

Grievor's Response to the University of Waterloo's "Written Submissions of the University and Case Law"

This is provided further to Tribunal Order #6 dated December 22, 2022.

The Tribunal will no doubt be very thankful that this document brings the "era of written submissions" to a close. Indeed, this sentiment is shared by the Grievor and most probably the University as well.

As expected, the University has submitted a quite comprehensive collection of legal cases that have supported an employer's right to (1) impose mandatory vaccination on its employees and (2) discipline them "appropriately", including dismissal. This Grievor is the first to admit that the majority of legal cases to date have gone this way. Indeed, it was never my intention to challenge the University's "right" to impose a vaccination policy or its "right" to discipline the "noncompliant". (That being said, I had suggested to the UW administration that it consider disciplinary measures that would avoid the dismissal of faculty members, in line with what was being done at the University of Guelph.) This was clearly stated in the Concluding Remarks of my first grievance as well as in the Concluding Remarks of my "Response to the University's Written Decision", dated December 10, 2022, quoted below,

The motives of my two grievances lie not in the University of Waterloo's "Requirement" itself but in the ways in which the "Requirement" was enforced. Firstly, as pointed out in these grievances, the University unnecessarily resorted to falsehoods (i.e., that it was compelled to adopt a vaccination mandate) and deception (two "Requirements") to justify its mandate.

Since I am **not** challenging the two "rights" mentioned above, but rather the **methods and procedures** employed by the University to enforce its so-called "Requirement" – as I tried to make abundantly clear in my grievances as well as in my Response – **the "case law and legal arguments" provided by the University are for the most part, in fact, irrelevant.** The issues raised by my grievances and Response fall well within the purview of the Memorandum of Agreement, mostly with regard to Policy 33, Ethical Behaviour. There is, therefore, no need to invoke "case law and legal arguments". Indeed, to my limited knowledge, no such "case law and legal arguments" relevant to my grievances are to be found.

(That being said, I did take a few opportunities in my two grievances to express my disagreement with the University's decision to impose a vaccination mandate. Even though the University's decision may, at least at this time, seem to be supported by the courts, the mandate was, in my opinion, unjust and unethical, if not immoral. It is often the case that the enforcement of unjust and unethical policies often leads to violations of ethical behaviour. These are the main subjects of my grievances.)

The University still expresses its uncertainty about my motives (or perhaps wants us to believe that it is uncertain so that it can inundate us with "case law and legal arguments") as seen in Paragraph 3 of its "Written Submissions of the University and Case Law" (henceforth "Submissions"),

The issues in dispute and/or the issues Vrscay seeks to raise in this grievance arbitration process are still unclear after reviewing Vrscay's Response and the academic papers submitted with that Response.

This statement, as well as a number of other statements in the Submissions, must not be allowed to go unchallenged. They are examples of the University's consistent tactic of directing the reader's

attention to “issues” that it wishes the reader to see, not those that have been presented by the Grievor. In this case, the University wants the reader to focus on its “rights”, i.e., its “right” to adopt a vaccination policy and its “right” to discipline the “noncompliant”. It then inundates the reader with “case law and legal arguments” that support these “rights”. What the University does **not** wish the reader to see, and therefore consider, are the **abuses** of these “rights” which have been the primary subjects of my two grievances, and which have also been discussed in my Response – see my notes on Paragraph 14 in the latter. These abuses were identified in the first quote above:

Firstly, as pointed out in these grievances, the University unnecessarily resorted to falsehoods (i.e., that it was compelled to adopt a vaccination mandate) and deception (two “Requirements”) to justify its mandate.

Let me repeat that the grieving of these abuses lies well within the purview of the Memorandum of Agreement according to Policy 33, Ethical Behaviour. Furthermore, no “case law and legal arguments” are relevant to the discussion. (That being said, I shall discuss one of the case laws presented by the University.)

Now if an alert reader, having noticed the University’s deflection tactics, attempts to focus on the abuses – the actual subjects of these grievances – the University then tries to diminish the importance of the abuses, e.g., “not significant or even relevant” (Paragraph 49), “irrelevant” (Paragraph 52) and “irrespective of specific facts” that the Grievor “continues to quibble about” (Paragraph 53). Indeed, Paragraph 53 represents the apex of the University’s deflection tactic, first stating the two issues that are **not** being grieved (having presented a mountain of “case law and legal arguments” concerning them) and then writing that any other “specific facts” are subjects for “quibble”. (Incidentally, this is why **my grievances should not be “dismissed”**. More on this later.)

Let us now consider some of these abuses, i.e., “specific facts”, from a new perspective – one that will hopefully make everything crystal clear.

The falsehoods

Given that the University had the “right” to adopt a mandatory vaccination policy, why did it not state this in its disciplinary letters to the “noncompliant”? Instead of writing the following **false** statement (as I have stated many times in my previous documents),

The University was required by statute to adopt a COVID-19 vaccination mandate,

why did it not write something to the effect,

The University was required by statute to adopt a COVID-19 vaccination policy. After careful review, the President, Provost and Deans of the University decided to implement a vaccination mandate.

After all, something like this appears in a UW document entitled, “Mandatory Proof of Vaccination Questions,” which was brought to my attention. (The document is attached to this letter – please see the section entitled, “Who decided vaccination should be mandatory?” on Page 5.) Why did such a statement not appear in letters to “noncompliant” faculty members who were being disciplined? I hope that the Tribunal will agree that in the interest of transparency and accountability, anyone who is disciplined for “violation” of a temporary policy, e.g., the “Requirement”, should be entitled to know exactly who was responsible for the drafting of the policy.

