

RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT (RSCCD)
Board of Trustees (Regular meeting)
via Zoom
2323 North Broadway,
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Monday, May 24, 2021

MINUTES

1.0 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 Call to Order

The Zoom meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. by Mr. Phil Yarbrough via video/teleconference. Other members present were Dr. Tina Arias Miller, Mr. David Crockett, Mr. Zeke Hernandez, Mr. Larry Labrado, Mr. Sal Tinajero, and Mr. Mariano Cuellar participated via video/teleconference (Zoom) pursuant to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20. Mr. John Hanna arrived at the time noted.

Administrators present during the regular meeting via video/teleconference (Zoom) were Ms. Tracie Green, Dr. Marilyn Flores, Mr. Marvin Martinez, Mr. Adam O'Connor, Mr. Enrique Perez, Mr. Jose Vargas, and Mr. Alistair Winter. Ms. Anita Lucarelli was present via video/teleconference (Zoom) as record keeper.

1.2 Pledge of Allegiance to the United States Flag

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Yarbrough, President, RSCCD Board of Trustees.

1.3 Approval of Additions or Corrections to Agenda

It was moved by Mr. Tinajero and seconded by Dr. Arias Miller to approve a revised page (page 7) on the agenda and remove Board Policy (BP) 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Students from Item 5.5 (First Reading of Board Policies). Discussion ensued. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, Mr. Tinajero, and Mr. Yarbrough. Student Trustee Cuellar's advisory vote was aye.

1.4 Public Comment

Ms. Pam Ragland, Ms. Kristie Sepulveda-Burchit, and Ms. Tina Vaccher, spoke regarding Item 5.5 (First Reading of Board Policies) in opposition of BP 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Students and BP 7325 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Employees.

Mr. Hanna arrived during Ms. Ragland's public comments.

1.4 Public Comment (cont.)

Ms. Claudia Agraz, Ms. Tisha Benson, Ms. Denise Billberg, Mr. Jacob Bereskin, Ms. Kendell Blunden, Ms. Dawn Dinh, Ms. Crystal Hickerson, Ms. Kathrine Lemen, Mr. Krishna Murphy, Ms. Gayle Rogers, Ms. Donna Scutti, Ms. Carley Vaccher, Ms. Kristen White, and Ms. Irene Yezbak spoke regarding Item 5.5 (First Reading of Board Policies) in opposition of BP 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Students and BP 7325 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Employees.

Mr. Kelvin Leeds asked the board to also consider those students who will not attend classes unless students are required to be vaccinated.

Ms. Carrie Graham and Dr. Narges Rabii-Rakin spoke regarding Item 5.5 (First Reading of Board Policies) in support of BP 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Students and BP 7325 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Employees.

1.5 Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Mr. Tinajero and seconded by Dr. Arias Miller to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held May 10, 2021. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, Mr. Tinajero, and Mr. Yarbrough. Student Trustee Cuellar's advisory vote was aye.

1.6 Approval of Consent Calendar

It was moved by Mr. Crockett and seconded by Mr. Hernandez to approve the recommended action on the following items (as indicated by an asterisk on the agenda) on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, Mr. Tinajero, and Mr. Yarbrough. Student Trustee Cuellar's advisory vote was aye.

3.1 Approval of Service Agreement between Rancho Santiago Community College District on behalf of Santa Ana College (SAC) and Santiago Canyon College (SCC), and Goodwill Industries of Orange County, California

The board approved the service agreement between RSCCD on behalf of SAC and SCC, and Goodwill Industries of Orange County located in Santa Ana, California, as presented.

1.6 Approval of Consent Calendar (cont.)

3.2 Approval of Service Agreement between Rancho Santiago Community College District on behalf of Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College and QuickCaption, Inc.

The board approved the service agreement between RSCCD on behalf of SAC and SCC, and QuickCaption, Inc., as presented.

3.3 Approval of Service Agreement between Rancho Santiago Community College District on behalf of Santa Ana College and Santiago Canyon College, and Accurate Communication Inc.

The board approved the service agreement between RSCCD on behalf of SAC and SCC, and Accurate Communication Inc. located in Los Angeles, California, as presented.

3.4 Approval of Educational Affiliation Agreement with Behavioral Learning Center, Inc.

The board approved the educational affiliation agreement with Behavioral Learning Center, Inc. located in Valencia, California, as presented.

3.5 Approval of Dual Enrollment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Agreement between Garden Grove Unified School District and Rancho Santiago Community College District

The board approved the dual enrollment MOU agreement between Garden Grove Unified School District and RSCCD, as presented.

3.6 Approval of Standard Inter-Agency Instructional Services Agreement with Orange County Sheriff's Department

The board approved the standard inter-agency instructional services agreement with Orange County Sheriff's Department located in Santa Ana, California, as presented.

3.7 Approval of Amendment to Original Fiscal Impact Requested for Memorandum of Understanding with California State Fire Marshal's Office, State Fire Training

The board approved the amendment to the original fiscal impact requested for the MOU with the California State Fire Marshal's Office, State Fire Training, as presented.

3.8 Approval of Amendment of Memorandum of Understanding between Consulate of Mexico in Santa Ana, California, and Rancho Santiago Community College District on behalf of Santa Ana College for Establishment of "Educational Orientation Window" Strategy

The board approved the amended amount increase in the MOU between the Consulate of Mexico in Santa Ana, California, and RSCCD on behalf of SAC for the establishment of the "Educational Orientation Window" Strategy as presented.

1.6 Approval of Consent Calendar (cont.)

3.9 Approval of Proposed Revisions for 2020–2021 Santa Ana College Catalog Addendum

The board approved the proposed revisions for the 2020–2021 SAC catalog addendum, as presented.

3.10 Approval of Proposed Revisions for the 2022-2023 Santa Ana College Catalog

The board approved the proposed revisions for the 2022–2023 SAC catalog, as presented.

3.11 Approval of Professional Service Agreement with Strategic Kids, LLC

The board approved the professional service agreement with Strategic Kids, LLC, as presented.

3.12 Approval of Memorandum of Understanding with Orange Unified School District

The board approved the MOU with Orange Unified School District for summer 2021, as presented.

3.13 Approval of Practicum Site Agreement with California Baptist University, Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) in Clinical Psychology Program

The board approved the practicum site agreement with California Baptist University, Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) in the clinical psychology program, as presented.

4.1 Approval of Payment of Bills

The board approved payment of bills as submitted.

4.2 Approval of Budget Increases/Decreases, Transfers, and Intrafund and Interfund Transfers

The board approved budget increases/decreases, transfers, and intrafund and interfund transfers from April 27, 2021, to May 10, 2021.

4.3 Approval of Public Hearing – 2021-2022 Tentative Budget

The board approved holding a public hearing on the 2021-2022 Tentative Budget at the meeting on June 21, 2021.

4.4 Approval of Amendment to Agreement with PBK Architects, Inc. for Architectural and Engineering Services for Barrier Removal for Nealley Library Restroom Remodel at Santa Ana College

The board approved the amendment to the agreement with PBK Architects, Inc. for architectural and engineering services for barrier removal for the Nealley Library restroom remodel at SAC as presented.

1.6 Approval of Consent Calendar (cont.)

4.5 Approval of Agreement with IDS Group, Inc. for Electrical Engineering Services for Building K Welding Lab Electrical Load Assessment Project at Santa Ana College

The board approved the agreement with IDS Group, Inc. for electrical engineering services for the Building K welding lab additional electrical load project at SAC as presented.

