

7. Determination

For the reasons set out above, I make the following determinations:

1. **The evidence establishes substantial deficiencies in Fellowship Prairies leadership process, governance clarity, and public communication.** Those deficiencies materially contributed to the escalation of conflict with Park City Gospel Church, Fairview Baptist Church, and Fellowship Baptist Church Edmonton. The Leadership Board, who has already committed to address these issues needs to complete these intentions.
2. **The three churches raised concerns that were materially justified in part.** Their concerns about processes, policy clarity, communication, and the attempted associate-status route had real grounding in the documentary record.
3. **The evidence does not establish the full scope of the broadest allegations of slander, systemic bad faith, or sweeping abuse of power in the form asserted by the churches.** The stronger conclusion is that the parties became trapped in a cycle of weak process, mixed messaging, escalating accusations, and mutual distrust.
4. **The churches themselves materially contributed to the widening and hardening of the conflict.** While their concerns were in part legitimate, the evidence shows that the three churches did not confine the dispute to established processes but instead escalated it outward through suspension of regional giving, wider communication with other churches, demands for public admissions of wrongdoing, and continued entrenchment in their allegations. The churches have shown little evidence of self-examination, concession, or willingness to moderate their claims.
5. **The arbitration itself proceeded in the face of serious and sustained objections to authority and process.** Those objections were documented and form part of the context and limits of this report.
6. **This dispute has brought Fellowship Prairies to a critical moment.** The present dynamic is untenable and cannot be allowed to continue. It has consumed disproportionate time, energy, and attention from both the Leadership Board and the three churches to the detriment of the mission and ministry of the region. I am not persuaded that the three churches are willing to accept any outcome that requires recognition of meaningful regional authority or participation in shared accountability. The evidence likewise does not demonstrate a meaningful willingness on the churches part to compromise or to engage in a mutually binding process of resolution. In my judgment, there is no realistic path forward other than an Acts 15:39 type of separation, in which these churches and Fellowship Prairies part ways. Given the record before me, it is unlikely that such a step will occur voluntarily, and it will therefore most likely fall to Equip 2026 to determine the future direction of Fellowship Prairies.

8. Directions

I therefore direct as follows:

1. **The allegations of abuse of authority and power and misconduct against the Regional Director and Leadership Board are not upheld on the evidence presently before the arbitrator**
2. **Fellowship Prairies should complete the governance and process reforms it has already acknowledged are necessary.**

This includes the completion and implementation of clear grievance, proposal, nomination, and dispute-resolution policies, together with bylaw clarification regarding the relationship between the Leadership Board, the Regional Director, the Convention, and member churches. The deficiencies identified in this report were significant and materially contributed to the present conflict. It is therefore important that the Board follow through on the reforms it has already indicated it intends to make.

3. **It should be recognized that the three churches' concerns were not without foundation.**

The Leadership Board should publicly acknowledge the aspects of its communication and process management that contributed to the escalation of the dispute. The church's concerns regarding process, policy clarity, communication, and the attempted associate-status route had real grounding in the record and warranted more timely, precise, and transparent responses than they received. Any future reflection on this conflict should acknowledge that the churches were raising issues that, at least in part, required correction.

4. **At the same time, the churches should be admonished for the manner in which they pursued the dispute.**

The evidence shows that they widened and hardened the conflict through suspension of regional giving, expanded communication with other churches, demands for public admissions of wrongdoing, and continued entrenchment in their allegations. These actions deepened the conflict, weakened trust, and hindered the possibility of restoration.

5. **This report should not be read as fully vindicating either side.**

The evidence does not support the broadest allegations advanced by the churches, but neither does it support the view that the conflict arose merely from unreasonable dissatisfaction on their part. The more accurate conclusion is that this dispute was driven by a combination of real governance deficiencies, mixed messaging, escalating accusations, and mutual distrust.

6. **The objections raised concerning the arbitration process itself should be acknowledged as part of the record.**

Because this arbitration proceeded in the face of serious and sustained objections regarding authority and process, this report should be read with appropriate modesty as

to its scope. Those objections do not erase the findings above, but they do form part of the context and limits of this report.

7. Fellowship Prairies should now recognize that this matter has reached a decisive point.

Because the deeper issue is not merely relational and a loss of trust but constitutional and ecclesiological, Fellowship Prairies should determine, through its proper governing structures, whether restored fellowship with these churches is realistically possible under clarified expectations, or whether an orderly separation is the healthier path.

In my judgment, there is no realistic path forward other than a formal separation between Fellowship Prairies and the three churches.

On the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the three churches are willing to accept any outcome that requires recognition of meaningful regional authority, shared accountability, or participation in a mutually binding process of resolution. Nor do I see evidence of a willingness sufficient to support renewed trust or restoration within the existing framework of regional life.

Because a voluntary withdrawal appears unlikely, the matter should be placed before Equip 2026 for determination.

9. Closing Observation

This record does not support a simple conclusion that one side was wholly right and the other wholly wrong.

The Leadership Board had real governance and communication weaknesses. The churches had real grounds for concern. The churches also escalated the dispute in ways that widened and hardened it. By 2025, the conflict had become not only relational and procedural, but constitutional, with the very legitimacy of the dispute-resolution path under dispute. That is why the right conclusion is neither total vindication of the Board nor total vindication of the churches, but a sober recognition that process weakness, adversarial rhetoric, and loss of trust combined to produce institutional breakdown. What has emerged is a dispute that is not only about particular actions or decisions, but about a deeper divide over the nature of Fellowship Prairies itself, as the Leadership Board and the three churches appear to hold materially different assumptions about autonomy, authority, accountability, and what membership in the region is meant to require. For these reasons, I conclude that Fellowship Prairies has reached a critical moment: the present dynamic is not sustainable, and there is no realistic path forward within the current framework.

Dated at Langley British Columbia this 18th of March, 2026.



Brent Chapman
Arbitrator