Category:	**Research and Copyright**
Approved By:	**Board of Governors**
Approval Date:	**May 13, 2015**
Effective Date:	**May 13, 2015**
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	**Provost and Vice President Academic**
Policy Administrator:	**Associate Vice President Research**

Research Involving Human Participants Policy

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to promote and advance a high standard of integrity and ethics in research involving human participants at Lethbridge College and to establish the authority of the Research Ethics Board in this regard.

Scope / Limits

This policy applies to all individuals undertaking research involving human participants under the auspices of Lethbridge College.

Definitions

Human participant(s) means an individual whose data, or responses to interventions, stimuli, or questions by a researcher are relevant to answering a research question; also referred to as "human participant," and in other policies/guidance as "subject" or "research subject."

Research means an undertaking intended to extend knowledge through a disciplined inquiry or systematic investigation.

Policy Statements

1. Research involving human participants at Lethbridge College is, at a minimum, conducted in accordance with the most current version of the Tri-Council Policy Statement for the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans (TCPS).

2. Lethbridge College adopts the following core principles and guiding ethical principles of the TCPS2 as foundational core principles and guiding ethical principles to be applied in the implementation of this policy and its procedures.

    a. Core Principles
        i. Respect for persons recognizes the intrinsic value of human beings and the respect and consideration that they are due. It incorporates the dual moral obligations to respect autonomy and to protect those with developing, impaired, or diminished autonomy.

ii. Concern for welfare requires researchers and research ethics boards to aim to protect the welfare of participants, and, in some circumstances, to promote that welfare in view of any foreseeable risks associated with the research.
iii. Justice refers to the obligation to treat people fairly and equitably. Fairness entails treating all people with equal respect and concern. Equity requires distributing the benefits and burdens of research participation in such a way that no segment of the population is unduly burdened by the harms of research or denied the benefits of the knowledge generated from it.

b. Guiding Ethical Principles:
i. Respect for human dignity
ii. Respect of individual free and informed consent
iii. Respect for vulnerable people and populations
iv. Respect for privacy and confidentiality
v. Respect for procedural justice
vi. Respect for inclusive research
vii. Balancing of harms and benefits
viii. Minimizing unnecessary risks of harm
ix. Maximizing benefits for participants, other individuals or society as a whole or for the advancement of knowledge

3. Lethbridge College authorizes the Research Ethics Board (REB) and its associated committees to govern the ethical conduct of research involving human participants (refer to Appendix A, Part A).

4. All research involving human participants, except in excluded categories (refer to Appendix A, Part C), requires prior approval of the REB before any research or participant recruitment begins.

5. Researchers have the right to request, and the REB has the obligation to provide, reconsideration of a decision. In cases where the REB and the researcher cannot reach an agreement through discussion, the researcher has the right to appeal the decision of the REB as outlined in Appendix A, Part H.

6. Violations of this policy will be dealt with appropriately. Failure by a researcher to observe this policy and related procedures may render the researcher personally liable should harm be caused to human participants as a result of the research.

A: Policy Supports

Research Involving Human Participants Procedures (Appendix A)

B: Legislated References

C: Other References

Tri Council Policy Statement 2

D: Related Policies

Applied Research and Promotion of Innovation
Integrity in Research and Scholarship
Board of Governors Executive Limitations:
EL-11 Ethical Research

Parent Policy:	**Research Involving Human Participants**
Effective Date:	**May 13, 2015**
Revised Date(s):	
Policy Sponsor:	**Provost and Vice President Academic**
Policy Administrator:	**Associate Vice President Research**
Appendix A	

Research Involving Human Participants Procedures

Part A: Research Ethics Board (REB)

The mandate of the Lethbridge College Research Ethics Board (REB) is to approve, reject, propose modifications to, or terminate any proposed or ongoing research involving human participants which is conducted under the aegis of the college, using the TCPS2 as the minimum standard. Depending on the location of the research and other parties involved additional review may be required. Prior approval for research activity or study involving human participants within the context of this policy must be obtained by the researcher from the REB in accordance with its procedures before any research or study is undertaken, before any college facilities or services are used, and before any funds are accepted or accounts opened.

