

Confidential Investigation Report into Possible Violations of Academic Personnel Manual by Professor [REDACTED]

June 26, 2024

Dean Kevin R. Johnson
UC Davis School of Law

Ellen London and Rachel Naor
London & Stout P.C.
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2010
Oakland, CA 94612

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	1
III.	BACKGROUND	2
	A. Notice to Respondent.....	2
	B. Relevant Policy Provisions	2
IV.	INVESTIGATION METHODOLOGY	3
	A. Investigation Structure	3
	B. Documents Reviewed	4
V.	ANALYSIS AND FACTUAL FINDINGS	5
	A. Evidence and Findings of Fact.....	5
	1. General Context.....	5
	2. Background on Professor [REDACTED]	6
	a. Professor [REDACTED] Academic Career	6
	b. Professor [REDACTED] Social Media Activity	8
	3. The October 10 Post.....	9
	4. Professor [REDACTED] Statements About the Post.....	9
	a. Professor [REDACTED] First Interview.....	9
	b. Professor [REDACTED] Second Interview.....	12
	5. Reactions to and Consequences of the Post.....	14
	a. Students.....	14
	b. Faculty.....	14
	c. [REDACTED] Department	15
	i. Staff	15
	ii. Faculty.....	16
	iii. [REDACTED]	18
	d. Administration	18
	e. Jewish Community	19
	i. Immediate Reaction to the Post	19
	ii. View of October 10 post as Antisemitic	21
	iii. Longer Term Impact/Long-Term Concerns	21
	f. Journalists	22
	g. Development.....	22
	h. Pro-Palestine Advocates.....	23
	B. Analysis.....	23
VI.	CONCLUSION	27

I. INTRODUCTION

On November 13, 2023, the University of California, Davis (“UC Davis,” or the “University”), charged Dean Kevin R. Johnson and Ellen London of the law firm London & Stout P.C. with investigating whether Assistant Professor [REDACTED] violated the University of California Faculty Code of Conduct (Academic Personnel Manual (“APM”) 015) by posting the below message on the social media platform “X” (formerly Twitter) (referred to in this report as the “October 10 post”).

[REDACTED]

one group of ppl we have easy access to
in the US is all these zionist journalists
who spread propaganda &
misinformation

they have houses w addresses, kids in
school

they can fear their bosses, but they
should fear us more 

The charge letter states that “[a]s a result of Professor [REDACTED] post, multiple members of the UC Davis community who either identify as Jewish or have not identified their religious beliefs have reported feeling threatened and unsafe and/or reported having concern for the safety of their children and the children of Jewish members of the UC Davis community.” Accordingly, we were charged with considering whether Professor [REDACTED] conduct violated certain specific sections of the Faculty Code of Conduct, as well as whether it constituted “[a]ny other types of unacceptable conduct subject to discipline.” [REDACTED]

The charges are made with knowledge that UC Davis is deeply committed to free expression and robust public debate. At the same time, UC Davis aspires to comply with the [principles of community](#), and respect for the dignity and respect for all members of the campus community. This investigation was conducted by Dean Johnson, and London & Stout attorneys Ellen London, Rachel Naor, and Michael Lundholm. This report contains the findings of Dean Johnson and the London & Stout team.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Although this investigation arose from a single X post, which Professor [REDACTED] has admitted to writing, it was far from straightforward. During the investigation, the people we interviewed raised issues pertaining to antisemitism, Islamophobia, attacks on academic freedom,

[REDACTED], [REDACTED] to name a few. We strived to be impartial and fair to all involved. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the lead investigators listened to the witnesses with open minds and tried to understand what we heard throughout our time working on this matter. We note that we found our partnership to be uniquely productive, in that we both have a range of different life and work experiences, and we both have conducted multiple prior investigations for UC Davis. We are completely aligned in our findings, and this report represents both of our views.

In the course of our interviews, we were struck by the amount of pain people experienced in response to the October 10 post. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] There is no question that the only reason that this post gained publicity was because certain right-wing outlets targeted Professor [REDACTED]. There is also no question that the October 10 post injured members of the Jewish community, who felt scared, isolated, and angry to see this type of violent and hateful rhetoric from a UC Davis professor, with no subsequent clarification or apology. Nor is there any question that the post caused a ripple effect of anxiety and increased burden on campus, in particular with the [REDACTED] as well as in areas such as communications and development.

Our findings reflect the complexity of the situation, as well as the serious consequences of the post. We carefully considered the fact that Professor [REDACTED] was targeted by the right-wing media, that she did not intend for this post to be read by anyone outside of her social circle, and that her social circle would have understood it to be satire. We found that Professor [REDACTED] did not intend for the post to be taken seriously or hope that it would be read as a call to violence. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] However, because of the nature of the post, and because of the widespread fear, hurt, and anxiety that it caused, we find that Professor [REDACTED] conduct was not justified by the University's Ethical Principles, and that some discipline is warranted. [REDACTED]

III. BACKGROUND

A. Notice to Respondent

Professor [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] She was notified of the charged allegations on November 6, 2023.

B. Relevant Policy Provisions

Our investigation focused on potential violations of APM 015. The charge letter identified specific provisions of the APM, which we focused on during our investigation. These sections were:

5. Any other types of unacceptable conduct subject to discipline, e.g., conduct that is not justified by the “Ethical Principles” of

- a. Teaching and Students under Section II.A,
- b. The University under Section II.C,
- c. Colleagues under Section II.D, and/or
- d. The Community under Section II.E

and that significantly impairs the University's central functions "to provide and sustain and environment conducive to sharing, extending, and critically examining knowledge and values, and to furthering the search for wisdom."

IV. INVESTIGATION METHODOLOGY

A. Investigation Structure

Our starting point for determining the investigative structure was the applicable policies identified in the charge letter. Those policies required us to make certain determinations about Professor [REDACTED] conduct, including: [REDACTED]

To assess these questions, we organized our investigation to collect evidence relevant to these questions. Besides speaking to Professor [REDACTED] herself and reviewing documents and information about her past, including her previous social media activity, we came up with other groups of people to speak with because we thought they could provide information that would inform our analysis. Broadly, this included: 1) members of the Jewish community, as the charge letter stated the University had received concerns about the post from Jewish people; 2) people who have supported the pro-Palestine political movement, to hear their perspectives on the post; 3) faculty or other staff who worked with Professor [REDACTED]; 4) administrators who could discuss the impact of the post on the University; and 5) individuals Professor [REDACTED] herself identified as people with whom she wanted us to speak as part of the investigation.

