellowship, and the communication of vital information. They are the principal legislative assemblies, which amend the district's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, consider and take action on reports

and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 5.2.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 5.2 Circuit Visitors ... 5.2.3 Each circuit visitor shall assist the district president within the circuit. ... (f) He shall seek to strengthen the spirit of cooperation among pastors, commissioned ministers, and congregations. (g) He shall assist in the development and attainment of Synod-wide mission and ministry emphases. (hg) He shall assist... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw section 5.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 5.3 Circuit Forums 5.3.1 The circuit forum is the group which aids the process of keeping congregations, particularly the lay leaders, commissioned ministers, and pastors, supportive of one another in their common confession and mutually active in developing programs for the good of member congregations, in considering and recommending... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, circuits; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 82-85).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 82-85.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 82).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 4-03: To Commend and Sunset Synod Mission Priorities

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 85 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 4-01, 08, 10-11 (CW, 303, 306-07) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns commend and sunset synod mission priorities (TB1, p. 85).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, districts, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend and identify the Synod objectives (Const. Art. III) as the mission priorities of the Synod and a faithful articulation of its work; and be it further" (TB1, p. 85).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2023 Synod convention instructed the Board for National Mission and Board for International Mission to recommend possible revisions to the mission priorities and possible bylaw revisions that would articulate both the process for developing mission... (TB1, p. 85).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The two mission boards have had extensive fraternal conversations with every district pertaining to the Synod's mission priorities and their effectiveness for the work of each district (TB1, p. 85).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The districts expressed general agreement with the doctrine and practice articulated in the current mission priorities, yet found them less than helpful for the specific priorities and work of their districts (TB1, p. 85).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Many districts have established their own mission priorities under the Synod's triennial mission and ministry emphasis (TB1, p. 85).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 85-85).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address commend and sunset synod mission priorities through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 85).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend and identify the Synod objectives (Const. Art. III) as the mission priorities of the Synod and a faithful articulation of its work; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-85).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend the district presidents and their districts for the constructive fraternal conversations they have had with the mission boards over the last triennium; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-85).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks for how the original mission priorities helped shape the work of national and international mission during the early years after restructuring; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-85).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod reaffirm the responsibility of the respective mission boards (Bylaws 3.8.2 -3), under the leadership of the President and pursuant to Bylaw 3.3.1.1.1, to assist in identifying the specific goals and priorities for national and international mission work. To Clarify Oversight and Revitalize Role of Registered Service Organizations Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-85).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 85-85.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 85).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 4-04: To Clarify Oversight and Revitalize Role of Registered Service Organizations

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 85-86 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-32-35 (CW, 319-22); President's Report, Part 2, (TB, 1:28); Overture L4-57 (TB, 1:46-48) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns clarify oversight and revitalize role of registered service organizations (TB1, p. 85).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod remain patient as t he RSO office and Synod staff continue implementing all the revisions from the 2016 task force and 2019 resolution that resulted in the current Bylaw section 6.2, "Recognized Service..." (TB1, p. 85).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2016 Synod convention created a task force to review the current structure and recommend the best model for the Synod's relationship to recognized service organizations (RSOs) (Res. 4 -03B, "To Convene Task Force to Review Recognized Service Organization... (TB1, p. 85).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The 2019 Synod convention adopted the recommendation of the task force in Resolution 4 -06A, "To Amend Bylaw Section 6.2 to Revitalize Synod's Recognized Service Organization Program" (Proc., 137-42), and began implementing the vast new recommendations (TB1, p. 85).

Text-supported rationale point 3: 2019 Resolution 4 -06A (ibid.) granted RSOs numerous privileges, under the ecclesiastical oversight of district presidents who report any concerns to Synod's mission offices (Office of International Mission or Office of National Mission) (Bylaw 6.2.1 [b-c]) (TB1, p. 85).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Synod Board of Directors (BOD), Board for International Mission , and Board for National Mission were charged with creating policy for RSO oversight, and implementation delegated to staff; and Page | WHEREAS, "Over the past five years, 115 organizations... (TB1, p. 85).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 85-86).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address clarify oversight and revitalize role of registered service organizations through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 85).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod remain patient as t he RSO office and Synod staff continue implementing all the revisions from the 2016 task force and 2019 resolution that resulted in the current Bylaw section 6.2, "Recognized Service Organizations" in collaboration with the appropriate district president; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-86).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the RSO office keep the BOD apprised of legal and regulatory constraints on the service of RSOs in the adoption and foster care space which may burden an RSO's religious exercise, and the BOD is encouraged to monitor this area for potential to stand with our organizations in the unfettered "extension of the divine mercy without compromising the church's scriptural and Lutheran-confession standards"... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-86).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the RSO office withdraw RSO status from organizations that intentionally promote actions contrary to the Word of God, including but not limited to unnatural or unbiblical family structures ; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-86).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks for the work of our many faithful RSOs. To Clarify Nomenclature for Chaplaincy and Institutional Care Work and To Amend Related Bylaws Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 85-86).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 85-86.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 85).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 4-05: To Clarify Nomenclature for Chaplaincy and Institutional Care Work and To Amend Related Bylaws

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 86-88 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-38-39 (CW, 323-24) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns clarify nomenclature for chaplaincy and institutional care work and to amend related bylaws (TB1, p. 86).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the 2026 Synod convention adopt the position that the title chaplain within Synod contexts be reserved for ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament; and be it further" (TB1, p. 86).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture teaches that the Office of the Holy Ministry is entrusted with the public preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments (Matt. 28:18 -20; John 20:21-23; 1 Cor. 4:1); and the Lutheran Confessions affirm the necessity and centrality of the called and ordained pastor in the life of the Church (AC XIV; Tr 67 -74). The Office of... (TB1, p. 86).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address clarify nomenclature for chaplaincy and institutional care work and to amend related bylaws through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 86).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That the 2026 Synod convention adopt the position that the title chaplain within Synod contexts be reserved for ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That institutions, agencies, and ministries within the Synod be encouraged to ensure that titles and job descriptions make clear any distinction between ordained chaplains and other spiritual care providers (e.g., deaconesses, lay ministers, or counselors) who may assist but are not called and ordained to the Office of the Holy Ministry; and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That districts, circuit visitors, and local congregations be urged to instruct their members regarding the proper use of the term chaplain, reaffirming our Lutheran-confession understanding that preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments are entrusted to the pastoral office; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks for the faithful service of all who provide spiritual care within our fellowship, while upholding in doctrine and practice that the title chaplain belongs to those ordained to serve as called ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4:1); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 2.11.1 (h) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Active Members 2.11.1 To remain on the roster of the Synod as an active member, an ordained or commissioned minister of religion must be a communicant member of a congregation which is a member of the Synod (except as provided in paragraph [c] below) and be regularly performing the duties of one of the following: ... (h) A military or... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.8.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Board for National Mission 3.8.2 The Board for National Mission is charged with developing and determining policies for the coordination of and in support of district ministries which support congregations and schools (Bylaw 1.2.1 [n]). These policies shall embrace and apply the mission and ministry emphases adopted by the national... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 6.2.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 6.2 Recognized Service Organizations ... 6.2.2 Policies shall distinguish the three classes of recognized service organization, with criteria, procedures, and benefits appropriate to each, further distinctions being drawn within the categories as needed: (a) A witness service organization, under the Scriptures and Lutheran Confessions, engages... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 86-88).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source

basis: TB1, pp. 86-88.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 86).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 4-06: To Amend Bylaws to Reinstate Commission on Worship

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 88-91 |
| Related overtures/reports: | President of the Synod. Such a Commission on Worship is clearly desirable: to coordinate, guide, and instruct the Synod by efforts that faithfully carry forward the Lutheran heritage of worship in the present day; to assure broad input and knowledgeable expertise from the Synod's membership in... |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws to reinstate commission on worship (TB1, p. 88).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, congregations, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod reinstate a Commission on Worship as a separate commission; and be it further" (TB1, p. 88).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Worship in Word and Sacrament is a mark of the church and as such is a "vital function of the church and as such its importance must be strongly emphasized" (1983 Res. 5-06, "To Reinstate Commission on Worship") (TB1, p. 88).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Constitution of the Synod, reflecting this emphasis, directs congregations of Synod "to strive for uniformity in church practice," "to develop an appreciation of a variety of responsible practices and customs which are in harmony with [the Synod's] common... (TB1, p. 88).

Text-supported rationale point 3: With the elimination of the Commission on Worship in 2010, there now exist no bylaw guidelines or processes for the production and adoption of agendas, hymnbooks, supplements, or other worship resources for use by the members of the Synod (TB1, p. 88).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws to reinstate commission on worship through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 88).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That the Synod reinstate a Commission on Worship as a separate commission; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 88-91).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.9.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.9 Commissions 3.9.1 The commissions of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod are the following: and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 88-91).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.9.6 be added as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Commission on Worship 3.9.6 The Commission on Worship exists to provide guidance and materials in matters of worship to the members of the Synod to assist them in their responsibility to make exclusive use of doctrinally pure agenda, hymnbooks, and catechisms in church and school (Const. Art. VI 4) and in their objective to strive for... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 88-91).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the 2026 Synod convention, upon adoption, would proceed with the filling of the elected positions on the newly constituted Commission on Worship, and, in order to achieve continuity through a plan of staggered terms, the constituting election shall elect the layperson to a half term of three years and the remaining elected members to a full six-47 year term; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 88-91).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the following overtures, which request action for which responsibilities are herein designated to the Commission on Worship, be referred to that Commission upon its constitution for consideration and possible response: Ov. 4-24-31, 40-42, 46. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate the annual cost to be... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 88-91).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 88-91.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 88).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 4-07: To Condemn Political Violence and Encourage Participation in Public Life

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 91-92 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-45, 47-48, 53-55 (CW, 327-28, 330-32) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns condemn political violence and encourage participation in public life (TB1, p. 91).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod offices.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention declare its opposition to political violence in any form and urge its members to oppose such violence in their local context; and be it further" (TB1, p. 91).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Scripture (Matt. 22:15 -21) and the Lutheran Confessions (AC XVI; LC I 4) affirm that the entire civil realm is an institution of God to be respected and supported (TB1, p. 91).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Our Lord commands us to pray for those who serve in public office (1 Tim. 2:1-3) and to respect all levels of government (Rom. 13:1; 1 Peter 2) (TB1, p. 91).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Our Lord reminds us through the words of St. Paul, that those serving in the civil realm have a God-11 ordained vocation (Rom. 13:6) (TB1, p. 91).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Large Catechism warns that the devil seeks to destabilize the civil realm through "contention, murder, sedition, and war": He is not satisfied to obstruct and overthrow the spiritual order, by deceiving souls with his lies and bringing them under his... (TB1, p. 91).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 91-92).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address condemn political violence and encourage participation in public life through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 91).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention declare its opposition to political violence in any form and urge its members to oppose such violence in their local context; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 91-92).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That pastors and congregations of the Synod be encouraged to affirm the importance of peaceful engagement in the public square; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 91-92).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That church workers and congregations of the Synod identify, encourage, and raise up from within our midst those with the gifts and abilities to serve God and their neighbor in public service, that through such representatives the church might provide a morally virtuous and theologically faithful example in this divisive climate; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 91-92).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the theological resources addressing matters of church and state from a Lutheran perspective be commended to the people of the Synod, including the publications of the Lutheran Center for Religious Liberty and the Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR), especially the CTCR's 1995 report, Render unto Caesar... and unto God: A Lutheran View of Church and State and its forthcoming report on... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 91-92).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 91-92.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 91).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 4-08: To Direct the Commission on Theology and Church Relations to Examine Current Political and Social Issues

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 92 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-13-22 (CW, 309-14) |
| Proposed action type: | directive |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns direct the commission on theology and church relations to examine current political and social issues (TB1, p. 92).

The proposal would direct a board, office, commission, district, or other entity to take specified action. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Synod in convention condemn all forms of racial hatred as sinful (James 2:8 -9); and be it further" (TB1, p. 92).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture declares that God created all humanity in His image (Gen 1:27) and that all believers are one in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:28), condemns all forms of racial hatred as sinful (James 2:8 -9), and exhorts us to love our neighbors as ourselves (Matt.... (TB1, p. 92).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Our Synod has regularly spoken to political and social issues affecting Christ's Church (2023 Res. 11 -8 02A, "To Reject All Forms of Racism and Affirm Our Witness to All People"; 2019 Res. 11-04A, "To Affirm the Common Humanity of All People and... (TB1, p. 92).

Text-supported rationale point 3: In recent years, certain ideologies and secular distortions have proliferated, leading to widespread confusion and harmful division especially in the church (TB1, p. 92).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Current political and social issues such as racism, antisemitism, and specific aberrations associated with "Christian Nationalism," demonstrate an urgent need for theologically -sound resources to address these concerns, providing faithful care for those... (TB1, p. 92).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address direct the commission on theology and church relations to examine current political and social issues through a directive approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 92).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (directive): Resolved, That Synod in convention condemn all forms of racial hatred as sinful (James 2:8 -9); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-92).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Synod in convention direct the Commission on Theology and Church Relations to examine such political and social issues, especially racism, antisemitism, and Christian Nationalism, and prepare documents as it deems appropriate for the edification of the Synod; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-92).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That pastors and congregations make use of these resources to foster repentance, reconciliation, and Christ-27 centered unity proclaiming that for those who belong to Christ by faith, "There is neither Jew nor Greek ... for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-92).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 92-92.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 92).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from

preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 4-09: To Address Uses of Artificial Intelligence

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 92-93 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-51-52 (CW, 329-30) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns address uses of artificial intelligence (TB1, p. 92).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include commissions, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod acknowledge the power of AI and other emerging technologies to harm our churches, their members, and the society in which we live, if not carefully and insightfully addressed with and limited by God's Word; and be..." (TB1, p. 92).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The capabilities and regular use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Large Language Models (LLMs) have dramatically increased in recent years (TB1, p. 92).

Text-supported rationale point 2: AI tools are increasingly being used by churches and pastors to create and curate digital content and communications, to create sermons, prayers, images, hymns, and other resources for use in worship; and to perform various ministry functions (TB1, p. 92).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) has published a study document, Online Technology in the Church: Study Materials (December 2024, resources.lcms.org/reading-study/ctcr-study-document-42-online-technology-in-the-church-study-materials),... (TB1, p. 92).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The CTCR document also encouraged "the cautious, morally responsible and theologically alert use of technology in a way that reflects what we know from Holy Scripture about who we are, how God has made us, how God Page | seeks to save us in Christ, and how... (TB1, p. 92).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 92-93).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address address uses of artificial intelligence through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 92).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod acknowledge the power of AI and other emerging technologies to harm our churches, their members, and the society in which we live, if not carefully and insightfully addressed with and limited by God's Word; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-93).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage all who employ these tools to do so in honest, transparent, and Christ -like ways that focus on loving God and loving our neighbor as ourselves (Matt. 22:37-40), never seeking to willfully deceive others or take advantage of them; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-93).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod proactively engage these emerging technologies rather than simply respond to the challenges of AI and other emerging technologies after they have already affected our churches and communities; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-93).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod ask the CTCR, in consultation with the Council of Presidents and the Office of the President, to produce a document that allows for appropriate theological reflection and study of the use of AI and that evaluates it in light of our theological assumptions, especially related to anthropology, the image of God, and Lutheran teaching on vocation, along with practical guidance to individuals and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 92-93).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 92-93.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 92).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 4-10: To Celebrate Concordia Historical Institute Centenary and Renew the Synod's Commitment to Treasure and Trumpet Its Redeemed History

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Life Together |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 93-95 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 4-56 (CW, 332-33) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns celebrate concordia historical institute centenary and renew the synod's commitment to treasure and trumpet its redeemed history (TB1, p. 93).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for the historical treasures entrusted to it over the past century and make fuller use of the historical resources offered through CHI, to her great benefit and blessing; and be it further" (TB1, p. 93).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Concordia Historical Institute (CHI) will observe its centenary anniversary on April 28, 2027, under the theme: "Treasuring & Trumpeting Our Lutheran History-for All the Saints" (TB1, p. 93).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Though officially incorporated as a Missouri State nonprofit in 1927, the institute's origins reach back to the organizational documents drafted in 1839 by the Saxons under Martin Stephan before they immigrated to Missouri -31 plans that included provision... (TB1, p. 93).

Text-supported rationale point 3: After the death of the first generation of Synod leaders and the subsequent scattering and loss of important historical materials related to the Synod's early years, a renewed commitment to preserving and proclaiming the redeeming work of Christ in the... (TB1, p. 93).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Over the past 99 years, CHI has actively curated and published "Ebenezers" (i.e., memorials, 1 Sam. 7:12) of its history through its journal, the Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly, the longest -running Lutheran historical journal in North America,... (TB1, p. 93).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address celebrate concordia historical institute centenary and renew the synod's commitment to treasure and trumpet its redeemed history through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 93).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for the historical treasures entrusted to it over the past century and make fuller use of the historical resources offered through CHI, to her great benefit and blessing; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That members, congregations, districts, as well as Synod departments and entities be encouraged to uphold the institute through prayer and financial support by becoming annual members of CHI and sustaining their financial contributions and estate gifts (with those of sufficient means becoming annual members of CHI's Director's Circle or Vault Society), so that the work and proper staffing of the institute... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod renew its commitment to retrieve, organize, preserve, and share her rich history for the benefit of both church and community; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention earnestly remind congregational, district, and Synod leaders of their fiduciary responsibilities to maintain and secure records that document our shared history -especially in those unfortunate circumstances when a congregation or educational institution closes; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That those with historical materials of various kinds (often in fragile and deteriorating condition) be encouraged to share them with the church and community and make them available to be copied or deposited with CHI for preservation and safekeeping; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod take Martin Luther's warning to heart, asking the Lord for a greater appreciation of her redeemed history and the historical treasures entrusted to her care, that our joy and thanksgiving for Christ's work among us might increase. 29 Page | To Recognize Altar and Pulpit Fellowship with Evangelical Lutheran Christian Church of Bolivia Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 93-95).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 93-95.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 93).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Theology and Church Relations

Resolution 5-01: To Recognize Altar and Pulpit Fellowship with Evangelical Lutheran Christian Church of Bolivia

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 95-97 |
| Related overtures/reports: | President Carlos Winterle signing an agreement of altar and pulpit fellowship with the ICEL in 2002. At this time, ICEL also began participating as an observer in regional meetings of the International Lutheran Council (ILC). There was also contact with and support from LCMS sister churches in... |
| Proposed action type: | church relations action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns recognize altar and pulpit fellowship with evangelical lutheran christian church of bolivia (TB1, p. 95).

The proposal would affect how the Synod recognizes, reviews, or speaks about relationships with other church bodies. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That we acknowledge with gratitude the unity of confession that has been given to our church bodies under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and be it further" (TB1, p. 95).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The ICEL is a Lutheran-confession Lutheran church in Bolivia consisting of around 1,000 baptized members in 15 congregations served by 12 ordained pastors (TB1, p. 95).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Formal discussions directed toward altar and pulpit fellowship with the ICEL began in 2022 and concluded in February 2025, when the CTCR unanimously recommended recognition of fellowship with ICEL (TB1, p. 95).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The ICEL accepts all the canonical books of the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testaments as the written Word of God and the only rule and norm of faith and practice and the confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, compiled in the Book of... (TB1, p. 95).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The ICEL is in altar and pulpit fellowship with the LCMS's sister church in Brazil (IELB) (TB1, p. 95).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address recognize altar and pulpit fellowship with evangelical lutheran christian church of bolivia through a church relations action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 95).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (church relations action): Resolved, That we acknowledge with gratitude the unity of confession that has been given to our church bodies under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this convention formally endorse the recognition of altar and pulpit fellowship between the ICEL and the LCMS; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we give thanks to God for the faithful Lutheran witness ICEL provides within its own country, and beyond; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we encourage and walk with ICEL as they proclaim the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ to a lost world; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we pray for God's blessings in the coming years on this agreement in the confession of the Gospel that we enjoy as sister church bodies; and be it finally Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That in thanksgiving for this partnership in the Gospel, the convention assembly celebrate its approval by rising and singing the common doxology. To Support and Encourage Recognition of Altar and Pulpit Fellowship with Lutheran Mission-Australia Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 95-97).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could affect formal fellowship, review, or conversation with another Lutheran church body or partner. Source basis: TB1, pp. 95-97.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations may notice implications for altar and pulpit fellowship, missionary partnerships, or how leaders explain church relationships. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 95).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 5-02: To Support and Encourage Recognition of Altar and Pulpit Fellowship with Lutheran Mission-Australia

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 97-98 |
| Related overtures/reports: | President Matthew Anker has stated: "The key issue that led to the establishment of LM -A was the undermining of the authority of the Word of God in the LCA's theology and life together. Even before women's ordination was introduced, we no longer shared the same confession and needed to be unyoked..." |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns support and encourage recognition of altar and pulpit fellowship with lutheran mission-australia (TB1, p. 97).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod offices, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That we acknowledge with gratitude the unity of confession that has been given to our church bodies under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and be it further" (TB1, p. 97).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The LM-A is a small but growing Lutheran-confession Lutheran church in Australia consisting of around 1,000 baptized members in 19 congregations served by 18 ordained pastors (TB1, p. 97).