1. The REB will have the following membership appointed by the Provost and Vice-President Academic:

    a) at least five members, including both men and women, the majority of whom have their primary responsibilities in research or teaching;
    b) at least two members with broad expertise in the methods or in the areas of research covered by the REB;
    c) at least one member who is knowledgeable in ethics;
    d) at least one member of the community who has no other affiliation with the college;
    e) if the REB is reviewing biomedical research, there must be a member knowledgeable in the relevant law;
    f) ad hoc members may be appointed by the Provost and Vice President Academic in consultation with the REB and the Chair for special purpose reviews; and
    g) as needed substitute members may be appointed by the Provost and Vice President Academic in consultation with the Chair to serve for standing members when they cannot attend. Substitute membership must not alter the membership structure and members must be competent to make judgments regarding the acceptability of proposals and knowledgeable of the Tri-Council Policy Statement.

2. The Provost and Vice President Academic will appoint one faculty member as Chairperson. Normally, the Chairperson will have a minimum of one year of experience on the REB and will be appointed for a one year term.

3. The normal term for REB members is two years. Membership terms will be staggered to ensure continuity.

4. Members may not serve more than eight consecutive years but are eligible for reappointment after a one year interval.

5. The Provost and Vice President Academic in consultation with the Chair of the REB may remove a member who frequently misses meetings without explanation.

6. Faculty representation on the REB will normally be from a variety of departments and programs within the college. Where possible, members will be recruited who have expertise in the following areas: ethics, law, and research methodology.

7. The Associate Vice President Research will act as a resource to the REB.

8. REB meetings and attendance:
   a) The REB shall schedule, if possible, regular monthly meetings to ensure a timely flow of reviews such that research is not unduly impeded.
   b) For consideration of applications requiring full review a quorum is at least one-half of the REB membership including the Chairperson and quorum is satisfied only if members attending the meeting possess the range of background and expertise stipulated above (see Part B – 1). A quorum is also required for any decisions related to policies and procedures.
   c) Minutes of all REB meetings, including all decisions, dissents, and the reasons for them shall be prepared and maintained by the REB Coordinator. Minutes of all REB meetings are accessible to authorized representatives of the institution, researchers and funding agencies.

9. If the REB is reviewing research in which a member of the REB has a personal interest in the research under review (e.g., as a researcher or as an entrepreneur), conflict of interest principles require that the member not be present when the REB is discussing or making its decision. The REB member may disclose and explain the conflict of interest and offer evidence to the REB, provided the conflict is fully explained to the REB, and the proposer of the research has the right to hear the evidence and to offer a rebuttal.

10. An annual activity report from the REB will be submitted to the Provost and Vice President Academic of Lethbridge College.

Part B: Approval

1. Researchers must obtain approval from the REB before any research activity, including participant recruitment commences. Failure to obtain approval may be considered non-compliance. All issues of non-compliance will be dealt with as outlined in the Non-Compliance Procedures outlined below in Part G.

2. When approval for research involving human participants is required from an external researcher who has already obtained REB approval from an institution other than Lethbridge College, the REB may accept the review of the external REB of one of the other institutions if in compliance with the requirements of the TCPS 2.

Part C: Research Requiring Ethics Review

1. The REB adheres to the principle of proportionate review: the degree of scrutiny of an application for ethics approval is apportioned according to the risk to the study participants. This proportionate approach is based on the general principle that the more invasive the research, the greater should be the requirements for assessing, explaining, defending, and cataloguing the potential consequences for all involved in the research. Regardless of the degree of scrutiny, the ethical requirements for approval are identical.

2. Proposed modifications to research approved by the REB, such as changes in design, procedures, instruments, sampling and so forth, that substantively alter the research shall be approved by the REB prior to the implementation of such modifications.

3. In those situations where researchers believe they are conducting research in an excluded category, they must consult with the REB Coordinator to confirm that this is the case. Examples of excluded categories (per Tri-Council Policy) are:

    a) Research that relies exclusively on publicly available information does not require REB review when:

        i. the information is legally accessible to the public and appropriately protected by law; or
        ii. the information is publicly accessible and there is no reasonable expectation of privacy.

    b) REB review is not required for research involving the observation of people in public places where:

        i. it does not involve any intervention staged by the researcher, or direct interaction with the individuals or groups;
        ii. individuals or groups targeted for observation have no reasonable expectation of privacy; and
        iii. any dissemination of research results does not allow identification of specific individuals.

    c) REB review is not required for research that relies exclusively on secondary use of anonymous information, or anonymous human biological materials, so long as the process of data linkage or recording or dissemination of results does not generate identifiable information.

    d) The opinion of the REB shall be sought whenever there is doubt about the applicability of this Policy to a particular research project.