We initially decided that we would try to speak with Professor ██████████ early in the investigation to hear her perspective before we spoke with other witnesses.

interviewed Professor [REDACTED] in person on January [REDACTED], 2024, and we conducted a follow-up interview on February [REDACTED] 2024. After both interviews, we prepared a written memorandum summarizing the interview and provided Professor [REDACTED] counsel with a copy of that document; Professor [REDACTED] chose to provide some written comments to the first memorandum but did not provide any written comments to the second memorandum.

We identified other individuals to interview in line with the categories identified above. On November 21, 2023, the University provided us with a spreadsheet in which it had compiled information on over 300 e-mail complaints received by the Office of the Chancellor and the Provost about the October 10 post. The University also provided each of the email complaints to us. Those complaints came from various members of the campus community as well as individuals not affiliated with the University, including students, parents of students, alumni, parents of prospective students, and individuals with no connection to the University. Some of the complaints called for Professor [REDACTED] termination. We reviewed those complaints and identified certain individuals with whom we wanted to speak based on their connection to the University and their reaction to the post.

We also developed a list of staff, faculty, and administrators with whom we wanted to speak to get a broad perspective on how the October 10 post affected various facets of campus life and University functions, including development and alumni relations, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and Jewish organizations. Over the course of the investigation, we spoke with 24 staff and faculty members. Some of those faculty members identified current students (both undergraduate and graduate students) who they felt we should speak with about the impact of the October 10 post on them, and we did so to the extent that the person in question responded to our interview request. We reached out to everyone on the list of potential witnesses that Professor [REDACTED] provided, and we spoke with all of them with the exception of [REDACTED]. We note that we had some difficulty speaking with individuals at the University who are active in pro-Palestine work on campus, because several of them either chose not to respond to our outreach or indicated that they were not comfortable speaking with us. Ultimately, we were able to speak to enough people from the various groups to allow us to reach the findings discussed in this report.

We began conducting interviews on December [REDACTED] 2023, and we concluded our interviews on May [REDACTED], 2024. We conducted interviews both by Zoom videoconference and in person. Both Dean Johnson and Ms. London attended all of the interviews. [REDACTED]

B. Documents Reviewed

The charge letter included a screenshot of the October 10 post. We reviewed the October 10 post through the X platform and also reviewed some of Professor [REDACTED] previous posts on Twitter/X.

On November 21, 2023, the University provided us with a spreadsheet summarizing 303 complaints about Professor [REDACTED] sent to the Office of the Chancellor and Provost up to that date. On November 28, 2023, the Office of the Provost provided us with access to a folder containing complaints regarding Professor [REDACTED]. At the time the folder contained 418 emails, 16 audio files, and 2 written letters. The University's Harassment & Discrimination Assistance and

Prevention Program (“HDAPP”) and Academic Affairs also provided us with a small number of additional emails and audio files they received regarding Professor [REDACTED]. The University has also periodically updated us regarding additional complaints received after November 2023. We reviewed these documents and recordings.

We also reviewed documents provided by Professor [REDACTED] herself, which are described in the section of this report describing our interview of Professor [REDACTED], and certain documents provided by the witnesses, which are described within the report.

V. ANALYSIS AND FACTUAL FINDINGS

A. Evidence and Findings of Fact

1. *General Context*

We begin with a brief discussion of the climate for Jewish students, faculty, and staff at UC Davis over the past few years, because that is relevant to our findings in this investigation. In our view, the climate is relevant to understanding why the October 10 post was perceived in the way that it was by some Jewish individuals. We of course do not hold Professor [REDACTED] accountable for antisemitism on the campus, but we do find that the context in which her post was made matters, both in terms of whether she adequately considered the campus climate in making the post and in terms of the credibility of those who have stated that the October 10 post caused them to experience genuine fear and/or concern.

The University’s DEI website includes a page entitled “Addressing Antisemitism,” which states, “[i]n recent years, we have seen a rise in displays of swastikas (banners, clothing), Holocaust denials, and white supremacist bias against Jewish people. When these displays are in public places in and around Davis, they are especially concerning.” [Addressing Antisemitism | Diversity, Equity & Inclusion \(ucdavis.edu\)](https://dei.ucdavis.edu/addressing-antisemitism). The page includes links to statements addressing various antisemitic incidents in Davis (for example, banners displayed over the Highway 113 bicycle overpass with antisemitic statements from August 2022) and on campus (swastikas displayed in a residence hall in October 2022).

When we interviewed the [REDACTED] during our investigation, she spoke credibly about antisemitism on campus, which she said was increasing before October 7, when the Israel-Hamas war began, but had worsened since October 7. [REDACTED] said that in 2021, in the wake of the UC Davis student government passing a resolution in support of the Boycott, Divest, and Sanctions (“BDS”) movement alongside other university student governments,¹ the Chancellor formed an advisory council to discuss issues of concern for the University Jewish community; the council includes student leaders, faculty members, Hillel Board members, and members of campus administration. This council meets four times a year. [REDACTED] also talked about the kinds of incidents that she has been observing on campus since October 7, which include members of the student group Aggies for Israel being called “Zio,” (a derogatory term for a Zionist) and otherwise being verbally harassed. Since October 7, [REDACTED] has kept a document with a running list of incidents that she views as antisemitic; while some of the incidents

¹ According to the BDS Movement website, BDS “works to end international support for Israel’s oppression of Palestinians and pressure Israel to comply with international law.”

are less extreme or less clearly antisemitic, it is clear to us that there has been a pattern of rising antisemitism in Davis.

This conclusion is supported by our interviews with other members of the campus Jewish community. We spoke with multiple Jewish faculty members and students, and they all spoke about an increasingly hostile climate for people who present as Jewish, regardless of their views on the Israel-Hamas war or Israel in general. Other witnesses corroborated what [REDACTED] described about the general fear and anxiety of being Jewish on campus. The [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that it was “relatively” safe to be Jewish on campus before October 7, although she mentioned some neo-Nazi activity from last year and said that someone [REDACTED] [REDACTED] however, she said that since October 7, it has been very stressful to be Jewish on campus. She explained that she wore a necklace with a Jewish symbol, and she has been yelled at, glared at, given the middle finger, and snarled at, such that she avoids certain parts of campus; she has at times skipped [REDACTED] if there were protests against Israel and now largely tucks in her Jewish necklace so that it is not visible. Another [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had a similar experience, and she also talked about her own and others’ fear of revealing their Jewish identity right now. She is aware of people taking off their kippot or otherwise hiding their Jewish identity due to this fear. And a third [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that he has been gagged at for wearing his kippah.