Text-supported rationale point 2: LM-A leaders, pastors, and congregations are to be strongly commended and encouraged for their faithful and courageous confession of the truth of God's Word in response to heterodox positions taken by the LCA due to erroneous views of the authority and... (TB1, p. 97).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Formal and informal discussions directed toward altar and pulpit fellowship with LM -A leaders began in 2022 and concluded in December 2025, when the CTCR unanimously recommended recognition of fellowship with LM-A (TB1, p. 97).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The LM-A accepts all the canonical books of the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testaments as the written Word of God and the only rule and norm of faith and practice and the confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, compiled in the Book of... (TB1, p. 97).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 97-98).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address support and encourage recognition of altar and pulpit fellowship with lutheran mission-australia through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 97).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That we acknowledge with gratitude the unity of confession that has been given to our church bodies under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 97-98).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this convention commend and support the CTCR's recommendation to recognize altar and pulpit fellowship with the LM-A and President Harrison's hope to do the same at the appropriate time; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 97-98).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we give thanks to God for the faithful Lutheran witness the LM -A provides within its own country and beyond; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 97-98).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we encourage and support the LM -A as they proclaim the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ to a lost world; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 97-98).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That as a sign of encouragement and support of the LM -A's confession and witness and in joyful anticipation of our mutual recognition of altar and pulpit fellowship in the near future, the convention assembly rise and sing the common doxology. To Give Thanks for the Mission Province in Sweden Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 97-98).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 97-98.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 97).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 5-03: To Give Thanks for the Mission Province in Sweden

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 98-99 |
| Related overtures/reports: | President met in St. Louis with representatives of the Mission Province, including Dr. Bengt Birgersson (general secretary of the MPSF at the time), for the purpose of encouraging the cause of biblical, Lutheran-confession Lutheranism in the Nordic world. In subsequent years, informal discussions... |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for the mission province in sweden (TB1, p. 98).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, congregations, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That we give thanks to God for the faithful and courageous Lutheran witness given by the MPS within its own country, to the entire Nordic world, and beyond; and be it further" (TB1, p. 98).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The MPS is a Lutheran-confession Lutheran church consisting of 20 congregations in Sweden served by 45 pastors (TB1, p. 98).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The MPS was formed to bear witness to the truth of the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions and to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ in an increasingly liberalized and radicalized cultural and ecclesial context in the Nordic region (TB1, p. 98).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Many MPS confessors of the faith were either defrocked or refused ordination because of their faithful witness to Christ and His Word (TB1, p. 98).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The MPS bears witness to the Gospel of Christ in a country where only about 2 percent of the population attends church on a weekly basis (TB1, p. 98).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 98-99).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for the mission province in sweden through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 98).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That we give thanks to God for the faithful and courageous Lutheran witness given by the MPS within its own country, to the entire Nordic world, and beyond; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 98-99).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we encourage and support MPS in appropriate ways as it proclaims the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ to a lost and dying world; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 98-99).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Synod in convention urge the President of Synod, his church relations staff, and the CTCR to continue conversations with the MPS in the 2026-2029 Triennium in the hopes of mutual recognition of altar and pulpit fellowship. To Address Concerns with Partner Churches Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 98-99).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 98-99.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 98).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 5-04: To Address Concerns with Partner Churches

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 99-101 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-03-09 (CW, 337-41) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns address concerns with partner churches (TB1, p. 99).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the President of the Synod, his church relations staff, and the CTCR be commended for their efforts to date in addressing concerns with partner churches, and that the noted CTCR resources be commended to members of the Synod..." (TB1, p. 99).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The psalmist writes, "Behold, how good and pleasant it is when brothers dwell in unity! It is like the precious oil on the head, running down on the beard, on the beard of Aaron, running down on the collar of his robes! It is like the dew of Hermon, which..." (TB1, p. 99).

Text-supported rationale point 2: We give thanks to God through His Son, Jesus Christ, for our 43 Synod partner churches united with us in Christ, in confession, in worship, and in the church working together through mission, mercy, vocation, and stewardship (TB1, p. 99).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Many of our partner churches and their leaders have often contended for the truth of God's Word in adverse circumstances; and Page | WHEREAS, The Holy Scriptures enjoin us to maintain the unity of the faith in the bond of peace (Eph. 4:3, 13) (TB1, p. 99).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Formula of Concord (FC), in line with this biblical truth, confesses that external fellowship in the church is to be based upon agreement "in the doctrine and all its articles," as well as "in the right use of the holy Sacraments" (FC SD X 31) (TB1, p. 99).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 99-101).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address address concerns with partner churches through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 99).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the President of the Synod, his church relations staff, and the CTCR be commended for their efforts to date in addressing concerns with partner churches, and that the noted CTCR resources be commended to members of the Synod and LCMS partner churches and their leaders, that they might be informed about these concerns and our theological responses to them; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 99-101).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we give thanks to God for the progress already made in these important conversations and for the willingness of many partner churches to listen to and respond to our concerns, and that the President of the Synod be urged to continue his efforts in this regard, making use of his church relations staff and others as he deems appropriate; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 99-101).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CTCR, in accordance with Synod bylaws, be urged to assist the President of the Synod by studying controversial theological matters in partner church relations in order to "provide guidance to the Synod in matters of Page | theology and church relations" (Bylaw 3.9.5.2.1) and "bring matters of theology and church relations through special studies and documents to the membership of the Synod and to... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 99-101).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the President of the Synod continue to address these matters directly and urgently in the coming triennium and report to the next convention concerning his progress. To Address Open Communion and Pastoral Exceptions in Extraordinary Circumstances Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 99-101).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 99-101.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 99).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 5-05: To Address Open Communion and Pastoral Exceptions in Extraordinary Circumstances

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 101-102 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-16-18 (CW, 345-347) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns address open communion and pastoral exceptions in extraordinary circumstances (TB1, p. 101).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention again affirm its longstanding commitment to the biblical and Lutheran-confession teaching concerning closed Communion; and be it further" (TB1, p. 101).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture teaches clearly that the Lord's Supper is the true body and blood of Christ (Matt. 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20; 1 Cor. 11:23-26), and that those who receive the body and blood of Christ are to examine themselves, lest they eat... (TB1, p. 101).

Text-supported rationale point 2: According to the Lutheran Confessions, "The people are instructed more regularly and with the greatest diligence concerning the holy sacrament, to what purpose it was instituted, and how it is to be used, namely, as a comfort to terrified consciences. In this... (TB1, p. 101).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Synod in convention has repeatedly and consistently affirmed the teaching and practice of closed Communion, which entails that "except in situations of emergency or in special cases of pastoral care" we "commune individuals of only those synods which are now... (TB1, p. 101).

Text-supported rationale point 4: There has been conversation within Synod over the distinction between "close Communion" and "closed Communion," implying that they are different teachings or practices (TB1, p. 101).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address address open communion and pastoral exceptions in extraordinary circumstances through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 101).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention again affirm its longstanding commitment to the biblical and Lutheran-confession teaching concerning closed Communion; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod clarify that the terms "close Communion" and "closed Communion," as used in documents of the Synod, are synonymous and pertain to the same aforementioned teaching and practice; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the pastors of our Synod, as stewards of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4:1), who are charged to watch over souls as those who must give an account (Heb. 13:17) and commanded to warn, instruct, examine, and withhold the Sacrament when necessary for the good of souls (1 Cor. 11:27-29; Titus 1:7-9), be urged pastorally and through sound catechesis to teach, exhort, practice, and defend closed Communion;... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the pastors of our Synod, as members of the ministerium of the Church, be urged to act charitably, seeking to put the best construction on everything as they observe and discuss Communion practice with each other and in their various contexts; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the President of Synod and the COP, as ecclesiastical supervisors, continue to be faithful in upholding the existing constitutional and bylaw provisions concerning unionism and sacramental practice and the Synod's position on closed Communion as articulated in numerous doctrinal resolutions; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That vacancy pastors, intentional interim pastors, circuit visitors, and district presidents be urged to assist congregations in improving communion practices, where necessary, prior to the issuance of calls; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That our pastors be encouraged to receive with joy the guidance and admonition provided by their ecclesiastical supervisors, especially in cases where congregations or pastors have been indiscriminate in their Communion practice; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Resolved clause 8 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CTCR provide the Synod with a study document that addresses extraordinary circumstances and pastoral exceptions to closed Communion, including case studies and study questions. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no significant incremental costs as the activity is understood to be within the existing... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 101-102).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 101-102.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 101).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 5-06: To Amend Bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b)

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 102-103 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:30) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b) (TB1, p. 102).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Commission on Theology and Church Relations ... 3.9.5.2.2 The Commission on Theology and Church Relations shall assist the President of the Synod at his..." (TB1, p. 102).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b)(1-3) speaks of "formal" recognition of altar and pulpit fellowship, which suggests that the Synod also informally recognizes fellowship, a confusing phrase understood by certain other churches to mean practicing church fellowship without... (TB1, p. 102).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b)(1-3) speaks of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations' (CTCR) "approval" within the church fellowship recognition process which, more accurately, is the CTCR's recommendation that the Synod in convention approve the recognition of... (TB1, p. 102).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b) through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 102).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.9.5.2.2 (b) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Commission on Theology and Church Relations ... 3.9.5.2.2 The Commission on Theology and Church Relations shall assist the President of the Synod at his request in discharging his constitutional responsibilities for maintaining doctrinal integrity as he relates to other church bodies. ... Page | (b) It shall address itself to potential... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 102-103).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 102-103.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 102).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 5-07: To Refer "Sister Church" Nomenclature Change to Commission on Handbook

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 103-104 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:30) |
| Proposed action type: | referral |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns refer "sister church" nomenclature change to commission on handbook (TB1, p. 103).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, seminaries, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention affirm that "sister church" more accurately reflects the nature of altar and pulpit fellowship as a God -given unity in the doctrine of the Gospel in all its articles, as confessed in the Formula of..." (TB1, p. 103).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: "Partner church" is a confusing term that can refer both to church bodies in fellowship and to church bodies not in fellowship but partnering toward a variety of ends (e.g., disaster relief, medical programming, seminary formation, etc.) (TB1, p. 103).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Both Synod entities and other church bodies partnering toward given ends frequently refer to the other as a "partner church," irrespective of church fellowship status (TB1, p. 103).

Text-supported rationale point 3: "Partner church" can create fellowship confusion. When church bodies in fellowship with The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) partner with the LCMS and its entities toward certain ends, and then speak of the LCMS as a partner church ; and when church... (TB1, p. 103).

Text-supported rationale point 4: "Partner church" emphasizes the human work of partnering, while true church fellowship speaks of the divine work of God creating unity of confession in the Gospel in all its articles and integrates the faithful into God's "family" and creates "sister churches" (TB1, p. 103).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 103-104).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address refer "sister church" nomenclature change to commission on handbook through a referral approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 103).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (referral): Resolved, That the Synod in convention affirm that "sister church" more accurately reflects the nature of altar and pulpit fellowship as a God -given unity in the doctrine of the Gospel in all its articles, as confessed in the Formula of Concord (FC SD Comprehensive Summary, 1-13; X 31); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, seminaries, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 103-104).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this matter be referred to the Commission on Handbook, with the instruction to change all bylaw occurrences of "partner church," "partner churches," and "partners" to "sister church" or "sister churches," respectively. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, note the Handbook changes would fall within the existing scope... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, seminaries, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 103-104).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 103-104.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 103).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 5-08: To Reaffirm the Synod's Positions on Men and Women in the Church

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 104-105 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-30-35 (CW, 354-57) |
| Proposed action type: | doctrinal or theological clarification |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns reaffirm the synod's positions on men and women in the church (TB1, p. 104).

The proposal would place a doctrinal or theological judgment before the convention for Synod-wide consideration. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That these CTCR documents be commended to the Synod for study and guidance, especially as concerns arise over the ordination of women, women's suffrage, women's board and committee membership, and the role of women in the worship..." (TB1, p. 104).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture clearly teaches that the pastoral office is reserved for qualified men, and therefore prohibits women from publicly preaching, teaching, or leading worship in the assembled congregation (1 Timothy 2; 1 Corinthians 11; 1 Corinthians 14) (TB1, p. 104).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Synod has repeatedly affirmed this biblical teaching and opposed the ordination of women into the pastoral office as contrary to the Word of God (1971 Res. 2 -04, "To Withhold Ordination of Women to the Pastoral Office"; 1977 Res. 3-15, "To Reaffirm the..." (TB1, p. 104).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Synod has also consistently maintained that these scriptural prohibitions do not apply to women voting in their congregations or serving on boards and committees at the congregational, district, or Synod level (1969 Res. 2-17, "To Grant Woman Suffrage and..." (TB1, p. 104).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Synod has urged against practices such as women serving as elders or assisting in the distribution of the Lord's Supper, due to potential confusion with the distinct ive functions of the pastoral office (1989 Res. 3 -10, "To Address Practice of Women..." (TB1, p. 104).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address reaffirm the synod's positions on men and women in the church through a doctrinal or theological clarification approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 104).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (doctrinal or theological clarification): Resolved, That these CTCR documents be commended to the Synod for study and guidance, especially as concerns arise over the ordination of women, women's suffrage, women's board and committee membership, and the role of women in the worship life of the church; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod again unequivocally reaffirm its opposition to the ordination of women to the pastoral office as contrary to the clear teaching of Scripture; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod reaffirm its doctrinal and practical positions regarding women's suffrage and participation in boards, committees, and commissions of the Synod; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage men, as it did in 2016 Res. 5 -14, "to continue to exercise leadership in their congregations even as they are encouraged to exercise their God -given leadership in a God -pleasing manner in their homes"; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage women to exercise their Spirit -given gifts in faithful service in scripturally appropriate ways within congregations, districts, and Synod structures to the glory of God and the building up of Christ's Body; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend the faithful service of women throughout its history and in the present , and actively encourage women to serve the church in various commissioned and lay vocations, including but not limited to: teachers, directors of

Christian education, directors of Christian outreach, directors of family life ministry, directors of parish music, deaconesses, parish assistants, and directors of... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 104-105).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could shape Synod-wide teaching, public witness, or future study. It may also affect how related overtures, publications, or practices are evaluated. Source basis: TB1, pp. 104-105.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Pastors, teachers, elders, and lay leaders may use the adopted language in catechesis, policy, pastoral care, or congregational conversations. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 104).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the desire for shared teaching that strengthens unity in the Gospel. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the wording is carefully grounded in Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and avoids overstatement.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Is the language as narrow and scripturally grounded as it needs to be, or does it bind consciences beyond Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: careful doctrinal language can guard the Gospel and help the church teach with one voice.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: overly broad wording can turn a real concern into a larger controversy or blur the line between doctrine and application.

Resolution 5-09: To Address the Public Reading of Scripture

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 105-106 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-26-29 (CW, 352-54) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns address the public reading of scripture (TB1, p. 105).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors, laypeople.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod urge its congregations not to provoke or engage in needless controversy, but teach, reprove, correct, train, and ultimately persuade one another solely by the Word of God (2 Tim. 3:16 -17); and be it further..." (TB1, p. 105).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The public reading of Scripture is an integral part of Christian worship services, as seen in the New Testament (Acts, 1 Timothy 4) and throughout Christian history (TB1, p. 105).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Commission on Theology and Church Relations (CTCR) advised the following concerning the public reading of lessons in its 1985 report, *Women in the Church: Scriptural Principles and Ecclesial Practice* ([adopted 1985], 45): All Christians have access to the... (TB1, p. 105).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The CTCR also advised that certain distinctive functions of the pastoral office should ordinarily be carried out only by clergy of the Synod, including "preaching in the services of the congregation, leading the formal public services of worship, the public..." (TB1, p. 105).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The 1989 Synod convention cited these statements by the CTCR approvingly, yet did not endorse the opinion of the CTCR that "the reading of the Scriptures is most properly the function of the pastoral office and should therefore not ordinarily be delegated to..." (TB1, p. 105).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address address the public reading of scripture through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 105).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod urge its congregations not to provoke or engage in needless controversy, but teach, reprove, correct, train, and ultimately persuade one another solely by the Word of God (2 Tim. 3:16 -17); and be it further Resolved, That, out of a desire for unity and in mutual love for fellow members of the Synod, the congregations of the Synod be encouraged to heed the counsel of the CTCR in 1985 and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the above-mentioned documents of the CTCR be commended to the Synod for their instruction and guidance in discussing the matter of the lay reading of Scripture lessons in public worship; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the exegetical faculties of each seminary, as appointed by their seminary president, be asked to offer a theological opinion on 1 Tim. 4:13 and how that passage relates to the public reading of Scripture in congregational worship services and who should attend to those readings, and that these opinions be submitted to, studied, and evaluated by the Council of Presidents (COP) with input by the CTCR at... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the COP and seminary faculties discuss this topic in detail at their annual joint meeting; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the COP report on its discussion, evaluation, and conclusions at the next Synod convention; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this encouragement not be understood as a denigration of the service of laity-men or women-in the church, but an expression of the desire to "maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3) and that "all things should be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. 14:40) in Synod congregations, giving due sensitivity to the precedent of that congregation's worship and the consciences of its... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, Synod offices, congregations, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 105-106).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 105-106.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 105).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 5-10: To Request Commission on Theology and Church Relations Report on Human Organ Donation and Transplantation

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 106 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 5-23 (CW, 350) |
| Proposed action type: | church relations action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns request commission on theology and church relations report on human organ donation and transplantation (TB1, p. 106).

The proposal would affect how the Synod recognizes, reviews, or speaks about relationships with other church bodies. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, Synod offices, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention ask the Commission on Theology and Church Relations to produce a document that considers and evaluates the theological and moral implications of human organ donation and transplantation. The Chief..." (TB1, p. 106).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 1981 Synod convention adopted Resolution 8 -05, "To Encourage Donation of Kidneys and Other Organs" (Proc., 204), which encouraged organ donation (TB1, p. 106).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Both medical technology and its academic, peer -reviewed, and published theological assessment have changed significantly since 1981 and raised complex and morally weighty questions about human organ donation and transplantation and the implications of its... (TB1, p. 106).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The encouragement given by the Synod in 1981 may, even unintentionally, burden the consciences of church workers and laity who hold informed and serious concerns about the practice and moral implications of routinized human organ donation and transplantation (TB1, p. 106).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address request commission on theology and church relations report on human organ donation and transplantation through a church relations action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 106).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (church relations action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention ask the Commission on Theology and Church Relations to produce a document that considers and evaluates the theological and moral implications of human organ donation and transplantation. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no significant incremental costs as the activity is... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-106).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could affect formal fellowship, review, or conversation with another Lutheran church body or partner. Source basis: TB1, pp. 106-106.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations may notice implications for altar and pulpit fellowship, missionary partnerships, or how leaders explain church relationships. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 106).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 5-11: To Reaffirm Sanctity of Human Life Regarding Practice of In Vitro Fertilization

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 106-107 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-19-21 (CW, 347-49) |
| Proposed action type: | doctrinal or theological clarification |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns reaffirm sanctity of human life regarding practice of in vitro fertilization (TB1, p. 106).

The proposal would place a doctrinal or theological judgment before the convention for Synod-wide consideration. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod condemn the needless loss of life that can occur through the use of IVF; and be it further" (TB1, p. 106).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture teaches that human life is a sacred gift from God, who is the Creator of all life (Gen. 1:26-39 28; Psalm 139:13-16) (TB1, p. 106).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Christ sanctified and redeemed all human beings, including human embryos, in His incarnation and conception by the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary, His shed blood upon the cross, His resurrection, and His ascension to the right hand of the Father (Luke... (TB1, p. 106).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The practice of in vitro fertilization (IVF) involves the creation of human embryos outside the womb, which can result in the needless destruction or indefinite freezing of embryos, which contradicts the biblical teaching on the sanctity of human life (TB1, p. 106).

Text-supported rationale point 4: IVF can commodify human life by treating embryos as objects to be purchased, stored, or discarded, instead of recognizing that life is a gift of God (TB1, p. 106).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address reaffirm sanctity of human life regarding practice of in vitro fertilization through a doctrinal or theological clarification approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 106).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (doctrinal or theological clarification): Resolved, That the Synod condemn the needless loss of life that can occur through the use of IVF; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage married couples struggling to bear children to seek pastoral care and guidance before pursuing reproductive technologies, and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage pastors and other church workers to serve married couples who have troubled consciences with respect to prior use of IVF and minister to them and to all people such that they may receive the comfort of Christ and His redeeming love; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all our congregations faithfully and compassionately speak to the God -given value and worth of all human beings; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod urge its members to uphold the biblical understanding of procreation as a sacred act within the marital union; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this matter be referred to the Commission on Theology and Church Relations in order to provide theological clarity. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no significant incremental costs as the activity is understood to be within the existing scope and budget of the Commission on Theology and Church... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 106-107).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could shape Synod-wide teaching, public witness, or future study. It may also affect how related overtures, publications, or practices are evaluated. Source basis: TB1, pp. 106-107.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Pastors, teachers, elders, and lay leaders may use the adopted language in catechesis, policy, pastoral care, or congregational conversations. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 106).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the desire for shared teaching that strengthens unity in the Gospel. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the wording is carefully grounded in Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and avoids overstatement.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Is the language as narrow and scripturally grounded as it needs to be, or does it bind consciences beyond Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: careful doctrinal language can guard the Gospel and help the church teach with one voice.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: overly broad wording can turn a real concern into a larger controversy or blur the line between doctrine and application.

