As a lifelong Nevada resident, UNLV alumni, and prospective Boyd Law School student, I wish to make a few comments in support of the proposed vaccine mandate.

1. Vaccine deniers think that with vaccine hesitancy among certain demographics, a mandate would restrict a disproportionate number of minority students and students with disabilities from accessing higher education.

Though discrimination based on race or disability may violate a long history of civil rights in this country, sometimes it's necessary for the public good. And discrimination against minorities is okay as long as we're not doing it intentionally... Right?

 Per the CDC's data and Pfizer's initial claim of 95% vaccine efficacy, a fully vaccinated 55 year old professor is twice as likely to die after contracting COVID-19 than an unvaccinated college student.

If we remove unvaccinated students from campus for their safety, I suggest we also remove all faculty and staff over the age of 50. Their lives are too valuable for us to risk, and we've already decided we're okay with discrimination as long as it might save a life.

3. Finally, a common complaint is that vaccine manufacturers and regulators assume no liability for vaccine injuries. This board can put those complaints to rest by offering full liability protection to all students that are injured, forced to miss work, or contract COVID-19 after taking the vaccine. This is a low risk proposition given this board's confidence in the safety and efficacy of the vaccine. If we wish to encourage more students to take the vaccine, then this board must approve full liability protection from vaccine injuries.

Sure, the state may have to pay a few small settlements here and there, but what is money compared to the lives saved by offering students the peace of mind of liability protection?

If it saves just one life, it's worth it.

Thank you, Mason McElroy