4. The following distinguishes research requiring REB review from non-research activities that have traditionally employed methods and techniques similar to those employed in research. Such activities are not considered "research" as defined in the TCPS, and do not require REB review. Activities outside the scope of research subject to REB review (see 3 above), as defined in the TCPS, may still raise ethical issues that would benefit from careful

consideration by an individual or a body capable of providing some independent guidance, other than an REB.

a) Quality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities, and performance reviews, or testing within normal educational requirements when used exclusively for assessment, management or improvement purposes, do not constitute research for the purposes of this Policy, and do not fall within the scope of REB review.
b) Creative practice activities, in and of themselves, do not require REB review. However, research that employs creative practice to obtain responses from participants that will be analyzed to answer a research question is subject to REB review.

Scholarly Review

1. The REB shall satisfy itself that the design of a research project that poses more than minimal risk is capable of addressing the questions being asked in the research.

2. The extent of the review for scholarly standards that is required for biomedical research that does not involve more than minimal risk will vary according to the research being carried out.

3. Research in the humanities and the social sciences that poses, at most, minimal risk shall not normally be required by the REB to be peer reviewed.

4. Certain types of research, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities, may legitimately have a negative effect on public figures in politics, business, labour, the arts or other walks of life, or on organizations. Such research should not be blocked through the use of harms-benefits analysis or because of the potentially negative nature of the findings. The safeguard for those in the public arena is through public debate and discourse and, in the extreme, through action in the courts for libel.

5. To ensure sufficient scholarly review has been undertaken the REB may:

   a) conclude, with proper supporting documentation, that the proposed research has already passed appropriate peer review, for example by a funding agency;
   b) establish an ad hoc independent external peer review; and
   c) establish a permanent peer review committee reporting directly to the REB.

Part D: Ethical Standards

Researchers' respect for human dignity is conveyed, in part, by adhering to the following ethical standards aimed at protecting human research participants.

Free and Informed Consent

1. Research shall begin only if prospective subjects, or authorized third parties, have been given the opportunity to give free and informed consent about participation and their free and informed consent has been given and is maintained throughout their participation in the research.

2. Evidence of informed consent by the participant or authorized third-party should ordinarily be obtained in writing, a copy of which is retained by the participant.

3. Where written consent is culturally unacceptable, or where a substantial rationale is provided for not recording consent in writing, the procedures used to seek informed consent shall be documented.

4. At the commencement of the informed consent process, researchers or their qualified representatives shall provide prospective participants with the following:

    a) information that the individual is being invited to participate in a research project;
    b) a comprehensible statement of the research purpose, the identity of the researcher, the expected duration and nature of participation, and a description of research procedures;
    c) a comprehensible description of reasonably foreseeable harms and benefits that may arise from research participation, as well as the likely consequences of non-action, particularly in research related to treatment, or where invasive methodologies are involved, or where there is a potential for physical or psychological harm;
    d) an assurance that prospective participants are free not to participate, have the right to withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements, and will be given continuing and meaningful opportunities for deciding whether or not to continue to participate; and
    e) information on the possibility of commercialization of research findings, and the presence of any apparent or actual or potential conflict of interest on the part of researchers, their institutions or sponsors.

5. The REB may approve a consent procedure which does not include, or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent, provided that the REB finds and documents that:

    a) the research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants (defined herein as research involving a probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation to be no greater than those encountered by the participant in those aspects of his or her everyday life that relate to the research);
    b) the waiver or alteration is unlikely to adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants;
    c) the research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration;
    d) whenever possible and appropriate, the participants shall be provided with additional pertinent information after participation;
    e) the waivered or altered consent does not involve a therapeutic intervention.

6. Free and informed consent must be voluntarily given, without manipulation, undue influence or coercion.

7. REB review is normally required for research involving naturalistic observation. However, research involving observation of participants in political rallies, demonstrations or public meetings should not require REB review since it can be expected that the participants are seeking public visibility.