Resolution 5-12: To Conclude Created Male and Female Task Force and Receive Its Recommendations

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 107-108 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-36, 5-41 (CW, 322-23, 360-61) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns conclude created male and female task force and receive its recommendations (TB1, p. 107).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, congregations, schools, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the final report of the task force be commended to the Synod for consideration and guidance; and be it further" (TB1, p. 107).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Holy Scripture teaches the following truths concerning humanity: God created humanity to be male and female (Gen. 1:27; Matt. 19:4); God instituted marriage between one man and one woman as a lifelong union for companionship and procreation (Gen. 1:28; 2:18... (TB1, p. 107).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Holy Scripture prohibits adultery, fornication, homosexuality, and other forms of sexual immorality as sin and as deviations from this created order (Ex. 20:15; Num. 5:11 -31; Deut. 5:18; Rom. 1:18 -32; 13:13; 1 Cor. 6:9 -11) (TB1, p. 107).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Cultural attitudes in recent decades have increasingly advocated for views of sexual orientation and gender identity that are at odds with Scriptural truth (TB1, p. 107).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In fulfillment of 2019 Resolution 11 -03A, "To Encourage Synod to Develop Resources to Aid Congregations and Schools regarding Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues," the Office of National Mission (ONM) created the ad hoc "Created Male and Female... (TB1, p. 107).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address conclude created male and female task force and receive its recommendations through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 107).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the final report of the task force be commended to the Synod for consideration and guidance; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 107-108).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention take up the recommendations proposed therein, including the following: * that the ONM continue facilitating retreats for families affected by sexual orientation and gender identity confusion in the coming triennium and begin to recruit and train potential facilitators so these retreats might be expanded nationally; * that the Council of Presidents (COP), in conjunction with the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 107-108).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention receive the Created Male and Female Task Force report and these recommendations as a conclusion to its work, give thanks to the individual task force members for their labors, and pray that God might heal individuals, families, congregations, and communities from the ills and consequences of these sinful behaviors and ideas. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, congregations, schools; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 107-108).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 107-108.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 107).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 5-13: To Give Thanks to God for 1700th Anniversary of First Council of Nicaea

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 108-109 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-37, 5-44 (CW, 358-59, 362) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks to god for 1700th anniversary of first council of nicaea (TB1, p. 108).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the 1700th anniversary of the First Council of Nicaea; and be it further" (TB1, p. 108).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The year 2025 marked the 1700th anniversary of the First Council of Nicaea, its having begun in Asia Minor on May 20, A.D. 325 (TB1, p. 108).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The First Council of Nicaea opposed Arianism and confessed the doctrine of the Holy Trinity from the Scriptures, that the Son is homoousios ("of the same substance") with the Father, equal in power, majesty, and glory (TB1, p. 108).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church are in concord with the ancient symbols of the faith, including the Nicene Creed ; and The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod continues to confess the doctrine of the Holy Trinity according to the Holy... (TB1, p. 108).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Heresies, errors, and other misunderstandings of the doctrine taught and confessed in these ancient ecumenical creeds are in need of renewed attention and response, including the eternal subordination of the Son (Carl L. Beckwith, "Eternal Subordination of... (TB1, p. 108).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 108-109).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks to god for 1700th anniversary of first council of nicaea through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 108).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the 1700th anniversary of the First Council of Nicaea; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 108-109).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention encourage ongoing catechesis of pastors, church workers, and congregations in the classical trinitarian doctrine confessed by the one holy catholic and apostolic Church, for the sake of the Gospel and the right confession of the Triune God, especially as it is expounded in Luther's catechisms; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 108-109).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod task the Commission on Theology and Church Relations with producing a study of the texts, theology, and usage of the three ecumenical creeds and of the contemporary theological errors challenging those creeds and their doctrine for the sake of the edification of the church. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 108-109).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 108-109.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 108).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related

practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 5-14: To Respectfully Decline Overtures

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 109-110 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 5-11-12, 38-39 (CW, 342-44, 359-60) |
| Proposed action type: | declination |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respectfully decline overtures (TB1, p. 109).

The proposal would decline one or more overtures and give the committee reason for doing so. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, seminaries, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 5-11 To Restore Apostles' Creed to Historical Form regarding Christ's "Descent into Hell" Contradicts our..." (TB1, p. 109).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The floor committee has considered all overtures assigned to it and has concluded, for various reasons, that certain overtures should be declined (TB1, p. 109).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respectfully decline overtures through a declination approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 109).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (declination): Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 5-11 To Restore Apostles' Creed to Historical Form regarding Christ's "Descent into Hell" Contradicts our Lutheran-confession standard (the 1580 Book of Concord has the phrase "niedergefahren zur Hölle" in the Apostles' Creed); therefore violates Constitution, Article II Ov. 5-12 To Review Practice of... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 109-110).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: the Synod would not take the action requested by the listed overture unless the item is amended, substituted, or pulled into separate consideration. Source basis: TB1, pp. 109-110.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations that submitted or supported the declined overture may need to decide whether to ask delegates to seek separate consideration or amendment. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 109).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the committee preserving convention time and directing attention to matters the Synod can actually address. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether any declined item raises a doctrinal, supervisory, or congregational concern that deserves separate consideration.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the committee reason for declining the overture satisfy the concern, or should a delegate consider separate treatment?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: declining an overture can prevent the convention from acting beyond its authority or duplicating existing work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: a legitimate pastoral, doctrinal, or governance concern may be left unresolved if the reason for decline is too thin.

Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries

Resolution 6-01: To Uphold a Deep and Broad Study of Holy Scripture and Book of Concord in Synod Seminaries

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 110-111 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-01-8 (CW, 363-66) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns uphold a deep and broad study of holy scripture and book of concord in synod seminaries (TB1, p. 110).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod's seminaries, across all their programs, maintain and enhance courses of study that attend to careful, thorough study of Holy Scripture and ensure that all pastors certified for ordination demonstrate strong..." (TB1, p. 110).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Pastors of the Synod vow in the rite of ordination to teach in accordance with Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions (TB1, p. 110).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Concordia Seminary, St. Louis and Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, have historically grounded pastoral formation in sustained, direct engagement with the text of Holy Scripture in the original languages (TB1, p. 110).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Faithful pastoral ministry requires not merely acquaintance with the biblical text through secondary sources, but the ability to read, translate, and interpret Holy Scripture firsthand for preaching, teaching, catechesis, pastoral care, evangelism, and... (TB1, p. 110).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The church benefits when pastors are formed to handle the Word of God with confidence rooted in direct textual study rather than dependence upon external aids alone (TB1, p. 110).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address uphold a deep and broad study of holy scripture and book of concord in synod seminaries through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 110).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod's seminaries, across all their programs, maintain and enhance courses of study that attend to careful, thorough study of Holy Scripture and ensure that all pastors certified for ordination demonstrate strong knowledge of and glad reception of "the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the ... only true standard or norm by which all teachers and doctrines are to be... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod reaffirm and encourage the seminaries to maintain and deepen rigorous instruction in the original languages of Holy Scripture, emphasizing direct translation and exegetical engagement with the biblical text, resisting trends toward reduced or merely introductory engagement with the biblical languages in pastoral formation; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod's seminaries be commended and encouraged to fully commit to and persist in forming pastors who are capable of independent, faithful handling of the scriptural text in the original languages for the sake of the church's preaching and teaching; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod's seminaries instill in our future pastors those habits and disciplines that maintain the ongoing study of Scripture, including the knowledge and use of the biblical languages, throughout a lifetime of ministry, and that circuits and districts foster and encourage the same; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod reaffirm and encourage the seminaries of the Synod to maintain and deepen comprehensive, integrated instruction in the Book of Concord throughout the curriculum and extended throughout a lifetime of ministry, and that circuits and districts foster and encourage the same; and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Lutheran-confession formation not be treated as a discrete academic subject alone, but as a hermeneutical and theological framework shaping all pastoral instruction; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in

Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the seminaries of the Synod be encouraged to form pastors whose preaching, teaching, and practice flow from a robust quia commitment to the Lutheran Confessions and to ensure that all pastors certified for ordination demonstrate knowledge of and glad reception of the Lutheran Confessions; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Resolved clause 8 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions and pray for pastors who confess them faithfully in doctrine and life. To Encourage Seminary Specialized Witness and Outreach Training Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 110-111).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 110-111.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 110).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 6-02: To Encourage Seminary Specialized Witness and Outreach Training

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 111 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 6-58 (CW, 399) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns encourage seminary specialized witness and outreach training (TB1, p. 111).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That we offer our thanks for the additional coursework and workshops in evangelism and outreach; and be it further" (TB1, p. 111).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: God "desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4), and the Lord Jesus is the "light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to [His] people Israel" (Luke 2:32) (TB1, p. 111).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The seminaries of the Synod have faithfully served God's Church, providing pastors who proclaim God's Word and administer the Sacraments since 1839 (TB1, p. 111).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The seminaries have throughout their history provided training for men who served the church in specialized areas of outreach ministry such as church planting, foreign and domestic missions, etc. (TB1, p. 111).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The seminaries are actively enhancing formation to embrace mission, witness, and outreach in response to the 2023 Res. 1 -01A, "To Stimulate Training for Witness" (Proc., 115), which was adopted by unanimous voice vote (TB1, p. 111).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address encourage seminary specialized witness and outreach training through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 111).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That we offer our thanks for the additional coursework and workshops in evangelism and outreach; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 111-111).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention request that the seminaries, in consultation with the Council of Presidents, identify specialized areas of seminary training that are needed today in the life of the church and its mission to the world, including the preparation of men for church planting. To Give Thanks for the Office of the Holy Ministry and our Synod's Pastors Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 111-111).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 111-111.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 111).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 6-03: To Give Thanks for the Office of the Holy Ministry and our Synod's Pastors

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 111-112 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Reports R13.1-2 (CW, 64-67) Preamble The foundational confession of the Lutheran Church was made before Emperor Charles V in 1530 at the Diet of Augsburg. The seven Lutheran princes made the Gospel the center of their Confession in Article IV: "Our churches teach that people cannot be justified..." |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for the office of the holy ministry and our synod's pastors (TB1, p. 111).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the pure confession of the faith made at Augsburg in 1530 and handed down to us today; and be it further" (TB1, p. 111).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Since its founding, the Synod has been bold in its confession of the Book of Concord's biblical theology (TB1, p. 111).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Office of the Ministry is a divine gift for the life of the Church; and Page | WHEREAS, All men who are trained, examined, called, and ordained into the Office of the Holy Ministry are brothers in the same holy office, even while their assignments and... (TB1, p. 111).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Lord has provided pastors who have been brought into the office via a "rightly ordered call" (AC XIV) for our Synod through various pathways (Master of Divinity, Residential Alternate Route, Cross-cultural Ministry Center, Specific Ministry Pastor [SMP],... (TB1, p. 111).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for the office of the holy ministry and our synod's pastors through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 111).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the pure confession of the faith made at Augsburg in 1530 and handed down to us today; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 111-112).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for all faithful pastors serving our Synod; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 111-112).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod rise and sing "To God the Holy Spirit Let Us Pray" (LSB 768). To Support Residential Master of Divinity and Alternate Route Pastoral Formation for the Sake of the Flock Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 111-112).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 111-112.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 111).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 6-04: To Support Residential Master of Divinity and Alternate Route Pastoral Formation for the Sake of the Flock

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 112-114 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-25-44 (CW, 379-91) Preamble The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) has repeatedly identified full -time, residential pastoral formation at its seminaries as the standard, preferred route for men preparing for a lifetime of ministry to the church (2016 Res. 6-03, "To Affirm the... |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns support residential master of divinity and alternate route pastoral formation for the sake of the flock (TB1, p. 112).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, seminaries, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention thank the seminaries for offering, maintaining, and constantly enhancing robust residential pastoral formation in their M.Div. and Alternate Route (AR) programs; and be it further" (TB1, p. 112).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: There is no other way that the Lord brings sinners to faith, salvation, and eternal life than through His blessed Word and Holy Sacraments (AC V) (TB1, p. 112).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Lord has appointed in and for His church ministers of His Word so that it may be publicly applied and used in truth and purity; and of His blessed Sacraments, so that they might be administered rightly and according to His command (AC VII 1) (TB1, p. 112).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Lord requires of His ministers that they "be found faithful" (1 Cor. 4:2) to such an extent that for their conduct in the Office they "[must] give an account" (Heb. 13:17; see also James 3:1) (TB1, p. 112).

Text-supported rationale point 4: It is a right of the Church to be assured -indeed, to demand-that her pastors are doctrinally sound and capable and ready to serve as pastors (Rom. 10:14-17; Hos. 4:6; 1 Timothy 3-4; Tr 67) (TB1, p. 112).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address support residential master of divinity and alternate route pastoral formation for the sake of the flock through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 112).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention thank the seminaries for offering, maintaining, and constantly enhancing robust residential pastoral formation in their M.Div. and Alternate Route (AR) programs; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That for the sake of the flock, the Synod in convention directs the seminaries to redouble their efforts to improve their residential pastoral formation in the M.Div. and AR programs and continue to address concerns regarding the accessibility and feasibility of residential formation; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That for the sake of the flock, Synod in convention affirms our corporate commitment to robust residential M.Div. and AR pastoral education and formation as highlighted in both seminaries' reports to the convention; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That for the sake of the flock, the Synod prays for an increase in candidates for the pastoral office, trusting the Lord of the Church to provide faithful shepherds (Luke 10:2); and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That for the sake of the flock, the Synod in convention reaffirm 2023 Res. 6-02A, "To Encourage Proper Pastoral Formation through Our Synod's Seminaries" (Proceedings, 160-61) (see also 2016 Res. 6 -03, 2019 Res. 6 -02; 2023 Res. 6-03A); and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That for the sake of the flock, the Synod in convention reject online M.Div. education since it is insufficient for achieving the high standards of the Office of the Holy Ministry. To Reaffirm the Synod's Process for Training and Certification for Pastors
 Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 112-114).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 112-114.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 112).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 6-05: To Reaffirm the Synod's Process for Training and Certification for Pastors

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 114-115 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-14-24 (CW, 370-79) |
| Proposed action type: | doctrinal or theological clarification |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns reaffirm the synod's process for training and certification for pastors (TB1, p. 114).

The proposal would place a doctrinal or theological judgment before the convention for Synod-wide consideration. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, Synod offices, districts, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention reaffirm 2023 Res. 6-02A; and be it further" (TB1, p. 114).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Article III of the Synod's Constitution lists the following among the objectives of the Synod: To accomplish these objectives, the Synod has established seminaries, various routes to ministry, and a robust procedure for training and certifying pastors (ministers of religion -ordained). This procedure requires that each man who is to be placed in the Office... (TB1, p. 114).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address reaffirm the synod's process for training and certification for pastors through a doctrinal or theological clarification approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 114).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (doctrinal or theological clarification): Resolved, That the Synod in convention reaffirm 2023 Res. 6-02A; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 114-115).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention reaffirm the routes to the Office of the Ministry created by the Synod as the only routes to certification, ordination, and service as ordained ministers of the Synod; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 114-115).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention specifically reaffirm these procedures: vesting certification with the seminary faculties, vesting placement with the C OP, and barring "LCMS laymen and commissioned ministers who complete a program of study leading to ordination or its equivalent at a non -LCMS seminary" from being "eligible for colloquy on that basis" (Bylaw 3.10.2.4); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 114-115).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention reaffirm that "the LCMS has continually developed and refined its residential and nonresidential routes to ordination in order to address the needs of the church as they have arisen and dynamically changed through time" (2023 Res. 6-02A) within the overall framework noted in the previous Resolved; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 114-115).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention reaffirm its call to all members of Synod to "honor, use, and promote Synod-30 approved programs and not create independent programs of pastoral preparation or direct men to pastoral preparation programs outside of our Synod's seminaries as such efforts are not in accord with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Synod (Const. Art. III 3; Bylaw 3.10.4)" (2023 Res. 6-02A). To... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 114-115).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could shape Synod-wide teaching, public witness, or future study. It may also affect how related overtures, publications, or practices are evaluated. Source basis: TB1, pp. 114-115.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Pastors, teachers, elders, and lay leaders may use the adopted language in catechesis, policy, pastoral care, or congregational conversations. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 114).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the desire for shared teaching that strengthens unity in the Gospel. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the wording is carefully grounded in Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and avoids overstatement.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Is the language as narrow and scripturally grounded as it needs to be, or does it bind consciences beyond Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: careful doctrinal language can guard the Gospel and help the church teach with one voice.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: overly broad wording can turn a real concern into a larger controversy or blur the line between doctrine and application.

Resolution 6-06: To Affirm and Support Established Parameters of Specific Ministry Pastor Program

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 115-116 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-46-63 (CW, 392-403) |
| Proposed action type: | doctrinal or theological clarification |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns affirm and support established parameters of specific ministry pastor program (TB1, p. 115).

The proposal would place a doctrinal or theological judgment before the convention for Synod-wide consideration. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That district presidents and congregations adhere faithfully to the approved SMP policies, so that they should be given opportunity to demonstrate their effectiveness and impact, and to prioritize residential seminary formation..." (TB1, p. 115).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod established the Specific Ministry Pastor (SMP) program to address pastoral needs in specific contexts where calling a residentially-formed pastor is not feasible (TB1, p. 115).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Specific ministry pastors provide essential service in ministries that would not otherwise receive pastors, keeping congregations from closing and enabling many of them to flourish under their leadership (TB1, p. 115).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Specific ministry pastors make significant sacrifices, often serving bi-vocational ministries while working other jobs to support their families (TB1, p. 115).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The SMP program was intentionally designed as a limited and contextual pathway, distinct from the Master of Divinity program (TB1, p. 115).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 115-116).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address affirm and support established parameters of specific ministry pastor program through a doctrinal or theological clarification approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 115).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (doctrinal or theological clarification): Resolved, That district presidents and congregations adhere faithfully to the approved SMP policies, so that they should be given opportunity to demonstrate their effectiveness and impact, and to prioritize residential seminary formation whenever feasible; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 115-116).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the presidents and BOR of both seminaries, in consultation with the COP, be encouraged to continue regular oversight and evaluation of the SMP program to ensure it remains consistent with its original purpose and stated intent; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 115-116).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for faithful specific ministry pastors who serve under call for the sake of Christ's Church. To Encourage and Support Specific Ministry Pastors to Pursue General Pastor Certification Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 115-116).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could shape Synod-wide teaching, public witness, or future study. It may also affect how related overtures, publications, or practices are evaluated. Source basis: TB1, pp. 115-116.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Pastors, teachers, elders, and lay leaders may use the adopted language in catechesis, policy, pastoral care, or congregational conversations. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 115).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the desire for shared teaching that strengthens unity in the Gospel. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the wording is carefully grounded in Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and avoids overstatement.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Is the language as narrow and scripturally grounded as it needs to be, or does it bind consciences beyond Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: careful doctrinal language can guard the Gospel and help the church teach with one voice.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: overly broad wording can turn a real concern into a larger controversy or blur the line between doctrine and application.

Resolution 6-07: To Encourage and Support Specific Ministry Pastors to Pursue General Pastor Certification

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 116 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-46-48 (CW, 392-94) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns encourage and support specific ministry pastors to pursue general pastor certification (TB1, p. 116).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts, circuits.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod encourage specific ministry pastors to pursue hybrid GPC, the RAR Program, or the M.Div.; and be it further" (TB1, p. 116).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod is blessed with faithful specific ministry pastors who serve under call for the sake of Christ's Church (TB1, p. 116).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Specific ministry pastors, the congregations they serve, and the Synod as a whole are blessed when specific ministry pastors pursue the hybrid General Pastor Certification (GPC, ordinarily achievable in an additional three years), the Residential Alternate... (TB1, p. 116).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Many specific ministry pastors desire to pursue GPC but are limited due to financial constraints and limits on access to needed classes (TB1, p. 116).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address encourage and support specific ministry pastors to pursue general pastor certification through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 116).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage specific ministry pastors to pursue hybrid GPC, the RAR Program, or the M.Div.; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 116-116).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the pastors' congregation(s), district, and seminary work collaboratively to fund all tuition and fees for specific ministry pastors pursuing GPC; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 116-116).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the seminaries work in partnership with each other and prospective GPC candidates to accommodate the schedules of students (evening courses, intensive classes, etc.); and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 116-116).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we give thanks for the specific ministry pastors who have completed or are in the process of completing the GPC. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, note no incremental costs to corporate Synod but that districts and seminaries will bear costs related to collaborative funding of "all tuition and fees" (estimate... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 116-116).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 116-116.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 116).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?

- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 6-08: To Amend Bylaw 2.13.1 to Clarify Terminology for Specific Ministry Pastor Mentorship and Oversight

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 116-118 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 6-09, 45 (CW, 366-67, 391-92) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 2.13.1 to clarify terminology for specific ministry pastor mentorship and oversight (TB1, p. 116).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, districts, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 2.13.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Specific Ministry Pastor Status and Limitations 2.13.1 A "specific ministry pastor" is a minister of religion -ordained who has completed the requirements for..." (TB1, p. 116).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: In 1998 the Synod added to its bylaws a set of definitions, now designated as section 1.2 "Definition of Terms." Two important definitions are those of supervision and oversight. In the Synod's Bylaws, outside of "ecclesiastical supervision," Page | the term "supervision" means "to have authority over, to direct actions, to control activities" (Bylaw 1.2.1... (TB1, p. 116).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 2.13.1 to clarify terminology for specific ministry pastor mentorship and oversight through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 116).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 2.13.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Specific Ministry Pastor Status and Limitations 2.13.1 A "specific ministry pastor" is a minister of religion -ordained who has completed the requirements for service as a specific ministry pastor and has been examined by one of the Synod's seminaries, has received a regular call, and has been placed by the Council of Presidents into a... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, districts, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 116-118).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 116-118.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 116).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 6-09: To Implore Council of Presidents to Fulfill 2019 Resolution 6-03A re Oversight of Specific Ministry Pastors

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 118 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-54, 63 (CW, 397, 403) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns implore council of presidents to fulfill 2019 resolution 6-03a re oversight of specific ministry pastors (TB1, p. 118).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, districts, circuits, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention implore the Council of Presidents (COP) to complete this important assignment quickly and with due attention; and be it further" (TB1, p. 118).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Synod Bylaw 2.13.1 states that every specific ministry pastor "shall serve under the supervision of his district president and another pastor who is not a specific ministry pastor" (TB1, p. 118).

Text-supported rationale point 2: There is a great variety of specific ministry pastors serving in a wide variety of contexts and with a great variety of education, years of service, and gifts (TB1, p. 118).

Text-supported rationale point 3: This situation has created a number of questions regarding the amount and level of oversight that shall be employed as per Synod Bylaws (TB1, p. 118).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The 2019 Synod convention adopted Resolution 6-03A, "To Enhance the Specific Ministry Pastor (SMP) Program," which includes the resolve, "That the Council of Presidents in coordination with the Pastoral Formation Committee draft guidelines and training to..." (TB1, p. 118).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 118-118).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address implore council of presidents to fulfill 2019 resolution 6-03a re oversight of specific ministry pastors through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 118).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention implore the Council of Presidents (COP) to complete this important assignment quickly and with due attention; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, circuits, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 118-118).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend to the COP, as a reference, the supervision plan included in 2026 Report R13.6 ("Report on the Development of a Comprehensive, Uniform, Synodwide Specific Ministry Supervision Plan," Workbook, 77-82) and encourage consultation with seminary SMP program directors concerning their approaches to training and support for SMP mentors and SMP vicarage supervisors; and be it... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, circuits, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 118-118).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention thank the COP for their service and efforts. To Amend Bylaws to Address Seminary Adjunct Faculty Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, circuits, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 118-118).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 118-118.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 118).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 6-10: To Amend Bylaws to Address Seminary Adjunct Faculty

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 118-120 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-10, 73 (CW, 367, 408) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws to address seminary adjunct faculty (TB1, p. 118).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, seminaries, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.11.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.11 Staff 3.11.1 Unless otherwise specified by the board of directors of the respective agency, all employees shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing..." (TB1, p. 118).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Both Concordia Seminary , St. Louis and Concordia Theological Seminary , Fort Wayne make use of contracted faculty, bearing various titles including "adjunct faculty," "guest instructors," "guest professors," or "visiting instructors" (hereafter "adjuncts") (TB1, p. 118).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The standard procedure is that adjuncts are appointed by the president through the provost and in consultation with the pertinent department chairman. Their services to the seminary are provided on a contractual basis, rather than through a call to the faculty (TB1, p. 118).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Adjuncts must conform to the doctrinal standards of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod by upholding the accepted doctrinal statements of the Synod, including Article II of the Synod Constitution (TB1, p. 118).