During the course of this investigation, we followed the news on increasing tensions on college campuses along with the rest of the country, and we are aware that these tensions continued to heighten since we interviewed the witnesses in this matter. We also recognize that many of the pro-Palestine supporters feel frustrated and angry about the situation in Gaza, as well as the response to the situation domestically. We simply provide this information to give context to the existing broader climate at UC Davis at the time that Professor [REDACTED] wrote the October 10 post.

2. *Background on Professor [REDACTED]*

a. Professor [REDACTED] Academic Career

Professor [REDACTED] joined UC Davis in 2017, where she has taught a variety of courses.² To give a sense of her teaching, in 2023, Professor [REDACTED] taught four courses, two in the winter quarter and two in the spring quarter. In the winter quarter, [REDACTED] course called [REDACTED] and a course relating to [REDACTED]. In the spring quarter, she taught a course about the individual and the community, involving a critique of possessive individualism, and she taught a thesis class of four to five students who were in the

process of drafting their theses. Professor ██████████ has exclusively taught undergraduates at UC Davis (there are no graduate students in ██████████).

Professor [REDACTED] also served as the undergraduate faculty advisor for [REDACTED] from December 2022 until [REDACTED]. In this role, she was responsible for advising students considering majoring in [REDACTED] as well as working with students seeking to have a designated emphasis in [REDACTED]. Professor [REDACTED] said that she did not have extensive relationships with any UC Davis students except for being on one graduate student's qualifying committee (though she did not have sustained interactions with this student) and serving as a mentor to one student, [REDACTED].

_____ beyond teaching and serving as the undergraduate advisor, Professor _____ has been a regular participant in the UC President's Postdoctoral Program, which involves reviewing fellowship applications. She has also served on committees fighting for racial justice in the academy since 2017.

Multiple people spoke highly of Professor [REDACTED] efforts to make the campus and/or UC more broadly a more welcoming place for marginalized groups. For example, Professor [REDACTED] said that Professor [REDACTED] has been very committed to fostering a welcoming campus culture and has put a lot of thought into that issue. [REDACTED] noted that she and Professor [REDACTED] were both a part of a campus coalition during the pandemic to create a sense of safety for marginalized students, noting that Professor [REDACTED] was particularly focused on protecting trans students. [REDACTED] said that he heard only positive comments from students about Professor [REDACTED], and that students, especially from marginalized backgrounds, appreciated the way that Professor [REDACTED] created a safe space for academic conversation. Professor [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] emphasized that Professor [REDACTED] is a valuable member of the UC community, and that her teaching and service work are significant; he noted that this work is often unacknowledged when done by [REDACTED] women. Finally, the student that Professor [REDACTED] mentored, [REDACTED] spoke highly of Professor [REDACTED] teaching style, and in particular her respect for individuals' identities.

Multiple [REDACTED] professors said that Professor [REDACTED] was not that involved with the department. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

We asked questions of various witnesses about whether Professor [REDACTED] had ever done or said anything inappropriate. There was one example given by two colleagues in [REDACTED] of questionable behavior by Professor [REDACTED], in which Professor [REDACTED] pushed back on a thesis plan from a politically conservative student; apparently, Professor [REDACTED] did not want to support the student's politics. One of the colleagues who raised this said that the student was strong academically and that Professor [REDACTED] behavior gave her pause, because it was not appropriate for a member of the faculty to take a stance like this against a student. The other colleague also felt it was not appropriate to take this kind of a position with a student.

Overall, we found no evidence of Professor [REDACTED] having exhibited any kind of pattern of saying anything that made people uncomfortable in the way that the October 10 post did.

b. Professor [REDACTED] Social Media Activity

Professor [REDACTED] social media history shows that she generally holds far-left political beliefs. In her X biography she refers to herself as a [REDACTED]. Her biography also has long included the phrase "Free Palestine."³ After a fire was set at the Israeli Embassy in Jordan, Professor [REDACTED] posted, "HELL YEAH," adding three Palestinian flag emojis. In another post before removing her account, Professor [REDACTED] wrote, "Fire to the US embassy. US out of everywhere. US GO HOME. US GO HOME." That post was in response to protests at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut.

Before her more recent posts, Professor [REDACTED] has long been critical of Israeli politics and has posted messages related to Palestine. On May 20, 2023, she retweeted a post stating that "there needs to be another list like this for the companies that support the ongoing nakba" regarding a list of companies involved with the Holocaust. She regularly posted on X about Palestinians imprisoned by the Israeli government. On January 21, 2023, she posted the following on X about Israelis who had allegedly desecrated a Muslim religious site: "Had this been a Muslim man desecrating a synagogue or a church, the MSM would have been in a frenzy. Israeli settlers peeing and drinking alcohol in Al Aqsa compound."

Beyond her posts about Israel and Palestine, she regularly posted and reposted far left and anti-capitalist political opinions. She was active in anti-police advocacy, including trying to remove police from UC Davis's campus. In one post from November 30, 2022, in response to New York City Mayor Adams involuntarily hospitalizing mentally ill individuals, Professor [REDACTED] posted "somebody gotta drive to jersey & [gun emoji] this [expletive] im so sick of him."⁴

³ Professor [REDACTED]s primary X account was @ [REDACTED], although she also had a backup account @ [REDACTED]. When asked about this account, she said she had not used it in four years and did not think it still existed.

⁴ We used the Wayback Machine to find prior posts, and we note that it does not capture all of Professor [REDACTED] posts on X or Twitter.

3. *The October 10 Post*

On October 10, 2023, Professor [REDACTED] made the statement at issue in this investigation from her personal account [REDACTED]. The account does not mention UC Davis or have any affiliation with the University. However, Professor [REDACTED] profile picture for her account appears to be the same image that is used for her profile on the [REDACTED] website. At the time, her account was public and had approximately 4,474 followers. That statement did not get public attention and was not connected to Professor [REDACTED] role at UC Davis until a week later, when on October 17, Jason Rantz, a self-described conservative Jewish radio host and frequent guest on Fox News, posted a screenshot of the October 10 post next to a screenshot of Professor [REDACTED] UC Davis faculty page with the text: "Hi. Is this you, [REDACTED]" Rantz has approximately 135,000 followers, so his post amplified the statement exponentially.

Immediately after Rantz's post, many other X users began to respond to the post. Many of the users also tagged the University in their response. As the post got more visibility, other conservatives with large X followings, including Andy Ngo, a conservative influencer and frequent guest on Fox News, and Charlie Kirk, a conservative activist and head of Turning Point USA, shared the post. By October 19, various news sources, including MSN, ABC10, and Mediaite, had published articles about the October 10 post.