The deceptions

Given, once again, that the University had the “right” to adopt a mandatory vaccination policy and given the fact that the University decided to impose a vaccination mandate, why did it post what appeared to be a second, less stringent, “Requirement” on its coronavirus webpage,

<https://uwaterloo.ca/coronavirus.return/vaccination-requirement>

as I discussed on Page 3 of my second grievance? (It has since been removed.) On this webpage was presented a list of four conditions for “Non-compliance”. As pointed out by both myself and Professor John Turri, it would follow that if none of these four conditions for “Non-compliance” were satisfied, then an individual would be “Non-Non-compliant”, i.e., “compliant”. But such “compliance” differed from compliance with the mandatory vaccination “Requirement”! In essence, the University had two “Requirements”, as I discussed in my second grievance. In Paragraph 50 of its Written Decisions, however, the Respondent wrote that the list was “non-exhaustive” as a kind of excuse. Unfortunately, this is a rather lame excuse. How could members of the UW community possibly know that the list was “non-exhaustive” since, as I pointed out in my Response, **there was absolutely no mention of this being a list of “four non-exhaustive examples of employee ‘non-compliance’”** on the website during the mandate? (As Detective Inspector (DI) Jack Frost – from the ITV drama series, *A Touch of Frost* – would often say, “Somebody’s telling porkies.”)

Let us now move to Paragraph 24, which I shall call the “Hearsay Paragraph.” My purpose in submitting the academic papers was to show that there are peer-reviewed studies and opinions which clearly conflict with the University’s statement, “the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccination is so well-established at this point”. One does not have to be an expert to see this conflict of opinions or to state that it exists. If the University cannot agree to this, then I would submit that its statement “the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccination is so well-established at this point” is hearsay.

The University then proceeds to attack the credibility of Professors Michael Palmer and John Turri. It has the audacity to suggest that because Professors “Palmer and Turri were both disciplined for noncompliance with the Vaccination Requirement,” they “are not in positions to provide impartial, expert opinions on COVID-19 vaccination or the University’s Requirement.” This is an unbelievable statement. It tries to “turn the table around” in an effort to convince the reader that because these two academics were disciplined for noncompliance, they cannot be reliable witnesses, i.e., their opinions and analyses could be compromised and, as such, should not be considered. Why should the reader not be allowed to consider the following alternative: Because of their individual and particular expertise, Professors Palmer and Turri chose to be noncompliant with the “Requirement”. **That a University administration would attack not only the credibility but the integrity of those who dare to disagree with it is insulting, unbecoming and, most seriously, unethical.**

That being said, if the University insists that the Tribunal pursue this route, then where is its proof that Professors Palmer and Turri are not qualified to express opinions or assessments of COVID-19 vaccination or the University’s “Requirement”? Following the University’s own words, no proof implies “hearsay”.

At the most likely risk of being accused of “hearsay” by the University, let me now write a few words about Professor Michael Palmer, MD, principal author of the textbook, *Biochemical Pharmacology* (Wiley, 2012) which has been used not only at UW (it is, after all, based on the courses that he had taught at UW) but at a number of other institutions. I shall first remind the Tribunal and the University that I wrote a few words about Professor Palmer’s early predictions of the toxicity of mRNA vaccines at the end of my first grievance – see Pages 7 and 8. The major mechanism of damage by mRNA vaccines that Professor Palmer and colleagues/co-authors predicted in their open letter to the European Medical Association in **March 2021**,

<https://doctors4covidethics.org/urgent-open-letter-from-doctors-and-scientists-to-the-european-medicines-agency-regarding-covid-19-vaccine-safety-concerns/>

have been fully substantiated. This mechanism involves an autoimmune-like inflammation of the blood vessels, triggered by the expression of the spike protein in the vessel walls. Downstream from such inflammation, the blood vessels may rupture and blood clots may form. (This was mentioned briefly in my first grievance.) In his paper, “A Case Report: Multifocal Necrotizing Encephalitis and Myocarditis after BNT162b2 mRNA Vaccination against COVID-19”, Michael Moerz has verified this predicted mechanism by demonstrating the presence of vaccine-induced spike protein expression within the inflammatory lesions of the brain and heart of a deceased patient,

<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/10/10/1651>

(published in the special issue of the peer-reviewed journal *Vaccines* entitled, “Adverse Events of COVID-19 Vaccines”). The reader might also wish to see the article entitled, “Autopsy-based histopathological characterization of myocarditis after anti-SARS-Cov-2-vaccination”, by C. Schwab *et al.* which was published in *Clinical Research in Cardiology*, the official (peer-reviewed) journal of the German Cardiac Society,

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00392-022-02129-5>

(In both papers, the figures showing proliferation of lymphocytes are striking.) Much more could be written (all of it “hearsay”, of course, according to the University) but I trust that this is sufficient for the Tribunal to conclude that the University’s claim that Professor Palmer is not an expert with regard to COVID-19 vaccination is unfounded or, as the University likes to write, “without merit”. Indeed, I conjecture that before his dismissal, Michael Palmer was among the most qualified experts – if not the most qualified expert – on COVID-19 vaccination at UW. (In fact, the vaccine researcher in a nearby university to whom I made reference in my first grievance – see Page 8 – considers Michael to be **the** expert at UW. But this, of course, is “hearsay”.)

Let us now turn our attention to Professor John Turri, who is a Canada Research Chair in Philosophy and Cognitive Science and who directs the Philosophical Science Lab at UW. According to his research website, Professor Turri practices philosophy “as a form of inquiry continuous with science.” His research expertise includes “practical ethics.” It is interesting that UW’s Department of Philosophy and Faculty of Arts, as well as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (which, in turn, implies the international research community) – let us also mention that Professor Turri was elected to the College of the Royal Society of Canada in 2016 – have clearly recognized Professor Turri’s

accomplishments and expertise, yet UW's senior administration refuses to do so at this time. (Professor Turri's penetrating analyses and criticisms of UW's "Requirement(s)" at his "Mandate Madness" site,

<https://mandates.substack.com/>

may have something to do with this.)