4.7 Ratification of Award of Bid #1404 for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Parking Lot Repairs Project at District Operations Center

The board ratified the award of Bid #1404 for the ADA and parking lot repairs project at the District Operations Center as presented.

4.8 Approval of Agreement with Sandy Pringle and Associates, Inc. for Project Inspection Services for Americans with Disabilities Act and Parking Lot Repairs Project at District Operations Center

The board approved the agreement with Sandy Pringle and Associates, Inc. for project inspection services for the ADA and parking lot repairs project at the District Operations Center as presented.

4.9 Approval of Agreement Amendment to Agreement with Hill's Bros. Lock & Safe, Inc. for Key Hardware Consulting Services District-wide

The board approved the amendment to the agreement with Hill's Bros. Lock & Safe, Inc. for key hardware consulting services District-wide as presented.

4.10 Approval of Amendment to Agreement with SVA Architects, Inc. for On-Call Architectural Design Services for Various Projects District-wide

The board approved the amendment to the agreement with SVA Architects, Inc. for on-call architectural design services for various projects District-wide as presented.

4.11 Approval of Foundation for California Community Colleges (FCCC) Contract 00003998 to Cranium Cafe, LLC dba ConexED

The board approved the district's participation in the FCCC Contract 00003998 to Cranium Cafe, LLC dba ConexED and any future renewals, addendums, supplements, modifications and extensions as presented.

4.12 Accepting and Awarding of Request for Proposal (RFP) #1393 for Johnson Student Center Café

The board accepted and awarded RFP #1393 for Johnson Student Center Café to FN CO Food Services, a Fresh & Natural Company, and authorized the Vice Chancellor, Business Operations/Fiscal Services or his designee to sign and enter into related agreements on behalf of the District as presented.

4.13 Approval of Purchase Orders

The board approved the purchase order listing for the period March 28, 2021, through May 1, 2021.

1.6 Approval of Consent Calendar (cont.)

5.1 Approval of Resource Development Items

The board approved budgets, accepted grants, and authorized the Vice Chancellor of Business Operations/ Fiscal Services or his designee to enter into related contractual agreements on behalf of the district for the following:

- CalFresh Outreach (SAC & SCC) \$ 51,268
- Child Care Access Means Parents in School (CCAMPIS- SAC & SCC) – *Augmentation Year 2* (District Office [DO]) \$ 105,610
- Child Care Access Means Parent in School (CCAMPIS- SAC & SCC) – Year 3 (DO) \$ 81,975
- Dream Resource Liaison Support (SAC & SCC) \$ 119,022
- Early Head Start – Emergency Supplemental COVID (Coronavirus Disease) (DO) \$ 42,136
- Emergency Financial Assistance to Low-Income Students (SAC & SCC) \$2,020,598
- Retention and Enrollment Outreach (SAC & SCC) \$ 403,581
- Veteran Resource Center One-Time Funding (SAC & SCC) \$ 77,917
- Veteran Resource Center Ongoing Funding (SAC & SCC) \$ 159,089
- Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, Title II – Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (SAC & SCC) – *Augmentation* \$ 133,898

5.2 Approval of First Amendment to Sub-Agreement between RSCCD and Stephen A. Wright, LLC for Statewide Director for Information Communications Technology/ Digital Media Sector Grant

The board approved the first amendment to the sub-agreement and authorized the Vice Chancellor, Business Operations/Fiscal Services or his designee to sign and enter into a related contractual agreement on behalf of the district.

5.3 Approval of Fiscal Agent Services Agreement (#C21-0010) from California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

The board approved the fiscal agent services agreement and authorized the Vice Chancellor, Business Operations/Fiscal Services or his designee to sign and enter into a related contractual agreement on behalf of the district.

5.4 Approval of Professional Services Agreement with Go To Technologies, Inc. for Information Technology (IT) Management and Transition Consulting Services

The board approved the professional services agreement with Go To Technologies, Inc. for IT management and transition consulting services as presented.

1.7 Presentation to 2020-2021 Student Trustee

On behalf of the board, Mr. Yarbrough presented (virtually) outgoing Student Trustee Cuellar with a plaque. Board members thanked Mr. Cuellar for his service to the students of the Rancho Santiago Community College District.

1.8 Presentation on May Revise Budget

Mr. O'Connor provided a presentation on the May Revise budget. Board members received clarification on data related to the presentation from Mr. O'Connor and Mr. Casey Elliott, Townsend Public Affairs.

1.9 Presentation on Return to Workplace

Mr. Alistair Winter provided a presentation on Return to the Workplace. Board members received clarification on data related to the presentation from Mr. Winter and Mr. Perez.

Mr. Yarbrough left the meeting and Dr. Arias Miller chaired the meeting during the discussion of Item 1.9 (Presentation on Return to Workplace).

2.0 INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND ORAL REPORTS

2.1 Report from the Chancellor

Mr. Marvin Martinez, Chancellor, provided a report to the board.

Mr. Yarbrough returned to the meeting during the Chancellor's report.

2.2 Reports from College Presidents

Dr. Marilyn Flores, Interim President, Santa Ana College, provided a report to the board.

Mr. Yarbrough recognized Ms. Elisabeth Neely as the newly-elected 2022-2022 student trustee. Ms. Neely thanked the board for a warm welcome.

2.2 Reports from College Presidents (cont.)

Mr. Jose Vargas, Interim President, Santiago Canyon College, provided a report to the board.

2.3 Report from Student Trustee

Mr. Cuellar provided a report to the board.

2.4 Reports from Student Presidents

The following student representatives provided a report to the board on behalf of the Associated Student Government (ASG) organization:

Ms. Monica Renteria, Student President, Santa Ana College
Mr. Henry Gardner, Student President, Santiago Canyon College

2.5 Report from Classified Representative

Ms. Roxzel Soto Tellez, Administrative Secretary, Santiago Canyon College, provided a report to the board on behalf of the classified staff.

2.6 Reports from Academic Senate Presidents

The following academic senate representatives provided reports to the board:

Mr. Craig Rutan, Academic Senate President, Santiago Canyon College
Mr. Roy Shahbazian, Academic Senate President, Santa Ana College

2.7 Reports from Board Committee Chairpersons and Representatives of the Board

Dr. Arias Miller provided a report on the May 13, 2021, Board Institutional Effectiveness Committee meeting.

Mr. Hanna provided a report on the May 17, 2021, Board Facilities Committee meeting.

3.0 **INSTRUCTION**

All items were approved as part of Item 1.6 (Consent Calendar).

4.0 **BUSINESS OPERATIONS/FISCAL SERVICES**

Items 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.7 through 4.13 were approved as part of Item 1.6 (Consent Calendar).

4.6 Adoption of Resolution No. 21-09 for Authorization to Procure Orange Education Center (OEC) Site Remediation Services by Negotiated Contract and Finding of Project Substantial Complexity

It was moved by Mr. Hernandez and seconded by Mr. Labrado to adopt Resolution No. 21-09 for authorization to procure OEC site remediation services by negotiated contract and finding of project substantial complexity. Discussion ensued. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, Mr. Tinajero, and Mr. Yarbrough. Student Trustee Cuellar's advisory vote was aye.

5.0 **GENERAL**

Items 5.1 through 5.4 were approved as part of Item 1.6 (Consent Calendar).