Following the publicity of the October 10 post, the University began to receive a wave of angry emails and complaints. These were submitted both by individuals affiliated with the University and individuals with no affiliation to the University.

Employees at [REDACTED] where [REDACTED] is located, also began receiving numerous complaints and emails following the October 10 post, and staff there felt inundated by the complaints and feared for their safety. In response to staff concerns, when the October 10 post became a news item and set off a flurry of angry responses, the administration decided to send the staff from [REDACTED] home.

4. *Professor [REDACTED] Statements About the Post*

a. Professor [REDACTED] First Interview⁵

When asked during her first interview about why she made the October 10 post and what she intended to convey, Professor [REDACTED] responded by reading from a prepared written statement to give context to the post and her personal experience after making it.⁶ The statement opened with describing Professor [REDACTED] experiences with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and shared

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

how she had feared for her safety after receiving death and other threats to her following the October 10 post. She felt that the University was complicit in failing to keep her safe.

The statement went on to state that Professor [REDACTED] has “never said or done anything antisemitic or anti-Jewish, not in [her] teaching or the service work [she has] done for UC Davis.” Professor [REDACTED] stated that her classes are focused on creating safe spaces away from and against racism and other forms of oppression. She pointed out that she has taught a number of Jewish scholars in her work and was [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] with whom she has worked closely. Professor [REDACTED] written statement also identified individuals, including students and colleagues, who she believed would support her and who she suggested we speak with for this matter.

In terms of why Professor [REDACTED] made the October 10 post, Professor [REDACTED] prepared statement described it as adopting “intentionally hyperbolic and satirical language,” which was “intended broadly to mimic and parody the tone of multiple October 10 posts, articles and statements by senior Israeli officials and journalists which [she] had seen dehumanizing Palestinian children in particular.” Professor [REDACTED] stated that the October 10 post was, in particular, a parody of an article in a Zionist journal, *Israel Hayom*, by Ariel Kahana, an Israeli journalist, entitled, “Enough with proportionality: It’s time to take radical steps” that advocated for abducting and harming senior Hamas officials and their families. Professor [REDACTED] said that she chose to create a “a parodic and satirical double or simulacrum (not an exact duplicate) of this statement, even ending [her] October 10 post with emojis, as if punctuation, to underscore the non-serious and non-literal character of [her] parodic October 10 post meant to draw attention to how absurd such genocidal rhetoric sounds.” When asked specifically who she was referring to by using the phrase “all these Zionist journalists,” Professor [REDACTED] responded that it was a reference to Kahana, as one example. She noted that she reads a lot of world news and offered to provide additional examples of the journalists and writings to which she was referring.⁷

Professor [REDACTED] stated that she has posted about the general topic of Israel and Palestine on prior occasions, and when asked about some of her prior posts that were political in nature, she described them as hyperbolic. Professor [REDACTED] acknowledged that she had previously shared on her X account the post stating that protestors had set the Israeli Embassy in Jordan on fire, with Professor [REDACTED] adding the words “HELL YEAH” with various emojis, including images of fire and the Palestinian flag. Professor [REDACTED] said this post was not similar to the October 10 post in that it does not use a parodic model, but that it was also intended to be hyperbolic and did not advocate violence. Professor [REDACTED] similarly described other previous posts as hyperbolic and not calling for violence. One was the former post she had made about people going to the United States Embassy in Beirut, to which she added the statement “[Fire emojis] to the US embassy, US out of everywhere, US GO HOME, US GO HOME.” Professor [REDACTED] said that this statement was hyperbolic and not advocating for violence. Another was the post from 2022 concerning her reaction to an article that Mayor Eric Adams was involuntarily hospitalizing mentally ill people, which also used emojis. Professor [REDACTED] also described this post as hyperbolic, noting that the use of emojis showed that it was satirical, and that the reference to “Jersey” was a satirical reference to the fact that the Mayor of New York is said to live in New Jersey.

During her interview, in addition to her written statement, Professor [REDACTED] separately shared that it was not her intent when she wrote the October 10 post to lead people to commit violence; she also said that in her view, the post did not refer to Jews and was not antisemitic. She stated her understanding that a lot of Jews do not identify as Zionists and a lot of Zionists do not identify as Jews. She said that she did not understand how people could construe the post to threaten violence when it was “overt satire” and that she would be surprised if anyone interpreted the post as a legitimate threat of violence.

Professor [REDACTED] also emphasized that she posted the statement on a personal account not affiliated with the University. She did not think others at the University followed her on X because she keeps a firm division between her personal and workplace conduct and communications, and she stated she has never encouraged anybody at the University to follow her account. Professor [REDACTED] explained that she made her account public so that she could circulate crowdfunding and fundraising links for campaigns by and for other [REDACTED] individuals in dire financial circumstances. She estimated that she had a few thousand followers but said she did not know who they were.

With respect to the public's response to the October 10 post, Professor [REDACTED] raised the fact that her X account was neither flagged nor suspended for the post. She said that in the week after she made the October 10 post, she got very few "likes" in response to it and did not send it to anybody. Then, around October 17, Professor [REDACTED] was contacted by a right-wing journalist affiliated with Turning Point USA, who wrote to her UC Davis email account. She also said that Charlie Kirk, a conservative activist associated with Turning Point, re-posted the October 10 post, which made the statement get publicity and got the University's attention. Professor [REDACTED] said she did not hear from any students or colleagues raising concerns about the post. She had one conversation with [REDACTED] after the October 10 post where [REDACTED] made a statement along the lines of, "this is such a storm."

Professor [REDACTED] also shared how the backlash to the October 10 post has personally affected and threatened her.

When asked if she considered issuing a statement clarifying that the post was not a serious threat, Professor [REDACTED] explained that given the harassment campaign against her, she did not think it was a good idea to issue any statement about the October 10 post, which she believed would just fuel the right-wing media that was harassing her. She never issued a statement on the post.

b. Professor [REDACTED] Second Interview

We asked Professor [REDACTED] about her understanding of antisemitism. Professor [REDACTED] explained that her understanding of antisemitism comes from both Jewish friends who have experienced antisemitism and scholarly texts, some of which she cited in her written statement and some of which she has also taught in her courses. Professor [REDACTED] explained that the history of antisemitism is part of her scholarly repertoire. She said she was aware of the well-documented increase in antisemitic incidents over the last few years in the United States, citing the Tree of Life Synagogue incident as “the most famous example.”