The University's derogatory treatment of Professors Palmer and Turri makes me recall Our Lord's own words after his rejection at Nazareth, "A prophet is not without honor except in his native place and among his own kin and in his own house." (Mark 6:4, see also Luke 4:16-30 for the famous "incident at the cliff".)

Now consider Paragraph 33, the "personal opinions Paragraph". The University states that "it would be absurd if an employee's personal opinions on a particular health and safety-related rule could exempt that employee from discipline for refusing to follow it." It then cites a "decision which is particularly relevant to this issue," where "the employer terminated an employee, for cause, for refusing to comply with a requirement to shave his beard to use applicable respiratory equipment." Unfortunately, no further information is provided about the reason for the employee's refusal to shave his beard. For example, his refusal could have been based on a religious creed, in which case the decision might well be "particularly relevant." A look at the entire case record, however, shows that the plaintiff's reasons could not be considered as "religious", e.g.,

Clearly, the plaintiff considered his beard to be very important to him and had only shaved it off four to five times since the late 1950's. He said the beard was important to him as an identifying characteristic or trademark and it did not cover any disfigurement or scars. The plaintiff acknowledged, however, that notwithstanding its importance, he had been prepared to shave his beard in the past on his own whim.

I trust that, contrary to the University's opinion, the Tribunal would judge that this Grievor's reasons for refusing to comply with the "Requirement" are based on much more than "personal opinions" such as Mr. Hogkin's reluctance to shave his beard, especially since the latter "had been prepared to shave his beard in the past on his own whim." Let me remind the Tribunal, as well as the University, that this Grievor refused to comply with the "Requirement" on the basis of the principle of "informed consent". Consider Article 6.1 of the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights,

<https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/universal-declaration-bioethics-and-human-rights>

(Consent 6.1) Any preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention is only to be carried out with the prior, free and informed consent of the person concerned, based on adequate information. The consent should, where appropriate, be express and may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without disadvantage or prejudice.

Does the University consider Article 6.1 to be "absurd"? Furthermore, consider Article 1 of the Nuremberg Code,

<https://history.nih.gov/display/history/Nuremberg%2BCode>

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as

to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that, before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject, there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person, which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.

Does the University consider this Article, indeed the entire Nuremberg Code, to be “absurd”? Finally, does the University then consider the major – but not the only – reason for my refusal, quoted immediately below from my letter of refusal dated September 27, 2021, to be “absurd”:

In its “Note on the morality of using some anti-COVID-19 vaccines”, namely those “that have been developed from cell lines derived from tissues obtained from two fetuses that were not spontaneously aborted,” the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (December 21, 2020) states that “practical reason makes evident that vaccination is not, as a rule, a moral obligation and that, therefore, it must be voluntary”. It continues with, “Those who, however, for reasons of conscience, refuse vaccines produced with cell lines from aborted fetuses,” - a group to which I belong unequivocally - “must do their utmost to avoid, by other prophylactic means and appropriate behavior, becoming vehicles for the transmission of the infectious agent” - no problems there. (That being said, it must be understood that the Church can make authoritative pronouncements only on moral matters and not on the scientific aspects of COVID-19 and vaccines, which lie beyond its expertise and hence “jurisdiction”.) Furthermore, with regard to the “exemptions” and “accommodations” of the mandate policy, I shall quote a faculty member, friend, and fellow Catholic at St. Jerome’s University who, in writing to his administration, pointed out so aptly that since the mandatory vaccination policy is unlawful, then so is the policy of granting exemptions and accommodations: “It is nonsensical for someone to be requesting an exemption from an unlawful activity.”

It is most unfortunate that the CDF chose to use the rather sterile – and less offensive – phrase, “aborted fetuses.” It makes these victims sound more like distant “things” as opposed to what they truly are, i.e., divinely-created human beings with souls. As a result, the magnitude of the sin can be conveniently diminished in the eye of the reader. I would much prefer to use the phrase, “aborted human beings.” Does the University then consider it “absurd” for me, a Roman Catholic, to refuse to be jabbed with a “vaccine” (this term had to be re-defined to include gene therapy) that was produced with cell lines from innocent human beings who were killed as a result of the procedure known as “abortion”? (I could also mention that the “vaccine” was experimental, untested and unapproved – some of the other reasons that I would not let it be injected into my body.) Paragraphs 35-36, as well as 39-40, indicate that the University equates my refusal with that of the man who refused to shave his beard. The University may well have some of the courts on its side at this time. Each and every one of us, however, will one day have to face the judgement of a Higher Court.

Note: Once again, this Grievor understands that such decisions based on personal conscience may be considered extraneous to this grievance. I have stated them for the record since the University has stated, for the record, that it considers them as “absurd”.

Now consider Paragraph 50. Here, the University is clearly “putting words into the mouth” of the Grievor. In my grievances and Response, I have **never** – let me repeat, **never** – suggested that I “was not aware of what the University considered ‘non-compliant’.” What I did, however – as did Professor John Turri – was to use the University’s second definition of the “Requirement” to come up with a logical, and embarrassing, consequence. (Indeed, the number “50” seems to be an unlucky one for the University: In Paragraph 50 of its previous document, i.e., its Response, it proposed a rather lame excuse – as I have pointed out earlier in this document – regarding its second definition of the “Requirement”, i.e., “non-exhaustive examples”.)

