



Susan Cochran
Telephone: (510) 987-0887
Email: susan.cochran@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate
Faculty Representative to the Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

January 31, 2023

**DOUGLAS HAYNES, VICE PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL & PROGRAMS**

**Re: Academic Senate Review of University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs –
with Interim Amendments**

Dear Vice Provost Haynes:

As requested, I distributed for systemwide Senate review a draft of the University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs – with Interim Amendments. The Senate distributed the original draft policy to Senate divisions and committees for review in September 2022 with a comment deadline of December 2022. We paused the review in November after learning that UCOP had updated the policy with interim amendments and circulated the revised policy for expedited review on December 14. All ten Academic Senate divisions and three systemwide committees (BOARS, UCFW, and UCAADE) submitted comments. These were discussed at Academic Council's January 25 meeting and are attached for your reference. The following summary captures several themes from the Senate review, but we encourage you to review the letters for additional details as you finalize the policy.

We understand the policy consolidates existing systemwide vaccination requirements into a single policy with specific program attachments for the COVID-19 Vaccination Program and the Seasonal Influenza Vaccination Program. The policy maintains the existing mandate for all faculty, staff, students, and trainees to receive the COVID-19 primary vaccination series, subject to limited religious, medical, and disability exceptions. Covered individuals must also receive the most recent CDC-recommended booster at least once per year, or affirmatively decline the booster by completing a vaccine declination statement. The seasonal influenza vaccine is an opt-out program that individuals are required to receive but may decline after receiving education.

In general, the Senate supports the policy as an important public health tool that facilitates the health and safety of the University community by aligning UC vaccine requirements and recommendations with science-based federal and state guidelines. The faculty strongly support maintaining a mandate for the COVID vaccine primary series. We know that widespread vaccination against contagious disease is sound public health policy and that the adoption of

COVID vaccines has saved lives, relieved pressure on the public health infrastructure, and allowed UC campuses to resume standard operations. The policy strikes the right balance with the mandate by including appropriate flexibility for individuals who need exceptions or wish to pursue alternatives for opting out. The allowable exceptions focus on populations with the most legitimate concerns about vaccinations and restricts loopholes that could undermine the mandate's public health purpose.

There was more mixed support for the policy's approach to booster mandates. Some faculty appreciate the relaxation of processes around continuous booster compliance in the interim amendments, particularly given the status of the virus. Other faculty seek a more rigorous mandate for annual boosters than provided in the policy. They are concerned about the low uptake of the latest COVID-19 booster and want the University to extend the primary series mandate to boosters. The UCLA division and UCFW oppose the interim amendments based on these concerns and the absence of data about the effects of removing the booster mandate on UC community safety.

Senate reviewers recommend moving the compliance deadline for the Influenza Vaccination Program to November 1 to better protect the public, given that flu season is well underway by December 1.

The Council believes the University should continue to make evidence-based policy decisions and commit to an ongoing review of UC public health mandates and mechanisms based on evolving scientific consensus of best practices for community health threats and emergencies. The vaccination policy should include enough flexibility to allow the University to respond to current public health conditions and to experts' advice and directives about the need for either more or less restrictive requirements.

The letters also include numerous suggestions for improving the policy to better convey information, purpose, and implementation. These include calls for a more educational and positive document, more explicit definitions to avoid future problems with differences in interpretation, and a quick reference guide table summarizing relevant deadlines and timelines for various compliance and exception processes to help covered individuals navigate these processes.

Reviewers emphasized that the University should ensure consistent enforcement of the policy across campuses and staff, faculty, and student groups. They observed that the policy encourages general campus locations, but not healthcare locations, to evaluate COVID-19 vaccination participation. All UC locations, including healthcare locations, should be encouraged to conduct program evaluations and provide annual compliance reporting. The policy should also clarify the extent to which it applies to outside contractors, volunteers, guests, and short-term visitors, and specify the section of the Faculty Code of Conduct that would apply to faculty who are out of compliance.

Reviewers also expressed concern that the removal of the guarantee of access to free COVID-19 vaccinations could hurt underrepresented communities, emphasized that the policy should apply only to vaccines that are broadly available and not restricted to marginalized social groups, and

encouraged UC to provide employees with the opportunity to take paid leave to recover from side effects associated with required vaccinations or boosters.

Finally, there were numerous comments that the short review timeline did not permit fuller evaluation of the proposed interim amendments. When we paused the review in November, some campus committees had already met to discuss and draft analyses of the policy. The subsequent reissuance of the policy created confusion and inconvenienced faculty who had invested time in the initial review and were asked to conduct an additional accelerated review during a period that included the winter break.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Susan Cochran', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Susan Cochran, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
Campus Senate Executive Directors
Executive Director Lin

Encl.



320 STEPHENS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

January 17, 2022

SUSAN COCHRAN
Chair, Academic Council

Subject: Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs, with updated interim amendments

Dear Chair Cochran:

I forward Berkeley's comments on the systemwide review of the *Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs*, with updated interim amendments. Our comments were developed by the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (FWEL), which I endorse on behalf of the Council of the Berkeley Division (DIVCO).

The consensus was that the Policy strikes the right balance, although the tone could perhaps be more positive. FWEL raised questions about who will pay for the vaccination(s) and whether supply chain delays or shortage of medical professionals have been considered in drafting this Policy. The Committee also suggested UCOP endeavor to develop a strategy for communicating about the effectiveness of the influenza and the Covid-19 vaccines, although it was agreed that this policy was not the appropriate place for such a statement.

Please see the enclosures for more information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Mary Ann Smart'.

Mary Ann Smart
Professor of Music
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Enclosures

cc: Maximilian Auffhammer, Vice Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
Jocelyn Surla Banaria, Executive Director, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
Thomas Leonard, Co-Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Nancy Wallace, Co-Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Patrick Allen, Senate Analyst, Committee on Faculty Welfare



320 STEPHENS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

January 5, 2023

CHAIR MARY ANN SMART
Academic Senate

*Re: Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy –
Policy on Vaccination Programs (revised from the September 2022 version)*

Dear Chair Smart,

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (FWEL) reviewed the revised “Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs.” FWEL had submitted comments regarding concerns with the original draft back on November 8, 2022. Overall, the Committee stands by the comments and have no further concerns to comment on at this time.

We appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Thomas C. Leonard'.

Thomas Leonard, Co-Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Nancy S. Wallace'.

Nancy Wallace, Co-Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

TL/NW/pgs



320 STEPHENS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

November 8, 2022

CHAIR MARY ANN SMART
Academic Senate

Re: Draft of the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Chair Smart,

On October 24, 2022, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (FWEL) reviewed and discussed “The Policy on Vaccination Programs—with Interim Amendments.” Two of our members had the benefit of hearing the thoughts on this public document from a UCBEA Working Group on Retiree Health that met a few days before our Oct. 24 meeting.

We believe that the Policy strikes the right balance, neither too stringent nor too relaxed, in the present circumstances. But we would likely support moves in either direction as federal or California health agencies advise at a later date.

The tone of the Policy should be made more positive, first thanking the UC community for protecting the health and well-being of all its members and also acknowledging our productive work in the very challenging environment of the pandemic.

FWEL seeks more clarity in the Policy about who will be paying for the vaccination(s). We wonder if delays in the supply chains, or a shortage of medical personnel to give the shots, has been properly factored into the Policy.

FWEL wishes the Policy could better inform everyone in our community about the effectiveness of both the influenza and the Covid-19 vaccines now available. But there is a consensus on our committee that the policy statement itself, including the FAQs, is not the place to handle this task. As a practical matter, information of this type would require constant updating and would have to allow for shifting expert opinion. This very important part of a complete Policy on Vaccination Programs is best achieved on each campus, we believe.