With respect to the October 10 post and whether she understood that it could be perceived as antisemitic, Professor [REDACTED] said she did not believe the October 10 post was antisemitic. She did acknowledge that people can debate and feel differently about that. Professor [REDACTED] made clear that she sees antisemitism and anti-Zionism as distinct concepts, and she believes other scholars do too. When asked again at the second interview if she would consider making a statement or an apology to address the October 10 post if she felt it were safe to do so, Professor [REDACTED] said it would not be safe. She emphasized that any time this matter comes up in the media, she gets more threats. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] She said that any time something about her comes up publicly, there will be a negative response. Professor [REDACTED] reiterated that she and [REDACTED] faculty have been targeted by right-wing hate groups, so in her view it seems almost impossible to come up with a context where she does not face threats of direct harm by making a statement. Professor [REDACTED] also referenced the anonymous nature of the threats she has received. She explained that she does not know where a statement would be available and whether it would be online; if it were to be posted online, she feels that she and UC Davis will be in this situation again. For all these reasons, Professor [REDACTED] expressed that it was impossible to envision a context where she would not be in danger if she issued a statement. Ultimately, she said that “maybe” she would issue a statement, but “maybe not.”

At the second interview, Professor [REDACTED] was also provided a detailed account of the information gathered and reviewed in this matter, which she was informed came from the 29 different interviews that had been conducted at that point, as well as hundreds of written submissions to the University following the October 10 post. The written submissions largely condemned the October 10 post and the University’s refusal to discipline Professor [REDACTED] for making the statement. With respect to the interviews, that evidence consisted of sharing how the individuals who were interviewed perceived the October 10 post and/or described its impact on University functions. We did not share the name of the individuals who were interviewed, but we informed Professor [REDACTED] that they included individuals she had recommended, campus administrators who could speak to the impact of the October 10 post on campus administrative functions, and individuals, largely identified by the administrators with whom we spoke, who had a perspective on the October 10 post relevant to our investigation.

In general, the evidence was summarized for Professor [REDACTED] as follows:

- Fourteen people described the October 10 post as violent in some form; this group included three faculty members or high-level administrators. This group did not necessarily think Professor [REDACTED] herself would do violence, but they thought the October 10 post could embolden others to do violence. This group cited the specific nature of the October 10 post, including its targeting of children and journalists. Eight individuals in this group who identified as Jewish said they personally felt fear. These individuals also commented on the specific nature of the October 10 post in fomenting that fear. At least three other people talked about observing others in the Jewish community experience fear as a result of the October 10 post.
- Multiple people interviewed described the October 10 post as part of a larger pattern of antisemitism. They saw the October 10 post as a symbol of the rising antisemitism they were observing and/or experiencing, but not the cause of it. People did note, however, that the October 10 post stood out because it was extreme in language and was sent by a professor. People noted that the October 10 post came at a time when the Jewish community was hurting. A number of people commented that Jews have not felt as safe on campus after October 7, due to various antisemitic incidents, and that the October 10 post came at a time of rising antisemitism on college campuses. On the other hand, three people said the October 10 post was clearly satirical. Of those three, one said they did not interpret it to be antisemitic but could understand how it could be interpreted that way, especially given the climate of antisemitism.
- Administratively, there was widespread disruption at [REDACTED] following the October 10 post. This included staff receiving angry emails about the October 10 post, and eventually the staff was instructed to work from home. [REDACTED] also stepped down as [REDACTED] due entirely to [REDACTED] of dealing with the October 10 post and the response to it, [REDACTED]. There was also additional work at the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in response to the October 10 post, and in particular responding to the angry emails and complaints (of which there were over 350).
- Donations to the University were jeopardized. The University has a major donor who has historically made six-figure gifts, who has said that there will be no more gifts until Professor [REDACTED] is fired, and if she is not fired, that donor states they will disassociate altogether from UC Davis. Many major donors have said they are waiting for the process to play out; if Professor [REDACTED] is not fired, the University expects to lose more money, but they cannot quantify how much.

5. Reactions to and Consequences of the Post

a. Students

The witnesses indicated that the October 10 post was not something that was raised as a topic of concern by UC Davis students as a general matter, other than by Jewish students (who are discussed in further detail below). For example, [REDACTED] noted that no one raised anything about the October 10 post at an event [REDACTED] attended by both students and faculty. We also note that Professors [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both established members of [REDACTED], said that no students had raised the issue with them.

We spoke with a former student, [REDACTED], who Professor [REDACTED] suggested as an individual for us to speak with. [REDACTED] who took multiple courses from Professor [REDACTED], described Professor [REDACTED] as a mentor. [REDACTED] said that they had not seen the October 10 post until we reached out to them, and their reaction to it was that it seemed to be in line with the kinds of things that are posted on X. They thought it was less inflammatory than the response to it from the right, and they thought it was satirical. They said that Professor [REDACTED] is witty and smart, and that Professor [REDACTED] X posts should not be seen as a reflection of her knowledge or teaching.

We spoke with another student, [REDACTED].

████████ said that she was shocked to hear about the October 10 post, but that when she heard that there was a problematic post, she assumed it had been written by Professor ██████████. ██████████ said that she was shocked and disappointed to see the post from her department because she said that a lot of the ██████████ professors are very conscious with the language that they use; to her, this read as a hateful statement and not very “academically rooted.” ██████████ was not clear about whether the post was antisemitic, given the use of the term “zionist,” which she tries to separate from Judaism, but she said she could see that the post could be interpreted as antisemitic. Other students also discussed the post with ██████████ (she referenced discussing it with approximately seven students), and, according to her, also saw it as problematic.

b. Faculty

None of the campus administrators with whom we spoke [REDACTED] [REDACTED], [REDACTED] indicated that the October 10 post was a topic of general concern across the faculty (other than the Jewish faculty, as discussed further below), although, in line with the below discussion, [REDACTED] mentioned that some faculty members are concerned about the free-speech implications of disciplining Professor [REDACTED] for the post.