8. Subject to applicable legal requirements, for research involving incompetent individuals, the REB shall ensure that:

    a) the research question(s) can only be addressed using individuals within the identified group(s);
    b) the research does not expose participants to more than minimal risk (as defined in Article 7.1.5.1.) without the potential for direct benefits to them; and
    c) free and informed consent of an appropriately authorized third-party is obtained and continues as long as the participant remains incompetent.

9. When a participant who has entered into a research project through third-party authorization becomes competent during the project, his/her informed consent is sought as a condition of continuing participation.

10. When a participant who has voluntarily entered into a research project but becomes incompetent during the project, the free and informed consent of an appropriately authorized third party is obtained and continues as long as the participant remains incompetent.

11. The authorized third party is not the researcher or any member of the research team the researcher demonstrates how free and informed consent is obtained from the authorized third-party, and how subjects' best interests are protected.

12. Where free and informed consent is obtained from an authorized third-party, and in those circumstances where the legally incompetent individual understands the nature and consequences of the research, the researcher seeks to ascertain the wishes of the individual concerning participation. The potential participant's dissent will preclude his/her participation.

13. Subject to all applicable legislative and regulatory requirements, research involving emergency health situations shall be conducted only if it addresses the emergency needs of individuals involved, and then only in accordance with criteria established in advance of such research by the REB. The REB may allow research that involves health emergencies to be carried out without the free and informed consent of the subject or of his or her authorized third-party if ALL of the following apply:

    a) a serious threat to the prospective subject requires immediate intervention;
    b) either no standard efficacious care exists or the research offers a real possibility of direct benefit to the subject in comparison with standard care;
    c) either the risk of harm is not greater than that involved in standard efficacious care, or it is clearly justified by the direct benefits to the subject;
    d) the prospective subject is unconscious or lacks capacity to understand risks, methods and purposes of the research;
    e) third-party authorization cannot be secured in sufficient time, despite diligent and documented efforts to do so; and
    f) no relevant prior directive by the subject is known to exist.

14. When a previously incapacitated subject regains capacity, or when an authorized third-party is found, free and informed consent shall be sought promptly for continuation in the project and for subsequent examinations or tests related to the study.

Privacy and Confidentiality

1. Dignity and autonomy of human subjects is the ethical basis of respect for the privacy of research subjects. Privacy is a fundamental value, perceived by many as essential for the protection and promotion of human dignity. Hence, the access, control and dissemination of personal information are essential to ethical research.

2. Subject to the exceptions detailed in section 3 below, researchers who intend to collect personal information from human participants shall secure REB approval for the procedures used and shall ensure the informed consent of the participants. Approval for such research shall include (but is not limited to) such considerations as:

    a) type of data collected;
    b) purpose for which the data are used;
    c) limits on the use, disclosure, and retention of the data;
    d) appropriate safeguards for security and confidentiality;
    e) modes of observation or access to information in the research that allow identification of particular participants;
    f) anticipated secondary uses of identifiable data from the research;
    g) anticipated linkage of data gathered in the research with other data about participants, whether those data are contained in public or personal records;
    h) provisions for confidentiality of data resulting from the research.

3. For research proposing to use secondary data (i.e., data contained in records collected for a purpose other than the research itself), REB approval shall be sought if identifying information is involved (defined herein as information which has the probability of revealing the identity of an individual). In those instances where such research involves no more than minimal risk (as defined in Part F) researchers may gain access to identifying information if they have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the REB that:

    a) identifying information is essential to the research;
    b) they will take appropriate measures to protect the privacy of the individuals, to ensure the confidentiality of the data, and to minimize harm to participants; and
    c) individuals to whom the data refer have not objected to secondary use.

4. For research proposing to use secondary data that involves identifying information and more than minimal risk (as defined in Part F), the REB shall also require that the use of such data be dependent upon:

    a) the informed consent of those who contributed data or of authorized third parties;
    b) an appropriate strategy for informing participants;
    c) consultation with representatives of those who contributed data; and
    d) researchers who wish to contact individuals to whom data refer shall seek the authorization of the REB prior to contact.

5. Researchers who wish to utilize information that falls under Alberta's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP Act) (see especially Section 42 "Disclosure for research or statistical purposes") shall provide documentation to the REB of approval to access such information by the college's Records Management Coordinator. REB approval does not constitute FOIP approval.