Text-supported rationale point 4: CCM Op. 2 4-3031, "Adjunct Seminary Faculty," has determined that "No bylaw sets forth specific procedures for appointment of part-time or temporary faculty," (i.e., adjuncts) (TB1, p. 118).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 118-120).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws to address seminary adjunct faculty through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 118).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.11.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.11 Staff 3.11.1 Unless otherwise specified by the board of directors of the respective agency, all employees shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing authorities. (a) Members of the Synod who are appointed to positions requiring an ordained minister or a commissioned minister, excluding part-time or temporary faculty, shall receive a... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 118-120).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.5.5 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.10.5.5 The board of regents of each theological seminary shall become familiar with and develop an understanding of pertinent policies, standards, and guidelines of the Synod. ... (g) It shall participate fully in the procedures for the selection and regular review of the president of the seminary and of the major administrators; approve... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 118-120).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.5.7 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Seminary Faculties 3.10.5.7 The faculty of each theological seminary of the Synod shall consist of the president, the full -time faculty, and the part-time faculty. (a) Part-time or temporary faculty members are distinguished by an appropriate prefix or suffix ("visiting, guest, adjunct, emeritus"). (b) Part-time or temporary faculty... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, seminaries, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 118-120).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 118-120.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 118).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 6-11: To Embed Church Work Formation and Recruitment in the Culture of the LCMS

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 120-122 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-76-78 (CW, 409-411) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns embed church work formation and recruitment in the culture of the lcms (TB1, p. 120).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod offices, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That every congregation and school of the Synod (conception-high school) be encouraged to implement a church work formation and recruitment plan in their mission and ministry plan within the 2026 -29 triennium (see..." (TB1, p. 120).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: St. Paul writes, "that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures ... and if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is..." (TB1, p. 120).

Text-supported rationale point 2: God our Savior desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth through the one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all (1 Tim. 2:3-6), and who sends pastors to preach the good news as... (TB1, p. 120).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Jesus saw the crowds and had compassion on them because they were harassed and helpless, like sheep without a shepherd, and said to His disciples, "The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few; therefore pray earnestly to the Lord of the harvest to send..." (TB1, p. 120).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In a world of sin and death, where the devil is relentless in seeking whom he may devour (1 Peter 5:8), and where millions of people are without Christ, therefore Christ's command for laborers continues until He comes again (Matt. 9:35-38) (TB1, p. 120).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address embed church work formation and recruitment in the culture of the lcms through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 120).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That every congregation and school of the Synod (conception-high school) be encouraged to implement a church work formation and recruitment plan in their mission and ministry plan within the 2026 -29 triennium (see files.lcms.org/file/preview/forming-congregation-sas-focus-team); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That every pastor, commissioned worker, parent, and layperson of the Synod be encouraged to intentionally encourage youth and adults in their ministry setting and families to prayerfully consider a full -time Synod church work vocation; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all 35 district presidents, education executives, staff, and board of directors be encouraged to implement a church work formation and recruitment plan in their district mission and ministry plan within the 2026-2029 triennium (files.lcms.org/file/preview/forming-district-sas-focus-team); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all circuit visitors be encouraged to include church work formation and recruitment as a standing item in their winkel agendas and circuit responsibilities, utilizing the quarterly Set Apart to Serve circuit visitor newsletter lcms.us8.list-manage.com/track/click?u=c5b5a2837db31893114eebbb8&id=2fc11ae9e6&e=e92e2543eb; and be it further Page | Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all Synod schools (early childhood-high school) be encouraged to implement the Set Apart to Serve church work vocation curriculum published by C PH each year to supplement their religion curriculum (resources.lcms.org/initiatives/set-apart-to-serve-curriculum); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That district and congregation leaders and committees be encouraged to enhance their financial support of individuals who are enrolled in church work programs at our Concordia universities and seminaries; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That district and congregation leaders be encouraged to intentionally address the compensation and overall wellness, love, and appreciation of all ordained and commissioned church workers in district congregations, schools, and entities. To Amend Bylaws to Reinsert 2007 Pastoral Colloquy Bylaws from Policy Manual Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod offices, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 120-122).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 120-122.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 120).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 6-12: To Amend Bylaws to Reinsert 2007 Pastoral Colloquy Bylaws from Policy Manual

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 122-124 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-11-13 (CW, 367-70) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws to reinsert 2007 pastoral colloquy bylaws from policy manual (TB1, p. 122).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.2.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING B. Colloquy Committee for the Pastoral Ministry ... 3.10.2.2 The Colloquy Committee for the Pastoral Ministry shall establish and monitor academic, theological,..." (TB1, p. 122).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2010 Synod convention removed numerous pastoral colloquy bylaws and added Bylaw 3.10.2.2 (a) (Res. 8 -08A, "To Realign National Synod Ministries around Two Mission Boards"), which directs the Colloquy Committee for the Pastoral Ministry (CCPM) to develop,... (TB1, p. 122).

Text-supported rationale point 2: For 61 years prior to the 2010 Synod convention (i.e., from 1949 -2010), the Synod Bylaws for pastoral colloquy, as contained in the Handbook, reflected the more fulsome details of policy and procedure that existed in the Bylaws (TB1, p. 122).

Text-supported rationale point 3: In response to the 2010 Synod convention action, the CCPM placed the removed bylaws into its policy manual (TB1, p. 122).

Text-supported rationale point 4: These former bylaws (now policies) have changed a little bit in the 16 years since then, though a large percentage of the material remains unchanged (TB1, p. 122).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 122-124).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws to reinsert 2007 pastoral colloquy bylaws from policy manual through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 122).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.2.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING B. Colloquy Committee for the Pastoral Ministry ... 3.10.2.2 The Colloquy Committee for the Pastoral Ministry shall establish and monitor academic, theological, and personal standards for admission to the office of the pastoral ministry by colloquy after consultation with the faculties of the seminaries. It may consider and approve those... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, pastors, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 122-124).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 122-124.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 122).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?

- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 6-13: To Affirm that the Lord has Ordained that Those Who Preach the Gospel Should Make their Living from the Gospel

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 124-125 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-79-80 (CW, 411-12) |
| Proposed action type: | doctrinal or theological clarification |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns affirm that the lord has ordained that those who preach the gospel should make their living from the gospel (TB1, p. 124).

The proposal would place a doctrinal or theological judgment before the convention for Synod-wide consideration. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, pastors.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That all pastors of the Synod be encouraged to catechize their congregations regarding biblical stewardship and first-fruits giving; and be it further" (TB1, p. 124).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: When our Lord Jesus Christ called Peter, Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee to be His apostles, "they left their nets and followed Him" (Matt. 4:20). When Matthew was called, he likewise left the tax booth and followed the Lord as His apostle (Matt. 9:9). Thus, St. Paul states that "The Lord has ordained that those who preach the Gospel should make their... (TB1, p. 124).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address affirm that the lord has ordained that those who preach the gospel should make their living from the gospel through a doctrinal or theological clarification approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 124).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (doctrinal or theological clarification): Resolved, That all pastors of the Synod be encouraged to catechize their congregations regarding biblical stewardship and first-fruits giving; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all pastors be encouraged to utilize the stewardship resources produced by the Office of National Mission (ONM) to further this catechization (lcms.org/stewardship); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That all congregations of the Synod be encouraged to follow their district salary guidelines for their pastors; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That where a congregation is too small to provide a full-time living wage for a pastor, the district assist that congregation in finding a partner congregation or congregations to form a multi -point parish, which can provide a pastor with a full-time living wage; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That districts make ample use of resources from the ONM (Exploring God's Mission Here, re:Vitality) and the Lutheran Church Extension Fund (Ministry Clarity, Seasons of Ministry) to help congregations assess their current situation and find the best model for ministry (multi -point parish, cathedral model, circuit rider, etc.) in their midst that will give them good pastoral care provided by a pastor who... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That in areas where congregations are so small and isolated that forming a traditional dual or triple -point parish is not possible, the districts, circuits, or nearby thriving congregations consider the funding of cathedral models and circuit rider models of ministry as a mission-oriented opportunity for revitalization; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod express its love, understanding, and support for pastors and congregations where financial and demographic realities and other local circumstances make all of these preferred solutions impossible; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 8 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That in these situations, congregations be encouraged to demonstrate understanding for, reduce the expectations of, and allot time for their pastors to seek ways to subsidize their salaries to alleviate any financial strain and stress upon their families; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Resolved clause 9 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That districts be encouraged to support and encourage lay leadership in such situations as they experience challenges related to their pastor having additional employment. To Respectfully Decline Overtures Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's

Business (TB1, pp. 124-125).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could shape Synod-wide teaching, public witness, or future study. It may also affect how related overtures, publications, or practices are evaluated. Source basis: TB1, pp. 124-125.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Pastors, teachers, elders, and lay leaders may use the adopted language in catechesis, policy, pastoral care, or congregational conversations. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 124).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the desire for shared teaching that strengthens unity in the Gospel. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the wording is carefully grounded in Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and avoids overstatement.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Is the language as narrow and scripturally grounded as it needs to be, or does it bind consciences beyond Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: careful doctrinal language can guard the Gospel and help the church teach with one voice.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: overly broad wording can turn a real concern into a larger controversy or blur the line between doctrine and application.

Resolution 6-14: To Respectfully Decline Overtures

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 125-126 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-72, 74, 84, 86-87 (CW, 408-09, 413, 414-15)27 |
| Proposed action type: | declination |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respectfully decline overtures (TB1, p. 125).

The proposal would decline one or more overtures and give the committee reason for doing so. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, seminaries, universities, laypeople.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 6-72 To Study the Feasibility of Intentional Seminary Professor Turnover and Parish Sabbatical Doesn't account for real..." (TB1, p. 125).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The floor committee has considered all overtures assigned to it and has concluded, for various reasons, that certain overtures should be declined (TB1, p. 125).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respectfully decline overtures through a declination approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 125).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (declination): Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 6-72 To Study the Feasibility of Intentional Seminary Professor Turnover and Parish Sabbatical Doesn't account for real world variations in age and capacities Ov. 6-74 To Direct Seminaries to Publish Annual Enrollment Numbers Every Fall This information may be requested from the seminaries Ov. 6-84 To... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, seminaries, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 125-126).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: the Synod would not take the action requested by the listed overture unless the item is amended, substituted, or pulled into separate consideration. Source basis: TB1, pp. 125-126.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations that submitted or supported the declined overture may need to decide whether to ask delegates to seek separate consideration or amendment. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 125).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the committee preserving convention time and directing attention to matters the Synod can actually address. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether any declined item raises a doctrinal, supervisory, or congregational concern that deserves separate consideration.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the committee reason for declining the overture satisfy the concern, or should a delegate consider separate treatment?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: declining an overture can prevent the convention from acting beyond its authority or duplicating existing work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: a legitimate pastoral, doctrinal, or governance concern may be left unresolved if the reason for decline is too thin.

University Education

Resolution 7-01: To Commend the Concordia University System

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 126 |
| Related overtures/reports: | President's Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:33); Overture L7-30 (TB, 1:43) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns commend the concordia university system (TB1, p. 126).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, universities, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention affirm and sustain the work of the CUS; and be it further" (TB1, p. 126).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Concordia University System (CUS) was established by the 1992 Synod convention (Res. 6 -04, "To Establish Concordia University System, Inc." [Proc., 160-61]), replacing the Board for Higher Education Services, to unify the universities of the Synod around... (TB1, p. 126).

Text-supported rationale point 2: 2023 Resolution 7 -04B, "To Revise Bylaws to Revisit and Renew Relationship of Colleges and Universities with the Synod" (Proc., 170-90), focused the role of CUS on the Lutheran identity and mission of the Synod's universities (TB1, p. 126).

Text-supported rationale point 3: CUS, in accordance with Bylaw 3.6.6.1, has adopted and implemented the Lutheran Identity and Mission Outcomes Standards and engaged in both formal and informal visitations of our Concordia universities (TB1, p. 126).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The presence of CUS staff and visitation teams on our campuses has produced significant positive results in relationship building and the growth of trust (TB1, p. 126).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 126-126).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address commend the concordia university system through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 126).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention affirm and sustain the work of the CUS; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, universities, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 126-126).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for the work of the CUS and our universities in carrying out their mission, and that the Synod pledge continued prayer, financial support, and encouragement. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, estimate with regard to sustaining and pledging financial support for the Concordia University... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, universities, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 126-126).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 126-126.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 126).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 7-02: To Amend Bylaw 3.10.6.2.2

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 126-127 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 7-10 (CW, 425) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 3.10.6.2.2 (TB1, p. 126).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, universities, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.6.2.2 be amended as follows: Page | PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING F. Concordia University System Boards of Regents ... 3.10.6.2.2 Persons elected or appointed to a board of regents shall undergo training for such..." (TB1, p. 126).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2023 Synod convention adopted Resolution 7 -04B, "To Revise Bylaws to Revisit and Renew Relationship of Colleges and Universities with the Synod" (Proceedings, 170-90) (TB1, p. 126).

Text-supported rationale point 2: 2023 Res. 7-04B significantly changed the way that the Synod relates to the universities of the Concordia University System (CUS) (TB1, p. 126).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Part of 2023 Res. 7-04B establishes mandatory training for the regents of the universities of the CUS (TB1, p. 126).

Text-supported rationale point 4: That training is now codified in Bylaw 3.10.6.2.2, its subparagraphs (a-d) further describing such training (TB1, p. 126).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 126-127).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 3.10.6.2.2 through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 126).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.6.2.2 be amended as follows: Page | PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING F. Concordia University System Boards of Regents ... 3.10.6.2.2 Persons elected or appointed to a board of regents shall undergo training for such service. (a) The Concordia University System and Synod Board of Directors shall provide for training of elected and appointed regents concerning their responsibilities under the Synod... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, universities, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 126-127).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 126-127.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 126).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 7-03: To Amend Bylaw 3.6.6.1

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 127-128 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 7-09 (CW, 425) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 3.6.6.1 (TB1, p. 127).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, seminaries, universities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.6.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Concordia University System ... 3.6.6.1 The Concordia University System Board of Directors shall: ... (b) upon the request from a Concordia university, review and..." (TB1, p. 127).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Bylaw 3.6.6 states that the Concordia University System (CUS) Board of Directors (BOD) is to assist with the cooperation and coordination of the Synod's colleges and universities in the "preparation of commissioned ministers for service in the Synod and of..." (TB1, p. 127).

Text-supported rationale point 2: There is perceived ambiguity between Bylaw 3.6.6.1 (b) and (g) (TB1, p. 127).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 3.6.6.1 through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 127).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.6.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Concordia University System ... 3.6.6.1 The Concordia University System Board of Directors shall: ... (b) upon the request from a Concordia university, review and approve new implementations of and discontinuances, whether actual or constructive, (whether actual or in practical effect) of programs of study leading to one of the professional... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 127-128).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS BOD's work be commended to the care and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ. To Clarify Prior Approval Protocols for University Theological Faculties Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 127-128).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 127-128.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 127).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 7-04: To Clarify Prior Approval Protocols for University Theological Faculties

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 128-129 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 7-14-24 (CW, 428-33) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns clarify prior approval protocols for university theological faculties (TB1, p. 128).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, universities, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to the Lord of the Church for using the Synod and its agencies to preserve and enlarge the workers of the harvest; and be it further" (TB1, p. 128).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Numerous overtures to the 2026 Synod convention have addressed the prior approval protocols for theology faculty for our Concordia universities and a desire for transparency and clarity (TB1, p. 128).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Synod treasures our Concordia universities as institutions that pass on the truths of Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions to those who are a part of the Synod, those of other denominations, and many who do not know the true God and the Lord Jesus... (TB1, p. 128).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The truth is passed on in classrooms as well as throughout our campus communities (TB1, p. 128).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Theology faculty not only teach the faith with words, but also with their lives (TB1, p. 128).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address clarify prior approval protocols for university theological faculties through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 128).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to the Lord of the Church for using the Synod and its agencies to preserve and enlarge the workers of the harvest; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to those engaged in the various prior approval processes for this important work; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention express thanks and appreciation to the CUS Board of Directors (BOD) for developing and making public their criteria for evaluating theology faculty candidates during their prior approval process (cus.edu/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Prior-Approval-Protocol-for-Theology-Faculty-2.pdf); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS BOD review the "Theological Faculty Information Form," requesting input from the Council of Presidents (COP), to discuss if there are other necessary categories and questions to be included on the form for the assessment of candidates for theological faculty positions in our universities; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod request that the calling university reach out to the local district president in order to notify the candidate's district president of initiation of prior approval so as to ascertain the candidate's effectiveness and suitability for a teaching position in light of his service to the Church; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS, in consultation with the Office of the President and the COP, re-examine the size and composition of the university theological faculty prior approval panel and report their recommendation to the 2029 Synod convention; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Synod leadership publish articles in both The Lutheran Witness and Reporter to explain what the prior approval process is and how it is being carried out; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Resolved clause 8 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod lift up in prayer those who aspire to teach on theological faculties in our universities and pray that those involved in assessing candidates would be given discernment of what would best serve the church and that the Spirit would cultivate trust among us regarding those involved in the prior approval process. Page | The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 128-129).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 128-129.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 128).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 7-05: To Clarify Prior Approval Protocols for University Presidential Candidates

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 129 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 7-14-24 (CW, 428-33) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns clarify prior approval protocols for university presidential candidates (TB1, p. 129).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, universities, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to the Lord of the Church for using the Synod and its agencies to preserve and enlarge the workers of the harvest; and be it further" (TB1, p. 129).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Numerous overtures to the 2026 convention have addressed the Synod prior approval protocols, including presidential candidates for the Synod's Concordia Universities and a desire for transparency and clarity (TB1, p. 129).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The presidents of Concordia Universities serve as spiritual, academic, and administrative heads of their institutions, ensuring that the faculty and staff pass on the truths of Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions to those who are part of the Synod,... (TB1, p. 129).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Bylaw 3.10.6.8.2 governs the selection of a college/university president, including the prior approval panel for presidential nominees (TB1, p. 129).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The Concordia University System (CUS) has on its website "Prior Approval Protocol for Theological Faculty of the Concordia Universities" (CUS, cus.edu/protocols-and-procedures, accessed May 31, 2026) and these protocols include the standards and process (TB1, p. 129).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 129-129).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address clarify prior approval protocols for university presidential candidates through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 129).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to the Lord of the Church for using the Synod and its agencies to preserve and enlarge the workers of the harvest; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-129).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to those engaged in the various prior approval process es for this important work; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-129).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS, in consultation with the Office of the President and the Council of Presidents, prepare and publishes a prior approval protocol specific to candidates for college/ university presidents, including standards and processes; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-129).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Synod leadership publish articles in both The Lutheran Witness and Reporter to explain what the prior approval process is and how it is being carried out; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-129).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod lift up in prayer those willing to serve as college/university presidents and pray that those involved in assessing candidates would be given discernment o f what would best serve the church, and that the Spirit would cultivate trust among us regarding those involved in the prior approval process. To Encourage University Worship Practices That Form Students to be Faithful to Scriptures and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-129).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 129-129.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 129).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 7-06: To Encourage University Worship Practices That Form Students to be Faithful to Scriptures and Lutheran Confessions

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 129-131 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 7-06 (CW, 423-24) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns encourage university worship practices that form students to be faithful to scriptures and lutheran confessions (TB1, p. 129).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries, universities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That worship life in the chapel services and across the campuses of the CUS is to be planned, practiced, and aimed at the goal of forming all students, faculty, and staff to be scripturally -faithful Christians, grounded in..." (TB1, p. 129).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod in convention (2023 Res. 7 -04B, "To revise Bylaws to Revisit and Renew Relationship of Colleges and Universities with the Synod") revised Bylaw 3.6.6 to direct the Concordia University System (CUS) Board of Directors to develop and adopt Lutheran... (TB1, p. 129).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Lutheran Church has long heeded the apostle's injunction that all things be done decently and in order (1 Cor inthians 14) by, for example, joyfully and freely receiving the church's historic order s of prayer (e.g., Matins, Vespers, Compline, etc.) and... (TB1, p. 129).