We spoke with multiple [REDACTED] faculty members about the post (addressed below), in addition to certain professors who Professor [REDACTED] suggested we speak with for this investigation. Two of these were professors from UC Davis, although not in [REDACTED]: Professors [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said that they interpreted the post to be satirical (with [REDACTED] noting that the use of emojis in particular underscored the post's satirical nature), and they both

expressed concern about the implications of this investigation for academic freedom. [REDACTED] has worked extensively on similar issues of faculty members being targeted in the media for their statements in her role as a [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] explained that she assists with peer support through this group. When [REDACTED] saw the October 10 post, she knew it was going to be a “rough ride” for Professor [REDACTED] given that the right-wing media commonly targets academics with [REDACTED]

Professor [REDACTED] also identified Professor [REDACTED] as somebody we should speak with; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] interpreted the October 10 post as satire, noting the “campy” nature of it and the use of emojis. They said that it has the kind of syntax that is common to X posts. Their first response when they saw the post was concern for Professor [REDACTED], because [REDACTED] recalled seeing a Breitbart article about the post that [REDACTED] perceived as “attempting to have [Professor [REDACTED] murdered,” and [REDACTED] whose academic work focuses on [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] are very vulnerable on UC campuses, [REDACTED]

We also spoke with Professor [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], who was in that role when Professor [REDACTED] was teaching in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] response to the October 10 post was that it did not seem that different from the types of statements being made by government officials, in terms of calling for and/or justifying violence. [REDACTED]

c. [REDACTED] Department

i. *Staff*

Once the October 10 post went viral and people started making complaints and threats to the University, that activity had an immediate impact on [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] We spoke with a number of administrators and faculty who discussed the impact of the October 10

post on the staff and how upset staff were about it. [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], said that immediately after the post went viral, some of the administrative staff in the [REDACTED] Department complained to her about feeling unsafe at [REDACTED] due to the number and seriousness of the complaints. [REDACTED], in consultation with the Dean's Office, decided to let the staff work remotely, which they did for the rest of the week and the following week after the October 10 post was publicized. [REDACTED] described the staff as united in their concerns and said that there are probably 15-20 members of the staff who are really upset about whether their concerns about the difficulties of dealing with the October 10 post were taken seriously. She said that there was subsequently an open staff forum with a "huge turnout," at which many staff expressed the view that they did not want to work with a faculty member who would make threats to children and to an entire race of people. The staff viewed the post as antisemitic, according to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] said that the staff members were seeking reassurance that Professor [REDACTED] would not be returning, and many of them expressed that if they posted a similar statement, they would be fired. [REDACTED] said that if Professor [REDACTED] returns, some members of the staff might quit.

Other administrators also observed that many staff members were upset following the October 10 post, although none of those administrators had as much insight into the staff's reaction as [REDACTED], for example, described a few members of the staff as being "shaken up" and struggling in the wake of the October 10 post. [REDACTED] confirmed that many [REDACTED] staff were concerned about safety in light of the post, and they felt dismissed. [REDACTED] instructed her team to make sure that employees' concerns were taken seriously, and she arranged a meeting with the concerned staff to let them know that the campus supported them and that the Academic and Staff Assistance Program (a program that offers support and referral services to faculty and staff) and the ombudsman office were getting involved with these issues.

Not all of the administrators agreed with the decision to let the staff work remotely, and some felt that the staff was overreacting in response to the October 10 post; however, nobody denied that the staff were genuinely upset. [REDACTED], for example, expressed his concerns that staff circulated the post too widely at [REDACTED] without pausing for consideration, and he felt that the immediate sending everyone home was an overreaction, but he acknowledged that the staff were the ones who had to receive a lot of the angry emails and messages, which seemed to cause them genuine distress.

ii. Faculty

The [REDACTED] faculty had varying reactions to the October 10 post itself but were largely unified in their concern over how much of the department's resources the post consumed as well as the state of the department in the aftermath of the post.

a. Reactions to the October 10 post

Although we spoke with [REDACTED] faculty and administrators primarily to obtain information about the impact Professor [REDACTED] post had on the [REDACTED] department, and more broadly those working in [REDACTED] we asked each of the people associated with [REDACTED] about their personal

reaction to the October 10 post as well. We found their perspectives on the post relevant to how the University community understood and reacted to the post.

[REDACTED] found the October 10 post to be despicable, and he noted that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which made the post more upsetting because he could see how journalists and people with children found the post to be particularly targeting. He said that he still does not understand why someone would perpetuate violence, no matter that person's political views, and he noted that, in his view, it would not be acceptable for an undergraduate to have made a similar post. In contrast, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both described the post as performative and did not think it was a serious threat.

[REDACTED] said that in her view it is not appropriate for anyone to post a message like that. She did not view the post as antisemitic, as she views anti-Zionism and antisemitism as separate, but she said that she understands that others perceive it as antisemitic. [REDACTED] said that he did not remember his reaction to the post, noting that there was a lot going on in the world and on campus at that time. In his view, the phrase "Zionist" is not synonymous with "Jewish"; [REDACTED]

b. Administrative impact on [REDACTED]

Many [REDACTED] faculty spoke about their frustration with Professor [REDACTED] for making the post, including her lack of thinking about the negative impacts it could have on the department and her colleagues, and expressed concern or uncertainty about Professor [REDACTED] fully returning to the department.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both expressed serious concerns about Professor [REDACTED] return. [REDACTED] said that the department did not discuss the post, due in part to a concern about legal issues, but she knew that people were upset about the situation. [REDACTED] expressed frustration with Professor [REDACTED] for not thinking through how the post would affect her colleagues and said she is unsure that she feels comfortable with Professor [REDACTED] returning. [REDACTED] expressed similar concerns about Professor [REDACTED] not thinking about others and about how her actions could have a detrimental impact on the culture of the department.

[REDACTED] expressed many of the same frustrations with Professor [REDACTED] shared by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. In addition to the effect on colleagues, he spoke about the effects on the staff, who he noted do not have the privileges and protections of being tenured. [REDACTED] talked about the ripple effects of the post, and he said that in the wake of the post, he had given thought to whether the department should be more explicit about its values, including its commitment to nonviolence and speech that is not harassing.

[REDACTED] said that the October 10 post had a significant impact on [REDACTED] and described the situation there as "extremely uncomfortable." And [REDACTED] and others on her staff confirmed that there was indeed fall-out at [REDACTED] as described in further detail above, with regard to the staff, which implicated the administrators who had to manage this fallout.

[REDACTED] said that handling the fallout from the October 10 post became her full-time job for many weeks. She was on phone calls “around the clock” with Professor [REDACTED] members of the administration, staff, and others. The emotional toll that work took on [REDACTED] was so great that she decided to [REDACTED] a decision she said was entirely due to the October 10 post.