A model for doing this at Berkeley has been the Response and Recovery Newsletter that was active from August 2021 to August 2022, supplemented by the current site:

<https://coronavirus.berkeley.edu>

To our knowledge, the effectiveness of these channels of communication has not been reviewed by committees of the Academic Senate. Perhaps this would be useful now.

We appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on these matters.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Thomas C. Leonard in black ink.

Thomas Leonard, Co-Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Handwritten signature of Nancy S. Wallace in black ink.

Nancy Wallace, Co-Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

TL/NW/pga



DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502
(530) 752-2220
academicsenate.ucdavis.edu

January 18, 2023

Susan Cochran
Chair, Academic Council

RE: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Susan,

The proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs was forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Five committees responded: Faculty Welfare (FW) and the Faculty Executive Committees of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), the College of Letters and Science (L&S), the School of Medicine (SOM), and the School of Nursing (SON).

Committees support the policy. SON notes, however, that half of its faculty recommend COVID-19 boosters be treated in the same way that the university treats the primary vaccination series for COVID-19.

To improve transparency, FW recommends that the policy “cite the overarching reason for the creation and implementation of this policy as well as citations to articles supporting this choice. There are many other vaccines that are not required by the University, so it would be helpful to provide more information on why these vaccines are being required.”

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ahmet Palazoglu".

Ahmet Palazoglu
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Distinguished Professor of Chemical Engineering
University of California, Davis

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

January 12, 2023

Ahmet Palazoglu

Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Request for Consultation – Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Ahmet:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare has reviewed the RFC – Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs and has some suggestions to help increase the transparency of the policy. The committee feels that it would be helpful for the policy to cite the overarching reason for the creation and implementation of this policy as well as citations to articles supporting this choice. There are many other vaccines that are not required by the University, so it would be helpful to provide more information on why these vaccines are being required. The committee also expressed concern with the December 1 deadline for flu vaccinations, as flu season starts before then.

Sincerely,



Janet Foley

Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

c: Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

FEC: College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Committee Response

January 13, 2023

The Faculty Executive Committee of College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences reviewed the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs. The committee appreciates the opportunity to comment on the program and supports the policy.

Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

FEC: College of Letters and Science Committee Response

January 13, 2023

The committee approves and has no further questions.

Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

FEC: School of Medicine Committee Response

January 13, 2023

The FEC approves this Proposal for Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs.

Has the public Health or someone looked at this policy?

Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

FEC: School of Nursing Committee Response

January 13, 2023

The SON FEC reviewed the revised policy and has two different opinions among the faculty members. The half of the members support the revisions made on the draft policy while the other half recommend the COVID-19 vaccination boosters be treated in the same way the University treats the Primary Series of the COVID-19 vaccination.

January 17, 2023

Susan Cochran, Chair
Academic Council


Re: Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Chair Cochran,

The Irvine Division discussed the presidential policy on vaccination programs at its Cabinet meeting on January 17, 2023. The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW), Council on Equity and Inclusion (CEI), Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE), and Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT) also reviewed the policy. The committees' feedback is attached for your review.

The Irvine Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Georg Striedter, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

Enclosures: CFW, CEI, CTLSE, CPT memos

Cc: Arvind Rajaraman, Chair Elect-Secretary
Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
Gina Anzivino, Associate Director



January 10, 2023

**GEORG STRIEDTER, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION**

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs


The Council on Equity and Inclusion discussed the updated presidential policy on vaccination programs at its meeting on January 9.

Overall, members did not have significant concerns about the updated policy. However, one member expressed strong support for requiring vaccinations in the interest of public health and shared their concern about the low uptake of the latest booster and general lack of masking indoors. By allowing covered individuals to opt out of COVID-19 boosters, the updated policy will not do anything to incentivize or encourage members of the UC community to take the booster. Another member noted the significant administrative burden involved with tracking employee compliance, noting that with multiple opportunities for deferrals, exemptions, or exceptions to the policy, it is almost impossible to ensure compliance.

Members appreciated that the policy builds in flexibility and responsiveness to current public health conditions and expert directives when more restrictive or protective requirements are needed. They also appreciated the “facts” section on the new vaccine declination statement, ensuring individuals who decline the booster are aware of the possible implications to others in the UC community.

The Council on Equity and Inclusion appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Jane Stoever, Chair
Council on Equity and Inclusion

Cc: Arvind Rajaraman, Chair Elect-Secretary
Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
Gina Anzivino, Associate Director and CEI Analyst
Stephanie Makhoul, Senate Analyst



January 11, 2023

**GEORG STRIEDTER, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION**

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

On August 30, 2022, the Policy on Vaccination Programs – With Interim Amendments was issued, with an effective date of September 1, 2022. On September 16, 2022, the University of California Office of the President distributed a draft policy for Systemwide Review with a comment deadline of December 15, 2022. Based on feedback received from the Systemwide Review thus far and discussions with leadership, updated interim amendments were made to the policy to include an option for members of the University community to opt out of COVID-19 boosters as well as technical edits. On December 12, 2022, the Policy on Vaccination Programs – With Updated Interim Amendments was issued.

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW) discussed the original draft policy on November 7, 2022, and then the interim amendments on January 10, 2023.

A member expressed some minor concern that “Laboratory Directors” in Section IV.C. are not defined. Otherwise, the Council has no objections to the current policy with interim amendments at this time.

Sincerely,



Lisa Naugle, Chair
Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom

C: Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
Academic Senate

Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
Academic Senate

Stephanie Makhlof, Cabinet Analyst
Academic Senate



January 12, 2023


**GEORG STRIEDTER, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION**

RE: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT) reviewed the revised Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs. Due to the abbreviated timeline for review, the Committee was unable to discuss the policy as a group so members provided written feedback instead.

The Committee submitted the following comments and questions for consideration:


- The policy should define “primary series” for COVID-19 vaccination in more detail (page 4, section II. Definitions). The different entities cited in the current definition may not use the same criteria and there are age-specific recommendations. The CDC gives guidance on the optimal primary series but it is not clear from the policy how much deviation from these optimal schedules would be allowed.
- When the policy references several sources, members questioned what happens if the sources are not in agreement (e.g., page 7, section III.A.4: “Additional education may be required consistent with applicable federal, state, or local mandates or accreditation standards.”). Which source -- federal, state, or local mandates or accreditation standards -- is prioritized and who decides?
- According to page 8, section III.D.2.a, for vaccinations administered by the University, appropriate information will be submitted to the California Immunization Registry (CAIR) or “other such registries as may be required by applicable public health agencies or University policy.” Members reported that initial doses of the vaccine administered by the University are not recorded on the CDC Vaccination Card and that CAIR is not accepted universally as proof of vaccination. There needs to be a mechanism in place to ensure vaccinations administered by the University are recorded on the CDC Vaccination Card.
- Members suggested that the University replace the word “shall” with “should” in sections of the policy that appear to be obligations rather than suggestions (e.g., page 9, section IV.B.2: “Each location *should* implement reasonable strategies for vaccine access, including efforts to ensure vaccination ability during all work shifts and to address vaccine hesitancy, particularly among groups at most significant risk for contracting vaccine-preventable disease and suffering severe illness.”).
- A member cited possible confusion over the reference to Laboratory Directors (page 9, section IV.C) and whether it refers to lab directors on the campuses or directors of University-affiliated National Laboratories. Others understood it to be the latter. It may be helpful to be explicit to avoid any confusion.
- A member noted that the reason given for why a COVID-19 infection does not exempt an individual from the primary vaccination series (pages 19-20, section VIII.8 of the



FAQ) makes no sense when it is clear that a recent COVID-19 infection provides better protection than a primary vaccination series taken at the beginning of the pandemic; other members agreed that a primary vaccination series taken at the beginning of the pandemic confers little protection today. Some members recommended that, given the current status of the virus, the University should consider making the COVID-19 vaccination program an opt out program for all non-healthcare workers.