Text-supported rationale point 3: It is simply not necessary for the true unity of the Christian Church that ceremonies instituted by human custom should be observed uniformly in all places (AC VII 3) (TB1, p. 129).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Th e Lutheran reformers could insist that those church usages that have been established by human authority ought to be observed, provided they could be observed without sin and without the erroneous opinion that they justified (AC XV), for the sake of... (TB1, p. 129).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 129-131).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address encourage university worship practices that form students to be faithful to scriptures and lutheran confessions through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 129).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That worship life in the chapel services and across the campuses of the CUS is to be planned, practiced, and aimed at the goal of forming all students, faculty, and staff to be scripturally -faithful Christians, grounded in Lutheran doctrine and practice, and active members of Synod congregations; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-131).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That use of LSB is encouraged as the benchmark, and that other worship materials and practices should be doctrinally pure (Const. Art. VI 4); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-131).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS Board and its Campus Worship Committee continue working to foster a rich, faithful, and distinctly Lutheran worship and spiritual life throughout the CUS; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-131).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS Board include in its report to the 2029 Synod convention the progress of its Campus Worship Committee. Page | To Clarify Lutheran Identity in Connection with the Concordia Universities Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, seminaries; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 129-131).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 129-131.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 129).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 7-07: To Clarify Lutheran Identity in Connection with the Concordia Universities

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 131 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 7-04-07 (CW, 422-24) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns clarify lutheran identity in connection with the concordia universities (TB1, p. 131).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, universities, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the CUS BOD, in consultation with the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, shall define and clarify what is meant by Lutheran identity and how it should be understood in connection with our Concordia universities,..." (TB1, p. 131).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2023 Synod convention (Res. 7 -04B, "To Revise Bylaws to Revisit and Renew Relationship of Colleges and Universities with the Synod," Proceedings, 170-72) revised Bylaw subsection 3.6.6 to direct the Concordia University System (CUS) Board of Directors... (TB1, p. 131).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The LIMOS are used during official CUS visitations of the Concordia universities, the goal being to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each university relative to the Lutheran identity standards adopted by the Synod (2016 Res. 7-01A, "To Adopt Lutheran... (TB1, p. 131).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The first round of evaluations of the Concordia universities by the CUS has recently been completed (TB1, p. 131).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Following this initial round of evaluations, some questions have been raised as to the breadth and depth of the term Lutheran identity, and especially as to how it should be understood in connection with, and applied to, our Concordia universities (TB1, p. 131).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 131-131).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address clarify lutheran identity in connection with the concordia universities through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 131).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the CUS BOD, in consultation with the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, shall define and clarify what is meant by Lutheran identity and how it should be understood in connection with our Concordia universities, and shall issue a report to the 2029 Synod convention, at the same time issuing the same report to the boards of regents of our Concordia universities; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 131-131).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the CUS BOD shall continue to utilize, and develop further as necessary, the LIMOS, while strengthening and clarifying them with references to the scriptural and Lutheran-confession bases for the standards, and making the updated, strengthened, and clarified LIMOS available to the Synod on the CUS website. To Study Synodwide Corporate Status of Concordia University System Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 131-131).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 131-131.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 131).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 7-08: To Study Synodwide Corporate Status of Concordia University System

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 131-132 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture L7-30 (TB, 1:43) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns study synodwide corporate status of concordia university system (TB1, p. 131).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, universities, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the BOD, in consultation with the CUS Board of Directors and the Institution Advisory Council, to analyze the relative strengths and weaknesses between retaining the CUS as a synodwide Page |..." (TB1, p. 131).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Overture 7 -01, "To Amend Bylaws to Convert Concordia University System, the Synodwide Corporate Entity, into Commission for University Education ," was submitted by the LCMS Board of Directors (BOD) for consideration at the 2026 Synod convention (TB1, p. 131).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Overtures 7-02 and 7-03, "To Affirm and Sustain Concordia University System as Synodwide Corporate Entity," were put forward by the Concordia University System (CUS) Board of Directors and St. John Lutheran Church in Springfield, P a., respectively ; and Late... (TB1, p. 131).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Overtures 7-01-03 and Late Overture 7-30 are irreconcilable with one another (TB1, p. 131).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The BOD submitted Overture 7 -01 in the interests of its duty to attend to financial and liability issues of the Synod (TB1, p. 131).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 131-132).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address study synodwide corporate status of concordia university system through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 131).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the BOD, in consultation with the CUS Board of Directors and the Institution Advisory Council, to analyze the relative strengths and weaknesses between retaining the CUS as a synodwide Page | corporate entity and converting the CUS into a commission of the Synod and propose the best model to the 2029 convention. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 131-132).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 131-132.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 131).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 7-09: To Give Thanks for Work and Ministry of Concordia University Ann Arbor

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 132 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 7-27 (CW, 435) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for work and ministry of concordia university ann arbor (TB1, p. 132).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, districts, congregations, universities, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the mission and ministry of CUAA since its founding in 1963, including the years with CUW, as well as what lies ahead; and be it further" (TB1, p. 132).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The congregations and people of the Michigan District and The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod have treasured a close relationship with Concordia University Ann Arbor (CUAA) since its founding in 1963 (TB1, p. 132).

Text-supported rationale point 2: In July 2013, an affiliation between CUAA and Concordia University Wisconsin (CUW) became official, which enabled the campus to continue providing for the spiritual development of students; including those who were being converted and baptized through the... (TB1, p. 132).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for work and ministry of concordia university ann arbor through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 132).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for the mission and ministry of CUAA since its founding in 1963, including the years with CUW, as well as what lies ahead; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-132).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod commend all past and present leaders of Concordia University Wisconsin and Ann Arbor (CUWAA) as well as the entire Synod for their support of the mission and ministry of CUAA since its founding and their remarkable efforts to sustain the ministry in Ann Arbor as a part of CUWAA for the last decade, for their communication of the vision, and for their encouragement and support of the many... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-132).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod, with united hearts and voices give thanks and praise to God for the blessings He has bestowed upon the kingdom at large through the work of His Holy Spirit and the ministry which has been done and is being done in Ann Arbor; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-132).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage CUWAA to develop church work programs on the Ann Arbor campus; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-132).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod affirm its commitment to and support for all our Concordia universities; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-132).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the assembly rise and join in singing the common doxology as an expression of thanksgiving. To Respectfully Decline Overtures Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, universities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-132).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 132-132.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 132).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related

practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 7-10: To Respectfully Decline Overtures

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | University Education |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 132-133 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 7-11, 13 (CW, 426-28) |
| Proposed action type: | declination |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respectfully decline overtures (TB1, p. 132).

The proposal would decline one or more overtures and give the committee reason for doing so. The affected parties named or implied by the text include boards, universities, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 7-11 To Strengthen Our Process for Supporting Our Concordias Overly broad; unfairly binds the boards of regents as to the..." (TB1, p. 132).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The floor committee has considered all overtures assigned to it and has concluded, for various reasons, that certain overtures should be declined (TB1, p. 132).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respectfully decline overtures through a declination approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 132).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (declination): Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 7-11 To Strengthen Our Process for Supporting Our Concordias Overly broad; unfairly binds the boards of regents as to the fulfillment of their duties Ov. 7-13 To Ask That Concordia University Nebraska Local Regents Be Appointed Concordia University Nebraska Board of Regents already working to make... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before boards, universities, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 132-133).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: the Synod would not take the action requested by the listed overture unless the item is amended, substituted, or pulled into separate consideration. Source basis: TB1, pp. 132-133.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations that submitted or supported the declined overture may need to decide whether to ask delegates to seek separate consideration or amendment. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 132).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the committee preserving convention time and directing attention to matters the Synod can actually address. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether any declined item raises a doctrinal, supervisory, or congregational concern that deserves separate consideration.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the committee reason for declining the overture satisfy the concern, or should a delegate consider separate treatment?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: declining an overture can prevent the convention from acting beyond its authority or duplicating existing work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: a legitimate pastoral, doctrinal, or governance concern may be left unresolved if the reason for decline is too thin.

Finance

Resolution 8-01: To Encourage Transparency and Accountability in Legal Judgments and Settlements

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 133 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 8-17 (CW, 445) |
| Proposed action type: | encouragement |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns encourage transparency and accountability in legal judgments and settlements (TB1, p. 133).

The proposal would encourage action without appearing to create a new binding requirement unless the resolves say otherwise. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend the process outlined in Bylaw 1.5.4; and be it further" (TB1, p. 133).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Constitution Articles VII and XI establish the Synod as a voluntary association acting on behalf of its member congregations and vest final human authority in the Synod in convention (TB1, p. 133).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Bylaws of the Synod charge the Board of Directors with fiduciary responsibility for the Synod's business and financial affairs (Bylaws 3.3.4.4 -5) and require reporting to the Synod in convention concerning the administration of those affairs (Bylaw 3.3.4) (TB1, p. 133).

Text-supported rationale point 3: These and other Bylaws of the Synod establish an accountability structure that depends upon the keeping and reporting of official records and financial information for the governance of the Synod, while permitting appropriate confidentiality through executive... (TB1, p. 133).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Bylaw 1.5.4 states that: 1.5.4 The Synod and each of its agencies shall fully disclose their financial books and records to any member congregation of the Synod. (a) Full disclosure includes all information (including, but not limited to, information... (TB1, p. 133).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address encourage transparency and accountability in legal judgments and settlements through a encouragement approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 133).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend the process outlined in Bylaw 1.5.4; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 133-133).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we give thanks to the Lord for His provision, for the faithful support by God's people and good stewardship of His resources, and we rejoice in these things as they enable our work of the Synod's mission. To Amend Bylaw Section 3.7 to Clarify Additional Assigned Responsibilities and Provisions on the Board of Trustees-Concordia Plans / Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 133-133).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 133-133.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 133).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: encouragement can call the church toward faithful practice without turning every concern into a new mandate.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: encouragement may be too vague if the concern needs accountability or too broad if local contexts differ.

Resolution 8-02: To Amend Bylaw Section 3.7 to Clarify Additional Assigned Responsibilities and Provisions on the Board of Trustees-Concordia Plans / Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 133-136 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 8-01-02 (CW, 437-38) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw section 3.7 to clarify additional assigned responsibilities and provisions on the board of trustees-concordia plans / board of directors-concordia plan services (TB1, p. 133).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw section 3.7 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.7 Synodwide Trust Entities 3.7.1 The synodwide trust entities of The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod are collectively known as the Concordia Plans. The..." (TB1, p. 133).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Bylaw section 3.7 currently describes the responsibilities of Concordia Plan Services (CPS) and those it serves in terms that no longer fully reflect its present scope of responsibilities and service. For example, this year Synod's Board of Directors (BOD)... (TB1, p. 133).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The same opinion (CCM Op. 24 -3043) recommended that "the Synod Bylaw description of the work of CPS to be amended by the next convention to include this new activity, even if already entered into"; and Page | WHEREAS, The change of the bylaw should clarify... (TB1, p. 133).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The sophistication of the services being provided continue to increase, the proposed amendments would update board composition and qualification requirements to reflect the expertise necessary for overseeing benefit, investment, and captive insurance company... (TB1, p. 133).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw section 3.7 to clarify additional assigned responsibilities and provisions on the board of trustees-concordia plans / board of directors-concordia plan services through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 133).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw section 3.7 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.7 Synodwide Trust Entities 3.7.1 The synodwide trust entities of The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod are collectively known as the Concordia Plans. The Concordia Plans ... 3.7.1.2 Concordia Plan Services is also responsible for managing other ancillary programs, including various supplemental insurance and administration services... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 133-136).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.1.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6 Synodwide Corporate Entities General Principles ... 3.6.1.1 Formation of a synodwide corporate entity, or assignment of a new area of responsibility to an existing one, shall require the approval of the Synod in convention or the Board of Directors of the Synod. (a) At least six months60 days prior to such approval an announcement thereof... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 133-136).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 133-136.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 133).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating

needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 8-03: To Fund Our Synod's Seminaries

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 136 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 8-15 (CW, 444) |
| Proposed action type: | financial / stewardship action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns fund our synod's seminaries (TB1, p. 136).

The proposal would affect reporting, stewardship, funds, benefits, or financial accountability. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for the faithful generosity of His people and pray for wise stewardship that strengthens both the Church's mission and the formation of her pastors; and be it further" (TB1, p. 136).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod maintains Concordia Seminary (CSL) and Concordia Theological Seminary (CTSFW) to form pastors for faithful Word and Sacrament ministry in the Church and her mission (TB1, p. 136).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The Synod has repeatedly affirmed residential seminary formation as the preferred and normative route for preparation for the pastoral office (2019 Res. 6 -02, "To Promote Residential Seminary Education as the Preferred Option for the Preparation of Men for... (TB1, p. 136).

Text-supported rationale point 3: As reported through CSL's annual report (csl.edu/files/legal/Annual-Report.pdf) and CTSFW's Strategic Plan 2024 -2029 (ctsfw.edu/about/who-we-are/strategic-plan), more than half of current funding is contributed by individuals and households; in addition,... (TB1, p. 136).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The funding mechanism throughout Synod has changed substantially over the last 40 years from a centralized to a decentralized funding model as evidenced by Together as Synod (TB1, p. 136).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 136-136).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address fund our synod's seminaries through a financial / stewardship action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 136).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (financial / stewardship action): Resolved, That the Synod give thanks to God for the faithful generosity of His people and pray for wise stewardship that strengthens both the Church's mission and the formation of her pastors; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 136-136).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the seminaries and Synod Board of Directors annually provide a joint standardized report of how operations are funded; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 136-136).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the individuals, households, and congregations of Synod be invited to directly support CSL and CTSFW or participate in partnership with corporate Synod through the JSF, GSI, and Together as Synod. To Expand Access to the Lutheran Confessions Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 136-136).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this may affect transparency, cost estimates, benefits, reporting, restricted gifts, budgets, or stewardship of Synod-wide resources. Source basis: TB1, pp. 136-136.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Congregations, schools, and workers may need to watch for new reporting, cost, benefit, or stewardship implications. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 136).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?

- Are the financial estimates, reporting expectations, and responsible parties clear enough for faithful implementation?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 8-04: To Expand Access to the Lutheran Confessions

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 136-137 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 8-09-27 12 (CW, 441-43) |
| Proposed action type: | financial / stewardship action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns expand access to the lutheran confessions (TB1, p. 136).

The proposal would affect reporting, stewardship, funds, benefits, or financial accountability. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That we commend CPH for making the Reader's Edition (2nd ed.) easily available as of January 2026 and for their endeavor to provide such resources as evidenced by the upcoming release of the Spanish version of the Book of..." (TB1, p. 136).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The primary objectives of The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod, as stated in Constitution Article III, are to: "conserve and promote the unity of the true faith (Eph. 4:3 -6; 1 Cor. 1:10), work through its official structure toward fellowship with other..." (TB1, p. 136).

Text-supported rationale point 2: We pray in the collect for the Church that "Thy Word, as becometh it, may not be bound, but have free course and be preached to the joy and edifying of Christ's holy people" (The Lutheran Hymnal, p. 14) (TB1, p. 136).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Lutheran Confessions), as listed in Const . Art. II "as a true and unadulterated statement and exposition of the Word of God," are an indispensable resource for achieving the primary objectives of the... (TB1, p. 136).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Concordia Publishing House (CPH) is the official publishing house of the Synod (TB1, p. 136).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 136-137).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address expand access to the lutheran confessions through a financial / stewardship action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 136).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (financial / stewardship action): Resolved, That we commend CPH for making the Reader's Edition (2nd ed.) easily available as of January 2026 and for their endeavor to provide such resources as evidenced by the upcoming release of the Spanish version of the Book of Concord; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 136-137).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That CPH explore the feasibility and cost of adding the helpful notes and annotations from the Reader's Edition (2nd) to its online publication at bookofconcord.cph.org and likewise include that as part of its report to the next convention of the Synod. To Give Thanks for Concordia Publishing House's Use of Bible Translations Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 136-137).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this may affect transparency, cost estimates, benefits, reporting, restricted gifts, budgets, or stewardship of Synod-wide resources. Source basis: TB1, pp. 136-137.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Congregations, schools, and workers may need to watch for new reporting, cost, benefit, or stewardship implications. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 136).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Are the financial estimates, reporting expectations, and responsible parties clear enough for faithful implementation?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 8-05: To Give Thanks for Concordia Publishing House's Use of Bible Translations

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 137 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 8-07-08 (CW, 440-41) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns give thanks for concordia publishing house's use of bible translations (TB1, p. 137).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That we give thanks to CPH for its continued efforts of identifying and utilizing translations available that best serve the mission of the Church, and further support its faithful stewardship and partnership with Synod. To..." (TB1, p. 137).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: We accept without reservation that the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament are "the written Word of God and the only rule and norm of faith and of practice" (Const. Art. II) (TB1, p. 137).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Passages of Holy Scripture are used throughout the hymnals, catechisms, and other printed resources of the Synod: "All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16);... (TB1, p. 137).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Throughout our history going back even to Luther, Bible translations have never been fully stable ; even Luther revised his German Bible multiple times, and English translations in Synod hymnals have shifted from the King James Version to the New... (TB1, p. 137).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In 2003, the Commission on Theology and Church Relations cautiously noted the challenges presented by different English Bible translations , declined to adjudicate among them, and left the Commission on Worship to choose which translation to use for the... (TB1, p. 137).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 137-137).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address give thanks for concordia publishing house's use of bible translations through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 137).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That we give thanks to CPH for its continued efforts of identifying and utilizing translations available that best serve the mission of the Church, and further support its faithful stewardship and partnership with Synod. To Commend Concordia Publishing House for Prioritizing Mission and Distribution Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 137-137).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 137-137.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 137).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 8-06: To Commend Concordia Publishing House for Prioritizing Mission and Distribution

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 137-138 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 8-13-14 (CW, 443-44) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns commend concordia publishing house for prioritizing mission and distribution (TB1, p. 137).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for CPH and its faithfulness to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions in providing materials to churches and church workers for 156 years; and be it further" (TB1, p. 137).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Concordia Publishing House (CPH) was established in 1869 to serve the congregations of the Synod by publishing materials that are useful to the church and faithful to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions (TB1, p. 137).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The mission statement of CPH further states that it "... will develop, produce, market, and distribute products and services that are faithful to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions and which will effectively serve such proclamation to people..." (TB1, p. 137).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The vision statement of CPH states that they will "strive to be the premier publisher and provider of choice for products and services that are faithful to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions" (ibid.); and Page | WHEREAS, CPH has a longstanding... (TB1, p. 137).

Text-supported rationale point 4: At the end of most years, CPH is able to make a financial gift to the Synod. One half of this is designated for the Synod to purchase resources from CPH to be used in ministry as they see fit. Over the last two years, CPH has given \$300,000 in resources to... (TB1, p. 137).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 137-138).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address commend concordia publishing house for prioritizing mission and distribution through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 137).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That the Synod in convention give thanks to God for CPH and its faithfulness to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions in providing materials to churches and church workers for 156 years; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 137-138).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the laborers and congregations of the Synod give thanks to God for the faithful authors, hymnwriters, and others who often work to provide useful teaching material to the church and pray God bless the wide distribution of their labors to the glory of God and the coming of His kingdom; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 137-138).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That we commend and give thanks to CPH for its policies, licensing structures, and discount programs described above that demonstrate that CPH is actively reducing barriers to global access without requiring Synod action to do so. To Address Concordia Publishing House Shipping Charges Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 137-138).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 137-138.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 137).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 8-07: To Address Concordia Publishing House Shipping Charges

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Finance |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 138-139 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 8-06 (CW, 440) |
| Proposed action type: | financial / stewardship action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns address concordia publishing house shipping charges (TB1, p. 138).

The proposal would affect reporting, stewardship, funds, benefits, or financial accountability. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend CPH for keeping costs to a reasonable level and that they continue to pursue opportunities to lower cost of shipping where possible. 38 Page | To Amend Bylaws 1.5.3.2-4 and Add Bylaw 4.7.6..." (TB1, p. 138).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Concordia Publishing House (CPH) serves as the official publishing arm of the Synod, providing essential Lutheran resources, books, curricula, and materials to support the faith, teaching, and mission of congregations, church workers, and individual members (TB1, p. 138).

Text-supported rationale point 2: It is projected the cost of free shipping could be upwards of \$4 million annually, which would cause financial repercussions that are unaffordable and unsustainable for CPH (TB1, p. 138).