We now move to the final Paragraph, No. 55, of the Submissions. The University recommends that (1) the Tribunal dismiss both grievances and that (2) the Grievor is not entitled to any remedies. First of all, I’m afraid that I do not understand the meaning of the word “dismiss”. This seems to be a rather unpleasant term, suggestive of the act of “discarding.” In order to “dismiss”, or perhaps “discard”, my grievances, the Tribunal would have to engage in at least some kind of deliberation – most likely at its “written hearing” – and provide a written summary of its decision to dismiss/discard, with reasons. In essence, therefore, it will have made a ruling on the grievances, and not simply have “dismissed” them. This Grievor thinks that he deserves a little more respect than a simple “dismissal” or “discarding” of his grievances. Let me remind the Tribunal and the University that it was I, the Grievor, who pointed out, in my letter dated November 15, 2021 (“What shall we do with a noncompliant senior faculty member?”), that the “Employee Disciplinary Procedure” announced in the University’s “Consequences of non-compliance” letter dated October 8, 2021, violated the Memorandum of Agreement, forcing the UW administration to change course immediately with regard to its discipline of “noncompliant” employees.

Summary

In its enforcement of a vaccination mandate (the “Requirement”) – which the Grievor has always considered to be unjust, unethical and immoral – the University of Waterloo, in the Grievor’s opinion, resorted to unethical behaviour toward “noncompliant” faculty members, including the Grievor. This unethical behaviour (not the “Requirement” itself) is the basis of the two grievances submitted by the Grievor. We summarize the various manifestations of this unethical behaviour below:

1. **Workplace harassment**, including “threats and empty accusations” by the Dean of Mathematics during the first stages of the mandate (Grievance 1, Page 2).
2. Lack of information/consultation and a consistent pattern of lack of respect on the part of the UW senior administration (from Dean up to the Provost and President) all of which contributed to a **poisoned environment** (Policy 33) on the UW campus (Grievance 1, Page 6). This includes the refusal by the President and Provost even to acknowledge receipt of two separate letters that I sent to them, one proposing another possible disciplinary measure for “noncompliant”

faculty members, along the lines of what was being used at the University of Guelph, and the other proposing a panel discussion on COVID-19 vaccination which would include Michael Palmer, MD, as one of the “local experts”. What makes matters even worse is the University’s attitude as demonstrated in Paragraph 33 of its Written Decisions, i.e., the “University was under no obligation to respond to Vrscaj’s (or any other employee’s) various letters and suggested approaches to the pandemic.” As I wrote in my Response (Page 5), “The arrogance of this statement and the neglect of academic ethics are astounding.”

3. Consistent appearance of the following false statement in disciplinary letters to “noncompliant” faculty members, “The University was required by statute to adopt a COVID-19 vaccination mandate”. (Grievance 2, Page 2). What makes matters even worse is that the University considers this propagation of falsehoods to be “largely irrelevant to the key issues in dispute.” (Paragraph 52 of its Submissions) This is another unbelievable statement representing the apex of insensitivity. I would like both the President of UW and the Provost to imagine themselves in the position of a faculty member being disciplined, with the threat of dismissal, and being subjected repeatedly to false statements. Workplace harassment or poisoned environment? Or both? I request that the Tribunal decide.
4. A second “Requirement” (Grievance 2, Page 5). Once again, I would like both the President of UW and the Provost to imagine themselves in the position of a faculty member being disciplined, with the threat of dismissal, and seeing conflicting information in front of them, i.e., the “Requirement” stated in their disciplinary letters and the alternate “Requirement” stated on the University’s coronavirus webpage.
5. The University’s unacademic and disrespectful treatment of those who dared to disagree with it. Of course, this was reflected in the University’s refusal to acknowledge not only my letters/proposals but also those of other faculty members. Perhaps the true colours of the University administration were revealed in its attacks on the credibility and integrity of Professors Palmer, MD, and Turri in its Written Submissions – see above. This should not go unnoticed by the Tribunal.

The “case law and legal arguments” supplied by the University in its “Written Submissions” do not apply to the above unethical behaviours which are being grieved.

Concluding Remarks

During the preparation of his March 23, 2022 article entitled, “University of Waterloo fires professor over vaccine mandate,” in The Waterloo Region Record (copy attached), reporter Robert Williams interviewed UW President Vivek Goel and asked him to respond to Professor John Turri’s comments that (i) UW’s own data shows virtually no change in COVID-19 cases on campus and (ii) Ontario’s COVID-19 data show that there is no clear evidence that unvaccinated individuals who comply with regular testing pose an elevated risk to a community that is overwhelmingly vaccinated. Mr. Williams wrote, “In response, Goel said that the success of the mandate is shown in the high level of compliance the school has had.” This is a remarkably revealing statement. If the success of the mandate is not to be measured by the reduction in cases (which was virtually zero) but rather in the degree of compliance, does it not seem that the principal goal of the “Requirement”, according to President Goel, was **not** health and safety but rather **compliance and control** over the university community?

It is sadly ironic that a University President who has very openly and energetically declared his dedication to the “decolonization” of UW is responsible for a coercive vaccination policy (the “Requirement”) which, along with its enforcement, is described perfectly by the phrase, “Reign of Colonialism”. The greater tragedy is that with only a slightly open heart and mind, and a sincere willingness to engage with those who disagreed with the “Requirement(s)”, UW could have established itself as a beacon of creative and humane problem solving – a model for other institutions to follow. First, it would have hopefully avoided the firing of fifty employees. (One must always ask why no “noncompliant” employees were fired at Wilfrid Laurier University. I continue to hear horror stories from staff members who were fired from UW and whose lives were completely upturned, if not ruined, e.g., told that they could never work again at UW and unable to collect EI because of the way in which they were fired.) Second, it would have avoided the unbearable tensions that emerged between “noncompliant” employees and those responsible for enforcing the “Requirement” (both faculty and staff) and which have left permanent scars on this campus. (Of course, those with their heads in the clouds will say, “What are you talking about? There are no scars.” But the scars are there. Understandably, however, what staff member would risk her/his job by talking about them?) Finally, let us not forget the largest group of the UW community which were affected by the vaccine mandate – our students. I fear that those many courageous and “noncompliant” students who were denied the opportunity to begin or continue with their studies at UW have been conveniently forgotten. What a tragedy, indeed.