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Bogi Andersen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Bogi Andersen, Chair
Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Cc: Arvind Rajaraman, Chair Elect
Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
Julie Kennedy, CPT Analyst
Stephanie Makhoul, Senate Analyst

January 11, 2023

**GEORGE STRIEDTER, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION**

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

On August 30, 2022, the Policy on Vaccination Programs – With Interim Amendments was issued, with an effective date of September 1, 2022. On September 16, 2022, the University of California Office of the President distributed a draft policy for Systemwide Review with a comment deadline of December 15, 2022. Based on feedback received from the Systemwide Review thus far and discussions with leadership, updated interim amendments were made to the policy to include an option for members of the University community to opt out of COVID-19 boosters as well as technical edits. On December 12, 2022, the Policy on Vaccination Programs – With Updated Interim Amendments was issued.

The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) discussed the original draft policy on November 7, 2022, and then the interim amendments on January 9, 2023.

The Council has no objections to the current policy with interim amendments at this time.

Sincerely,

Mary McThomas

Mary McThomas, Chair
Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience

C: Jisoo Kim, Executive Director
Academic Senate

Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
Academic Senate

Stephanie Makhoul, Cabinet Analyst
Academic Senate



January 18, 2023

Susan Cochran
Chair, UC Systemwide Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Chair Cochran,

At the January 12, 2023, meeting of the Executive Board, members reviewed the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs, and divisional committee and council responses. Members appreciated the opportunity to review the policy and offered the following comments.

The Executive Board recognizes this is a complicated issue. For such a proposed change, members requested a stronger empirical justification and sound data to show that removing the COVID-19 booster mandate will not negatively affect the safety of our university population. They requested citations to support this important claim: "At this point, however, a large proportion of the population has experienced COVID-19 since January 2022, and the University has concluded that the combination of Primary Series, earlier boosters, and naturally occurring immunity provides a large majority of the University community with adequate protection to reduce the public health risk faced during earlier stages of the pandemic." Thus, members could not support the proposal at this time. Specifically, they asked for further consideration and evidence that this proposed opt-out change in policy would not place greater risks on campus members who may be more vulnerable due to age, disability status, or medical issues.

Sincerely,



Jessica Cattelino
Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Marco Giovannini, Chair
Committee on International Education

Date: October 27, 2022

Re: **Systemwide Senate Review: Presidential Policy – University of California – Policy on
Vaccination Programs**

Dear Chair Cattelino,

At its meeting on October 26, 2022, the Committee on International Education discussed the Presidential Policy – University of California – Policy on Vaccination Programs.

Members support the concern raised by the Graduate Council regarding pregnancy being labeled as a disability. Members also recommend that the university provide ample opportunities for students to obtain the vaccines before the compliance deadline.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Committee on International Education analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.

3125 Murphy Hall
410 Charles E. Young Drive East
Los Angeles, California 90095

October 25, 2022

To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: James Bisley, Chair, Graduate Council

**Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Presidential Policy - University of California - Policy on
Vaccination Programs**

At its meeting on October 14, 2022, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the *(Systemwide Senate Review) Presidential Policy – University of California – Policy on Vaccination Programs* and offers the following observations for the Executive Board's consideration:

Some members expressed concern over pregnancy being labeled as a disability. Members noted that the policy does not mention breastfeeding and that proposers should consider including breastfeeding for exemption or deferral.

As an aside, members were interested in the origin and rationale for the flu vaccine mandate. There was a concern that the Seasonal Influenza Vaccination Program grew out of an executive order during the COVID-19 pandemic and that there was no consultation and justification for retaining this new standard.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our views on this matter. If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council's Analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
PATTI LIWANG, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

January 18, 2023

To: Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Council

From: Patti LiWang, Chair, UCM Divisional Council

Re: [Systemwide Senate Review of Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs](#)

The Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs was distributed for comment to the Merced Division Senate Committees and School Executive Committees.

Two committees offered comments in fall 2022 and have no further comments. One committee submitted comments in December 2022 following the new request from UCOP and their comments are highlighted below. All committee comments are appended to this memo.

- The Graduate Council (GC) recommended that in order to improve accessibility of this policy, a table should be added at the beginning of the policy that summarizes all the various relevant deadlines/timelines (3 days, 14 days, 15 days, 30 days, 90 days, and 180 days are mentioned throughout the policy for various different processes). GC believes this key information should be initially stated together with references to the corresponding detailed policy sections. GC also recommended making the 14- and 15-day requirement to submit proof of vaccination/booster consistent (e.g. 15 calendar days) throughout the policy. Additionally, GC was concerned that 15 days may not be sufficient time for certain individuals in areas that are underserved and have limited access to health services.

Divisional Council reviewed the committees' comments and supports their various points and suggestions.

The Merced Division thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this policy.

CC: Divisional Council
Monica Lin, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Senate Office



ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

December 21, 2022

To: Patti LiWang, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Michael Scheibner, Chair, Graduate Council (GC)

Re: [Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs \(previously paused in November\)](#)

GC reviewed the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs and offers the following comments:

In order to improve accessibility of this policy, GC recommends adding a table at the beginning of the policy that summarizes all the various relevant deadlines/timelines (3 days, 14 days, 15 days, 30 days, 90 days, and 180 days are mentioned throughout the policy for various different processes). GC believes this key information should be initially stated together with references to the corresponding detailed policy sections.

GC recommends making the 14- and 15-day requirement to submit proof of vaccination/booster consistent (e.g. 15 calendar days) throughout the policy. Additionally, GC is concerned that 15 days may not be sufficient time for certain individuals in areas that are underserved and have limited access to health services.

GC thanks you for the opportunity to review the proposal.

Cc: Graduate Council
Senate Office



ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM
DAVID JENNINGS, CHAIR
djennings3@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

November 1, 2022

To: Patti LiWang, Chair, Division Council

From: David Jennings, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF)

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

FWAF reviewed the proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs and offers the below comments.

FWAF generally supports the proposed policy. However, we wish to highlight the need for clearly communicating to all stakeholders both what the policy requires of them and what the consequences of noncompliance are. It's also important that there be uncomplicated processes for documenting one's compliance and for seeking exceptions to the policy.

Should the decisions concerning exemptions be entrusted to third-party actors (as the policy permits), FWAF recommends the campus or system oversee them carefully.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE FOR EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

October 28, 2022

To: Patti LiWang, Chair, Divisional Council
From: Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)
Re: [Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs](#)

The Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) reviewed the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs and offers the following comments.

This new policy is primarily a reorganization and simplification of existing policy language. From the EDI perspective, the change to the Covered Non-Affiliates makes sense, because it sufficiently considers diversity and inclusion.

EDI has a question about the change to the locations that are “encouraged to evaluate COVID-19 Vaccination Program Participation”. In the proposed new policy, the Healthcare Locations are not required to evaluate the participation. EDI wonders whether the change can lead to missing records of participation. But this question may not be related to EDI.

EDI appreciates the opportunity to comment.

cc: EDI Members



CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

SANG-HEE LEE
PROFESSOR OF ANTHROPOLOGY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-4390
EMAIL: SANG-HEE.LEE@UCR.EDU

January 18, 2023

Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

**RE: Systemwide Review: Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on
Vaccination Programs**

Dear Susan,

The Riverside Executive Council will discuss the subject policy during their January 23, 2023 meeting after which Council's comments and those pending from other local committees will be transmitted to your attention.

For now, I attach the comments of committees able to respond by the January 18, 2023 due date.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sang-Hee Lee", is written in dark ink.

Sang-Hee Lee
Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Monica Lin, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

January 11, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Lorenzo Mangolini, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

RE: Proposed Revision to Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed the proposed revision to the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs at their January 6, 2023 meeting and noted that the proposal does not fall under the Committee's charge of undergraduate education.