[REDACTED] echoed some of the concerns of the [REDACTED] faculty as described above, noting that she heard from people who were upset over the turmoil in the department, in addition to concerns about Professor [REDACTED] wellbeing.

d. Administration

We spoke with multiple administrators, from both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all of them thought that the October 10 post was inappropriate. They all spoke about the fallout from the post. It is clear that multiple administrators on campus had to spend many hours handling this fallout, ranging from efforts to protect Professor [REDACTED], to addressing the people who were upset about the post, to thinking through the appropriate way to handle the situation going forward. Several of the administrators expressed concern about the comparison between Professor [REDACTED] case and the situation with [REDACTED], either because they felt that there was a potential unfair difference in treatment and/or that this is how it would be perceived by outsiders.

[REDACTED] talked about the campus community’s response to the post, and his observation was that Jews within the campus community were concerned about the post for around a week after it went viral, but then their concerns shifted to the pro-Palestine demonstrations on campus. He said that [REDACTED] from the University due to antisemitism on campus, but made clear that the antisemitism they felt was part of a larger, more general climate on campus and not just Professor [REDACTED] post. [REDACTED] acknowledged, however, that some people sincerely felt that the October 10 post was a threat and that their concerns needed to be taken seriously.

[REDACTED] described the October 10 post as “horrendous, inflammatory, [and] hurtful,” and he said that someone could “make a good case” that the post is antisemitic. He described the efforts within his department to handle hundreds of emails in response to the post. [REDACTED] explained that his communications team sorted through the emails to try to determine whether there were students in need of support and provided any students potentially needing support with an online referral form to fill out regarding their concerns (they sent approximately 30 out). No one filled out the forms. [REDACTED] concluded that while people were hurt and offended there was no educational harm to the Jewish students who raised concerns about the October 10 post.

[REDACTED] also found the October 10 post to be highly problematic; she said she interpreted it as antisemitic at the time but has since learned that there is debate about whether anti-Zionism is antisemitism. She was more focused, she

said, on the extreme language used in the post. [REDACTED] heard from Jewish groups on campus who were asking about whether Professor [REDACTED] was going to be terminated. She expressed surprise about the diversity of perspectives among members of the Jewish community. Her office received thousands of emails about the post from people who identified as Jewish. [REDACTED] noted that if Professor [REDACTED] returns to teaching, the campus should accommodate students who might feel uncomfortable with that.

[REDACTED], said that when the story of the October 10 post broke, his office got approximately 32 media inquiries. That is a high number for UC Davis, he said, and there was pressure to respond due to the high-profile nature of the media outlets reaching out. [REDACTED] said that the October 10 post gave the campus a “huge black eye,” and that every time this issue comes up as a topic in the news, UC Davis will be a part of the story.

Finally, the administrators overseeing [REDACTED] including [REDACTED] and members of her staff, discussed the fallout that they handled, which is discussed in the above section on [REDACTED]

e. Jewish Community

i. *Immediate Reaction to the Post*

The responses we heard from the members of the Jewish community with whom we spoke about the October 10 post generally reflected three emotions: shock, fear, and anger.¹⁰

First, with regard to those who discussed feeling shock, multiple people said that what struck them about the post was that it was made by a professor. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] said that while the October 10 post was a symbol of more widespread antisemitic or anti-Israel sentiment following October 7, she viewed it as a “turning point” because it was made by a professor. She said that before the post, she had seen other anti-Israel “microaggressions” from students [REDACTED] [REDACTED] also said that community and [REDACTED] were shocked and horrified. Students were particularly shocked and/or disturbed to see this kind of rhetoric from a professor. Three students with whom we spoke, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], expressed this. Others on campus also reported feeling shocked by the post.

[REDACTED], said she felt “a bit of shock” when she saw it; [REDACTED] she described herself as particularly aware of the power of a faculty member over students. She said that even people who do not identify as Jewish who talked to her about this expressed frustration that UC Davis would allow this type of behavior by a faculty member. [REDACTED]

¹⁰ We note that multiple witnesses pointed out to us that there are members of the Jewish community who are active in the pro-Palestine movement and/or may have different views from Jews who are supportive of Israel. We also note that we heard from multiple witnesses that there is a real fear of retaliation amongst Jews on campus, so we only heard from those individuals who were comfortable participating in this process. We are not purporting to be reporting on the views of any group writ large; rather, we describe in this section what we heard from certain witnesses who had concerns about the October 10 post. We understand that others might have a different view on Israel, antisemitism, Zionism, or other issues.

Multiple Jewish witnesses spoke about feeling genuine fear for their safety (or the safety of others) as a result of the October 10 post. [REDACTED]

Others also expressed feeling fear in response to the post. [REDACTED], for example, said that she herself felt afraid for her [REDACTED] after seeing the October 10 post. She said that students have expressed a real fear to her [REDACTED] about what the post means and that other professors may share Professor [REDACTED] feelings. [REDACTED] said that the main response to the October 10 post was fear; she noted that the post mentioned children and having peoples' addresses, and she said it was scary to feel like someone employed at UC Davis and who might be teaching Jewish students did not think that those students have a right to live. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] said that as a Jewish woman she was concerned for her safety in the aftermath of the post. Professor [REDACTED] talked about the threatening nature of the October 10 post, noting that because she [REDACTED] has published letters in newspapers about these issues, she could be considered a journalist and thus a target. Professor [REDACTED] said that he has heard from many Jews at the [REDACTED] in the wake of October 7, and that the October 10 post made people feel unsafe and uncomfortable. [REDACTED]

Finally, many witnesses described feeling angry in response to the post or hearing from others who felt angry. [REDACTED] said that "overwhelmingly," what he heard in response to the October 10 post was anger; people wanted to know what the campus was doing in response to it. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] she also observed that parents and alumni are furious, and they are wondering why Professor [REDACTED] has not been terminated. We also saw this reflected in the written complaints, where people expressed shock and anger over the October 10 post and the University's failure to terminate or otherwise discipline Professor [REDACTED] immediately following the post.

ii. *View of October 10 post as Antisemitic*

The Jewish witnesses with whom we spoke all said that the October 10 post was antisemitic, with one person disagreeing on political grounds but agreeing that it could be seen that way.

Specifically, as noted above, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] said that Zionism means the “yearning for homeland by the Jews,” and that while people have a right to criticize the war in Gaza, in his view it is objectionable for the Jews to have to treat the word Zionist as a “dirty word.” Two others talked about the large percentage of Jews in the U.S. who consider themselves to be Zionists as evidence that the post was antisemitic. [REDACTED] said that everyone with whom she has spoken in depth about the post viewed it as aimed at Jews.

[REDACTED] as referenced above, said that no one in their social circles described the October 10 post as antisemitic but that they are part of groups that are explicitly focused on de-linking Jews from Israel. [REDACTED] said that it did not surprise them that people would call the post antisemitic, noting that there has been a big increase in antisemitism. They said that they were not doubting the sincerity of people who believe that it is antisemitic, although in their view, it is not correct to say that anything that is anti-Israel is necessarily antisemitic.