Text-supported rationale point 3: We give thanks for CPH and its efforts to reduce shipping costs and make its resources readily available. Examples of this include the church resource program which provides free shipping and a 20 percent discount on orders of \$60.00 or more for... (TB1, p. 138).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address address concordia publishing house shipping charges through a financial / stewardship action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 138).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (financial / stewardship action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention commend CPH for keeping costs to a reasonable level and that they continue to pursue opportunities to lower cost of shipping where possible. 38 Page | To Amend Bylaws 1.5.3.2-4 and Add Bylaw 4.7.6 regarding Regulations for Committees Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 138-139).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this may affect transparency, cost estimates, benefits, reporting, restricted gifts, budgets, or stewardship of Synod-wide resources. Source basis: TB1, pp. 138-139.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Congregations, schools, and workers may need to watch for new reporting, cost, benefit, or stewardship implications. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 138).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Are the financial estimates, reporting expectations, and responsible parties clear enough for faithful implementation?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Structure and Administration

Resolution 9-01: To Amend Bylaws 1.5.3.2-4 and Add Bylaw 4.7.6 regarding Regulations for Committees

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 139-141 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-01 (CW, 449-50) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws 1.5.3.2-4 and add bylaw 4.7.6 regarding regulations for committees (TB1, p. 139).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, districts, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaws 1.5.3.1-4 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Organization ... 1.5.3.1 Unless otherwise stipulated in these Bylaws, at At the initial meeting after members take office under new terms filled by regular..." (TB1, p. 139).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Commission on Constitutional Matters, noting frequent issues encountered in applying Bylaw section 1.5 to the committees of districts, universities, and other agencies of the Synod, referred the language to the Commission on Handbook for study and potential revision. The following is the proposal of the latter commission, intended to clarify the bylaw... (TB1, p. 139).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws 1.5.3.2-4 and add bylaw 4.7.6 regarding regulations for committees through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 139).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaws 1.5.3.1-4 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Organization ... 1.5.3.1 Unless otherwise stipulated in these Bylaws, at At the initial meeting after members take office under new terms filled by regular election or appointment (including the regular election or appointment of any fraction of the members), all mission boards, commissions, and governing boards shall organize themselves... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 139-141).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 4.7 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 4.7 District Nominations, Elections, and Appointments ... Page | 4.7.6 A district convention may, by bylaw or resolution, create standing or ad hoc committees responsible to the district. These shall act on specific assignments or within authority delegated and shall conduct business in accordance with accepted parliamentary rules. Unless these... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 139-141).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 139-141.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 139).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-02: To Amend Bylaws 1.5.1.2-1.5.2 to Clarify Service Expectations and Handling of Conflicts of Interest

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 141-143 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-02 (CW, 450-51) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws 1.5.1.2-1.5.2 to clarify service expectations and handling of conflicts of interest (TB1, p. 141).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 1.5.1.2-1.5.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.5 Regulations for Corporate Synod and Agencies of the Synod General ... 1.5.1.2 No one, either in the Synod or a district, or between the Synod and a..." (TB1, p. 141).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Bylaw section 1.5 provides regulations applicable to all agencies of the Synod, including provisions dealing with ethical standards, conflicts of interest, and removal from office. These date, at least in their modern form, to a Commission on Structure project that culminated in 2007 (TB1, p. 141).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws 1.5.1.2-1.5.2 to clarify service expectations and handling of conflicts of interest through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 141).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 1.5.1.2-1.5.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.5 Regulations for Corporate Synod and Agencies of the Synod General ... 1.5.1.2 No one, either in the Synod or a district, or between the Synod and a district, shall hold more than one elective office; or hold more than two offices, although one or both be appointive; or ever hold two offices of which one is directly responsible for... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 141-143).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 141-143.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 141).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-03: To Amend Bylaws regarding Doctrinal Review

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 143-146 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-04 (CW, 452-54) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws regarding doctrinal review (TB1, p. 143).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw section 1.9 and subsection 3.9.3 be amended as follows:

PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.9 Doctrinal Review Definition 1.9.1 Doctrinal review is the exercise of the Synod's responsibility to determine that every doctrinal..." (TB1, p. 143).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Synod has a sweeping basic principle of inclusivity for doctrinal review. It is stated in Bylaw 1.9.1.1 (a): "All official periodicals and journals of the Synod as well as any material with doctrinal content issued publicly by boards, commissions, or other subordinate groups of the Synod except as stipulated in these Bylaws shall be subject to doctrinal..." (TB1, p. 143).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws regarding doctrinal review through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 143).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw section 1.9 and subsection 3.9.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.9 Doctrinal Review Definition 1.9.1 Doctrinal review is the exercise of the Synod's responsibility to determine that every doctrinal statement made in its or any of its agencies' or auxiliaries' materials is in accord with the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions. Page | Material Subject to Doctrinal Review... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 143-146).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 143-146.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 143).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-04: To Amend Various Bylaws for Purposes of Clarification or Improvement

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 146-152 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-05 (CW, 454-58) Preamble The Commission on Handbook (COH), responding to a variety of observations from officers, agencies, and members of the Synod, has proposed amendments to bylaws that have given opportunity to confusion or required repeated or nonobvious interpretation by the... |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend various bylaws for purposes of clarification or improvement (TB1, p. 146).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.3.3.3 be inserted (with renumbering of the following bylaw) as follows : PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Secretary ... Inability to Serve 3.3.3.3 When the Secretary is unable to serve, the duties and responsibilities of the..." (TB1, p. 146).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Questions have arisen as to how university faculties may vote to submit overtures to a convention, as allowed in Bylaw 3.1.6.2 (TB1, p. 146).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Bylaws provide in other instances for how faculties elect advisory representatives (Bylaw 3.10.6.9 [c]), certify church work students (Bylaw 2.7.2), and deal with their voting in general (Bylaw 3.1.6.2), but do not deal with this specific issue (TB1, p. 146).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The submission of an overture to a convention of the Synod is a right afforded only, otherwise, to bodies composed entirely of members of the Synod or of members of Synod member congregations (Bylaw 3.1.6.2) (TB1, p. 146).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The voting model used for certification of church work students (Bylaw 2.7.2) therefore seems appropriate to this faculty function, as well (TB1, p. 146).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend various bylaws for purposes of clarification or improvement through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 146).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.3.3.3 be inserted (with renumbering of the following bylaw) as follows : PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Secretary ... Inability to Serve 3.3.3.3 When the Secretary is unable to serve, the duties and responsibilities of the Office of Secretary shall be assumed by an acting secretary appointed by the Board of Directors. (a) The Board of Directors of the Synod shall determine when the Secretary is unable... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 146-152).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.6.1 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING F. Concordia University System Boards of Regents ... 3.10.6.1 In fulfilling its commonly understood fiduciary duties owed to the institution, and its governance responsibilities, the board of regents shall: Page | (a) serve as the governing body corporate of the institution, vested with all powers its members may exercise either as... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 146-152).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 4.2.2 (a) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 4.2 District Conventions ... 4.2.2 The delegates of a voting congregation or multi -congregation parish to a district convention shall be accredited. (a) To be entitled to vote, delegates shall return the proper credentials provided by the district secretary and signed by two of the congregation's officers, either by mailing them to the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 146-152).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.1.3.2 be amended and a header be inserted as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Nonvoting Advisory Delegates ... Certification of Voting and Advisory Delegates and District Advisory Representatives 3.1.3.2 All district voting and nonvoting advisory delegates and representatives and their alternates shall be certified before attending a convention of the Synod. (a) The names and addresses of all... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 146-152).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.10.6.9 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Concordia University System Faculties 3.10.6.9 The faculty of each college or university of the Synod shall consist of the president, the full-time faculty, and the part-time faculty. (a) Part-time or temporary faculty members are distinguished by an appropriate title. (b) Part-time or temporary faculty members shall hold nonvoting... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 146-152).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 146-152.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 146).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-05: To Amend Bylaw 3.6.4.3 to Increase the Number of Lutheran Church Extension Fund Directors Elected by the Synod in Convention from Three to Four

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 152 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-15 (CW, 474-75) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 3.6.4.3 to increase the number of lutheran church extension fund directors elected by the synod in convention from three to four (TB1, p. 152).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4.3 (1) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod ... 3.6.4.3 The board of directors for the Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod shall consist of..." (TB1, p. 152).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: During a review of Lutheran Church Extension Fund (LCEF)'s articles and bylaws, the Commission on Constitutional Matters stated the following in Opinion 24-3024, dated March 15-16, 2024: Synod Bylaw 3.6.1.3 (a) provides that a minimum of one-third of the voting members of the governing board of a synodwide corporate entity [including LCEF] shall be elected... (TB1, p. 152).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 3.6.4.3 to increase the number of lutheran church extension fund directors elected by the synod in convention from three to four through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 152).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4.3 (1) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod ... 3.6.4.3 The board of directors for the Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod shall consist of such number of directors as are specified in the bylaws of The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod. All voting members of the board of directors of the Lutheran Church... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 152-152).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 152-152.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 152).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-06: To Amend Bylaws 3.6.1.8 (c) and 3.6.4 (a) to Clarify that Two-Thirds Approval Requirements for Synodwide Corporate Entity and Lutheran Church Extension Fund Governing Document Amendments are Based on Members Actually Present at Meeting

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 152-154 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 9-16, 46 (CW, 475, 490) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws 3.6.1.8 (c) and 3.6.4 (a) to clarify that two-thirds approval requirements for synodwide corporate entity and lutheran church extension fund governing document amendments are based on members actually present at meeting (TB1, p. 152).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.1.8 (c) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6 Synodwide Corporate Entities General Principles ... 3.6.1.8 Each synodwide corporate entity shall provide in its governing instruments ... (c) a provision..." (TB1, p. 152).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: During a review of Lutheran Church Extension Fund's (LCEF) articles and bylaws, the Commission on Constitutional Matters (CCM) stated the following in Opinion 24-3050A (Minutes of the CCM, May 6, 2025, 92-93) with respect to the conformity of LCEF's membership voting process with Synod Bylaws: With regard to the first item, in view of Synod Bylaws 3.6.4 (a)... (TB1, p. 152).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws 3.6.1.8 (c) and 3.6.4 (a) to clarify that two-thirds approval requirements for synodwide corporate entity and lutheran church extension fund governing document amendments are based on members actually present at meeting through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 152).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.1.8 (c) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6 Synodwide Corporate Entities General Principles ... 3.6.1.8 Each synodwide corporate entity shall provide in its governing instruments ... (c) a provision that any amendments to a provision of its governing instruments which relate to its objects and purposes, the designating of its members, or the procedure for amending its governing... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 152-154).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4 (a) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod 3.6.4 The Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod, as established on June 15, 1978, as a corporate entity under the laws of the State of Missouri, is operated by its members and Board of Directors, in accordance with its Articles of Incorporation and corporate Bylaws, to further the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 152-154).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 152-154.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 152).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-07: To Amend Bylaw 3.6.4.3 to Clarify That No More Than Two Lutheran Church Extension Fund Directors Can Be from the Same District

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 154 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-47 (CW, 490) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 3.6.4.3 to clarify that no more than two lutheran church extension fund directors can be from the same district (TB1, p. 154).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, districts, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6.4.3 The board of directors for the Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod shall consist of such number of directors as are specified in the bylaws of..." (TB1, p. 154).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Lutheran Church Extension Fund (LCEF) Bylaws in Section 1, Article II, contain a sentence that reads, "No more than two elected Directors can be from the same district of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod." (The elected directors in the language of the LCEF Bylaws include all the voting directors on the board, both those elected by the Synod... (TB1, p. 154).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 3.6.4.3 to clarify that no more than two lutheran church extension fund directors can be from the same district through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 154).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4.3 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6.4.3 The board of directors for the Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod shall consist of such number of directors as are specified in the bylaws of The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod. All voting members of the board of directors of the Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod shall serve a maximum of four... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 154-154).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 154-154.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 154).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-08: To Amend Bylaws to Clarify and Streamline Responsibilities of Appointed Synod Officers

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 154-157 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-09 (CW, 468-70) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws to clarify and streamline responsibilities of appointed synod officers (TB1, p. 154).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That to effectuate the consolidation of the C AO position and C FO position into the COO position and to make other adjustments accordingly to improve efficiency and coordination with the Synod, Bylaws 3.1.6.1, 3.1.9, 3.2.1.1,..." (TB1, p. 154).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Under current Bylaws, the positions of Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) exist to assist the Synod Board of Directors (BOD) in carrying out the responsibilities of the BOD to the Synod. These responsibilities include managing, on behalf of the BOD, left-hand kingdom affairs of the Synod and coordination with all other... (TB1, p. 154).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws to clarify and streamline responsibilities of appointed synod officers through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 154).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That to effectuate the consolidation of the C AO position and C FO position into the COO position and to make other adjustments accordingly to improve efficiency and coordination with the Synod, Bylaws 3.1.6.1, 3.1.9, 3.2.1.1, 3.3.4.6, 3.3.4.9, 3.4.1, 3.4.1.1-3.4.1.4, 3.5.1.1, 3.6.4.2.1, and 3.9.4.1 be amended and that Bylaws 3.4.2-3.4.2.3 and 3.5.2-13 3.5.2.1 be deleted as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 154-157).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 154-157.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 154).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-09: To Amend Bylaws to Coordinate Responsibilities of Chief Mission Officer with Other Synod Officers

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 157-159 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-10 (CW, 470-71) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws to coordinate responsibilities of chief mission officer with other synod officers (TB1, p. 157).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That to assist in the overall coordination and efficiency of the Synod's mission operations and to assist the overall coordination and efficiency of the work of the CMO, other Synod officers, and the BOD, the bylaws be amended as..." (TB1, p. 157).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2010 Synod convention made substantial changes to the structure and organization of the national Synod office that impacted significantly the mission operations of the Synod. These changes included creating the Chief Mission Officer (CMO) position, eliminating the Synod's Board for Mission Services, and creating the Board for National Mission (BNM) and... (TB1, p. 157).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws to coordinate responsibilities of chief mission officer with other synod officers through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 157).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That to assist in the overall coordination and efficiency of the Synod's mission operations and to assist the overall coordination and efficiency of the work of the CMO, other Synod officers, and the BOD, the bylaws be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Chief Mission Officer 3.4.3 The Chief Mission Officer shall be responsible to the President of the Synod for the mission, ministry, and any... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 157-159).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 157-159.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 157).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-10: To Revise the Membership of the Pastoral Formation Committee

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 159-160 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 6-64-71, 9-10 (CW, 403-8, 470-71) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns revise the membership of the pastoral formation committee (TB1, p. 159).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw section 3.10 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING D. Pastoral Formation Committee ... 3.10.4.6 The Pastoral Formation Committee shall comprise the following five members: Voting Members: appointed by the..." (TB1, p. 159).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: One of the objectives of the Synod is to "recruit and train pastors, teachers, and other professional church workers and provide opportunity for their continuing growth" (Const. Art. III 3) (TB1, p. 159).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The 2013 Resolution 5 -14A Task Force (2013 Res. 5 -14A, "To Conduct Study of Alternate Routes to Pastoral Ministry," [Proceedings, 155]) recognized "the need to provide for greater coordination and collaboration between our two seminaries" (Report R64, 2016... (TB1, p. 159).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The task force recommended "that there be an entity ensuring that the seminaries do coordinate and collaborate with respect to these various programs" (Report R64, 2016 Workbook, 279) (TB1, p. 159).

Text-supported rationale point 4: In 2016 , the Synod resolved that Bylaw section 3.10 be amended , creating the Pastoral Formation Committee (PFC) (2016 Res. 6-01, "To Create Pastoral Formation Committee," [Proceedings, 165-6]) (TB1, p. 159).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 159-160).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address revise the membership of the pastoral formation committee through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 159).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That Bylaw section 3.10 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING D. Pastoral Formation Committee ... 3.10.4.6 The Pastoral Formation Committee shall comprise the following five members: Voting Members: appointed by the Council of Presidents Nonvoting Advisory Member: The Executive Director of the Office of Pastoral Education 3.10.4.7 The executive director of the Office of Pastoral Education shall... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, seminaries, pastors; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 159-160).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 159-160.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 159).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 9-11: To Amend Bylaw Section 1.5, etc., to Unify in the Bylaws and Revise Corporate Formation Requirements for Instrumental Entities of Corporate Synod and Agencies of the Synod

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 160-173 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report LR63 (TB, 1:37-38) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw section 1.5, etc., to unify in the bylaws and revise corporate formation requirements for instrumental entities of corporate synod and agencies of the synod (TB1, p. 160).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, congregations, Concordia entities.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod and its agencies commit themselves to their defined roles in carrying out the changes in these bylaws, focusing on the things of God; and be it further" (TB1, p. 160).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: "The Synod's Constitution says our objective is to 'strengthen congregations and their members in giving bold witness by word and deed to the love and work of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and extend that Gospel witness into all the world.' This is as biblical and clear as the Word and work of Jesus, and the word and works of His apostles in Acts 4... (TB1, p. 160).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw section 1.5, etc., to unify in the bylaws and revise corporate formation requirements for instrumental entities of corporate synod and agencies of the synod through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 160).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That the Synod and its agencies commit themselves to their defined roles in carrying out the changes in these bylaws, focusing on the things of God; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 160-173).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 1.2.1 be amended to adjust the definition of agency to distinguish from other instrumental entity types, to harmonize language with that of other sections, to account for the formation of Concordia Risk Solutions (the assets of which are reserved to meet claims of the insureds), and to clarify that the property of the Synod definition covers only the property of corporate Synod and Synod... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 160-173).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw section 1.5 be amended, to distinguish different types of instrumental entities, to allow for creation of investment and special purpose entities as described, to integrate and update requirements for corporate documents and governance of instrumental entities, and to allow the Board of Directors to permit certain waivers and modifications, as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 1.5 Regulations... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 160-173).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw section 3.3.4.7 be amended as follows: Board of Directors ... 3.3.4.7 The Board of Directors shall serve as the custodian of all the property of the Synod as defined in Bylaw 1.2.1 (r). Except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws, it shall have the authority and responsibility with respect to the property of the Synod as is generally vested in and imposed upon a board of directors of a... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 160-173).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw section 3.6.1.1 be amended, to allow the Board of Directors not only to create new synodwide corporate entities but also to assign new responsibilities to those existing, as follows : PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6 Synodwide Corporate Entities General Principles ... 3.6.1.1 Formation of a synodwide corporate entity, or assignment of a new area of responsibility to an existing one, shall require the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, congregations, Concordia entities; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 160-173).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 160-173.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p.

160).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-12: To Amend Bylaws Exclusive to Lutheran Church Extension Fund to Clarify That It May Provide Real Estate Evaluation and Redevelopment Services in Support of Synod Mission and Ministry

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 173-174 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-08 (CW, 467-68) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaws exclusive to lutheran church extension fund to clarify that it may provide real estate evaluation and redevelopment services in support of synod mission and ministry (TB1, p. 173).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod 3.6.4 The Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod, as established on June 15, 1978, as a corporate entity..." (TB1, p. 173).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Most congregations and ministries within the Synod are owners of real estate. Many of these ministries need assistance evaluating their property so they can steward their assets wisely. In some cases, they may not have need for some or all of their real estate. In many cases, sale of the real estate is the best option to raise funds for future operations or... (TB1, p. 173).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaws exclusive to lutheran church extension fund to clarify that it may provide real estate evaluation and redevelopment services in support of synod mission and ministry through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 173).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING The Lutheran Church Extension Fund-Missouri Synod 3.6.4 The Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod, as established on June 15, 1978, as a corporate entity under the laws of the State of Missouri, is operated by its members and Board of Directors, in accordance with its Articles of Incorporation and corporate Bylaws, to further the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 173-174).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.6.4.4.1 be amended as follows: Page | PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 3.6.4.4.1 The assets of the Lutheran Church Extension Fund -Missouri Synod shall be used exclusively to provide financing and services for the acquisition of sites, for the construction of facilities, for the purchase of buildings and equipment, for operating expenses, for professional church worker education, for the residential... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 173-174).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 173-174.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 173).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-13: To Adopt Recommendations of 2023 Res. 9-06A Task Force on Electoral Circuit Parameters

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 174-175 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 9-19-20, 33 (CW, 476-77, 485) |
| Proposed action type: | commendation / thanksgiving |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns adopt recommendations of 2023 res. 9-06a task force on electoral circuit parameters (TB1, p. 174).

The proposal would publicly thank God for faithful service and encourage continued support. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, circuits, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 3.1.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Voting Delegates 3.1.2 Electoral circuits shall meet as required by the Bylaws of the Synod to elect circuit voting delegates to the Synod's national conventions...." (TB1, p. 174).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: 2023 (TB1, p. 174).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address adopt recommendations of 2023 res. 9-06a task force on electoral circuit parameters through a commendation / thanksgiving approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 174).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (commendation / thanksgiving): Resolved, That Bylaw 3.1.2 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Voting Delegates 3.1.2 Electoral circuits shall meet as required by the Bylaws of the Synod to elect circuit voting delegates to the Synod's national conventions. (a) An electoral circuit shall consist either of one or two of one or more adjacent visitation circuits, as shall be determined by the district board of directors on the basis of... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, circuits, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 174-175).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 174-175.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 174).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate giving public thanks where the Lord has blessed service, witness, mercy, education, or partnership. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether gratitude is expressed clearly without implying approval of every related practice beyond the resolution.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: public thanksgiving can encourage weary servants, honor the Lord's gifts, and strengthen shared support for good work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: commendation language can sometimes be read more broadly than intended, so the exact scope matters.

Resolution 9-14: To Amend Constitution Article XII 15 as to Call of Special District Conventions

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 175-176 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-03 (CW, 451-52) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend constitution article xii 15 as to call of special district conventions (TB1, p. 175).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices, districts.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Constitution Article XII 15 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Article XII Districts of the Synod and Their Regulation ... of his district; he must, however, previously have obtained consent of at least a majority..." (TB1, p. 175).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: In its periodic review of various district bylaws, the Commission on Constitutional Matters (CCM, "Removal of a District President from Office," minutes of April 8-9, 2022) has noted the following: * Bylaw 1.5.8.1, introduced by 2016 Res. 12 -11, "To Establish a Procedure Based on Article XI A 2 for Removal from Office of Officers of the Synod or a District..." (TB1, p. 175).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend constitution article xii 15 as to call of special district conventions through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 175).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Constitution Article XII 15 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Article XII Districts of the Synod and Their Regulation ... of his district; he must, however, previously have obtained consent of at least a majority of the voting members of the district after having informed them and the President of the Synod of the purpose of the intended special session. may be called: a. by the district... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 175-176).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the above amendment be submitted, according to Const. Art. XV 4, to the congregations of the Synod for ratification. To Increase Congregation Participation in Election of Synod President Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 175-176).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 175-176.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 175).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 9-15: To Increase Congregation Participation in Election of Synod President

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 176-177 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 9-21-22 (CW, 477-80) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns increase congregation participation in election of synod president (TB1, p. 176).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, districts, congregations, laypeople.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That congregations be encouraged to complete their Congregation Profile in LISN, including current email contact information for their lay leadership, and update it annually during their statistical reports (Bylaw 1.3.4.3); and..." (TB1, p. 176).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2010 Synod convention changed the longstanding practice of electing the Synod President at the convention and conferred that right to congregations using electronic voting (2010 Res. 8 -17, "To Elect the Synod President," [Proceedings, 167]) (TB1, p. 176).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The move to direct representation has seen decreased participation in every election since this process was adopted, to wit: * The 2013 presidential election saw 8,201 registered electors and 6,432 votes cast, representing 78.43 percent voted; * The 2016... (TB1, p. 176).

Text-supported rationale point 3: 2019 Resolution 9-16 amended Bylaw 3.12.2.3 by allowing the district president to know the registration status of his congregations for the sole purpose of encouraging their participation (Proc., 327-28) (TB1, p. 176).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Congregations with updated contact information (in particular, email addresses) on file in the Synod database (LCMS Information Support Network [LISN]) have greater rates of participation (TB1, p. 176).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address increase congregation participation in election of synod president through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 176).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That congregations be encouraged to complete their Congregation Profile in LISN, including current email contact information for their lay leadership, and update it annually during their statistical reports (Bylaw 1.3.4.3); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 176-177).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct all district presidents to encourage participation in the Synod President election by educating all congregations and their pastors in their districts of their right to vote and the process by which they can exercise their right to vote (Bylaw 4.4.8); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 176-177).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the districts in convention allot time to educate their respective districts about the process for the election of the Synod President; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 176-177).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Council of Presidents utilize the information from the Secretary of the Synod about the registration process at their November and February meetings in the twelve months prior to the Synod convention; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 176-177).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct all circuit visitors to work with the vacant congregations in their circuits to help them register to vote and to understand the process by which they can exercise their right to vote (Bylaw 5.2.3.[h]). To Direct Board of Directors, Board for National Mission, Board for International Mission, and Chief Mission Officer to Review Overture 9-11 Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, districts, congregations, laypeople; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 176-177).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 176-177.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 176).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 9-16: To Direct Board of Directors, Board for National Mission, Board for International Mission, and Chief Mission Officer to Review Overture 9-11

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 177 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overture 9-11 (CW, 471-73) |
| Proposed action type: | directive |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns direct board of directors, board for national mission, board for international mission, and chief mission officer to review overture 9-11 (TB1, p. 177).