Instead of seizing an opportunity to make itself unique, UW showed itself to be just like most other academic institutions, responding to COVID-19 in a manner that was authoritarian, mediocre and heartless. And, as the data show, the “Requirement” did not even work! (It may well have done more harm than good, as the German autopsies and many other studies have shown.) To which the University of Waterloo will most probably respond, “We’re still Number One!” In other words, it’s time to change the subject.

Let us hope and pray, on this Feast day that celebrates Purity and Light, that the Truth be revealed and more eyes are opened so that the darkness that covered our campuses and communities will never be allowed to return. Indeed, there is hope that the tide is turning:

<https://www.newsweek.com/its-time-scientific-community-admit-we-were-wrong-about-coivd-it-cost-lives-opinion-1776630>

Edward R. Vrscaj
Department of Applied Mathematics

Dated February 2, 2023, the Feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin and the Presentation of Our Lord

Mandatory Proof of Vaccination Questions

Will the University of Waterloo require proof of vaccination for campus access?

Yes. All students, staff, faculty and visitors are required to provide proof of being fully vaccinated or have an approved accommodation, in order to come to campus. Being fully vaccinated means it has been 14 days or more since you received a full course of a COVID-19 vaccination approved by either a Health Canada or a World Health Organization approved vaccine. A full course means you have had your final dose of either a two-dose or a one-dose vaccine series.

Who is required to show proof?

All University community members (students, faculty, staff) and visitors (including contractors, guests, parents, etc) who wish to access a University of Waterloo campus or facility are required to provide proof of vaccination.

Are there exemptions to these rules?

You can apply for accommodations that may exempt you from providing proof of vaccination on medical or protected human rights grounds. If you are coming to campus while you wait for your approved accommodation plan:

- You must test negative on a rapid antigen test no more than 72 hours before coming to our campuses and buildings. COVID-19 [testing, rapid antigen testing and vaccination](#) is available through Campus Wellness for all University of Waterloo students, employees, postdocs and their family members.
- Wear a face mask or other appropriate face covering in all common indoor spaces, in accordance with [University guidelines](#). If you require a face covering accommodation due to disability or other grounds related to the Ontario Human Rights Code, please refer to the University's [face covering exemption request](#) process.
- You must complete a daily COVID-19 screening assessment every day using Campus Check-In.
- In order to continue to access campus with a vaccine accommodation, you must submit your vaccine accommodation application (including all required documentation) on or before **October 17, 2021**.

What happens if I am granted an exemption?

Your accommodation will automatically be provided for the fall 2021 term on an interim basis, provided that your vaccine accommodation form is complete and verified by the appropriate person. It can take time to obtain an appointment to have your form completed by the appropriate verifier. We strongly encourage you to begin this process immediately.

If you are coming to campus while you wait for your approved accommodation plan:

- You must test negative on a rapid antigen test no more than 72 hours before coming to our campuses and buildings. COVID-19 [testing, rapid antigen testing and vaccination](#) is available through Campus Wellness for all University of Waterloo students, employees, postdocs and their family members.
- Wear a face mask or other appropriate face covering in all common indoor spaces, in accordance with [University guidelines](#). If you require a face covering accommodation due to disability or other grounds related to the Ontario Human Rights Code, please refer to the University's [face covering exemption request](#) process.
- You must complete a daily COVID-19 screening assessment every day using Campus Check-In.

- In order to continue to access campus with a vaccine accommodation, you must submit your vaccine accommodation application (including all required documentation) on or before **October 17, 2021**.

How do I apply for an exemption?

You can apply through [Campus Check-In](#). Student requests for accommodation are handled by AccessAbility Services. Employee requests are handled by Occupational Health.

What do you mean by fully vaccinated?

Fully vaccinated means it has been 14 days or more since you received a full course of a COVID-19 vaccination approved by either a Health Canada or a World Health Organization approved vaccine. A full course means you have had your final dose of either a two-dose or a one-dose vaccine series.

Which vaccines are approved?

Any [Health Canada](#) or [WHO-approved](#) vaccine will be recognized.

I'm an international student who's had a full course of a vaccination not recognized by WHO/Health Canada, Do I have to go home? My doctor has instructed me not to get additional doses a different vaccination.

International students will get support from Health Services if they don't have a completed series of WHO-approved vaccines in line with the government guidance. UWaterloo will recognize completed series of Health Canada and WHO-Approved vaccines. The Public Health Agency of Canada [recently updated guidance on international visitors with vaccines not approved in Canada](#), recommending one additional dose of mRNA for individuals who do not have a Health Canada approved vaccine.

Will international students be encouraged to get vaccinated once they arrive?

Yes. International students will get support from Health Services if they don't have a completed series of WHO-approved vaccines in line with the PHAC guidance. UWaterloo will recognize completed series of WHO-Approved vaccines. The Public Health Agency of Canada [recently updated guidance on international visitors with vaccines not approved in Canada](#), recommending one additional dose of mRNA.

My Proof of Vaccination documents are not in English. Do I need to provide a translation?

We will accept documents supplied in English or French. Any other languages must be provided with translation.

If I am unvaccinated, what happens?

Without proof of vaccination, or an accommodation, you are not permitted to come to campus.

By when must I have provided proof of vaccination?

From September 7, anyone coming to campus must have completed the Campus Check-In vaccination form. We recognize that some people may need additional time to complete their vaccination series or apply for an accommodation, so we will allow individuals to provide their proof by October 17 at the latest.

How do I find proof of my vaccination?

For anyone who was vaccinated in Ontario: copies of your receipts are available on the [Government of Ontario website](#).

For anyone who was vaccinated elsewhere in Canada: copies of your receipts are available on the relevant provincial website that you can find links to on the [Government of Canada website](#).