5.5 First Reading of Board Policies

The following policies were presented for a first reading as an information item:

- BP 6620 Naming district Properties and Facilities
- BP 7132 Management Medical/Dental Insurance Benefits
- BP 7325 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) - Employees

5.6 Board Member Comments

Dr. Arias Miller reported that she plans to attend the virtual SCC Faculty/Staff Service Award Ceremony on May 26, 2021, and she and Mr. Hernandez plan to attend the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) virtual parliamentary procedures workshop on June 3, 2021. In addition, she reported that she attended the SAC Annual Scholarship Awards Ceremony on May 20, 2021, and congratulated all the students who received scholarships.

Mr. Crockett and Mr. Yarbrough expressed appreciation for the comments and dialogue from board members regarding those that have differing opinions on the implementation of mandatory vaccines. Mr. Tinajero indicated that he plans to research the scientific data regarding the vaccines (and encouraged others to do so also) and be better prepared to address any issues that may arise at the next meeting since the board plans to take action on BP 7325 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Employees at that meeting.

Mr. Hanna congratulated SAC on the hiring of its new football coach, Mr. Anthony White.

Mr. Hanna stated that, for the first time since being a member of the board, he is unable to attend the commencement ceremony for SCC since graduation is so late this year and he had already made plans for June 14, 2021.

Mr. Hernandez reported that he attended the SAC Civic Engagement Committee and California Citizens Redistricting Commission event to learn more about the redistricting process on May 14, 2021; the SAC Foundation Ed Arnold Golf Classic Tournament on May 17, 2021; SAC Awards for Excellence virtual event on May 19, 2021; the SAC Foundation Annual Scholarship Awards virtual ceremony on May 20, 2021; and a recent virtual SAC student recital.

Mr. Hernandez thanked the students in the construction trades at the Remington School campus who recently asked him to say a few words at their 10-week course completion ceremony.

Mr. Hernandez reported that he attended the Board of Governors meeting on May 24 where a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) item was discussed. He asked that board members consider having a DEI item on a future agenda or holding a retreat regarding DEI. He also mentioned that the State Chancellor's Office has a sample resolution in support of DEI.

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

The board convened into closed session at 8:53 p.m. to consider the following items:

1. Public Employment (pursuant to Government Code Section 54957[b][1])
 - a. Full-time Faculty
 - b. Part-time Faculty
 - c. Management Staff
 - d. Classified Staff
 - e. Student Workers
 - f. Professional Experts
 - g. Educational and Classified Administrator Appointments
 - (1) Interim Public Information Officer
 - (2) Interim District Administrator for Institutional Equity, Compliance & Title IX
2. Conference with Legal Counsel: Existing Litigation (pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9[a])

Loretta Jordan v. Rancho Santiago Community College District, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2019-01072357-CU-WT-CJG

Alfonso Roman v. Rancho Santiago Community College District, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2021-01196907-CU-OE-CJC

3. Conference with Labor Negotiator (pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6)

Agency Negotiator: Alistair Winter, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Employee Organizations: Faculty Association of Rancho Santiago Community College District (FARSCCD)
California School Employees Association (CSEA), Chapter 579
California School Employees Association, Chapter 888
Continuing Education Faculty Association (CEFA)
Unrepresented Management Employees
4. Public Employee Performance Evaluation (Gov. Code section 54957[b][1])
 - a. Chancellor Marvin Martinez, annual review

Mr. Cuellar left the meeting at this time.

RECONVENE

The board reconvened at 10:12 p.m.

Mr. Hanna and Mr. Tinajero did not rejoin the public meeting.

Mr. Yarbrough asked that the public comments received via email be attached to the minutes.

Closed Session Report

Mr. Crockett reported the board discussed public employment, existing litigation, labor negotiations, and evaluation of the Chancellor; and the board took no action during closed session.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

6.0 HUMAN RESOURCES

6.1 Management/Academic Personnel

It was moved by Mr. Labrado and seconded by Mr. Hernandez to approve the following action on the management/academic personnel docket. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, and Mr. Yarbrough.

- Approve Revised Job Descriptions
- Approve Adjusted Position Designations
- Approve Interim Appointments/Assignments
- Approve Extensions of Interim Assignment
- Ratify Resignations/Retirements
- Approve Adjusted Effective Dates of Resignation/Retirement
- Approve Part-time Hourly New Hires/Rehires
- Approve Non-Paid Instructors of Record
- Approve Non-Paid Internships and Agreements

6.2 Classified Personnel

It was moved by Mr. Labrado and seconded by Mr. Hernandez to approve the following action on the classified personnel docket. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, and Mr. Yarbrough.

- Approve Professional Growth Increments
- Approve Out of Class Assignments
- Approve Changes in Position
- Approve Changes in Position/Location
- Approve Leaves of Absence
- Ratify Resignations/Retirements
- Approve Short Term Assignments
- Approve Additional Hours for Ongoing Assignment
- Approve Substitute Assignments
- Approve Miscellaneous Positions
- Approve Instructional Associates/Associate Assistants
- Approve Volunteers
- Approve Student Assistant Lists

6.3 Approval of RSCCD Equal Employment Opportunity Plan 2021-2024

It was moved by Mr. Hernandez and seconded by Mr. Labrado to approve the RSCCD Equal Employment Opportunity Plan 2021-2024 and authorization for its transmission to the State Chancellor's Office. Discussion ensued. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, and Mr. Yarbrough.

6.4 Approval of RSCCD Equal Employment Opportunity Fund Multiple Method Allocation Model Certification Form for Fiscal Year 2020-2021

It was moved by Mr. Crockett and seconded by Mr. Hernandez to approve the RSCCD Equal Employment Opportunity Fund Multiple Method Allocation Model Certification Form for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 and authorization for its transmission to the State Chancellor's Office. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, and Mr. Yarbrough.

6.5 Approval of Public Disclosure of Collective Bargaining Agreement between Rancho Santiago Community College District and Rancho Santiago Community College District Continuing Education Faculty Association (CEFA)

It was moved by Mr. Crockett and seconded by Mr. Hernandez to approve the collective bargaining agreement between RSCCD and the RSCCD CEFA for the period of July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2024. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, and Mr. Yarbrough.

6.6 Approval of Public Disclosure of Collective Bargaining Agreement between Rancho Santiago Community College District and CSEA Chapter 888 (Child Development Teachers)

It was moved by Mr. Crockett and seconded by Mr. Hernandez to approve the collective bargaining agreement between RSCCD and CSEA Chapter 888 for the period of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2021. The motion carried with the following vote: Aye – Dr. Arias Miller, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Hernandez, Mr. Labrado, and Mr. Yarbrough.

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held on June 21, 2021.

There being no further business, Mr. Yarbrough declared the meeting adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marvin Martinez, Chancellor

Approved: _____
Clerk of the Board

Minutes approved: June 21, 2021

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

From: Pam Ragland
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2021 12:45 AM
To: # Board of Trustees
Subject: 5/24 Mandatory Vaccine Policy Feedback (OBJECT)

To whom it may concern –

I attended the SCC Senator meeting today regarding the proposed mandatory vaccine policy. Not only do I help special needs students, but my daughter attends SCC and both my kids will next year. That is, unless you adopt this policy. If you do, they will not. As parents we deserve to know right away, especially because many parents will be sending their kids out of state and we need to plan for it. I object to your policy. I imagine if you try to do this, not only will the lawsuits fly but your enrollment will reflect it.