The proposal would direct a board, office, commission, district, or other entity to take specified action. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, Synod offices, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the BOD, BNM, BIM, and the Chief Mission Officer together review Overture 9 -11 and recommend structural changes to the Synod convention to accomplish those goals; and be it further" (TB1, p. 177).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: the Board of Directors (BOD) desires to enhance the coordination and efficiency of the Synod's mission operations to better align the responsibility of the Board for National Mission (BNM) and Board for International Mission (BIM) with the authority given to... (TB1, p. 177).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address direct board of directors, board for national mission, board for international mission, and chief mission officer to review overture 9-11 through a directive approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 177).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (directive): Resolved, That the BOD, BNM, BIM, and the Chief Mission Officer together review Overture 9 -11 and recommend structural changes to the Synod convention to accomplish those goals; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 177-177).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That they bring these recommendations to the 2029 Synod convention. To Respectfully Decline Overtures Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, Synod offices, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 177-177).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 177-177.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 177).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 9-17: To Respectfully Decline Overtures

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Structure and Administration |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 177-180 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 9-17, 23-32, 36-40, 44-45, 48, 52 (CW, 475-76, 480-95) |
| Proposed action type: | declination |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respectfully decline overtures (TB1, p. 177).

The proposal would decline one or more overtures and give the committee reason for doing so. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices, districts.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 9-17 To Initiate Proposal to Realign Districts Bylaw 4.1.1.3 not followed Ov. 9-23 To Affirm Regional Selection of Board..." (TB1, p. 177).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The floor committee has considered all overtures assigned to it and has concluded, for various reasons, that certain overtures should be declined (TB1, p. 177).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respectfully decline overtures through a declination approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 177).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (declination): Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 9-17 To Initiate Proposal to Realign Districts Bylaw 4.1.1.3 not followed Ov. 9-23 To Affirm Regional Selection of Board Members Bylaws 3.3.4.1, 3.8.2.3, and 3.8.3.3 already reflect the intent of the overture Page | Overture Subject Reason Ov. 9-24 To Create Task Force to Develop Overture for Change in... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, boards, commissions, Synod offices; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 177-180).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: the Synod would not take the action requested by the listed overture unless the item is amended, substituted, or pulled into separate consideration. Source basis: TB1, pp. 177-180.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations that submitted or supported the declined overture may need to decide whether to ask delegates to seek separate consideration or amendment. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 177).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the committee preserving convention time and directing attention to matters the Synod can actually address. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether any declined item raises a doctrinal, supervisory, or congregational concern that deserves separate consideration.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the committee reason for declining the overture satisfy the concern, or should a delegate consider separate treatment?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: declining an overture can prevent the convention from acting beyond its authority or duplicating existing work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: a legitimate pastoral, doctrinal, or governance concern may be left unresolved if the reason for decline is too thin.

Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution

Resolution 10-01: To Seek Commission on Theology and Church Relations Opinion regarding Usage of Matthew 18:15-20

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 180 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 10-10, 12 (CW, 505-7) |
| Proposed action type: | church relations action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns seek commission on theology and church relations opinion regarding usage of matthew 18:15-20 (TB1, p. 180).

The proposal would affect how the Synod recognizes, reviews, or speaks about relationships with other church bodies. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, commissions, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the CTCR to study Matthew 18:15-20 as it applies to public and private sin with special consideration of the 2006 Report "Public Rebuke of Public Sin"; and be it further" (TB1, p. 180).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod, being faithful to Scripture, acknowledges, "All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16) (TB1, p. 180).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Holy Scripture distinguishes between private sins that are first to be rebuked privately (Matt. 18:15); and public sins that are to be rebuked publicly (1 Tim. 5:20) (TB1, p. 180).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Bylaw 1.10 and Bylaw 2.14 make multiple references to Matthew 18:15 as support for guiding, respectively, the dispute resolution process and expulsion of members from the Synod (TB1, p. 180).

Text-supported rationale point 4: There is disagreement as to whether Matthew 18:15 must be followed when responding to public sin, as required by Bylaw 2.14 and its subsections (TB1, p. 180).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 180-180).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address seek commission on theology and church relations opinion regarding usage of matthew 18:15-20 through a church relations action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 180).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (church relations action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the CTCR to study Matthew 18:15-20 as it applies to public and private sin with special consideration of the 2006 Report "Public Rebuke of Public Sin"; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-180).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this new CTCR report provide comment as to Matthew 18:15 -20 and its relationship or implications, if any, to the practices of maintaining ecclesiastical order and practices of church polity in their historical and contemporary applications; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-180).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this report be made available to the Synod as a whole prior to the 2029 Synod convention. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, anticipate no significant incremental costs to the Synod as the activity is understood to be within the existing scope and budget of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations (estimate... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, commissions, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-180).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could affect formal fellowship, review, or conversation with another Lutheran church body or partner. Source basis: TB1, pp. 180-180.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations may notice implications for altar and pulpit fellowship, missionary partnerships, or how leaders explain church relationships. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 180).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 10-02: To Create a Task Force to Clarify Relationship Between Bylaw 1.10 and 2.14 and Consider Bylaw Changes for Dispute Resolution (Bylaw 1.10) and Expulsion of Congregations or Individuals from Membership in the Synod (Bylaw 2.14)

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 180-181 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 10-06, 08, 12-17, 20-23 (CW, 503-4, 506-13) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns create a task force to clarify relationship between bylaw 1.10 and 2.14 and consider bylaw changes for dispute resolution (bylaw 1.10) and expulsion of congregations or individuals from membership in the synod (bylaw 2.14) (TB1, p. 180).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, congregations.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention create a task force to study and recommend changes, if needed, to the 1.10/2.14 processes; and be it further" (TB1, p. 180).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The Lutheran Church -Missouri Synod is united in a common confession of Holy Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions and is called to maintain unity in doctrine and judgment while addressing disputes in a fraternal and timely manner (Matt. 5:23-24; 1 Cor.... (TB1, p. 180).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The relationship between Bylaw 1.10 and 2.14 (hereinafter referred to as 1.10/2.14 processes) is frequently confusing and the processes need clarification (TB1, p. 180).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Numerous overtures to this Synod convention (referenced above) indicate the necessity * to clarify the relationship between the Bylaws concerned in the 1.10/2.14 processes; * to clarify appropriate responses and differences in public vs. private disputes... (TB1, p. 180).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address create a task force to clarify relationship between bylaw 1.10 and 2.14 and consider bylaw changes for dispute resolution (bylaw 1.10) and expulsion of congregations or individuals from membership in the synod (bylaw 2.14) through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 180).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention create a task force to study and recommend changes, if needed, to the 1.10/2.14 processes; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-181).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the task force consist of the following members: * the President of Synod or his designee; * the Secretary of Synod or his designee; * three district presidents and two district secretaries selected by the Council of Presidents to represent each of the geographical regions of the Synod; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-181).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this task force seek the input of experienced lay panel facilitators and reconcilers; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-181).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this task force, in its study, include special attention to changes in these Bylaws, address the concerns expressed including, but not limited to, the process being too costly, cumbersome, lengthy, and ine fficient; and provide clear guidance regarding private/public processes and face-to-face versus electronic communications; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-181).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the report of recommendations made by the task force be made available to the congregations and pastors of the Synod no less than nine months prior to the 2029 Synod convention for the purpose of receiving input, comment, and feedback prior to publishing the 2029 Convention Workbook; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-181).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the report and all feedback be assigned to the proper floor committee for the purpose of adopting resolutions to present at the 2029 Synod convention. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance Committee, estimate an incremental cost of \$90,000-\$120,000 for task force meetings (estimate required by Bylaw 3.1.7 [g]). To Respond to... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, congregations; implementation details should

be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 180-181).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 180-181.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 180).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 10-03: To Respond to Sexual Misconduct by Rostered Workers and Make Provision for Spiritual Care of Those Affected

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 181-183 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 10-27-30 (CW, 515-18) |
| Proposed action type: | mixed action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respond to sexual misconduct by rostered workers and make provision for spiritual care of those affected (TB1, p. 181).

The proposal combines encouragement, direction, and/or study language that delegates should read clause by clause. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations, schools.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the Chairman of the Council of Presidents (COP) to appoint a task force to continue the work assigned by 2023 Resolution 10 -05A, "To Speak to Spiritual Care of Victims of Sexual Misconduct by..." (TB1, p. 181).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: God establishes the Office of the Holy Ministry for the care of His people (John 20:21 -23; 1 Tim. 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9), and those who serve in this office are called to lives that are "above reproach" (1 Tim. 3:2) (TB1, p. 181).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Offices auxiliary to the Office of the Holy Ministry have been established by the church and entrusted to fallible men and women who must remain above reproach for the sake of Christ's Church; and Page | WHEREAS, The Synod, in seeking to be faithful to these... (TB1, p. 181).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The Synod uses the term sexual misconduct to describe a range of sinful behaviors reflecting an ungodly life (Constitution Article XII 8) that gives offense to the victims, the congregation or institution, all affected individual s, and the church's witness... (TB1, p. 181).

Text-supported rationale point 4: A member accused of such an ungodly life or a giving of offense may resign from the roster at any time, removing himself or herself from ecclesiastical supervision (TB1, p. 181).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respond to sexual misconduct by rostered workers and make provision for spiritual care of those affected through a mixed action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 181).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (mixed action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the Chairman of the Council of Presidents (COP) to appoint a task force to continue the work assigned by 2023 Resolution 10 -05A, "To Speak to Spiritual Care of Victims of Sexual Misconduct by Individual Members of the Synod" (Proc., 219); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the task force be comprised of no more than six individuals, including: * the Secretary of Synod or his designee; * the Synod's legal counsel; * a member of the COP; * a female commissioned minister; * female lay representation, giving special consideration to victims of rostered worker sexual misconduct or experienced therapy professionals in this field; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That this task force be encouraged to seek the input of outside consultants with expertise in sexual misconduct issues and the testimony of victims of rostered worker sexual misconduct; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the task force will: * review current bylaws, manuals, procedures, and opinions from the Commission on Constitutional Matters pertaining to sexual misconduct; * recommend revisions, if any, to applicable bylaws regarding cases of sexual misconduct; * contribute to continued refinement of advisory procedures and guidelines for ecclesiastical supervisors ; * recommend resources to congregations and... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the task force report recommendations to the 2029 Synod convention; and be it finally Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That in cases of alleged sexual misconduct, regardless of the roster status of the accused, the district president will assess the spiritual needs and make provision for the spiritual care of the victims, the accused, the congregation(s) or institution(s) involved, and all affected individuals. The Chief Financial Officer and LCMS Accounting and Financial Services staff, in consultation with the Finance... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts, congregations; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 181-183).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 181-183.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 181).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 10-04: To Seek Unity and Peace in the Synod and to Establish a Practical Statement for God-Pleasing Use of Digital Communications

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 183-184 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 4-43-44, 49, 10-04-05 (CW, 326-28, 502-3) |
| Proposed action type: | task force / structural action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns seek unity and peace in the synod and to establish a practical statement for god-pleasing use of digital communications (TB1, p. 183).

The proposal would create or use a study or task-force process to develop further recommendations. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the Synod in convention strongly urge people across the church to pray fervently, both in corporate worship and as individuals, for the unity and health of the Synod, believing that all things are possible with God (Phil...." (TB1, p. 183).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: Our Lord Jesus Christ prayed for the unity of His Church so that the world might believe He has been sent by the Father (John 17:11, 20 -23) and declared that all people would know we are his disciples by the love we have for one another (John 13:35) (TB1, p. 183).

Text-supported rationale point 2: The apostle Paul enjoins God's people to "walk in a manner worthy of the calling to which you have been called, with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"... (TB1, p. 183).

Text-supported rationale point 3: The first objective listed in Article III of the Synod Constitution is to "conserve and promote the unity of the true faith (Eph. 4:3-6; 1 Cor. 1:10), work through its official structure toward fellowship with other Christian church bodies, and provide a... (TB1, p. 183).

Text-supported rationale point 4: Unity in the Church is a gift from God (Rom. 15:5-6) which we should humbly seek from Him in prayer (TB1, p. 183).

The source contains additional rationale clauses; this guide summarizes the main themes rather than reproducing every clause (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address seek unity and peace in the synod and to establish a practical statement for god-pleasing use of digital communications through a task force / structural action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 183).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (task force / structural action): Resolved, That the Synod in convention strongly urge people across the church to pray fervently, both in corporate worship and as individuals, for the unity and health of the Synod, believing that all things are possible with God (Phil. 4:13); and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Resolved clause 2 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, that the Synod in convention encourage all rostered workers and laypeople to commit themselves anew to guarding their tongues and keyboards, that we may "[speak] the truth in love" (Eph. 4:15) and avoid harming Christ's flock through uncharitable or disorderly speech; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Resolved clause 3 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, that those using pseudonymous accounts for the purpose of sowing discord within Synod be encouraged to repent, delete their accounts, and confess to their pastor or ecclesiastical supervisor to receive absolution; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Resolved clause 4 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod call on individuals to "[bear] with one another in love" (Eph. 4:2), by providing forgiveness, by speaking well of each other, by praying for one another, by seeking peace, and by explaining everything in the kindest way; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Resolved clause 5 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod encourage its rostered workers, congregations, and laity to avoid using social media to express their disagreements, and for the sake of theological clarity, pastoral care, and a spirit of reconciliation, seek in -41 person opportunities to engage each other in civil and respectful conversations; and be it further Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Resolved clause 6 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, That the Synod in convention direct the CTCR, in consultation with the Council of Presidents, to prepare a theological and pastoral statement addressing: * the Eighth Commandment in the digital age; * the proper handling of accusations against pastors and congregations; Page | * the appropriate and inappropriate uses of social media, blogs, podcasts, and similar media in relation to ecclesiastical... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Resolved clause 7 (additional implementation / encouragement): Resolved, that the CTCR include this work in its report to the next Synod convention. To Amend Bylaw 4.2.4 regarding Installation of District Presidents Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 183-184).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this would guide or encourage Synod-wide work in the named area without necessarily changing doctrine or bylaws unless the exact resolves say so. Source basis: TB1, pp. 183-184.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local impact will depend on whether districts, circuits, congregations, schools, or workers choose or are directed to participate. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 183).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate places where the proposal encourages cooperation, shared witness, local care, transparent process, or practical support. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposal clearly distinguishes doctrine from preference, encouragement from mandate, and evangelical oversight from unnecessary control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: the resolution could help the Synod speak or act together in a clearer, more accountable, and more orderly way in the area named by the title.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: implementation may depend on details not fully resolved in the text, including cost, authority, local flexibility, or how the wording is applied.

Resolution 10-05: To Amend Bylaw 4.2.4 regarding Installation of District Presidents

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 184 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Report, Part 2 (TB, 1:35) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 4.2.4 regarding installation of district presidents (TB1, p. 184).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 4.2.4 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 4.2 District Conventions ... 4.2.4 The President of the Synod or his representative shall report on the condition and affairs of the Synod. He shall also deliver the..." (TB1, p. 184).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The President of Synod or his representative reports to each district convention of the Synod (Bylaw 4.2.4) (TB1, p. 184).

Text-supported rationale point 2: It is the desirable practice that the elected or re-elected district president be installed before the conclusion of the district convention (TB1, p. 184).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 4.2.4 regarding installation of district presidents through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 184).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 4.2.4 be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING 4.2 District Conventions ... 4.2.4 The President of the Synod or his representative shall report on the condition and affairs of the Synod. He shall also deliver the sermon at the opening or convention service. He shall also install or reinstall the elected or re-elected district president prior to the conclusion of the district convention in... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 184-184).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 184-184.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 184).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 10-06: To Amend Bylaw 2.11.2.2 (c)

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 184-185 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 10-38-39 (CW, 520-21) |
| Proposed action type: | structural / bylaw action |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns amend bylaw 2.11.2.2 (c) (TB1, p. 184).

The proposal would change governing text or organizational expectations rather than merely express encouragement. The affected parties named or implied by the text include Synod, Synod offices, districts.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That Bylaw 2.11.2.2 (c) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Candidate 2.11.2.2 A "candidate" member is one who is eligible to perform the duties of any of the offices of ministry specified in Bylaw section 2.11 but..." (TB1, p. 184).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The 2023 Synod convention adopted Resolution 10 -06, "To Amend Bylaw 2.11.2.2 regarding Candidate Status," that moved the filing deadline for the required candidate annual report from January 31 to July 31 (TB1, p. 184).

Text-supported rationale point 2: Annual reports for emeriti remain due on January 31 (TB1, p. 184).

Text-supported rationale point 3: Many district offices find it more efficient to request and process both candidate and emeriti annual reports simultaneously (TB1, p. 184).

Text-supported rationale point 4: The preparation and conduct of both district and Synod conventions coincide with this annual reporting time period two out of every three years (TB1, p. 184).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address amend bylaw 2.11.2.2 (c) through a structural / bylaw action approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 184).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (structural / bylaw action): Resolved, That Bylaw 2.11.2.2 (c) be amended as follows: PRESENT/PROPOSED WORDING Candidate 2.11.2.2 A "candidate" member is one who is eligible to perform the duties of any of the offices of ministry specified in Bylaw section 2.11 but who is not currently an active member or an emeritus member. ... (c) The candidate shall, by July/January 31, make an annual report to the district president who shall determine the... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before Synod, Synod offices, districts; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 184-185).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: this could alter how Synod entities, officers, boards, districts, or commissions carry out assigned responsibilities. Delegates should compare the proposed wording with the current Handbook before assuming the change is merely technical. Source basis: TB1, pp. 184-185.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local leaders may notice changed procedures, reporting lines, eligibility rules, or expectations when interacting with districts, Synod offices, universities, seminaries, or boards. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 184).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate clearer lines of responsibility when they build trust and reduce confusion. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the proposed structure preserves congregational life, evangelical oversight, and accountability without creating needless central control.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the proposed wording solve the stated problem without creating ambiguity, added bureaucracy, or unintended limits on congregations and districts?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: a bylaw or structural change can reduce uncertainty and make responsibilities more transparent.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: structural language can have consequences beyond the immediate concern, especially if terms are undefined or authority is shifted.

Resolution 10-07: To Respectfully Decline Overtures

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Committee: | Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 185-186 |
| Related overtures/reports: | Overtures 10-07, 11, 18-19, 26, 33 (CW, 504, 506, 511, 514, 519)3 |
| Proposed action type: | declination |
| Confidence level: | High - based on the clarity of the extracted title, rationale, and resolved clauses. |

Plain-language summary:

This proposed resolution concerns respectfully decline overtures (TB1, p. 185).

The proposal would decline one or more overtures and give the committee reason for doing so. The affected parties named or implied by the text include commissions, districts, laypeople, mission partners.

The main operative language begins with: "Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 10-07 To Establish an Independent Appeals Panel in Cases Involving the President's Decisions Action called for is addressed..." (TB1, p. 185).

Because it is printed in Today's Business as a proposed resolution, it should be treated as proposed convention business, not final Synod action.

Whereas / rationale understanding:

Text-supported rationale point 1: The floor committee has considered all overtures assigned to it and has concluded, for various reasons, that certain overtures should be declined (TB1, p. 185).

Tone and authorial intent:

Text-supported inference: The committee appears to be trying to address respectfully decline overtures through a declination approach rather than treating the item as final action already taken (TB1, p. 185).

Resolved clauses and likely effects:

Resolved clause 1 (declination): Resolved, That the following overtures be respectfully declined for the reasons given: Overture Subject Reason Ov. 10-07 To Establish an Independent Appeals Panel in Cases Involving the President's Decisions Action called for is addressed by Bylaws 2.14.9 and 2.14.9.1 Ov. 10-11 To Amend Bylaw 4.4.6 (c) to Require Reporting Complaints to Subjects Overture provides insufficient rationale of theology and practice for... Likely effect: it would place this action, encouragement, referral, or governing change before commissions, districts, laypeople, mission partners; implementation details should be checked against the exact wording in Today's Business (TB1, pp. 185-186).

Impact for the Synod:

Possible impact: the Synod would not take the action requested by the listed overture unless the item is amended, substituted, or pulled into separate consideration. Source basis: TB1, pp. 185-186.

Impact for local congregations and workers:

Local congregations that submitted or supported the declined overture may need to decide whether to ask delegates to seek separate consideration or amendment. Local leaders should read the source text before assuming implementation details (TB1, p. 185).

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may appreciate the committee preserving convention time and directing attention to matters the Synod can actually address. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether any declined item raises a doctrinal, supervisory, or congregational concern that deserves separate consideration.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- What exact action would the convention be taking, and is it encouragement, direction, referral, or a change to governing documents?
- Does the committee reason for declining the overture satisfy the concern, or should a delegate consider separate treatment?
- How would this affect congregations, called workers, schools, and ordinary members who are not sitting in the convention hall?

Possible benefits:

Strongest faithful case: declining an overture can prevent the convention from acting beyond its authority or duplicating existing work.

Possible risks or tensions:

Possible risk or tension: a legitimate pastoral, doctrinal, or governance concern may be left unresolved if the reason for decline is too thin.

Omnibus Analysis

Procedural meaning: An omnibus resolution groups multiple overtures under one proposed action. If adopted as printed, the listed items receive the omnibus treatment, such as referral, reference to previous action, or receipt as encouragement/gratitude. If a delegate moves to pull an item for separate consideration under the convention rules, the convention can deliberate on that item separately instead of including it in the single omnibus vote.

Omnibus Resolution A

Omnibus A refers overtures to a named board, office, individual, or commission because responsibility for the requested work has been delegated elsewhere. Source: Today's Business, Issue 1, pp. 51.