For anyone who was vaccinated outside of Canada: Proof can include vaccination receipts or letters from physicians, hospitals, or government agencies that include what specific vaccinations you have already received.

If I have already provided proof to UWaterloo (e.g., for residence students), do I need to do this again?

Students living in Campus Housing residences or AFIW residences that have already supplied proof of vaccination or sought an accommodation do not need to resubmit proof.

How will community members share their proof of vaccination?

You can submit proof through [Campus Check-In](#).

What file formats will you allow?

pdf, png, jpg, doc, docx up to 100MB

What counts as proof? What documents will I need to provide and how?

You should upload your vaccination record or receipt. In most cases this will be the receipt from your second dose appointment. Please upload your vaccination record or receipt. Please ensure your upload includes:

- Date(s) received
- Name of vaccine(s) that you received

The number of valid doses you have received

What if I am working from home or have all my classes online during the fall term and have no reason to come to campus?

We are asking everyone to complete the Campus Check-In vaccination form. As employees may be required to come to campus at any time as part of their work requirements, they must supply proof of vaccination or request an accommodation as soon as possible.

Students who will not be coming to the campus for fall 2021 do not have to provide proof of vaccination but we will ask you to attest to submitting proof if your plans change. The vaccination rules will remain for the winter term when we expect even more in-person experiences for all. However, we encourage everyone to upload their proof of vaccination as soon as possible.

What if I am coming to campus to use the library, gym or any other campus facility?

All University community members (students, faculty, staff) and visitors (including contractors, guests, parents, etc) who wish to access a University of Waterloo campus or facility are required to provide proof of vaccination.

Will you be checking vaccine status information when I come into a campus building?

We will monitor attendance using existing tools. Failure to provide the required information or comply with the vaccine mandate may impact an individual's ability to attend Campus.

What is the University going to do to/for people who do not supply their proof of vaccination or apply for an exemption?

Individuals who are not fully vaccinated and those who have an exemption as the result of an approved accommodation but who have failed to provide proof of a negative COVID-19 test(s) as required by the University's vaccination mandate are not permitted on Campus.

I don't have access to a device to upload my proof. Can I submit proof manually or in person?

For select employees who do not have routine access to a device to complete Campus Check-In, we will provide a paper copy of the forms to complete. Please let your supervisor know if you require a paper copy of the forms.

How will my vaccine information be safeguarded?

Your personal information will be kept confidential in compliance with statutory privacy requirements and will only be shared with health and safety staff as required to protect our community.

Personal information on the Campus Check-In vaccination form is collected under the authority of the University of Waterloo Act 1972 (as amended) and because it is necessary to the proper administration of a lawfully authorized activity. The information will be used to determine the qualification of the person identified on the form and the documents submitted as adequate for fulfillment of the requirements of University of Waterloo's COVID-19 vaccination mandate.

The information will be retained only so long as it is necessary for the purpose for which it was collected and will be destroyed when mandatory vaccines are no longer determined to be necessary for public health purposes. While the information is retained it will be accessed only by those University of Waterloo personnel who require access in order to determine whether the requirements of the COVID-19 vaccination mandate have been met. The information will not be shared with any third parties.

Questions about this collection of information should be directed to coronavirus@uwaterloo.ca. General Questions about the University's collection of personal information should be directed to the Privacy Officer, 200 University Ave W, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, (519) 888-4567 X36101, fippa@uwaterloo.ca.

Will supervisors or instructors have access to individual vaccination declarations or records?

No. The information will be accessed only by those University of Waterloo personnel who require access in order to determine whether the requirements of the COVID-19 vaccination mandate have been met. The information will not be shared with any third parties.

Who has access to the data provided through the Campus Check-in?

Your personal information will be kept confidential in compliance with statutory privacy requirements and will only be shared with health and safety staff as required to protect our community. The information that you provide will be managed in compliance with privacy legislation.

Information on vaccination will be accessed only by those University of Waterloo personnel who require access in order to determine whether the requirements of the COVID-19 vaccination

mandate have been met. Vaccination status information in Campus Check in will only be shared publicly in aggregate.

Data on health screening questions is kept for 30 days and is only reviewed if an individual fails screening. If you fail the screening questions, a health professional will contact you to ensure you have medical advice on how to proceed.

If I am fully vaccinated, do I need to adhere to other safety measures such as wearing a mask and self-screening?

If you are coming to campus, you must continue to follow all applicable health and safety measures. You must also complete the [Campus Check-In daily screening assessment](#) questions each day you plan to visit campus. You will be automatically reminded to complete the screening the next day you come to campus and connect to our wifi network.

Who decided vaccination should be mandatory?

On August 17, 2021, the Chief Medical Officer of Health indicated that mandatory vaccination policies will be required for post-secondary institutions, with specific minimum requirements. On August 24, 2021, the Council of Ontario Ministers of Health wrote to Universities to strongly recommend that those policies include providing proof of full vaccination against COVID-19. The University of Waterloo's plan aligns with the direction from the government and the chief medical officer of health, and was ultimately decided upon by the President, Provost, Vice-Presidents and Deans.

Why is proof of vaccination now a requirement?

On August 17, 2021, the Chief Medical Officer of Health indicated that mandatory vaccination policies will be required for post-secondary institutions, with specific minimum requirements. On August 24, 2021, the Council of Ontario Ministers of Health wrote to Universities to strongly recommend that those policies include providing proof of full vaccination against COVID-19. We know that ensuring high rates of vaccination remains the most important way we can protect public health during the pandemic and reduce the spread of COVID-19.

Where can I get more information, ask questions or get support and assistance?

More information is available on the COVID-19 information website.

If you have questions about accommodations, you can contact the AccessAbility Services office (students) or Occupational Health (employees).