This policy seems to be based on fear, and misinformation about the following:

- Asymptomatic spread – no proof (in fact, my daughter went to her high school last year with Covid and a fever and we had no idea right as the knowledge of Covid was coming out – and not a soul got sick!!)
- There are no treatments available – there are multiple treatments available should anyone get sick
- The vaccines are “safe and effective” – this is completely false

My concerns:

- **This cannot be mandated or coerced or even “encouraged”, and to do so violates CA law** (Health and Safety Codes, CIV 51), Federal laws, and the Nuremberg Code as it is still a mandatory procedure.
- **This is not technically a vaccine, it’s an experimental DNA modification procedure.** I make this point as we cannot treat this like a “flu shot” (which is also not benign but nothing like this.)
- **It has recently come to my attention chemicals in masks are on the Prop 65 list in CA as causing cancer, sterility, developmental disabilities and birth defects.** This substantiates the fact these “mandates” are all an EXPERIMENT. It is concerning a year later it was ME who discovered this -- not a health official. This goes to the very from the hip nature of treating medical decisions as political ones and this should simply not happen. Government is really not appropriately qualified to make important health decisions for the public, and there are huge questions as to who has liability for these dangerous and unsafe decisions.
- **Transmission to others is happening from the vaccines.** This is not a guess, the Pfizer trial documentation actually informs trial participants the vaccine can transmit by bodily fluids, breath, and touch. [PP 67-68, FDA website] These transmissions also seem to be different “strains”, so conceivably a person vaccinated by Pfizer could still be infected by the Moderna strain. (I have actually seen this happen.) Are you taking liability for other people getting Covid by mandating vaccines which transmit to unvaccinated people, who may not be able to get the “vaccine” or may not choose to for religious reasons? Are you taking liability for the miscarriages and other menstrual issues being reported to non-vaccinated individuals?
- **There are multiple reports (hundreds) of “Breakthrough cases” from the vaccine i.e. Covid positive patients.** This is so prevalent the CDC on 5/14 decided not to continue counting them unless people are hospitalized, which seems curious since “cases” of asymptomatic has replace “deaths”, and the point of the vaccine is supposed to be to keep people from getting Covid. Are you willing to take liability for people getting sick as a result of trying to comply with your

policy? Here is one such article. https://m.theepochtimes.com/at-least-9245-americans-tested-positive-for-covid-19-after-vaccination-132-dead_3798410.html

- **What about vaccine injured children who can't take these?** Both my kids have vaccine injuries, both discovered at age 14. Due to the ridiculous “medical exemption” laws neither could get a medical exemption – even though my son could literally die from this vaccine. Clearly, we do not wish to repeat these issues. Will my children and others like them be discriminated against? (I also want to take offense to SCC Senator Yanina calling me an “anti-vaxxer” by expressing this concern – since to point out the obvious for my kids to have vaccine injuries discovered at age 14, they are both vaccinated so this is uber irritating and illogical.)
- **The most recent data is showing 27% injury to pregnant women** (just reported yesterday) 14% miscarry, 13% have pre-term or too small babies.
- **What about people who react to the first dose and cant' take the second?** For example, my neighbor went into heart failure after the first dose of Pfizer. Clearly, he nor anyone else in that boat should take another dose. The youngest person dying from Pfizer is age 2. There are documented 15, 16, and 17 year old's dying – the 15 year old also died from Pfizer. Will these people be refused an education and discriminated against?
- **There are 0% deaths from 0-17 in CA why is this even needed?** This data is from the report “Children and Covid-19: State Data Report” by the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Children's Hospital Association.
- **Has anyone looked at the high deaths of these vaccines?** They appear to be the most deadly vaccine ever created. When the H1N1 vaccine had 53 deaths, the program was stopped. As-of today, there are **4,057 deaths reported**. This is at an estimated 1% of actual reports per Harvard, so likely 405,700 actual deaths. Even more concerning – they are **THREE MONTHS BEHIND LESS THAN 5 MONTHS OF REPORTING**. So--this is for 2 months of these vaccines. In contrast, even at 1% this is more than the last 20 years of all other vaccines combined. Are you taking responsibility if someone staff or student dies? <https://www.openvaers.com/openvaers>
- **Has anyone looked at the high adverse event rates?** Again, higher than any other vaccine product. **As-of today there are 192,954 adverse events reported with 90,249 in the up to age 50 range**, and this is at the estimated 1% of actual reports. **This means there could be 19.3M adverse events!!** Are you taking liability? Because you are going to have it by forcing these products... It is hard to imagine they are pushing for approval with these horrendous injury and death numbers.
- **What about fertility issues being reported all over?** These are being reported in people who simply stand by someone who has had the vaccine, including miscarriages. The youngest is a 5 month old baby having a period!! Are you taking responsibility for these? Because you will have liability if you try to force these unsafe products on students or employees.
- HIPPA – it is not legal to request or keep all this medical record data it's private.

Some good questions raised by your staff:

- What if only one of the vaccines is approved but students had the other?
- What if they had one but have to wait a month for another?
- What if they won't take it for medical or religious reasons and are in with other students?
- Is this only for approved vaccines? (Most seemed to believe it should be.)
- What if people have natural immunity because they had Covid?
- Who will ensure “compliance” and how?
- Who will track these records and does that violate the law? [Yes it does]
- Are teachers expected to determine compliance?
- What about students already registered before the policy is implemented?

- What about students who change classes (i.e. virtual to in person)
- What about the fact they are now saying the vaccine is only good for 6 mos.?
- The highest risk group seems to be 18-48 which is 50% of the student population and 45% of employee population. Since that is the single highest risk group does this policy make sense?
- Many of the staff expressed concern this is political vs. based on science
- Will students for virtual classes be expected to have the vaccine?
- One teacher said she feared for her life every time a student was diagnosed with Covid. (This seems crazy to me, but I'm sure she's not the only one. Why not make treatments like Hydroxychloroquine +zinc +D available as prevention?)
- One teacher suggested slowing this down, and perhaps only voluntary teachers and students come back in person. This seems like a much saner approach.

There is no question, you cannot mandate these deadly, dangerous experimental procedures right now. I assure you if you try it, my kids and the students I support will leave the state for school. But worse, you are opening yourselves up to substantial liability. Not to mention, civil rights violations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warmly,
Pam

Pam Ragland, Aiming Higher – AAAP Advocates (Assoc. of Autistic, ADHD, & other special needs Parents)

From: Tísha Benson
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2021 4:46 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Mandatory Vaccination

Dear Honorable Board Members,

I am strongly opposed to the experimental gene therapy which has not been approved by the FDA. I understand BP 5215 and BP 7325 are being heard as a first reading with no action at this time. I urge you to oppose mandatory vaccines for students and employees of the Rancho Santiago Community College District.

THANK YOU!!!

Tísha Benson

From: Gayle Rogers
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2021 8:33 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021

Dear Honorable Board Members,

I understand that BP 5215 and BP 7325 are being heard as a first reading with no action at this time. I urge you to oppose mandatory vaccines for students and employees in the Rancho Santiago Community College District.

Vaccines should be a personal choice not a mandated requirement. You must consider that not everyone is able to get vaccines because they have underlying health issues which would make getting a vaccine dangerous for them. Others may not want vaccines for religious or other personal reasons.

The United States constitution upholds the God given rights and freedoms of individuals, and no schools board has the right to take those rights and freedoms away.

Is the board willing to take responsibility for the adverse effects, including possible death, the vaccine may have on students and employees?