Inclusive Research

1. Researchers shall not exclude prospective or actual research participants on the basis of such attributes as culture, religion, race, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, sex or age, unless there is a valid reason for doing so.

Part E: Principles for Review of New and Ongoing Research

1. Research that is deemed to be of minimal risk to participants may be given a delegated review. Delegated review consists of a review by two REB members, one of whom is the Chair (the REB will provide Guidelines for Delegated Review - See Criteria for Delegated Review below). All decisions regarding Delegated Reviews will be reported to the full REB at the first scheduled meeting after the decision was made. Regardless of review method utilized, the REB is responsible for all research involving human subjects within the jurisdiction of the institution.

2. Faculty members responsible for student research class activities should seek review and approval of the general proposed research class activity. The application should include a complete description of the proposed activity/project and a discussion of strategies that will be implemented by the faculty member to ensure student research is conducted in a manner consistent with the college's ethical policies and Tri-Council Policy (e.g. students required to incorporate ethical guidelines into their proposals). It is expected that such activities will normally be suitable for delegated review (Part E section 1). The REB shall develop procedures to ensure an appropriate level of review and reporting of student research class activities. Independent study student research requires review by the REB.

3. The REB must be satisfied that a project posing more than minimal risk has undergone appropriate scholarly review.

4. Reviews of studies that pose more than minimal risk must be conducted in a face-to-face meeting of the REB.

5. Normally REB decisions are made by consensus. If decisions are made by majority vote, the views of the minority will be communicated to the researcher.

6. Research proposals that require multicentred research, when several REBs consider the same proposal from the perspectives of their respective institutions, the college REB is responsible for determining the ethical acceptability of research undertaken within its institution. When submitting a proposal for multicentred research, the researcher may wish to:

a) distinguish between core elements of the research—which cannot be altered without invalidating the pooling of data from the participating institutions—and those elements that can be altered to comply with local requirements without invalidating the research project.
b) indicate on the application what other institutions will be conducting an ethical review of the proposal and, upon request of the researcher, the REB will facilitate a coordinated review of multicentred projects and communicate any concerns that they may have with other REBs reviewing the same project.

8. Research to be performed outside the jurisdiction or country of the institution which employs the researcher shall undergo prospective ethics review both (a) by the REB within the researcher's institution; and (b) by the REB, where such exists, with the legal responsibility and equivalent and procedural safeguards in the country or jurisdiction where the research is to be done.

9. Ongoing research is subject to continuing ethics review that is based on a proportionate approach to risk assessment.

    a) As part of each research proposal submitted for REB review, the researcher shall propose to the REB the continuing review process deemed appropriate for that project.
    b) Normally, continuing review should consist of at least the submission of a succinct annual status report to the REB. The REB will decide on the specific process for ongoing review after consultation with the researcher and the funding agency. This may include more detailed and/or frequent reporting or other additional requirements.
    c) Projects that are classified as minimal risk will require annual status reports and a formal request for continuing approval. A project can only be approved through this mechanism for a maximum period of three years, after which a new ethics application must be submitted.
    d) In all cases, the researcher will promptly notify the REB of any modifications, safety/ethical problems, or the termination of a project. Researchers are obliged to promptly report, in writing, any known serious adverse event to the REB.

10. In addition to the above procedures, the REB requires applicants to consult the Tri-Council Policy for special requirements that may pertain to particular types of research (e.g. secondary use of data, human genome investigations, clinical trials) or particular groups of participants (competency issues, ethnicity, age, etc.) and to ensure that the safety, welfare and rights of participants are protected.

11. Prior to REB approval, some research projects may also require a formal risk assessment in coordination with the college's office of Institutional Planning, Analysis and Risk Services.

Part F: Criteria for Delegated Review

1. Research proposals that are of minimal risk including research conducted as a part of course work may not require a full review by the REB. The REB will observe the Tri-Council Policy statement on minimal risk, "if potential participants can reasonably be expected to regard the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research to be no greater than those encountered by the subject in those aspects of his/her everyday

life that relate to the research, then the research can be regarded as minimal risk." (TCPS2 Chapter 2, Section B). Applicants have the right to make a formal appeal regarding the results of the delegated review, using the stipulated procedure.