COVID-19 [testing, rapid antigen testing and vaccination](#) is available through Campus Wellness for all University of Waterloo students, employees, postdocs and their family members.

If you are struggling with your mental health during these changing times, reach out for support through [Human Resources](#), [Occupational Health](#), [Here247](#) and [Wellness Together Canada](#). Ongoing employees can access supports through [Homewood Health](#), the University's [Employee and Family Assistance Program](#) partner or at 1-800-663-1142.

What happens if I am found to have provided false or inaccurate documentation?

Any false information or misrepresentation submitted may result in changes in your ability to access the University of Waterloo.

What is the process involved in providing proof?

[Campus Check-In](#) – you will upload a PDF or image of your documentation.

If I am vaccinated, will I still have to self-declare daily?

Yes – everyone must complete Campus Check In screening every day in accordance with the Ontario regulations.

How long do you keep my vaccine proof for?

The information will be retained only so long as it is necessary for the purpose for which it was collected and will be destroyed when mandatory vaccines are no longer determined to be necessary for public health purposes.

What about those who are on satellite campuses? What is the process for rapid antigen screening?

People visiting satellite campuses (Cambridge, Kitchener, Stratford) and other non-campus locations are also required to submit proof of their vaccination status. For those that need it, we expect to be able to provide take-home self-test kits at each of these locations. Further information will follow.

Will every campus location provide easily accessible testing opportunities?

We expect to be able to provide take-home self-test kits at each of our campus locations. Further information will follow.

What are the options for people who are unable to get vaccinated, yet decline the weekly testing? Will they be terminated/suspended, or will they be offered virtual learning?

Refusal to participate may result in changes in your ability to access our campuses.

I am a visitor to campus but will only be outside. Do I need to complete a campus check-in?

Yes, but please discuss arrangements with your host on campus.

If I only come to campus once or twice a week and I am not vaccinated, do I still need to participate in the rapid testing program twice a week?

You must be vaccinated or have an exemption to come to campus.

Do I need to provide a “negative result” on my rapid antigen test to someone?

If you are enrolled in the rapid antigen testing program, you must test negative within 72 hours of coming to campus. You should keep a record of any tests you do at home as we may ask you to provide proof of your test results if required.

When am I expected to complete the screening? If I am required to do rapid antigen testing, will it make me late for class or work?

Your first visit to the rapid antigen testing program may take as long as 20 minutes. You will be issued testing kits, trained on how to use the kits and helped to administer your first test. Once trained, the test itself takes less than a minute and you receive a result in around 15 minutes.

How long does it take to complete Campus Check-In?

It takes less than three minutes to complete your proof of vaccination and less than a minute to complete the daily screening questions.

What if I am not planning to get vaccinated and don't have a valid exemption? What options do I have?

Students: if you don't want to get vaccinated do not have a valid exemption you will be able to withdraw with no penalty and obtain a refund. Please visit [Undergraduate Notice of Withdrawal Form](#) or [Graduate Change of enrolment status](#) to withdraw.

Employees: The University will address issues of vaccination mandate violation(s) in accordance with established University policies and procedures and/or by the terms of existing contracts or collective agreements, where applicable.

How will I make up for missed classes if I'm not double vaccinated by the time classes start?

You have until Oct 17 to get fully vaccinated. You must enrol in rapid testing to come to campus before then.

What are the ramifications for forged proof?

Any false information or misrepresentation submitted may result in changes in your ability to access the University of Waterloo.

What documentation will campus visitors need to provide?

Contractors, service providers and invited visitors to the University's campuses who are vaccine-eligible (currently those born during or before 2009) are required to be vaccinated and must declare their vaccination status in [Campus Check-In](#).

Contractors and service providers include:

- Employees of leased business (e.g., Student Life Centre operations such as SOS Physio, Campus Dentist, Pharmacy)
- Athletics rental participants (coaches, athletes)
- Staff at Bright Starts Daycare
- All contractors performing work in campus buildings

Invited visitors to campus include:

- Invited academic visitors (e.g., visiting professors/researchers, industry partners, hiring candidates)
- Athletics rental participants and spectators
- Community members booking space for use on campus
- Participants in student competitions that may occur in-person on campus

These guidelines do not apply to customers of on-campus retail outlets, on-campus public event participants, pedestrians traversing campus grounds, transit personnel or delivery drivers.

What considerations/best practices the university is enforcing for hosting international visitors?

International visitors to Canada must comply with the [Government of Canada entry guidelines](#).

Will those who are not attending campus (e.g. learning remotely) still be required as previously outlined to complete the self-declaration? Or is mandatory proof required?

We encourage everyone to get vaccinated and share proof as soon as possible. This will allow for most flexibility as we seek to expand in person experiences for all and look ahead to Winter

term. Students not coming to campus in Fall 2021 do not need to submit proof (take language from survey tool) but must do so if their plans change.

I will not be able to be fully vaccinated within the time frame provided. Do I have to do rapid antigen tests in the meantime?

You must submit proof of vaccination or apply for an accommodation no later than October 17, 2021. Please complete the [Campus Check-In](#) vaccination form for instructions.

What is the process/how can I access rapid antigen testing?

[Book a test with the rapid testing program.](#)

For those who require rapid antigen testing until their full course of vaccines are complete, can any rapid antigen site be accessed?

We are asking those who require rapid antigen testing to attend the main campus site in the Student Life Centre (SLC) or Health Services for testing, or to pick up a home testing kit from one of the available locations.

[Waterloo Region](#)

University of Waterloo fires professor over vaccine mandate

Move comes in same week school says it's dropping its vaccine mandate; other faculty also facing termination

By [Robert Williams](#) Record Reporter

Wed., March 23, 2022

Article was updated 11 hrs ago

WATERLOO — At least one professor at the University of Waterloo was fired this week for not complying with the school's mandatory COVID-19 vaccine policy.