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

January 11, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Lorenzo Mangolini, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

RE: Proposed Revision to Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed the proposed revision to the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs at their January 6, 2023 meeting and noted that the proposal does not fall under the Committee's charge of undergraduate education.



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

January 18, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Katherine Stavropoulos, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: [Systemwide Review] Proposed Policy: Extension of Systemwide Review
of Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Senate Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) has reviewed and deliberated on the subject proposal and has no additional comments to add and accept it in its present form.



Academic Senate

January 17, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Weixin Yao, Chair
Committee on Research

Re: 22-23. SR. Systemwide Review: Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs

The committee on research reviewed the proposal and had no comments.



Academic Senate

FACULTY WELFARE

January 10, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Robert Clare, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

**RE: Proposed Policy: Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy
– Policy on Vaccination Programs**

Faculty Welfare reviewed the Policy on Vaccination Programs at their January 10, 2023 meeting. The committee agreed the policy was acceptable as written.



Academic Senate

GRADUATE COUNCIL

December 20, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Christiane Weirauch, Chair
Graduate Council

Re: [Systemwide Review] (Proposed Policy) Extension of Systemwide Review of
Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs

Graduate Council reviewed the Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy on UC Vaccination Programs and was supportive of the policy.

January 13, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Division Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate and Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the UCR Academic Senate

From: Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D., Faculty Chair of the School of Education Executive Committee

Subject: [Systemwide Review] (Proposed Policy) Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs

The SOE Executive Committee reviewed the [Systemwide Review] (Proposed Policy) Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs. Committee members provided feedback via email because the deadline for comments fell between FEC meeting dates.

The Executive Committee does not have any additional feedback to offer on this policy at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Raquel M. Rall".

Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D.
Faculty Executive Committee Chair 2022-2025
School of Education
University of California, Riverside

January 17, 2023

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division


FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

SUBJECT: Response to [Systemwide Review] Proposed Policy: *Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs*

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs. The committee feels that the revisions would assist in streamlining the current array of policies to ensure the policies surrounding this topic are clear and concise. The committee feels this policy would enhance the safety of the work place environment. There are no recommendations for further edits.

Yours sincerely,



Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

January 17, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Peter M. Sadler, Chair
Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

Re: Systemwide Review – Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on
Vaccination Programs

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions reviewed the Extension of Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – Policy on Vaccination Programs and did not have any concerns as it relates to the Committee's charge of undergraduate admissions. However, the question of whether students (both first year and transfer) were deterred from attending a UC due to the strict vaccination requirements was raised.



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640
FAX: (858) 534-4528

January 12, 2023

Professor Susan Cochran
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
VIA EMAIL

Re: Divisional Review of the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Chair Cochran,

The Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs was discussed at the January 9, 2023 Divisional Senate Council meeting. Senate Council endorsed the proposal. Reviewers agreed with the revised and more restrictive deferral and exception request policies.

The initial version of the policy was distributed to all Senate standing committees. Due to the review schedule of the revised policy, there was insufficient time to distribute the review materials to all standing committees for formal review. The Divisional Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) submitted a response (attached) after reviewing the initial version of the policy; CFW did review the revised policy but had insufficient time to submit an updated memo. It was reported to Senate Council that CFW also endorsed the additional revisions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nancy Grey Postero".

Nancy Postero
Chair
San Diego Divisional Academic Senate

Attachment

cc: John Hildebrand, Vice Chair, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
Lori Hullings, Executive Director, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
Monica Lin, Executive Director, UC Systemwide Academic Senate

November 14, 2022

NANCY POSTERO, CHAIR
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – University of California – Policy on
Vaccination Programs

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs at its October meeting. The members of the committee endorsed the proposed revisions.

Sincerely,

Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: J. Hildebrand

Office of the Academic Senate
Wayne & Gladys Valley Center for Vision
490 Illinois Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158
Campus Box 0764
tel.: 415/514-2696
academic.senate@ucsf.edu
<https://senate.ucsf.edu>

Steven W. Cheung, MD, Chair
Steve Hetts, MD, Vice Chair
Pamela Ling, MD, Secretary
Kathy Yang, PharmD, Parliamentarian

January 18, 2022

Susan Cochran
Chair, Academic Council
Systemwide Academic Senate
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Re: Revised Vaccination Policy

Dear Susan:

The San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate recently reviewed the revisions to UC's Vaccination Policy. This policy facilitates protection of the health and safety of the University community, including its patients, as well as its students, personnel, and others, by aligning our vaccine recommendations with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the California Department of Public Health. While we welcome the reorganization and simplification of prior language and are appreciative of clarifications in sections concerning corrective action for policy-covered employees, UCSF offers comments related to healthcare locations, influenza vaccinations, and policy enforcement. Our Clinical Affairs Committee (CAC), Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), and Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) opined on the revised policy.


Healthcare Locations:

- Definition of 'Healthcare Locations': UCSF's R&J believes there may be a typographical error in the definition of "Healthcare Location" and asks UCOP to consider whether "serve as" was intended to be used instead of "service" at the beginning of the definition, as follows, "A collection of buildings and Personnel that service an academic health system or student health or counseling center including hospitals, ambulatory surgery centers, outpatient centers, clinics, or other locations where..."
- Program Reviews: Both CFW and R&J feel that that "Healthcare Locations" should conduct program evaluations, and should be encouraged to do so, just as "Location[s]" are. CFW believes program evaluations are especially important in health care settings. Indeed, R&J was unsure why the University would create this distinction. R&J reviewed the policy more carefully and found definitions for "Healthcare Location" and "Location (or Facility)." However, R&J did not find anything in the policy that explains why Locations are encouraged to evaluate their programs, but Healthcare Locations are not. As R&J cannot think of a reason Healthcare Locations should not evaluate their programs, R&J does not support this revision.

Influenza Vaccination Program:

- Compliance Deadline: Both CAC and CFW agree that the University-wide compliance deadline for the Seasonal Influenza Vaccination Program should be November 1 rather than December 1 to better protect the University and our larger communities from influenza.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on the revisions to this important Policy. If you have any questions, please let me know.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven W. Cheung". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Steven" and last name "Cheung" being the most prominent parts.

Steven W. Cheung, MD, 2021-23 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Enclosures (3)

Cc: Matt Tierney, Chair, UCSF Clinical Affairs Committee
Jenny Liu, Chair, UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare
Spencer Behr, Chair, UCSF Rules & Jurisdiction

Clinical Affairs Committee

Matt Tierney, MS, NP, FAAN, Chair

November 30, 2022

Steven Cheung, MD
Division Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs Systemwide Review

Dear Chair Cheung:

The Committee on Clinical Affairs (CAC) writes to comment on the [Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs](#) that is out for a systemwide review.

CAC recommends that the University revise the compliance deadline for the Seasonal Influenza Vaccination Program from December 1 to November 1. Flu season is well underway by December 1. CAC recommends a systemwide compliance deadline of November 1 to facilitate more members of the UC community getting vaccinated earlier in flu season so the vaccine can better protect against infection and severe disease.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs*. Please contact me or Senate analyst Kristie Tappan if you have questions about CAC's comments.

Sincerely,



Matt Tierney, MS, NP, FAAN
Clinical Affairs Committee Chair

CC: Todd Giedt, Senate Executive Director
Sophia Root, Senate Analyst

Committee on Faculty Welfare

Jenny Liu, PhD, MPP, Chair

January 12, 2023

Steven Cheung, MD
Division Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs Systemwide Review with Interim Amendments

Dear Chair Cheung:


The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) writes to comment on the [Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs](#) that is out for a systemwide review. CFW joins its colleagues on the Senate's Clinical Affairs Committee (CAC) and the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee (R&J) in raising two issues.

First, CFW agrees with CAC that the University-wide compliance deadline for the Seasonal Influenza Vaccination Program should be November 1 rather than December 1. CFW believes a November 1 compliance deadline will better protect the University and our larger communities from influenza.