Part G: Non-compliance Procedures

Non-compliance shall include failure to obtain Research Ethics Board (REB) approval for research involving humans, failure to comply with any conditions of an approval issued by the REB, as well as failure to obtain REB approval for substantive changes to approved research project.

1. Reports of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance will be forwarded to the REB Coordinator.

2. The REB Coordinator will work with the REB Chair to investigate all reports of non-compliance to determine their credibility. The REB may request that research is suspended during an investigation.

3. The REB Coordinator will inform the Provost and Vice President Academic, the appropriate dean/director, and the Associate Vice President Research that the REB has initiated an investigation and indicate if they are requesting that senior administration suspend research during the investigation.

4. The REB will determine whether there is non-compliance and the severity of non-compliance.

5. The Associate Vice President Research and the supervisor (at the Dean or higher level) of the investigator(s) shall be informed of:

    a. requests to suspend research;
    b. specific actions/modifications requested; and
    c. if the REB finds an investigator in non-compliance.

6. In cases of non-compliance the REB shall contact the investigator(s) involved and request specific action be taken to bring the research into compliance. Findings will also be reported to the appropriate Dean/Director, Provost and Vice President Academic, and Associate Vice President Research.

7. When the REB has requested that research be modified and/or suspended, or in the case of non-compliance, halted, the Associate Vice President Research will take reasonable steps to monitor compliance with the REB's recommendations and stop the research if necessary.

8. The REB Chair and/or REB Coordinator may act on behalf of the REB pending a meeting of the Board.

Part H: Appeal Process

1. Lethbridge College has an agreement with Red Deer College that enables Red Deer College to address appeals from decisions of the Lethbridge College REB. In the event that a researcher is dissatisfied with the decision of the REB, and satisfactory agreement cannot be reached, the researcher may appeal the decision under the following mechanism agreed with Red Deer College that is consistent with the Tri-Council Policy.

2. Appeals may only be heard on the basis of a procedural error that materially and adversely influenced the decision of the Lethbridge College REB. Procedural error includes real or reasonably apprehended bias, including bias based on validity, method, theory of the method, theoretical grounds of the work or scope, or undeclared conflict-of-interest on the part of one or more members of that REB.

3. The appellant will provide the Centre for Applied Research & Innovation (CARI) with a written description of the alleged procedural error that is the basis of the appeal (the "Submission"). The appellant must also sign a waiver in favour of each of Lethbridge College and Red Deer College, in the prescribed form, to protect the institutions from any liability or legal claim related to the review.

4. As soon as is practicable, the CARI will send the appellant's submission to the Chair of the Lethbridge College REB.

5. Within 30 working days of receipt of the appellant's submission, the Chair of the Lethbridge College REB will file with the CARI a written response to the allegation. As soon as is practicable, the CARI will send a copy of the Chair's response to the appellant. The appellant will have the opportunity to provide a written reply to that response within 30 working days of receipt of the response.

6. Once the file, comprising the original application for ethics approval and the documents referenced above, is complete, the CARI will forward the file to the Associate Vice President, Strategic Planning and Research, Red Deer College with a cover letter requesting an Appeal Board review.

7. The procedures to be followed by the Red Deer College REB will be those of the Red Deer College and may be modified, as required, by the Red Deer College Chairperson, Research Ethics Board. The appellant and the Chair of the Lethbridge College REB have the right to meet with the Red Deer College REB regarding the appeal. In reviewing the appeal, the Red Deer College REB will determine if there has been a procedural error that materially and adversely influenced the decision of the Lethbridge College REB, normally within 30 working days of receipt of the file, and will transmit its decision and reasons to the parties.

8. If the Red Deer College REB determines that there has been such a procedural error, it will direct the Lethbridge College REB to reconsider the application, employing any changes in procedure outlined by the Red Deer REB within its decision and reasons.

9. Normally, within 10 working days of the decision of the Red Deer College REB, the written results of the appeal and reasons will be forwarded to the appellant and the Chair of the

Lethbridge REB. The results will be binding on the appellant and Lethbridge College and any reconsideration of the application will be binding and not subject to further appeal.

10. Should any costs be associated with the appeal (e.g. travel of the appellant, lawyers' fees, etc.), the appellant and Lethbridge College will each bear their own costs.