I urge you to consider the moral and legal consequences of mandating vaccines for students and employees and oppose both BP 5215 and BP 7325.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gayle Rogers

From: Sharon Gullikson
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 1:13 PM
To: # Board of Trustees
Subject: I am AGAINST mandating COVID "vaccine" for college entry/continuing

I am 100% against you trying to force students to take an injection in order to attend classes. You have no right to do this, just as you have no right to force someone to have an abortion, cut off their leg, or receive a lobotomy. We get to choose what to do with our own bodies, and a school trying to coerce students to accept a mixture of chemicals is WRONG.

We will be fighting this.

Sharon Gullikson

From: Lela Thorne
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:55 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021

Re: Board Policy (BP) 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus
2) Vaccination Program (NEW) - Students

To Whom It May Concern,
I would like to ask the board not to require mandatory vaccination to attend or teach at the colleges.

Many people have valid concerns about putting any sort of vaccine into their bodies. We have the right to decide what goes into our bodies and we also have the right to be able to attend a community college if we choose not to be vaccinated. Please consider our request.

Thank you,
Lela Thorne

From: Leslie Edlington
Sent: Saturday, May 22, 2021 11:59 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Comments for the meeting of May 24,2021

To whom it may concern,
My name is Leslie Edlington, I am a Registered Nurse and a resident of Irvine, Orange County.
I urge you to oppose the mandatory vaccine. That is violation of human rights and against HIPPA law.
It's definitely unconstitutional to coerce individual.
Thank you for hearing us, we the people.

From: Holly Lauterborn
Sent: Sunday, May 23, 2021 10:20 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Comments for the meeting of May 24, 2021 Agenda item 5.5

Dear Board,

Higher education is a priority for many students. Having that right to education blocked by mandating a vaccine is unethical.

mRNA vaccines never previously came to market because after being studied for several years they have caused cancer, autoimmune, and neurological problems That is why they have been around since the 1990s but never used. The cost -risk benefit for a college age group with almost no Covid death risk is to make a vaccine with has the potential of devastating side effects.

Physicians agree:

<https://aapsonline.org/open-letter-from-physicians-to-universities-reverse-covid-vaccine-mandates/>

Did you know the trials were vaccines were not studied on animals? Previous 2012 SARS coronavirus mRNA studied the vaccine on mice and it showed harm for long term lung function, "Clinical trials with SARS coronavirus vaccines have been conducted and reported to induce antibody responses and to be "safe" [29,30]. However, the evidence for safety is for a short period of observation. The concern arising from the present report is for an immunopathologic reaction occurring among vaccinated individuals on exposure to infectious SARS-CoV, the basis for developing a vaccine for SARS. Additional safety concerns relate to effectiveness and safety against antigenic variants of SARS-CoV and for safety of vaccinated persons exposed to other coronaviruses, particularly those of the type 2 group."

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3335060/pdf/pone.0035421.pdf>

With a 70% of elderly Americans vaccinated (New York Times) and out of the 332,333,385 million Americans ([census.gov](https://www.census.gov)) and the 123,917,385 Americans that have had at least one dose (69 million have had two), AND the 200,000,000 Americans who have had Covid and recovered we have already reached herd immunity. It is not the responsibility of community colleges to mandate a health requirement for something that no longer poses a problem.

The Wall Street Journal on Saturday, May 15, 2021 (Variant Test UK is Plan to Lift Lockdown) article explained that the new variance in the UK are NOT as deadly as the original variant, "In a risk assessment prepared for the government ministers... Health official said there was no evidence that B.1617.2...Causes more severe disease and older variants..." Hospitalizations are down in the UK even with these new variants.

A vaccine has proved unnecessary as updates on isolated communities such as Hasidic Jews have shown that they have had herd immunity without getting a vaccine and no new outbreaks since last year. <http://www.jewishledger.com/2020/07/covid19-do-brooklyns-hasidic-jews-have-herd-immunity/>

In addition, The Covid vaccine does not prevent Covid in the paperwork From Moderna it clearly states that it just lessens symptoms and this is true as we just saw the eight Yankees players just came down with Covid and they were isolated after being vaccinated. In addition it's more important to have somebody naturally have Covid and RECOVERED because that is the only method of retrieving antibodies to use in plasma for sick patients in the hospital. They DO NOT ask for plasma from people who've been vaccinated.

Quite honestly, why should a college community mandate a vaccine when half the CDC has not been vaccinated. They clearly do not think that this is necessary.

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4963284/user-clip-fauci-admits-50-60-cdc-nih-employees-vaccinated>

On a personal note I have a friend who is an OB for a large Orange County hospital. He has never seen so many still births, miscarriages, and late term bleeding from women who got the vaccine. When any vaccine is FDA approved then it must adhere to the same medical standards as others and investigated if it's over 50 deaths. Right now the deaths associated on the Covid Vaccine is over 4000. The CDC must investigate but it will take months.

Please let the CDC study this in a complete cycle of trials as they would any normal vaccine. Don't let the long term health effects of a young generation be on your hands.

Sincerely,
Holly Lauterborn

From: Kim Paul
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 7:51 AM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Comments for the Meeting of May 24

Good Morning,

Please find attached comments for agenda item 5.5 and confirm via email that they have been received and will be read during the meeting.

Thank you in advance and have a great day

Kim Paul

Rancho Santiago Community College Board,

My name is Kim Paul, I live in Atascadero, I heard that you are considering requiring the experimental Covid vaccine for students to go to Community College. It is completely unacceptable to require anything that is experimental, especially a vaccine. Everyone has the right to choose freely regarding the experimental vaccine without fear of being denied an education or receiving goods and services in their community.

Community Colleges serve local students who may not otherwise be able to afford College, mandating the vaccine would effectively shut the door to many students or cause students who have no other options to get an experimental vaccine they don't truly want. Why would you want to put students in that horrifying position? You have a responsibility to provide education to students, not to force them into situations that could be unsafe for their health.

There are affordable medications that can be taken if an individual becomes sick with Covid. Ivermectin and Hydroxychloroquine to name a couple, both of these medications have been around for decades and have been proven effective against Covid. Why would you mandate an experimental vaccine when there are effective alternative medications? Big pharm is making and will continue to make billions of dollars off the experimental Covid vaccines. Mandatory vaccines would bring in billions more dollars for Big Pharma. I believe this is about big pharma making tons of money, not keeping people safe. That is the only logical explanation.

The experimental vaccines are causing injuries and death in individuals at alarming rates. Blood clots, heart attacks, strokes and irregularities in women's menstrual cycle to name a few. None of this is acceptable as reactions to a vaccine. What kind of America do we live in where mandatory experimental vaccines are even being considered against a virus with a greater than 99% recovery rate in the general population? Talking heads like to say that deaths from Covid aren't acceptable but it looks like deaths and injury from the experimental Covid vaccine don't seem to bother anyone, I have a huge problem with that and so do millions of other Americans. Do what is right and DO NOT mandate the experimental Covid vaccine for CC students. Thank you for your consideration.

Kim Paul

From: Hannah Carbajal
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 10:38 AM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Comments for the Meeting of May 24, 2021

Dear Board Members,

I am writing with concern over the requirement for mandatory vaccination for RSCCD faculty and students. I myself have received my second dose of the Pfizer vaccine and believe in the importance of protecting one another from the very real dangers of COVID-19. However, there are people whom I care about who believe strongly that the vaccine is harmful to them. While I do not agree with them, I disagree with requiring them to take a vaccine that they don't believe in. I think it is discriminatory to ask an employee or student to violate their belief in order to keep their job or pursue their education. For this reason I would ask that you please make exemptions available for those employees and students who reject this form of medical treatment.