Second, CFW agrees with R&J that "Healthcare Locations" should conduct program evaluations and should be encouraged to do so just as "Location[s]" are. CFW believes program evaluations are especially important in health care settings. Without knowing or understanding why "Healthcare Locations" were carved out of the program evaluation section, CFW cannot support this provision.

CFW reviewed these comments following the addition of amendments to the proposed revisions in the middle of the systemwide review. The amendments did not impact CFW's comments. Please contact me or our Senate analyst Kristie.Tappan@ucsf.edu if you have questions about CFW's comments.

Sincerely,



Jenny Liu, PhD, MPP, MA
Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair

CC: Todd Giedt, Senate Executive Director
Sophia Bahar Root, Senate Analyst

Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
Spencer Behr, MD, Chair

January 13, 2023

Steven Cheung, MD
Division Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs Systemwide Review (with interim amendments)

Dear Chair Cheung:

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) writes to comment on the proposed revisions with interim amendments to the [Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs](#). R&J previously submitted comments on the proposed revisions before interim amendments were made to the proposed policy. The changes addressed several of R&J's concerns. R&J has two remaining comments.

1. Program Evaluations for Healthcare Locations

The introductory letter for the review signed by Vice Provost Douglas Haynes and Vice President Cheryl Lloyd states, "Locations are encouraged to evaluate COVID-19 Vaccination Program Participation, but Healthcare Locations are not required to do so." R&J was unsure why the University would create this distinction. R&J reviewed the policy more carefully and found definitions for "Healthcare Location" and "Location (or Facility)." However, R&J did not find anything in the policy that explains why Locations are encouraged to evaluate their programs, but Healthcare Locations are not. As R&J cannot think of a reason Healthcare Locations should not evaluate their programs, R&J does not support this revision.

2. Typo in "Healthcare Location" Definition

R&J believes there may be a typographical error in the definition of "Healthcare Location" and asks UCOP to consider whether "serve as" was intended to be used instead of "service" at the beginning of the definition. The definition for "Healthcare Location" follows with the potential typo in bold.

A collection of buildings and Personnel that **service** an academic health system or student health or counseling center including hospitals, ambulatory surgery centers, outpatient centers, clinics, or other locations where preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, or other interventional physical or behavioral healthcare services are provided to UC Health patients, students, employees, or research participants and any associated educational, research, or administrative facilities

and offices. A Healthcare Location refers only to that part of a campus that meets this definition.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this review. Contact me or Senate analyst Kristie Tappan (kristie.tappan@ucsf.edu) with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to be 'SB', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Spencer Behr, MD
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction Chair

Cc: Todd Giedt, UCSF Academic Senate Executive Director
Sophia Bahar Root, UCSF Academic Senate Analyst



UC SANTA BARBARA

Academic Senate
Susannah Scott, Chair
Shasta Delp, Executive Director

1233 Girvetz Hall
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3050
<http://www.senate.ucsb.edu>

January 18, 2023

To: Susan Cochran, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Susannah Scott, Chair
Santa Barbara Division *Susannah L Scott*

Re: Systemwide Review on the Proposed Presidential Policy – University of California –
Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Santa Barbara Division distributed the Proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs to the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW), the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), the Graduate Council (GC), the Undergraduate Council (UgC), the Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE), the Committee on International Education (CIE), the Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources (CLIIR), the Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP), the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools (CAERS), the Charges Advisory Committee (CAC), the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Committee on Courses and General Education (CCGE), and the Faculty Executive Committees (FECs) of the College of Letters and Science (L&S), College of Engineering (ENGR), College of Creative Studies (CCS), Bren School of Environmental Science and Management (BREN), and the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE). CIE, CLIIR, CAP, CCGE, L&S FEC, BREN FEC, and CCS FEC opted not to opine.

The reviewing agencies expressed broad support for the UC Policy on Vaccination Programs, viewing these programs as an indispensable public health tool in support of the University's ability to carry out its mission. At the same time, they raised some general concerns about the seemingly indefinite nature of the programs, and questioned the inconsistency of the policy in its mandate of the flu vaccine, particularly given the fact that other CDC-recommended vaccines are not mandated. There were a number of additional areas for which the groups offered feedback, summarized below. More details are provided in the attached reviewing group responses.

CPB called attention to the clarified language regarding exceptions on the premise of "medical exemption, disability, and/or religious objection," which had previously been less stringent. In reference to these changes, the Council emphasized the need for the policy to be fair, tailored to the particular population with the most legitimate concerns about vaccinations, but also to restrict loopholes that could undermine the mandate's public health purpose.

CFW noted that the revised policy has eased some of the onerous steps regarding continuous booster compliance and provides more information and education for those who do not wish to receive boosters. CPB questioned the utility of the opt-out programs as currently designed, specifically, whether the minimal requirements of the program would encourage more vaccinations or would simply increase bureaucratic paperwork and time spent in vaccine education. They note that the recent weakening of the COVID-19 booster mandate may in turn weaken the overall Policy, creating a precedent for adopting a “wait-and-see” attitude by employees. CPB therefore advocates for the adoption of a robust core Vaccination Policy, delegating other adjustments to regularly-updated (e.g. quarterly or annually, or as needed by CDPH directives) Program Attachment documents.

Several groups expressed concerns related to the lack of transparency regarding unvaccinated individuals on UC campuses. In order to increase transparency for others who share a space with unvaccinated individuals while also respecting their privacy, the COE FEC suggested that the University provide faculty with the percentage of their classroom that is vaccinated. This logic could also be extended to include other shared spaces, if feasible. CPB highlighted the need for an option to impose localized masking requirements in research and teaching scenarios that require close physical proximity, such as in labs or shared vehicles during field trips, given that unvaccinated individuals are unidentifiable. The Council suggested that the policy list such situations explicitly and offer guidance on how they might be addressed. They further called attention to the vague language surrounding the expectations regarding Nonpharmaceutical Interventions (NPI) and how they are to be enforced.

The Charges Advisory Committee requested clarification of the language in Section IV. Employee Non-Compliance. In reference to the Faculty Code of Conduct, under the heading Corrective Action and/or Discipline, the policy appears to indicate that Senate faculty could conceivably face disciplinary charges based on their non-compliance with UC’s Policy on Vaccinations. The Committee asked that the policy specify the precise section of the Faculty Code of Conduct that would be applicable, given the need to cite this information in the event that related disciplinary cases come forward. GC expressed concern about the seemingly inconsistent enforcement of vaccinations policy on the campuses, with reports of some staff being fired for non-compliance, and faculty and students not being subject to the same consequences. CPB recommended that each location prepare and distribute an annual report regarding disciplinary actions for mandate violations, summarizing the latest location enforcement policy, the aggregate number of violations, and their resolution.

Finally, the reviewing groups made a number of comments about the structure of the policy. CPB recommended that the policy begin with an articulation of the public health and campus community welfare goals the policy seeks to meet. The Council also encouraged inclusion of a statement of UCOP's commitment to a transparent and accountable ongoing review of UC public health mandates and mechanisms based on evolving evidence-based scientific consensus regarding best practices for community health threats and emergencies. CPB further pointed out that the document remains vague with respect to policy coverage of outside contractors, volunteers, guests, and short-term visitors, and suggested the inclusion of clearer

definitions for the different categories of individuals and reasons for including non-covered individuals in that category. CRPP felt that important terms should be defined earlier in the document, and noted that some of the policy information seems to only be detailed in the FAQ, which may not be officially part of the policy. CRPP also noted that while University privacy and security policies are mentioned, the measures that will be taken to secure medical data, particularly those that are required by law, should be clearly stated.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment.