Omnibus A - Ov. 1-07: To Study, and To Make Recommendations to Stop and Reverse, Long Decline in Synod Membership

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Office of National Mission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to study, and to make recommendations to stop and reverse, long decline in synod membership. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Office of National Mission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 1-16: To Proactively Put in Place National Standards for Our Schools to Protect Students

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Synod Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to proactively put in place national standards for our schools to protect students. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Synod Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 1-20: To Include Homeschool Enrollment in Statistical Reports of the Synod

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | LCMS Rosters, Statistics, and Research Services |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to include homeschool enrollment in statistical reports of the synod. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to LCMS Rosters, Statistics, and Research Services. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 1-27: To Propose LCMS Men's Ministry Office of National Mission

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to propose lcms men's ministry office of national mission. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 1-28: To Study and Recommend Strategies to Advance Congregation- based Older Adult Ministries

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Office of National Mission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to study and recommend strategies to advance congregation- based older adult ministries. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Office of National Mission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 2-04: To Promote Divine Call Opportunities for Ethnic Immigrant Institute of Theology Pastors

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Board for International Mission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to promote divine call opportunities for ethnic immigrant institute of theology pastors. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Board for International Mission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 2-05: To Amend Bylaws to Protect Divine Calls of Missionaries Commission on Theology

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to amend bylaws to protect divine calls of missionaries commission on theology. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to and Church Relations. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 2-07: To Thank God on the 60th Anniversary of the Inception of LCMS International Schools in Asia and Pray for God's Guidance in Advancing Their Ministry and Mission

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | International Schools Task Force |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to thank god on the 60th anniversary of the inception of lcms international schools in asia and pray for god's guidance in advancing their ministry and mission. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to International Schools Task Force. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 3-05: To Establish District Commission on Immigration and Immigration Resources

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Office of National Mission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to establish district commission on immigration and immigration resources. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Office of National Mission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 3-08: To Define Leadership and Its Priority for Worker Wellness Office of National Mission

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to define leadership and its priority for worker wellness office of national mission. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 4-50: To Encourage Production of Sunday School Material for Very Small Congregations

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Concordia Publishing House |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage production of sunday school material for very small congregations. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Concordia Publishing House. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-13: To Request Comprehensive Review When Call is Terminated or Self-Terminated

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to request comprehensive review when call is terminated or self-terminated. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-14: To Study How to Amend Practice of Issuing "Divine Calls" to Positions Not in Direct Service of Proclamation of Gospel and Administration of Sacraments

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Commission on Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to study how to amend practice of issuing "divine calls" to positions not in direct service of proclamation of gospel and administration of sacraments. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Commission on Theology and Church Relations. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/prior-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-15: To Encourage and Promote Sound Teaching on Eschatology or Last Things

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Concordia Publishing House |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage and promote sound teaching on eschatology or last things. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Concordia Publishing House. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-22: To Believe, Teach, and Confess Missio Dei Commission on Theology and Church Relations in consultation

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | with Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to believe, teach, and confess missio dei commission on theology and church relations in consultation. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to with Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-24: To Urge Church of Christ to Stay and Do Her Duty Office of President and Council of Presidents Page | 2026 Today's Business, 1st Edition-Omnibus Resolutions

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Overture Title Board, Office, Individual, Commission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 51 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to urge church of christ to stay and do her duty office of president and council of presidents page | 2026 today's business, 1st edition-omnibus resolutions. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 51).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Overture Title Board, Office, Individual, Commission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 51).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-25: To Publicly Acknowledge Theological and Ecclesial Errors in Church's Response to COVID-19 Pandemic

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Office of President and Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to publicly acknowledge theological and ecclesial errors in church's response to covid-19 pandemic. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Office of President and Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-36: To Affirm Inspiration and Authority of Mark 16:9-20 Seminary Faculties

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to affirm inspiration and authority of mark 16:9-20 seminary faculties. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-40: To Address Release and Use of Luther's Large Catechism with Annotations and Contemporary Applications

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Commission on Theology and Church Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to address release and use of luther's large catechism with annotations and contemporary applications. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Commission on Theology and Church Relations. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-42: To Amend Bylaw 3.3.1.1.2 (c) to Designate President's Director of Church Relations as His Primary Representative for Ecclesiastical Relations with Other Church Bodies

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Office of the President and Commission on Constitutional Matters |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to amend bylaw 3.3.1.1.2 (c) to designate president's director of church relations as his primary representative for ecclesiastical relations with other church bodies. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Office of the President and Commission on Constitutional Matters. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 5-43: To Refer Some Assignments from CTCR to Seminaries Commission on Theology and Church

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Relations |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to refer some assignments from ctcr to seminaries commission on theology and church. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Relations. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 6-75: To Encourage the Council of Presidents to Prioritize Assignment of Seminary Candidates to Sole Vacancies over Associate Positions

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage the council of presidents to prioritize assignment of seminary candidates to sole vacancies over associate positions. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 6-81: To Mandate Continuing Education for Parish Pastors Office of Pastoral Education

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to mandate continuing education for parish pastors office of pastoral education. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 6-82: To Encourage Congregations to Establish Sabbatical Policy for Church Workers

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Office of National Mission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage congregations to establish sabbatical policy for church workers. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Office of National Mission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 6-83: To Encourage Ministry Sabbaticals for Church Workers Office of National Mission

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage ministry sabbaticals for church workers office of national mission. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 6-85: To Standardize Vacancy Pastor Remuneration Guidelines Council of Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to standardize vacancy pastor remuneration guidelines council of presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 6-88: To Affirm That Functions of Pastoral Office Belong to That Office

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to affirm that functions of pastoral office belong to that office. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. L6-89:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Commission a Study to Support Ethnic Ministry Pastors and Commissioned Workers Office of National Mission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns . It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Commission a Study to Support Ethnic Ministry Pastors and Commissioned Workers Office of National Mission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 7-12: To Encourage Licensed Counselors Serving Recognized Service Organizations to Complete Director of Family Life Ministry Colloquy Program Colloquy Committee for Commissioned Ministry, Concordia University System

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage licensed counselors serving recognized service organizations to complete director of family life ministry colloquy program colloquy committee for commissioned ministry, concordia university system. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 7-28: To Conduct a Project Postmortem Examination of Concordia University Ann Arbor

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Synod Board of Directors; Concordia University System Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to conduct a project postmortem examination of concordia university ann arbor. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Synod Board of Directors; Concordia University System Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 7-29: To Request Transparency from Concordia University Wisconsin- Ann Arbor

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Synod Board of Directors; Concordia University System Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to request transparency from concordia university wisconsin- ann arbor. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Synod Board of Directors; Concordia University System Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 8-03: To Affirm Concordia Plans and To Amend Bylaws to Require Annual ERISA-Comparable Transparency to Participants

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Board of Trustees-Concordia Plans / Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to affirm concordia plans and to amend bylaws to require annual erisa-comparable transparency to participants. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Board of Trustees-Concordia Plans / Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 8-04: To Amend Bylaws to Ensure Sustainability of Concordia Plan Services by Its Working with Other Church Bodies

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services, Synod Board of Directors, and the Commission on Constitutional Matters |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to amend bylaws to ensure sustainability of concordia plan services by its working with other church bodies. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services, Synod Board of Directors, and the Commission on Constitutional Matters. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 8-05: To Stabilize the Cost of Benefits Offered by Concordia Plan Services

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services, Synod Board of Directors, and the Commission on Constitutional Matters |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to stabilize the cost of benefits offered by concordia plan services. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Board of Directors-Concordia Plan Services, Synod Board of Directors, and the Commission on Constitutional Matters. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 8-16: To Encourage Synod Transparency and Unity regarding Concluded HotChalk Litigation

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Synod Board of Directors and Legal Counsel Page 2026 Today's Business, 1st Edition-Omnibus Resolutions Overture Title Board, Office, Individual, Commission |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 52 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage synod transparency and unity regarding concluded hotchalk litigation. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 52).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Synod Board of Directors and Legal Counsel Page | 2026 Today's Business, 1st Edition-Omnibus Resolutions Overture Title Board, Office, Individual, Commission. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 52).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 8-18: To Encourage Transparency and Accountability in Legal Judgments and Settlements

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Synod Board of Directors and Legal Counsel |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage transparency and accountability in legal judgments and settlements. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Synod Board of Directors and Legal Counsel. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. L8-19: To Request Concordia Plans to Explore Cost-of-Living Increase Options for Concordia Retirement Plan

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Concordia Plan Services |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to request concordia plans to explore cost-of-living increase options for concordia retirement plan. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Concordia Plan Services. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 9-12: To Restructure Mission Boards Office of the President

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | and Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to restructure mission boards office of the president. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to and Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 9-13: To Revisit 2010 Restructuring Office of the President

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | and Synod Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to revisit 2010 restructuring office of the president. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to and Synod Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 9-14: To Revisit 2010 Restructuring Office of the President

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | and Synod Board of Directors |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to revisit 2010 restructuring office of the president. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to and Synod Board of Directors. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 9-18: To Reclaim Beneficial Understanding of Our Synodical Union Office of the President

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to reclaim beneficial understanding of our synodical union office of the president. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 9-41: To Provide Clarity about Amendments to Resolutions Secretary of Synod

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to provide clarity about amendments to resolutions secretary of synod. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 9-49: To Clarify Multipoint and Multicampus Parish Office of National Mission

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to clarify multipoint and multicampus parish office of national mission. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-01: To Encourage Visitation by Synod and District Council of Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage visitation by synod and district council of presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-02: To Develop Guidelines for Ecclesiastical Supervision of Internet Accusations

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to develop guidelines for ecclesiastical supervision of internet accusations. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-03: To Address Use of Named or Anonymous Social Media Accounts to Create Strife and Division Within the Church

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to address use of named or anonymous social media accounts to create strife and division within the church. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-09: To Provide Pastoral Care for Congregations Affected by Major Disciplinary Actions

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to provide pastoral care for congregations affected by major disciplinary actions. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-24: To Request Council of Presidents to Clarify Circumstances of Called Worker Removal or Resignation

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to request council of presidents to clarify circumstances of called worker removal or resignation. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-25: To Request Council of Presidents to Clarify Circumstances of Called Worker Removal or Resignation from Roster

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to request council of presidents to clarify circumstances of called worker removal or resignation from roster. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-31: To Certify Accuracy and Trustworthiness of Call Council of Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to certify accuracy and trustworthiness of call council of presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-32: To Allow Pastors to Opt Out of Pre-Call Interviews and/or Contact

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to allow pastors to opt out of pre-call interviews and/or contact. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-34: To More Directly Oversee Service of Ordained Ministers to Congregations to Which They Have No Formal Call

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Council of Presidents |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to more directly oversee service of ordained ministers to congregations to which they have no formal call. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to Council of Presidents. The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-35: To Encourage Pastors to Honor Their Own Call Council of Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage pastors to honor their own call council of presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-36: To Call for Publication of Council of Presidents Manual Council of Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to call for publication of council of presidents manual council of presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus A - Ov. 10-37: To Provide Compensation for Circuit Visitors District boards of directors

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | referral |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 53 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to provide compensation for circuit visitors district boards of directors. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution A (TB1, p. 53).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be referred to . The convention would not be adopting the overture itself, but assigning or acknowledging responsibility elsewhere (TB1, p. 53).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus Resolution B

Omnibus B points overtures to previous convention action because the committee judged that the Synod has already spoken and that the source did not provide sufficient rationale to change course. Source: Today's Business, Issue 1, pp. 54.

Omnibus B - Ov. 1-11: To Inspire Training for Witness 2023 Res. 1-01A

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to inspire training for witness 2023 res. 1-01a. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: . The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 1-26: To Strengthen Christ Centered Homes Through Family Discipleship Work

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 2019 Res. 12-07B |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to strengthen christ centered homes through family discipleship work. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 2019 Res. 12-07B. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 4-37: To Continue to Oppose Practice of Couples Living Together outside Marriage and To Support Pastors and Congregations Who Lovingly Call to Repentance, Give Absolution, and Help to Live in Harmony with God's Word

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 2023 Res. 5-11 |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to continue to oppose practice of couples living together outside marriage and to support pastors and congregations who lovingly call to repentance, give absolution, and help to live in harmony with god's word. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 2023 Res. 5-11. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 5-10: To Encourage and Promote Biblical Teaching of Creation

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 1932 Report of Committee 20, adopted ("A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod"); 1967 Res. 2-31; 1973 Res. 3-01 ("A Statement of Scriptural and Lutheran-confession Principles"); 2004 Res. 2-08A; 2019 Res. 5-09A |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage and promote biblical teaching of creation. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 1932 Report of Committee 20, adopted ("A Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Missouri Synod"); 1967 Res. 2-31; 1973 Res. 3-01 ("A Statement of Scriptural and Lutheran-confession Principles"); 2004 Res. 2-08A; 2019 Res. 5-09A. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 7-08: To Encourage Congregations to Include in Annual Mission Budgets Support for Regional University of Concordia University System

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 2023 Res.7-06B |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to encourage congregations to include in annual mission budgets support for regional university of concordia university system. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 2023 Res.7-06B. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 7-25: To Appeal for Recognized Ecclesiastical Relationship with Luther Classical College

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 2023 Res. 7-04B |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to appeal for recognized ecclesiastical relationship with luther classical college. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 2023 Res. 7-04B. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 9-34: To Strengthen Convention Participation of Ministers of Religion-Commissioned

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Bylaws 3.1.5, 3.1.3.1; 2023 Res. 9-08A |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to strengthen convention participation of ministers of religion-commissioned. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: Bylaws 3.1.5, 3.1.3.1; 2023 Res. 9-08A. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 9-35: To Strengthen Nonvoting Advisory Role of Commissioned Ministers at Synod Conventions

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Bylaws 3.1.5, 3.1.3.1; 2023 Res. 9-08A |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to strengthen nonvoting advisory role of commissioned ministers at synod conventions. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: Bylaws 3.1.5, 3.1.3.1; 2023 Res. 9-08A. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 9-42: To Change to Four-Year Convention Cycle Declination of 2023 Res. 9-09A

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Not clearly extracted; see source table. |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to change to four-year convention cycle declination of 2023 res. 9-09a. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: . The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 9-43: To Amend Const. Art. VIII A 1 to Change to Four-Year Convention Cycle

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Declination of 2023 Res. 9-09A |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to amend const. art. viii a 1 to change to four-year convention cycle. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: Declination of 2023 Res. 9-09A. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 9-50: To Adopt Dual Title of Bishop and President for District Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 1981 Res. 3-19 |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to adopt dual title of bishop and president for district presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 1981 Res. 3-19. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus B - Ov. 9-51: To Authorize Title Bishop for Synod President and District Presidents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | previous action affirmed / referred to prior action |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | 1981 Res. 3-19 |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 54 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to authorize title bishop for synod president and district presidents. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution B (TB1, p. 54).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

Petitioners would be referred to the listed prior action: 1981 Res. 3-19. The practical effect is to leave the previous Synod action or bylaw framework as the controlling response (TB1, p. 54).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus Resolution C

Omnibus C receives listed overtures as expressions of encouragement or gratitude rather than as separate directives. Source: Today's Business, Issue 1, pp. 55.

Omnibus C - Ov. 1-31: To Give Thanks for and Offer Renewed Commitment to Work of Atlantic District

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | encouragement or gratitude |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Thank God for 120 years of faithful Gospel service and mission work of the Atlantic District |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 55 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to give thanks for and offer renewed commitment to work of atlantic district. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution C (TB1, p. 55).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be received as encouragement or gratitude, with the noted thanks: Thank God for 120 years of faithful Gospel service and mission work of the Atlantic District. It would not create a new directive unless amended separately (TB1, p. 55).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus C - Ov. 1-33: To Commend Family Discipleship Work of Concordia Center for the Family (CCF)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Proposed omnibus action: | encouragement or gratitude |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Thank God for the continued blessing of the work of CCF including its leaders, especially Rev. Dr. Todd A. Biermann |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 55 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to commend family discipleship work of concordia center for the family (ccf). It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution C (TB1, p. 55).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be received as encouragement or gratitude, with the noted thanks: Thank God for the continued blessing of the work of CCF including its leaders, especially Rev. Dr. Todd A. Biermann. It would not create a new directive unless amended separately (TB1, p. 55).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Omnibus C - Ov. 7-26: To Give Thanks for the Board of Regents of Concordia College-New York

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Proposed omnibus action: | encouragement or gratitude |
| Recipient or referenced prior action: | Thanks for diligent, fair, and faithful work |
| Source location: | Today's Business, Issue 1, p. 55 |

Plain-language summary:

This omnibus item concerns to give thanks for the board of regents of concordia college-new york. It is not presented as a standalone proposed resolution, but as one line within Omnibus Resolution C (TB1, p. 55).

What happens if it remains in the omnibus and passes:

The overture would be received as encouragement or gratitude, with the noted thanks: Thanks for diligent, fair, and faithful work. It would not create a new directive unless amended separately (TB1, p. 55).

What would change if pulled for separate consideration:

Separate consideration would allow delegates to debate the overture or substitute language on its own merits, amend the proposed treatment, or ask whether referral/previous-action/encouragement is sufficient. A delegate might consider this when the item involves doctrine, governance, supervision, finances, worker formation, local congregational practice, or substantial trust questions.

Bridge-building and distinction-keeper reading:

A bridge-building reader may value the efficiency of omnibus treatment and the desire to send matters to responsible bodies. A Lutheran distinction keeper may ask whether the omnibus action risks burying a matter that needs public clarity, careful theological speech, or direct accountability.

Questions for delegates to consider:

- Is the proposed omnibus action the right action for this item, or does the subject deserve separate deliberation?
- Does the named recipient or prior action actually address the petitioner's concern?
- Would pulling the item help the convention act more clearly, or would it consume time without changing the result?
- Is there a local congregational, doctrinal, financial, supervisory, or worker-care impact hidden inside a procedural bucket?

Possible benefits:

The strongest case for leaving this item in the omnibus is that it respects time, avoids duplicating existing work, and routes matters to bodies already assigned responsibility.

Possible risks or tensions:

The main risk is that important issues may receive little public explanation. Delegates should read the item closely if it touches doctrine, governance, supervision, formation, finances, or direct congregational practice.

Cross-Cutting Themes

Gospel sending and witness

Committee 1 and 2 contain many encouragements toward witness, church planting, global mission, campus ministry, and ministry among varied communities. The delegate question is whether proposed support strengthens local congregations and workers for faithful outward-facing witness.

Doctrine and church relations

Committee 5 and portions of Committees 4, 6, and 10 include doctrinal study, fellowship, sacramental practice, roles in the church, and theological review. Delegates should ask whether claims are narrow, charitable, and clearly supported.

Governance and trust

Committees 7, 8, 9, and 10 repeatedly address transparency, bylaw authority, legal judgments, prior approval, supervision, and dispute processes. Trust grows where accountability is high and control is not needlessly heavy.

Formation and workers

Committee 6 is heavily focused on pastoral formation, seminary education, routes to ministry, Specific Ministry Pastor matters, and church worker recruitment. Committee 3 adds worker wellness and care.

Local congregational life

Proposals touch schools, family discipleship, worship practice, Communion, youth, urban contexts, digital witness, worker calls, and pastoral supervision. Local leaders should ask what would actually change on Monday morning.

Finance and stewardship

Committee 8 and portions of Committee 9 involve transparency, Concordia Plans, Concordia Publishing House, LCEF, legal matters, and partnership funding. Delegates should ask what costs, reports, or responsibilities follow adoption.

Local Congregation Impact Guide

Pastors and elders

Watch items on worship practice, the Lord's Supper, lay service, public teaching, dispute resolution, digital accusations, sexual misconduct response, calls, and pastoral formation.

Lay delegates and voters

Watch the items that change representation, convention procedures, presidential election participation, omnibus treatment, and the rights and responsibilities of congregations.

Schools and universities

Watch items on Lutheran identity, university governance, prior approval, Concordia University System structure, educational standards, curricula, school safety, and religious liberty.

Congregations and circuits

Watch items on church planting, revitalization, urban ministry, family discipleship, youth and young adults, call processes, circuit visitors, and district relationships.

Districts and Synod offices

Watch items that assign studies, referrals, task forces, reporting, supervision, financial responsibilities, or bylaw implementation.

Delegate Reading Plan

- First, read Today's Business pages 3-17 for how the issue functions, proposed standing rules, speaker recognition, and consent calendar provisions.
- Second, read the high-priority items in Committees 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, especially bylaw, doctrine, prior approval, pastoral formation, finance, and supervision items.
- Third, read Omnibus A carefully. Referral can be wise, but items involving doctrine, supervision, finance, worker formation, or congregational practice may deserve closer review.
- Fourth, read Committee 1-4 items for local congregation impact, especially church planting, youth, family discipleship, mercy, worship, recognized service organizations, and public witness.
- Fifth, compare later daily issues of Today's Business with this guide. Substitute resolutions and amendments can materially change the effect of an item.

Coverage Check

| Committee | Proposed resolutions analyzed |
|---|-------------------------------|
| National Witness | 15 |
| International Witness | 5 |
| Mercy | 7 |
| Life Together | 10 |
| Theology and Church Relations | 14 |
| Pastoral Ministry and Seminaries | 14 |
| University Education | 10 |
| Finance | 7 |
| Structure and Administration | 17 |
| Ecclesiastical Supervision and Dispute Resolution | 7 |
| Omnibus A items | 55 |
| Omnibus B items | 12 |
| Omnibus C items | 3 |
| Total proposed resolutions | 106 |
| Total omnibus items | 70 |

All ten floor committees were reviewed based on the extracted text of Today's Business, Issue 1.

Omnibus Resolutions A, B, and C were reviewed. No Omnibus D was present in the source pages extracted from Issue 1.

Consent calendar items were not listed as a separate set of items in Issue 1. The issue notes the option of a daily consent calendar in the proposed standing rules and schedule, so delegates should watch later daily issues.

No proposed item in this guide is described as adopted. Every item remains proposed business unless later convention action adopts it.

Limitation: This guide uses text extraction from the provided PDF. When bylaw language is long or tables wrap across columns, the guide summarizes the operative effect and cites the source page rather than reproducing the full legal text.

Closing Gospel frame: The convention is not the church's Savior. Christ is risen indeed, and the church deliberates best when repentance, faith, clarity, courage, and neighbor-love are held together under His Word.