This comes after the school announced on Tuesday it was suspending its mask and proof of vaccination requirements for entry to campus, effective May 1.

Michael Palmer, a chemistry professor, was notified Monday his position with the school — a post he has had for more than two decades — has been terminated.

“I’m an old warhorse. I knew what was coming and I had already made up my mind that I was not going to budge and this was simply how things were always going to play out,” he said. “This is not something that devastates me. I’m OK, I’m going to pick myself back up.”

The university's discipline process for faculty follows an escalation of suspensions before a final termination. Palmer was first notified he was being placed on a three-day paid leave earlier this year, followed by an eight-day unpaid leave, and finally termination on Monday.

The process for each professor is handled by the dean of their respective department, with some moving quicker than others to follow through with the terminations. The Record is aware of at least two other professors in the suspension process, and one lecturer set to be terminated on Thursday.

Palmer said he is now in the process of procuring a lawyer, and intends to file a grievance over his dismissal, which he alleges did not follow proper procedure.

Palmer's termination is considered “with cause,” which means he will likely not be eligible for a severance package under the current conditions.

“I will make no bones about it, I think this is a purge and it is a vendetta to get rid of all people who dared to defy the university and its set of superior wisdom,” said Palmer. He has a medical degree from Germany and spent more than 10 years working in laboratories and diagnosing infectious pathogens before joining Waterloo’s faculty.

Palmer has long been an opponent of mRNA vaccines and has been calling for further studies on possible adverse effects, including damage to blood vessels, the introduction of auto-immune diseases and the inflammation of organs and tissues.

As set out by the province, Waterloo was required to have a vaccine policy in place for its community for the fall semester. Under the guidelines, anyone who chose not to be vaccinated had to take part in an education session and submit to regular testing. However, universities across the province chose to institute mandatory vaccination policies, with little leeway for both medical and religious exemptions.

The province removed its requirement for the university to have a vaccine policy on March 1, but Waterloo announced it was keeping its in place until the end of the term.

Now, it has suspended its vaccine policy for the spring term but cautions it may be forced to bring it back based on public health indicators.

“If the situation changes, it may become necessary to bring back requirements for mask wearing and proof of vaccination on short notice,” a memo reads. “To ensure we can minimize any disruption to work and learning if this happens, we will maintain a requirement for all members of our community to provide information on their up to date vaccination status.”

Waterloo president Vivek Goel said Wednesday the vaccine status information will only be used for planning purposes if requirements are brought back — the current mandate only requires two doses, but subsequent policies could require a third or fourth dose. Goel said it will be important to have an updated view of where the community is at before reintroducing another mandate.

“We’re sending a very clear signal that things could change very quickly, and we could have a requirement to reimpose the requirements on short notice,” he said.

If Waterloo does reinstate a vaccination policy, employees will once again be subject to the university’s discipline policy if they don’t comply.

Many staff who didn’t comply with the original mandate were terminated in February, and students are currently unable to enrol in in-person classes. Unvaccinated staff are not allowed to teach this semester.

When asked why the university didn’t just allow for regular testing as an alternative, Goel said that due to the amount of mixing and activity that takes place in a school setting, the university felt a strict vaccine mandate was required.

“There are very different views about the appropriateness of a testing regime as an alternate to vaccine, and these are things that are being debated out there,” he said. “Certainly, in the advice we got from the Council of Chief Medical Officers of Health, it was very clear they did not feel that a testing regime would be an adequate substitute.”

Disciplinary action

Along with Palmer, mathematics professor Edward Vrscay, philosophy professor John Turri and lecturer Rosina Kharal are moving through University of Waterloo’s disciplinary process.

Vrscay, who has been with the university for more than 35 years, has entered his eight-day unpaid suspension and awaits a notice for his eventual termination.

Kharal, a former Waterloo student, expects to be served her termination notice Thursday.

Kharal said the vaccine mandate has consumed her life since its announcement in late August. She has spent the last few months researching the school’s policy, sending [letters](#) outlining her findings, and speaking with members of the community to hear their stories.

In one instance, she said, a computer science student who was given a vaccine exemption at Wilfrid Laurier University was denied the same accommodation at Waterloo. After filing a grievance, she said the student was told their decision would come the day after the deadline to drop their courses.

The student was eventually denied their grievance, was forced to drop their classes without pay, and now has withdrawal notices on their official transcript. Kharal said the student was subsequently kicked out of university residence as well.

“What is the justification for these decisions made by the university?” she asked. “Is it worth the trauma and this injustice that they’ve inflicted on their own people?”

For months, Turri has been calling on the university to provide its benchmarks and measures of success for the rollout of the vaccine mandate.

Turri points to the university’s public historical data on positive COVID-19 cases on campus, which found the introduction of a mandatory vaccine policy was associated with one fewer positive COVID-19 test on campus every two months.

Now, he points to Ontario provincial COVID-19 data for March 22, which found that not fully vaccinated people had the lowest positivity rate per 100,000 people at 8.49, compared to 11.38 for fully vaccinated and 13.53 for vaccinated with a booster.

Turri said there is no clear evidence that unvaccinated individuals who comply with regular testing pose an elevated risk to a community that is overwhelmingly vaccinated to begin with.

“If they’re doing a cost-benefit analysis I would very much like to hear what that turns out and what they’re feeding into that analysis,” he said.

In response, Goel said the success of the mandate is shown in the high level of compliance the school has had.

“One of the things about public health is that success becomes hard to measure because we don’t know if we didn’t have high levels of vaccination whether there would be more outbreaks happening in our community.”

If Waterloo is able to have students, faculty and staff back on campus interacting with limited disruption, “that’s a success for me,” said Goel.

[RW](#)

[Robert Williams](#) is a Waterloo Region-based reporter for The Record. Reach him via email: robertwilliams@torstar.ca