**Academic Senate
Santa Barbara Division**

January 13, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
Academic Senate

From: Subhash Suri, Chair 
Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom and Awards

Re: University of California - Policy on Vaccination Programs

At its meetings of November 2, 2022 and January 11, 2023, the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom and Awards (CFW) discussed the University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs. There was broad support from the Council for UC's vaccination policy. Widespread adoption of the policy has saved lives, relieved pressure on our health infrastructure, and allowed campuses to resume normal operations. The revised policy has eased some of the onerous steps regarding continuous booster compliance, has better safeguards, and provides more information and education for those who do not wish to receive boosters. One member of the Council expressed opposition to the policy, and shared a letter signed by 11 faculty across the UC system who share his views.

A few members did raise questions about whether UC is discussing how long this mandate will last. Will the expiration of California's "state of Covid emergency" affect the policy? There was also a suggestion that UC could do more cost-benefit analysis in order to correlate mandates with studies of the effects on operations.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ACADEMIC SENATE
SANTA BARBARA DIVISION
Council on Planning & Budget

January 13, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
UCSB Academic Senate

From: James Rawlings, Chair
Council on Planning & Budget

Re: Policy on Vaccination Programs (Revised)



The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) has reviewed the revised proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs With Updated Interim Amendments. Along with other reviewing agencies, CPB expresses support for a vaccine mandate. We and others regard such a mandate as essential for safeguarding the population of students, faculty, and staff, in addition to protecting those unable to be vaccinated and maintaining normal teaching and research operations.

CPB recommends that the vaccination policy begin by articulating the public health and campus community welfare goals the policy seeks to meet. We also encourage restating UCOP's commitment to a transparent and accountable ongoing review of UC public health mandates and mechanisms based on evolving evidence-based scientific consensus regarding best practices for community health threats and emergencies. This is especially relevant given the frequent adjustments that are being made as the pandemic situation continues to evolve. CPB notes that the recent weakening of the COVID-19 booster mandate may in turn weaken the overall Policy, creating a precedent for adopting a "wait-and-see" attitude by employees. The CPB therefore advocates the adoption of a robust core Vaccination Policy, delegating other adjustments to regularly-updated (e.g. quarterly or annually, or as needed by CDPH directives) Program Attachment documents.

We are pleased to see that an issue of past concern, the mandate of obtaining only CDC recommended vaccines, a provision that would potentially have hindered access for international students, has been addressed with the expansion of internationally approved vaccines for this population. And the exception policy has been clarified to extend to the specific cases of "medical exemption, disability, and/or religious objection," providing clearer guidelines than the more diluted language previously granting exceptions to "beliefs, observances, or practices, which an individual sincerely holds." The revised exception policy needs to be fair but tailored to the particular population with the most legitimate concerns about vaccinations while also redressing potential loopholes that would undermine the mandate's public health purpose.

There are a few issues that remain vague and potentially confusing in the document. "Covered affiliates" who are not subject to the vaccine mandate sensibly exclude attendees at art, sport,

and entertainment events open to the public. But the status of outside contractors, volunteers, guests, and short-term visitors remains unclear. It may not be feasible in such a policy statement to spell out every category of non-covered personnel, but clearer definitions and reasons for including non-covered individuals in that category would be helpful.

Also unclear is the issue of Nonpharmaceutical Interventions (NPI), which appears in the context of those granted an exception or pending a decision. The regulations state that such individuals “must as a condition of Physical Presence observe any NPI defined by the LVA [Local Vaccination Authority] consistent with public health directives.” Masks are mentioned in a later provision as an NPI for unvaccinated workers. Earlier we heard of hand washing, quarantining when sick, social distancing, etc. The vaccine mandate policy should more clearly explain the NPI activities expected of unvaccinated workers and the ways, if any, to enforce the policy. There is a provision stating “third parties and some locations may distribute badges, stickers, pins” to identify vaccinated individuals, authorizing bodily identification and ad hoc enforcement, but some reviewing agencies are concerned that such an approach could stigmatize unvaccinated employees.

CPB notes an ongoing concern of many faculty regarding their rights in instituting a mask mandate in research and teaching scenarios. For example, some labs require physical proximity, as do activities such as field trips that entail driving together for many hours. An option to impose localized masking requirements is essential given that campus members cannot identify unvaccinated workers. It would be helpful if the policy listed such situations explicitly and offered guidance on how to proceed.

CPB is pleased to see more detail about the policy’s mechanism of enforcement. CPB recommends that each location prepare and distribute an annual report regarding disciplinary actions for mandate violations, summarizing the latest location enforcement policy, the aggregate number of violations, and their resolution.

Our final concern is with respect to Opt-Out Programs. As described, these programs appear to be nothing more than more compliance paperwork, which carries substantial institutional cost. On the one hand, the stated process for declining an Opt-Out Vaccine Program includes only “formally decline vaccination by completing an opt-out form provided by their Location” followed potentially by “Vaccine Education.” CPB questions whether such minimal effort to opt out would have any real effect of inducing more vaccinations. On the other hand, the policy generates a non-negligible aggregate overhead for all Covered personnel to fill out (either affirmatively or declining) these forms and additional overhead for the time spent in Vaccine Education. Moreover, this overhead is expected to be on an annual basis. Is this extra overhead justified and does the Opt-Out mandate actually benefit our community rather than merely introduce more bureaucratic paperwork? Moreover, what is the expected scope of the Opt-Out Program? The earlier draft concerned only influenza vaccination, but now also includes COVID-19 boosters, both to be completed annually. CPB notes that CDC has been recommending annual Flu vaccinations for many years, but UC only added them to its Vaccination policy in 2020. Will influenza now be part of the Vaccine Opt-Out Program indefinitely? And is the UC committed to ensuring that all members of the community have access to free Opt-Out

programs/vaccinations at each Location? CDC has many other recommended vaccines, such as TdaP boosters.


cc: Shasta Delp, Academic Senate Executive Director

**Academic Senate
Santa Barbara Division**

January 11, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
Academic Senate

From: Michelle O'Malley, Chair
Graduate Council



Re: University of California - Policy on Vaccination Programs

At its meeting of October 17, 2022, and over email, Graduate Council reviewed the University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs. The Council noted that enforcement of vaccinations is becoming unwieldy for our campus. Enforcement has also not been consistent, with reports of some staff being fired for non-compliance, while it does not seem like faculty or students have had the same consequences.

Graduate Council would like to see more clarity about the requirements, as well as better future planning, especially around return to work or return to classroom protocols. Covid protection is becoming highly individualized, and blanket policies are not necessarily working.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate

January 13, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Chair

Julie A. Bianchini

From: Julie Bianchini, Chair
Undergraduate Council

Re: University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Undergraduate Council has reviewed and considered the revised policy at its meeting of January 12th. The Council chose not to opine, as members do not possess the relevant expertise to assess the policy, but they emphasized their support for the health and safety of our undergraduate students.

**Academic Senate
Santa Barbara Division**

January 13, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
Academic Senate

From: Peng Oh, Chair 
Committee on Diversity and Equity

Re: University of California - Policy on Vaccination Programs

At its meeting of November 14, 2022, and over email, the Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) reviewed the University of California Policy on Vaccination Program.

The Committee had no issues with the policy other than that it seems late, as other institutions are currently removing policies implemented during the height of the pandemic.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate

**Academic Senate
Santa Barbara Division**

January 12, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
Academic Senate

From: David Stuart, Chair 
Committee on Research Policy and Procedures

Re: University of California - Policy on Vaccination Programs

At its meeting of October 14, 2022 and via email, the Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP) discussed the University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs, and had the following minor comments:

- HIPAA is not specifically referenced in the body of the policy. While University privacy and security policies are mentioned, the measures that will be taken to secure medical data should be clearly stated.
- Some of the policy information seems to only be detailed in the FAQ, which may not be officially part of the policy.
- Important terms should be defined earlier in the document.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate

January 13, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Chair

From: Greg Mitchell, Chair
Committee on Admissions, Enrollment & Relations with Schools

Re: University of California Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Committee on Admissions, Enrollment & Relations with Schools (CAERS) reviewed and considered the original policy at its meeting of November 10th. They voted to endorse the policy with six in favor, zero against, and two abstentions. CAERS decided to endorse the policy for the health of the community. They did not have a meeting following the distribution of the revised policy.