Many thanks for your consideration,
Hannah Carbajal

From: Kathleen Finn-Miller
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 9:32 AM
To: # Board of Trustees; Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021

COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021
Agenda Item 5.5

Dear RSCCD Board of Trustees,

California Health Coalition Advocacy has been overwhelmed by a high volume of outreach to us from concerned parents, students and employees who oppose any California Community College District's proposal of required COVID-19 vaccination for students or employees.

Students and employees should be free to make their own decisions regarding medical interventions in consultation with their medical practitioners and without coercion. A COVID-19 vaccine requirement would violate basic human rights, including the right to bodily autonomy, and would create discrimination based on vaccination status. **For community college students, a COVID-19 vaccine requirement might preclude them from enrolling, further contributing to declining community college enrollment in California.**

California Health Coalition Advocacy strongly urges you to abandon any policy that would require a COVID-19 vaccine. **Enforcement of a COVID-19 vaccine requirement would go against the vision and mission of California Community Colleges and would lead to inequity through the creation of two classes of students and employees: vaccinated versus unvaccinated.** Unvaccinated students and employees, who have medical or religious reasons for not getting the COVID-19 vaccine, would stand out, as

they might be required to submit to accommodations suggested in the “Mandated COVID-19 Vaccinations in California Community Colleges” advisory: “for individuals claiming an exemption, the district will need to provide an individualized interactive process to identify appropriate accommodations, which may involve adjustments to job duties, remote work or learning, isolation of individuals in campus locations, ventilation, limiting interactions, mask requirements, social distancing, testing, symptom reporting, and contact tracing.”

Thank you for taking into consideration the inequity that would result if RSCCD were to adopt a COVID-19 vaccine requirement.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Finn-Miller
California Health Coalition Advocacy Co-founder

From: Educate Advocate
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 12:05 PM
To: Gerard, Debra; # Board of Trustees
Subject: RE: Written Comments for Meeting May 24, 2021 Agenda Item 5.5 Students and Staff

Please see the attached written public comments

Thank you

Sincerely

Kristie Sepulveda-Burchit
Educate. Advocate.
PO Box 1011
Guasti, CA 91743

May 24, 2021
RSCCD Board of Trustees Rancho Santiago Community College District
2323 N. Broadway
Santa Ana, CA 92706-1640

Email Board of Trustees and Debra Gerard
RE: Written Comments for Meeting May 24, 2021 Agenda Item 5.5 Students and Staff

Educate. Advocate. is a statewide grassroots nonprofit organization that serves families who have children with disabilities and special needs. We are writing today to address item 5.5 First Reading of both Board Policy (BP) 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Students and BP 7325 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) – Employees

The policy for students (262) states in part: “Program participation should be mandatory, however, participation in the program is subject to limited exceptions, exemptions, and accommodations, which include approved medical exemptions, disabilities, and/or religious or personal accommodations. In

addition, RSCCD students under the age of sixteen (16) years old are exempt from this program. Any students of RSCCD who are not vaccinated and require in-person access to RSCCD's facilities and programs may be required to participate in additional non-pharmaceutical safety and intervention practices as directed by the Chancellor to mitigate risk to COVID-19 within the RSCCD community."

The policy for employees (page 268) states in part: "Program participation should be mandatory, however, participation in the program is subject to limited exceptions, exemptions, and accommodations, which include approved medical exemptions, disabilities, and/or religious or personal accommodations. Any faculty, academic appointees, staff and other employees of RSCCD who are not vaccinated and require in-person access to RSCCD's facilities and programs may be required to participate in additional non-pharmaceutical safety and intervention practices as directed by the Chancellor to mitigate risk to COVID-19 within the RSCCD community."

The California Community Colleges sent out an advisory on May 7, 2021 titled 2021-01 Advisory - Mandated COVID-19 Vaccinations in California community colleges. On page 7 of the advisory it states "Among the exemption-related issues college districts will need to consider, are the following:" and one of the items states: "for individuals claiming an exemption, the district will need to provide an individualized interactive process to identify appropriate accommodations, which may involve adjustments to job duties,

remote work or learning, isolation of individuals in campus locations, ventilation, limiting interactions, mask requirements, social distancing, testing, symptom reporting, and contact tracing;..."

[https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/sbcc/Board.nsf/files/C2VPER6411F1/\\$file/CCCCO%202021-01%20Advisory-1.pdf](https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/sbcc/Board.nsf/files/C2VPER6411F1/$file/CCCCO%202021-01%20Advisory-1.pdf)

Imposing these kinds of draconian actions for those students and staff with exemptions is unprecedented. We have never asked those with an exemption for instance to the measles vaccine to wear masks or isolate or to test, social distance and to do contact tracing on them. In fact the community college system in California has never had vaccine requirements period!

It is immoral unethical and discriminatory to segregate and isolate students and staff. This goes against everything our country, our state, our communities were build on. This is a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. You are setting up a scenario where those with exemptions that have health or medical conditions, religious beliefs, personal beliefs and disabilities and unvaccinated for the covid vaccine are treated as second class citizens branded with a scarlet letter (face covering) to stand out among all others. By the way, no mention of those who have actually already had covid and recovered and have antibodies, t cells or b cells for their natural immunity.

We request that you stay in line with the mission and goals of RSCCD which state that "RSCCD will support innovations and initiatives that result in quantifiable improvement in student access..."

<https://www.rsccd.edu/Trustees/Pages/Mission-Goals.aspx>

Allow students and staff unfettered access to your campus and do not discriminate against either or create a system in where they are viewed as second class citizens; forced to be isolated and segregated and branded with a mark of a face covering that singles them out as having an exemption.

We request that you strike from your policy this:

~~Any students of RSCCD who are not vaccinated and require in-person access to RSCCD's facilities and programs may be required to participate in additional non-pharmaceutical safety and intervention practices as directed by the Chancellor to mitigate risk to COVID-19 within the RSCCD community. (for students)~~

and

~~Any faculty, academic appointees, staff and other employees of RSCCD who are not vaccinated and require in-person access to RSCCD's facilities and programs may be required to participate in additional non-pharmaceutical safety and intervention practices as directed by the Chancellor to mitigate risk to COVID-19 within the RSCCD community. (for staff)~~

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Kristie Sepulveda-Burchit
Executive Director,
Educate. Advocate.

From: Sara Semmes
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021. Agenda Item 5.5

I urge you to keep the COVID Vaccine optional for students and staff. Every person has the right to informed consent and bodily autonomy. To coerce a person into submitting to a medical procedure in order to gain access to education is the definitive opposite of consent. A presumption of bodily autonomy and the right to refuse medical care is well established by rulings of our Supreme Court. Two pertinent examples:

- First, in 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court tersely traced the history of the right to refuse medical treatment: Under the common law of torts, the right to refuse any medical treatment emerged from the doctrines of trespass and battery [Superintendent of Belchertown State School v. Saikewicz](#).
- Second, [Matter of Farrell](#) in 1987 finds that "Generally, a competent informed patient's interest in freedom from nonconsensual invasion of her bodily integrity would outweigh any state interest."

