

THREE insights | TWO strategic directions | ONE unresolved tension

University Campus Ministry

3	<p>1. Mission integrity: Guard against the danger of not prioritizing university campus ministry (i.e. becoming ineffective on campus)</p> <p>2. Communication: Desire for more communication between gatherings</p> <p>3. Demographic awareness: Our strategy needs to account for the high prevalence of mental health challenges in younger generations</p>
2	<p>1. United community: Growth in felt unity between congregations</p> <p>2. Ministry visibility: God-at-work slot used in Sunday services</p>
1	<p>1. One-church emphasis: What does involvement of City & Fields look like at Campus?</p>

>> What problem are we really trying to solve?

Risk of losing our uni campus mission focus as Cornerstone Church.

The realities of a continual turnover of students at Campus Church and unreached/nominal mission field on campus.

Maintaining a relationship with the university so that they value our contribution, but where venue changes or policy shifts can quickly disrupt years of culture-building.

>> What could bold but wise progress look like by 2030?

Ownership/personal investment by City & Fields in campus ministry. Unity between three congregations.

Valuing leaders e.g. Kid's Space and youth group leaders from Campus Church

Bringing the experience and maturity of City/Fields members into Campus Church through one-to-one or group mentorship; building connections.

>> What must be true for this to succeed?

Communication, hearts shaped to love unity, one-church emphasis

Kids & Youth

3	<p>1. Sharing the gospel: Empowering the children and youth to share the gospel message with those around them.</p> <p>2. Relational discipleship: One-to-one mentoring for youth; ways for kids & youth to be serving to create a sense of belonging for them</p> <p>3. Confidence building: More support for everyone parenting in 2026–2030 acknowledging the unique cultural and mental health pressures of this time.</p>
2	<p>1. Resourcing the home: Equipping parents to minister to their children in challenging times; parents feel confident and equipped in handling the Bible at home</p> <p>2. Strong ministry structure and skillset: Resourcing this ministry through staffing, training, curriculum, leader development. Having a large number of leaders in both areas who can teach, have capacity and are equipped in Bible knowledge</p>
1	<p>1. High standards & high demand: How do we resource a high standard of Bible teaching, safe and healthy kids & youth ministries AND significant growth demands for leaders and staff time?</p>

>> What problem are we really trying to solve?

Confidence in the gospel: parents feel like there is a gap in their own knowledge when it comes to feeling confident with Bible teaching in their own homes.

Leader capacity: the numbers and training level of leaders are not keeping pace with the growth

Integration: bridging the gap between life stages for kids and youth (Primary → High School → Uni) transition. Understanding their mental, emotional, spiritual needs.

>> What could bold but wise progress look like by 2030?

Parents feeling fully equipped and resourced as primary ministers to their kids.

A diverse, well-staffed team (including apprentices/pastors) with high Bible knowledge and mentoring skills.

Kids and youth actively serving on Sundays, using creative outlets, and sharing the gospel themselves.

>> What must be true for this to succeed?

Strong foundation of leaders, training and resourcing that foresees the future growth and is ready for it.

Church Gatherings

3	<p>1. Care needs: We have diverse needs to cater for: demographic, cultural, mental health, neurodiversity</p> <p>2. Growing Ministry Leaders: Need to grow leadership and volunteers proportionately to congregation growth</p> <p>3. Going deeper as we grow: Not only focusing on numbers but depth and maturity. Must avoid compromising depth of spiritual growth and find ways to cultivate depth of relationships and belonging</p>
2	<p>1. Twinning & Service planting: Benefits: leverages resources; smaller services; flexibility of venues if smaller; good for shift workers. Costs: identity challenges; divides people; stretches volunteers/staff</p> <p>2. Network of churches: Partnering with other churches to grow the kingdom</p>
1	<p>1. Pastoral & Relational: What is the desired community/congregation size? What is the typical person's relational capacity?</p>

>> What problem are we really trying to solve?

We are facing growth stagnation caused by venue constraints. Without expanding physical capacity or rethinking service structure, the church risks losing its ability to welcome new members and potential lack of growth (numbers and depth).

There is a tension between the desire for relational depth and the current resources, specifically a shortage of Growth Group leaders and a lack of clear strategies to accommodate a diverse demographic (including awareness of neurodiversity and cultural needs).

>> What could bold but wise progress look like by 2030?

1. Twinning/service planting: moving to multiple smaller services (including mid-week or afternoon slots) to accommodate shift workers and new demographics. The goal is to maintain a relational size while increasing total capacity. It's bold because it risks dividing the congregation, but wise because it utilizes the building more efficiently.
2. Radical generosity in sending. Kingdom impact could mean sending people to other existing churches, partnering with other churches or planting our own.
3. Growth in capacity. Creating more space for people to join us, but also spaces and service styles that grow our capacity to meet different needs (e.g. cultural needs and neurodiversity). Could different gathering sizes / venues/styles cater to different needs?

>> What must be true for this to succeed?

Training and leadership development. Sustainable finances.

Property

3	<p>1. Identified obstacles: Our current main constraints are venue security (no guarantee of hire), a lack of nearby viable properties, and the large effort required for weekly setup/packdown.</p> <p>2. Riccarton High School partnership: Partnering financially with RHS is seen as risky with potential for low benefit.</p> <p>3. Core Focus: The end goal is not property or a building itself</p>
2	<p>1. Long-Term Vision: If we decide that a purchase or even lease of a building is not possible within five years, we need to see the five-year window as a preparation toward future options.</p> <p>2. Strategic Partnerships: Given our current financial constraints and our specific focus on university ministry, we should actively explore opportunities to partner with other churches, ministries, or philanthropic organizations to share resources and expand gospel impact.</p>
1	<p>1. Limited Capacity: Even if a building was purchased it is unlikely to meet the meeting needs of three gatherings.</p>

General notes

In this current time period we need options to prevent venue constraints from stifling growth, so we are in a position to consider better options in the next five year period.

The finances (such as needed for a large building project) rely on members having healthy financial practices at a household level: budgeting, saving, generosity planning.

We could consider both five-year plans AND long-term thinking (e.g. thinking 30 years ahead).

Some discussion was had around pastoral staff housing and this was viewed as a helpful step in the larger goal of demonstrating to lenders our capacity to manage our finances and grow our asset base.