During its discussion, CAERS members raised concern about the vague language in the policy with respect to vaccine enforcement. These concerns may have been addressed by the recent policy updates which CAERS did not have the opportunity to review.



October 4, 2022

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair, Academic Senate

From: Joao Hespanha, Chair, Charges Advisory Committee

Re: Review of Draft UC Policy on Vaccinations

After reviewing the draft UC Policy on Vaccinations, the Charges Advisory Committee (the Committee) would like to suggest a clarification in *Section IV. Employee Non-Compliance*. Specifically, Section IV.C.2 includes the following language:

All members of the faculty are subject to the standards set forth in APM – 015 (The Faculty Code of Conduct).

For Senate Faculty, the administration of discipline is set forth in APM – 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline) in conjunction with Academic Senate Bylaw 336 Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Disciplinary Cases concerning disciplinary hearings.

Several committee members noted that this reference to the Faculty Code of Conduct, under the heading *Corrective Action and/or Discipline*, appears to indicate that Senate faculty could conceivably face disciplinary charges based on their non-compliance with UC's Policy on Vaccinations. If this is the case, the Committee would like to see clarification on which section of the Faculty Code of Conduct would be applicable in cases of vaccine non-compliance. Should a charges case be brought against a Senate faculty member for non-compliance, the Committee is concerned that it may not be clear to Charges Advisory Committee members which section of the Faculty Code of Conduct would be relevant to their review of the charges.

The Charges Advisory Committee appreciates the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes.

Cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Monica J. Solorzano, Analyst, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

January 11, 2023

TO: Susannah Scott
Divisional Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Steven DenBaars, Chair
College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee

DocuSigned by:



274089D035704C0...

Chris Bates, Vice Chair
College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee

DocuSigned by:



FCDF6BBDA0FD47F...

RE: University of California - Policy on Vaccination Programs

The College of Engineering FEC met on Tuesday, November 1st, Tuesday, November 15th, and Wednesday, January 11th to review and discuss the draft policy.

The committee members noted that there is flexibility in the policy for those who wish to pursue options for opting-out.

The committee has concerns about lack of transparency regarding unvaccinated individuals on campus. Some faculty want to know if students and colleagues are unvaccinated so that they may take extra precautions in the classroom or lab. They understand that they may not ask individuals for their vaccination status and the university will not provide this information on an individual level. Instead, the committee suggests that the university provide faculty with a percentage of their classroom that is vaccinated without disclosing individual, private information.


January 13, 2023

To: Susannah Scott, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Ty Vernon, Chair
Faculty Executive Committee, GGSE

Re: University of California – Policy on Vaccination Programs

The Faculty Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education has reviewed the University of California – Policy on Vaccination Programs and is in support of this regulation.



Ty Vernon, Ph.D.

Faculty Executive Committee Chair

Gevirtz Graduate School of Education

UC SANTA BARBARA



1156 HIGH STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

Office of the Academic Senate
SANTA CRUZ DIVISION
125 CLARK KERR HALL
(831) 459 - 2086

January 18, 2023

Susan D. Cochran, Chair
Academic Council

RE: Revised Proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Susan,

The Santa Cruz Division has completed its review of the proposed revisions to the proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs. This response includes comments from the first and second cycle of reviews. The Committees on Academic Freedom (CAF) and Privilege and Tenure (CPT) provided comments on the first iteration but not the second. The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) provided comments on the second round but not the first.

CFW raised concerns about both the lack of a guarantee for access to free vaccination, and the lack of reference of a guarantee for all employees (including faculty) to take paid time off in order to recover from potential side effects associated with required vaccinations (in particular COVID vaccinations). This is of a particular concern for faculty who do not accrue sick leave. CFW suggested that a program similar to the New Emergency Paid Sick Leave (EPSL22) for COVID-19 relief be created to ensure that all UC employees are able to take paid leave to recover from symptoms related to a COVID-19 vaccine or vaccine booster.

CAF observed that while the policy contemplates vaccines such as those for covid, flu, etc., which are broadly available to the general public, some in the future may be available only to those who fall under the status of specific marginalized and/or legally protected classes. CAF offered the example of the Monkeypox vaccine, which was initially offered only to sex workers, intravenous drug users, and/or men who have sex with men. Their concern was that this could create a system in which the University is mandating the collecting of data on which of its employees are sex workers, intravenous drug users, and/or men who have sex with men. CAF recommended that explicit protections are needed to ensure that the vaccination policy will be applied only to vaccines that are broadly available and not restricted to particular marginalized social groups. This could prevent any potential chilling of the speech and academic freedom of university employees who may choose not to be employed at the university should the University's vaccination policy require them to disclose their status within specific marginalized groups.

On a related note, CPT wrote that it is unreasonable to expect members of the University to keep monitoring Up-To-Date required vaccines pursuant to any Center for Disease Control and California Department of Public Health recommendations. When changes are made to the list of required vaccinations, CPT suggested notifications should be mandated in the policy, and all UC members notified by email.

As well, CPT noted that the definition of Program Attachment states that it is an attachment describing a specific Vaccination Program. The committee suggests the alternate phrasing of “an attachment to the end of this Policy, describing a specific Vaccination Program” to improve clarity.

Finally, CPT took issue with language on page 11, item 11 in the FAQ, which states that individuals who fail to comply with the policy will be:

“barred from Physical Presence at University Facilities and Programs, and may experience consequences as a result of non-Participation, up to and including termination or dismissal.”

This language implies that those meeting the definition of Covered Individual, someone who normally physically accesses University facilities, but can fulfill their duties without doing so, may face “consequences” as a result of non-Participation. To address this, CPT offered this alternative language:

“barred from Physical Presence at University Facilities and Programs. The inability to be physically present may result in consequences in accordance with the provisions of employment, up to and including termination or dismissal.”

On behalf of the Santa Cruz division, I thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this policy.

Sincerely,



Patty Gallagher, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

encl: Senate Committee Responses (Bundled)

cc: Roger Schoenman, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF)
David Cuthbert, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)
Alexander Sher, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW)
Onuttom Narayan, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT)
Andy Fisher, Chair, Graduate Council (GC)
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate

January 17, 2023

PATTY GALLAGHER, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Re: Proposed Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Patty,

While overall, we had a generally positive reaction to the Vaccination Programs Policy Draft that we reviewed, we had one concern we would like to see addressed in a future revision of the policy. While the kinds of vaccinations that the policy seems to have in mind (covid, flu, etc.) are vaccinations that are broadly available to the general public, some vaccinations that could potentially fall under the policy in the future may be vaccines that are only available to certain individuals who fall under the status of specific marginalized and/or legally protected classes.

For example, earlier this past summer, Monkeypox vaccinations were only being made available to sex workers, intravenous drug users, and/or men who have sex with men, as part of a public health effort to stop the spread of Monkeypox among these high-risk groups. However, if a vaccination requirement were to be required for a vaccination that is not broadly available, such as could have happened with the Monkeypox vaccination earlier this summer, it could unintentionally create a system in which the University is mandating the collecting of data on which of its employees are sex workers, intravenous drug users, and/or men who have sex with men. Similar issues could emerge in the future with gene-based vaccinations designed for particular racial or ethnic groups as part of race-based medicine (such as future sickle-cell anemia advancements, Tay-Sachs advancements, or Cystic Fibrosis advancements).

To protect from the university collecting data on marginalized identities in their relationship to potential future vaccinations, both to prevent discrimination lawsuits, and to avoid creating the appearance of discrimination, we would recommend that explicit protections be put in that the vaccination policy will only be applied to vaccines that are broadly available and not restricted to particular marginalized social groups.