Sincerely,
Sara Semmes
San Luis Obispo County

From: Nicole Dorfman
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 12:36 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021. Agenda Item 5.5

Dear Board Members,

I am writing to urge you to oppose any attempt to mandate covid-19 vaccination at Rancho Santiago Community College. With zero long-term safety studies and a student population that is not high-risk, mandatory vaccination may very well create more health problems than it solves. Evidence is demonstrating that Covid-19 vaccination is, in fact, very risky. More adverse effects have been reported

from Jan-April 2021 due to Covid-19 vaccination than from ALL vaccines combined for the WHOLE HISTORY of the recording system.

Keep in mind that should any person be harmed or killed by these brand-new pharmaceutical products, you will be culpable and complicit.

Thank you for walking the road of caution and not mandating this vaccine.
All the best,
Nicole Dorfman

From: Lana Zimprich
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 1:09 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Comment - Board Policy (BP) 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) - Students & Employees

Ms. Gerard,

I will keep this as concise as I can for a multi-layered, multi-faceted issue of profound impact and importance.

I am appalled that the Board would consider mandating anything which is not approved (this SARS-CoV-2 "vaccine" is **authorized for emergency use only**) and for an illness with a **survivability of 99.8%** globally and 99.97% under age 70. Under age 20 it is 99.997% - 'statistical zero'.

Where there is risk there must be choice, and every medical intervention - from an aspirin to an injection, whether over the counter or prescription - carries potential risks. Medicine is not, never has been, and never will be one-size-fits all.

There are **therapeutics** available, as well as proactive/preventative measures which can be taken (interesting that these are quite literally never discussed).

Mandating a "vaccine" is draconian overreach regardless, but under the current conditions, it's criminal.

Please go here and scroll down to review supporting documentation: <https://www.americasfrontlinedoctors.org/legal/tro>

TRO

53 Health Impact News 2021 Canadian Doctor Defies Gag Order and Tells the Public How the Moderna COVID Injections Killed and Permanently Disabled Indigenous People in ...
www.americasfrontlinedoctors.org

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Lana M. Zimprich

From: Lee Salkowitz
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 1:11 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Public comment for 5/24 board meeting

Dear Esteemed Board,

My name is Lee Ann Salkowitz and I am a high school teacher here in Santa Ana.

I strongly oppose the board's proposed resolution to mandate the covid vaccine for staff and students.

This vaccine is still under the emergency use authorization and should not be mandated at this time.

Although the resolution states that exemptions will be allowed, many will not look that far into it and just go along with your request. Potentially having adverse reactions and death that could have been prevented by you. The board does not have the right to mandate experimental medicine on their staff and students.

I am asking you to not move forward with this resolution. And if this conversation needs to be continued, then at least wait until the clinical trials are completed in 2022 / 2023.

Thank you,

Lee Ann Salkowitz

From: Vanessa Schultz
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 1:16 PM
To: Gerard, Debra; # Board of Trustees
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for the meeting May 24 Agenda item 5.5

Dear RSCCD Board of Trustees,

As a mother to two children who hope to use community college during their high school careers, I urge you to not require the Covid 19 vaccine. No long term studies have been completed, and the vaccine remains in emergency use status.

Please do not require faculty or students to choose bodily autonomy or their jobs or education.

Vanessa Schultz
Orange, CA

From: anjeanelandresse
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 3:02 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: [EXTERNAL] COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021

FOR AGENDA 5.5

Hello,

I wish it to be known that I strongly oppose any sort of vaccine mandate! Individuals come to this collage for education. How is it then that you are forcing a life changing decision on them and not allowing them to

educate and decide for themselves? Everybody is an individual. Everybody tolerates different things. Education is the process of facilitating learning, or the acquisition of knowledge, skills, values, morals, beliefs, and habits. So are you facilitating education on the Covid Vaccine or are you being a Nazi dictator about it? I'm also wondering how you can force people to take a vaccine that is not legally a vaccine? It does not match the definition of a vaccine and it does NOT stop one from contracting Covid 19! So then what is the point of taking it? Finally, the notion of an individual being able to opt out of something "mandatory" only excludes them and certainly puts their name on a "black list".

From: Kathrine Lemen
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 2:58 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021: Agenda Item 5.5

As a community member, a continuing ed teacher at the college, and a parent, I am highly disturbed and saddened that a mandatory vaccine proposal is even being considered for our community!! I find it highly concerning that despite the fact that humanity has existed for hundreds of thousands of years, in 2021 every person must be injected with a pharmaceutical product in order to participate in public life?! There is something wrong with this picture. Our bodies are capable & intelligent and can overcome a multitude of threats, as we have for hundreds of thousands of years, and the threat of this virus is not what we thought it was. Most people have above a 98% percent chance of survival even if they were to contract the virus!

Also, this is not a vaccine as we typically understand them. No virus has been isolated, but yet we are being asked to accept an injection of genetic code with no long term safety studies in which the animals in the phase of the animal trials all died.

Additionally, there are alternate treatments! Vaccines are not the only answer. There are doctors around the globe who have spoken about the concerns of mandatory widespread vaccinations, as well as available safe and effective treatments for covid that are a fraction of the cost of vaccines, yet these voices have been silenced! Why in a trying and unprecedented time, when the knowledge and resources from everyone are needed to rise up to the challenge are we seeing such censorship? and such advertisement and propaganda... When dissenting voices are silenced, are people really making choices based on informed consent? Is the board aware that there have been over 4,000 adverse events, related to the covid vaccine, that have resulted in death just since January? And these instances were in healthy people

who would have survived COVID had they faced it! 4,000 deaths is more deaths reported than for all other vaccines over the past twenty years.

I believe that mandatory vaccine policies will begin to create a society that we won't want to live in - a further polarized and discriminatory society where we people are segregated & discriminated against based on this issue. I believe we live in a free country where people can decide to opt out of treatments, procedures or lifestyles that they don't agree with, and I believe our constitution, California codes, and our civil rights protect those freedoms.

Further, forced vaccination is a violation of:

- CA GOV Code 51, which protects FREE AND EQUAL access to ALL PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS.

Public Accommodations are "private businesses engaged in commerce." That means retail stores, banks, restaurants, recreation, transportation – any entity, location or establishment that is open to the public is prohibited from discriminating against the entry of a member of the public.

- CA GOV CODE 12926 (q) protects one's religious liberty and practice, including the ability to NOT PARTICIPATE in practices that violate one's sincerely held religious beliefs

- CA GOV CODE 37100 – prevents any creation, application or enforcement of a law or policy that violates the California Constitution or the Constitution of the United States.

- CA HSC 24171 and 24172 declare that individuals have the right to determine what is done to their own bodies and to refuse consent to medical experimentation without duress, coercion or influence

I hope the board will choose to be leaders and support policies that will create the kind of society we all want to live in! A society where tolerance is valued and diversity is celebrated.

I believe in the immune system of my body to do what it needs to do to keep me healthy, and I will not be coerced into accepting a medical injection that I do not consent to.

Thank you,
Kathrine Lemen

From: Hillery Hafner
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 2:52 PM
To: Gerard, Debra

Please do not mandate COVID vaccines. This is discriminatory toward people with autoimmune conditions that cannot be vaccinated. Where there is risk to injury there should always be choice. Especially considering there have been 200,000 plus reported serious adverse affects from the COVID vaccine.

From: Crystal Hickerson
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 2:50 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Cc: Kathrine Lemen; anjeane a
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021 Re: Agenda item 5.5

To the Rancho Santiago Community College District RSCCD:

I am concerned about Rancho Santiago Community College District RSCCD's proposed Board Policy (BP) 5215 SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2) Vaccination Program (NEW) - Students. This policy is to be read today. While the board is invested in creating a safe environment for college staff, students, and teachers, I do not agree that a policy of mandatory COVID vaccination is a responsible method of protecting the college community's health.