Requiring these disclosures as a manner of policy would potentially chill the speech and academic freedom of university employees who may choose not to be employed at the university if the university is requiring them to disclose their status within specific marginalized groups as part of a vaccination policy. Thus, to protect academic freedom, we would recommend these protections be explicitly included in the Vaccination Programs Policy.

Sincerely
/s/
Roger Schoenman, Chair
Committee on Academic Freedom

cc: David Cuthbert, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)
Alexander Sher, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW)
Onuttom Narayan, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT)
Andy Fisher, Chair, Graduate Council (GC)

January 16, 2023

Patty Gallagher, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – UC Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Patty,

During its meeting of October 20, 2022, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) considered the original proposed UC Policy on Vaccination Programs, which is aimed to consolidate existing systemwide vaccination requirements into systemwide policy with program attachments for the COVID-19 Vaccination Program and the Seasonal Vaccination Program. In January 2023, CFW reviewed the updated materials for this review online. Members were pleased to see that additional optional measures such as masking are protected under the proposed policy. However, the committee raised concerns about both the lack of a guarantee for access to free vaccination, and the lack of reference of a guarantee for all employees (including faculty) to take paid time off in order to recover from potential side effects associated with required vaccinations (in particular COVID vaccinations).

As noted, members were pleased to find that optional additional measures such as wearing masks or face coverings (even for those up to date on all relevant vaccines) is protected by the draft policy in section III.A.6 – Optional Additional Measures.

CFW notes that section IV.B.1. states that each location is responsible for informing personnel and students that required vaccines will be provided at no out-of-pocket cost if they receive the vaccine from the university. Further, section III.A.1 – Access to Vaccination requires that all campuses and medical centers offer any required vaccination on-site or maintain a list of nearby and accessible off-site locations offering vaccination to covered individuals during working and non-working hours. However, CFW acknowledges that some campuses (particularly those without medical centers) may not be able to provide the full range of required vaccines to all employees. As such, this policy may unintentionally create inequities if some campuses and/or individual employees are able to receive free vaccination on campus, and others are forced to pay a copay or fee for required vaccinations. Although it may not be possible to require all campuses to provide free vaccination on campus, CFW notes that there should be some process spelled out in the policy whereby free vaccination for required vaccines is guaranteed to every employee on every campus.

Further, members noted that the Frequently Asked Questions Section VII.8 recommends employees who suffer from COVID vaccine side effects to “contact their supervisors, local human resources, or academic personnel offices with questions but as a general matter, accrued sick leave, vacation, and/or PTO may be used to take time off as needed to recover.” This is an issue of concern for faculty, who do not accrue sick leave or vacation. Members noted that some departments are supportive of faculty taking time off to recover from vaccine side effects, but some are not. Furthermore, the answer in Section VII.7 does not apply to faculty, making them ineligible

for a time off for receiving vaccination. In order to avoid placing the burden of recovery for a UC mandate on the individual, CFW recommends that the policy explicitly state that all employees must be provided with time to recover from potential side effects associated with receiving required vaccines, and should not have to claim personal sick leave and/or vacation hours to do so. Members discussed the temporary New Emergency Paid Sick Leave (EPSL22) for COVID-19 relief that was made available to employees and expired in September 2022, and recommend that a similar permanent program be put in place and noted in this policy, in order to ensure that employees are able to take paid leave to recover from symptoms related to a COVID-19 vaccine or vaccine booster.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,



Alexander Sher, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Roger Schoenman, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
David Cuthbert, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
Kate Jones, Chair, Committee on Teaching
Andy Fisher, Chair, Committee on Graduate Council
Onuttom Narayan, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections

October 7, 2022

PATTY GALLAGHER, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

**Re: Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy – University of California – Policy on
Vaccination Programs**

Dear Patty,

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) has reviewed the draft Policy on Vaccination Programs, and has the following comments:

Being Up-To-Date with required vaccines is defined in terms of CDC and CDPH recommendations. P&T believes that it is unreasonable to expect members of the University to keep monitoring these recommendations. Some updates may not even be relevant to UC employees. This definition should be amended to state that all vaccines that are required to be up-to-date are recommended by the CDC and CDPH, and are listed in the attachments to the Policy on Vaccination Programs. In addition to being posted with other UC policies, this Policy should be posted on relevant websites (such as campus health centers). When changes are made to the list of required vaccinations, all UC members should be notified by email. Campus (or systemwide) notification should be mandated in the policy.

On a related point: the definition of Program Attachment states that it is an attachment describing a specific Vaccination Program. This would be clearer if it were changed to “an attachment to the end of this Policy, describing a specific Vaccination Program”. The attachments themselves should be reviewed to eliminate unnecessary repetition, now that they are attachments instead of independent policies.

On page 11, item 11 in the FAQ states that individuals who fail to comply with the policy will be “barred from Physical Presence at University Facilities and Programs, and may experience consequences as a result of non-Participation, up to and including termination or dismissal.”

This should be changed to “barred from Physical Presence at University Facilities and Programs. The inability to be physically present may result in consequences in accordance with the provisions of employment, up to and including termination or dismissal.”

As it stands, the draft policy implies that even someone who normally physically accesses University facilities (thus making them a Covered Individual), but can fulfill their duties without doing so, may face “consequences” as a result of non-Participation.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Onuttom Narayan", followed by a period.

Onuttom Narayan, Chair
Committee on Privilege and Tenure

cc: Roger Schoenman, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF)
David Cuthbert, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)
Alexander Sher, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW)
Catherine Jones, Chair, Committee on Teaching (COT)
Andy Fisher, Chair, Graduate Council (GC)



BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)

Barbara Knowlton, Chair

knowlton@psych.ucla.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

January 18, 2023

**SUSAN COCHRAN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Susan,

The Board of Admission and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has reviewed the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs, and we have a few comments. We are generally supportive of the policy, but we encourage clarifications regarding international students and approved “foreign equivalent” vaccinations. We also encourage additional specificity regarding the exemption criteria and the grace period, particularly for international students. Finally, communications in this area should follow the “early and often” rule.

Thank you for your support,

Sincerely,

Barbara Knowlton
BOARS Chair

cc: Members of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Executive Director Lin

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, DIVERSITY,
AND EQUITY (UCAADE)
Louis DeSipio, Chair
ldesipio@uci.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

October 27, 2022

SUSAN COCHRAN
CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: PRESIDENTIAL POLICY ON VACCINATION PROGRAMS

Dear Susan,

UCAADE discussed the vaccination policy proposed by the President and is in favor of wide vaccination uptake, both for COVID-19 and influenza. However, the committee expressed mixed responses to the policy, as exposure to COVID-19 on UC campuses is inevitable even with substantial vaccination rates, as vaccination does not confer immunity, rather a lessening of symptoms and effects.

As the policy asserts the principle that widespread vaccination for all communicable diseases is sound public health policy, UCAADE supports the policy.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "LDS", is placed above the typed name.

Louis DeSipio
Chair, UCAADE

cc: UCAADE



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
Terry Dalton, Chair
tdalton@uci.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

January 18, 2023

**SUSAN COCHRAN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

Dear Susan,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has discussed the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs, and we have several comments. The majority of the committee finds that the policy is too lax: boosters should be mandatory, opt-out clauses should be tightened, and deadlines should be earlier, especially for the flu. Statistically, COVID remains deadly, and “long COVID” may require long-term disability accommodations. Voluntary reporting complicates already unclear enforcement guidelines.

We appreciate the goal of having an overarching Vaccination Policy, but this only seems to collate existing policies, not to improve them. We look forward to working on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Terry Dalton, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
Monica Lin, Executive Director, Academic Senate
James Steintrager, Academic Council Vice Chair