First of all, the COVID vaccines do not protect against spread. They therefore do not decrease transmission rates.

Secondly, the COVID vaccines are and will remain experimental for some time. When the FDA fully approves the COVID vaccines and removes their emergency authorizations, institutions will likely feel that it is acceptable to mandate these vaccines. However, even if the FDA does not deem the vaccines experimental, they have only been available for less than a year, and past laboratory tests of different COVID vaccines on rats and cats have resulted in 100% of participants' deaths once the vaccinated animals were subjected to the live virus. -- CA HSC 24171 and 24172 declare that individuals have the right to determine what is done to their own bodies and to refuse consent to medical experimentation without duress, coercion or influence. College students, faculty, and staff should be able to decide for themselves if they want to take a new vaccine with relatively new RNA technology into their bodies. I am not even mentioning the numerous cases of severe side effects and even deaths resulting from these vaccines, just in San Diego county this past spring.

In addition to concerns about protecting health, COVID vaccine mandates take away civil liberties. Even though the proposed board policy allows for exceptions and accommodations due to medical, personal, and religious reasons, such a policy does not ensure the privacy or freedom of those who do not want to have such a new vaccine injected into their bodies. If this policy passes, the college will have a list of all those not vaccinated, violating HIPPA protections around individuals' rights to keep their medical information private. Moreover, the history of vaccine freedom in California shows us that allowing exceptions is only a step along the path to fully requiring vaccines. Children who once enjoyed such exemptions only a few years ago are, after the passing of SB 277, no longer allowed to attend public school without complying with state vaccine requirements.

I expect that the colleges feel inclined to enact a mandatory vaccination policy based upon liability concerns. No where is there a precedent for an institution being held liable for an individual contracting a virus. I cannot imagine how such a thing could be proven even if such a case were brought to court. Instead of weakening the civil rights of those working at and attending its colleges, pressuring students and staff into taking an experimental vaccine, the Rancho Santiago Community College District should act to protect civil liberties and leave medical decisions to the sovereign individual.

Thank you for your time,

Crystal Hickerson, PhD
Class Teacher, Sycamore Creek Community Charter School

From: Kristin Brancalone
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 2:46 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: Comment regarding Mandatory Covid Vaccines

Dear Debra,

My name is Kristin, and I strongly oppose mandatory vaccines for students and staff at RSCCD. I am a former student, and I have friends who are employed by the colleges who are worried they will be fired or experience prejudice because they will be refusing the vaccine.

I just had to send my comments in that I'm appalled that this is even being proposed. The vaccine is not yet FDA approved, and many many folks do not want to participate in this experimental vaccine. I truly appreciate community colleges and the opportunities they afford students and staff of all races, creeds and socioeconomic classes. It's so sad to even imagine students or staff being turned away from these fine colleges. One shouldn't have to choose between their college dreams and their own personal health freedom.

Thank you for listening,
Kristin

From: Kendell Blunden
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 2:34 PM
To: Gerard, Debra
Subject: COMMENTS FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 24, 2021. Agenda Item 5.5

Dear RSCCD Board of Trustees,

My name is Kendell Blunden and I understand that the Rancho Santiago Community College District is considering implementing a vaccine mandate for its students and employees. I am a student at Santa Ana College, and I would like to express my opposition to this.

Students and Employees within the Rancho Santiago Community College district should have the freedom to make their own medical decisions without school or workplace coercion. **Will RSCCD be held liable if a student or employee undergoes serious or life-threatening reactions to the vaccine if it is required for admission and employment?** Creating a COVID-19 vaccine requirement would create discrimination in the school and workplace, and impinges upon a person's rights to their own bodily autonomy. Personal exemptions should be allowed in addition to the medical and religious exemptions in order to avoid violating basic human rights. This is especially true of a vaccine that is still under emergency-use authorization and in trials. The mission of RSCCD includes improving "the rates of course completion and completion of requirements for transfer, degrees, certificates, and diplomas." This aligns with the goal of California Community Colleges hoping to further increase student enrollment. A COVID-19 vaccine requirement could cause the opposite effect of the goals, by supporting the potential decrease in the number of students enrolling

and completing their requirements of transfers/degrees/certificates/diplomas. **Enforcing a COVID-19 vaccine requirement directly contradicts the vision and mission of California Community Colleges, as well as the mission and goals of Rancho Santiago Community College District.**

In the "Mandated COVID-19 Vaccinations in California Community Colleges" advisory, it stated that districts will need to consider: "for individuals claiming and exemption, the district will need to provide an individualized interactive process to identify appropriate accommodations, which may involve adjustments to job duties, remote work or learning, isolation of individuals in campus locations, ventilation, limiting interactions, mask requirements, social distancing, testing, symptom reporting, and contact tracing." Altering an employee's job duties and environment, as well as a student's access to the same education as their vaccinated peers is inequitable and only further promotes discrimination between vaccinated and unvaccinated peoples. **A protocol including increased ventilation, symptom reporting, and social distancing where possible should be incorporated for all students and employees, not just the vaccinated due to the fact that according to the FDA Pfizer, Moderna, and Johnson and Johnson fact sheets, the duration of protection against COVID-19 is still unknown.** Weekly testing could be a potential option for the unvaccinated, however, non-invasive options such as the saliva test should be offered. Lastly, I would like to address the importance of considering the students who have naturally acquired antibodies of COVID-19. **Students and employees who have obtained natural immunity to COVID-19 should be allowed to present a positive antigen test or a positive T-Cell Detect Covid test to meet the exemption requirements. There is strong scientific evidence that natural immunity provides the same level of protection as vaccination does.**

I appreciate your time in considering the violation of bodily autonomy and inequity that would result if RSCCD were to adopt a COVID-19 vaccine requirement.

Sincerely,
Kendell Blunden, Santa Ana College Student

From: Sarah Henderson
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 5:12 PM
To: Board Comments; # Board of Trustees
Subject: Public Comments

Please do not mandate Covid vaccines for students who wish to attend college. Please forever ban them from implementation.

A concerned parent and citizen

Related Articles:

<https://www.thecollegefix.com/bulletin-board/association-of-american-physicians-and-surgeons-pleads-with-universities-do-not-mandate-covid-vaccine/>

<https://www.lewrockwell.com/2021/05/joseph-mercola/covid-vaccines-may-bring-avalanche-of-neurological-disease/>

From: Christopher Graycen
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 9:47 PM
To: # Board of Trustees
Subject: [EXTERNAL] COVID Vaccine Policy

To the Rancho Santiago Community College District Board of Trustees,

I am writing this evening in support of mandatory COVID-19 vaccines for students and employees of SAC, SCC, and the District Office. This policy would be in line with the rest of the local higher education institutions including UCI, Cal State Fullerton, and Chapman University.

We know that health outcomes are worse for the working class and communities of color. In order to better protect these communities and the members in them, including many of our RSCCD students,

faculty, and staff members, we must ensure that those who arrive on our campuses are vaccinated and following the latest in community health protocols.

If you are unable or unwilling to set such a mandate, I ask that you consider remote work and instruction for all individuals (students, faculty, and staff) who may feel unsafe being subjected to unvaccinated individuals. Please think about the health of our community and all who reside here.

Much appreciated,

Chris Graycen
Orange Resident