The issue of whether anti-Zionism is necessarily antisemitism is a topic of heated debate. Nonetheless, there is no doubt based on the interviews we conducted that many Jews within the University community genuinely interpreted the post as an antisemitic statement. We note the witnesses we spoke with contextualized the post and its impact on the Jewish community within a larger climate of antisemitism following the October 7 attacks and noted the post itself was one of many antisemitic statements or acts that contributed to their feelings of unsafety or discomfort. We also note that multiple witnesses who do not identify as Jewish also characterized the post as antisemitic, or at least acknowledged that they could see how others would feel that way, so it was not just Jewish witnesses who perceived the post in this way.

iii. *Longer Term Impact/Long-Term Concerns*

Many of the Jewish witnesses talked about their concerns with regard to the October 10 post beyond their immediate reaction to it. There was concern with Professor [REDACTED] returning to campus and whether Jewish students would feel comfortable taking her class. There was also some concern about people being in [REDACTED] with her.

More broadly, there was a concern about the fact that people viewed the post as contributing to rising antisemitism and/or emboldening others to act in an antisemitic manner. [REDACTED] described the October 10 post as “just one more piece of the puzzle” with regard to students not feeling welcome on campus in the aftermath of October 7. [REDACTED] expressed a concern that seeing this post from an authority figure with this type of hateful language would embolden student groups. [REDACTED] mentioned seeing a story published by a student with very similar language to that used by Professor [REDACTED] in the October 10 post, which in his view reflected the impact that the post has had. [REDACTED] similarly referenced seeing language on social media that was not necessarily connected to Professor [REDACTED] post but that [REDACTED] felt demonstrated that the post had started to make violent rhetoric permissible. [REDACTED] said, “we [the Jewish community on campus] can’t help but see this [the post] as part of something bigger.”

f. Journalists

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

g. Development

[REDACTED] provided information regarding the impact of the October 10 post on donations to the University. As noted above, we find this relevant in terms of potential impact to the campus as a result of the post.

[REDACTED], compared the donor response to the October 10 post to the response following the pepper spray incident, when university police pepper sprayed a group of student demonstrators in 2011. That incident was widely publicized, and after that incident, [REDACTED] said his office heard from thousands of upset individuals, including major donors. In contrast, [REDACTED] stated that after the October 10 post, his office heard from 200-300 people, largely through email, and from fewer major donors. The donors who contacted the Office for Development and Alumni Relations have told him that they found the post to be offensive, but they have stated that they understand that the University is aware of the issue and considering discipline against Professor [REDACTED] so they are waiting for that process to play out before deciding whether to change or withhold their donations. That said, one donor, [REDACTED], has said they will not make any more gifts to the University until Professor [REDACTED] is terminated, and if she is allowed to stay, then that donor will stop any giving.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] But if Professor [REDACTED] is not terminated, [REDACTED] said he expects another wave of communications from angry donors, and at that point he would be concerned about losing significant gifts. [REDACTED] said it is impossible to quantify the amount the University might lose.

[REDACTED]

h. Pro-Palestine Advocates

We spoke with several people who identified themselves as actively pro-Palestine. We did this both because several of the witnesses were identified by Professor [REDACTED] but also because we wanted to see if the October 10 post was being interpreted in the way that Professor [REDACTED] said she intended it. As discussed below, a few of the witnesses viewed it as satirical; however, one of the witnesses who is heavily involved with student politics found the post to have been sent in poor judgment and said that this was the general consensus among his peers.

██████████ said that the post was “categorically not antisemitic”; if she had said “Jewish journalists,” that would have been an entirely different situation. ██████████ expressed that, in his view, many people lack a nuanced understanding (as he has) of the difference between Judaism and Zionism, but to him it is “very obvious” that those two concepts are different. He said that “pretty much everyone” in his social and activism circles viewed the post in the same way, which was that it was a “stupid” statement to make and a distraction. ██████████ also shared said that while he thought that Professor ██████████ made a mistake, he feels that much worse language has been directed at Palestinians during this conflict.

██████████ said that the post was the kind of sarcasm that they would have expected from Professor ██████████, and that in their part of the Jewish community it was received as one of many social media posts written in response to the situation in Gaza and the killing of Palestinian journalists; in other words, in their social circle the political context was the focus more than the particular language of this post. And while, as noted above, they were not surprised that people sincerely interpreted the post as antisemitic, they said that in their experience with her, Professor ██████████ “completely differentiates her reaction to Israel from how she feels about Jews.”

[REDACTED] who is a pro-Palestine activist, said that he read the October 10 post as obviously sarcastic and performative. He said that he had not heard from a single person who took it seriously; to the contrary, the people in his circles understood it to be “completely absurd.” [REDACTED] said that he and others are appalled at the idea that this is being investigated and that Professor [REDACTED] is concerned about her position at UC Davis.

B. Analysis



For more information, contact the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development at 319-273-2500 or research@uiowa.edu.

The image consists of a large, dark, irregular shape on the left side, which appears to be a scan of a physical object. To the right of this dark shape is a bright, white area with a distinct stepped or jagged pattern, suggesting a digital reconstruction or a specific type of sensor output. The overall contrast is very high, with deep blacks and bright whites.

1. **What is the primary purpose of the study?** (Please check one box)

1. **What is the primary purpose of the study?**

1. **What is the primary purpose of the study?** The study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of a new treatment for hypertension in a diverse population.



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5. Any other types of unacceptable conduct subject to discipline, e.g., conduct that is not justified by the “Ethical Principles” of
 - a. Teaching and Students under Section II.A,
 - b. The University under Section II.C,
 - c. Colleagues under Section II.D, and/or
 - d. The Community under Section II.E

and that significantly impairs the University’s central functions “to provide and sustain an environment conducive to sharing, extending, and critically examining knowledge and values, and to furthering the search for wisdom.” (UC APM 015, Preamble)

In our view, this is the policy provision that is most directly applicable to Professor [REDACTED] conduct in making the October 10 post. In assessing this provision, we have considered Professor [REDACTED] lack of intent in causing harm but the undeniable impact it had on the University, as well as the difficulty of simultaneously addressing the harm that she has experienced and her particularly vulnerable position. Although we have never questioned the genuine fear Professor [REDACTED] felt after the post received national media attention, we remain concerned about her lack of acknowledgement or willingness to deeply consider that her post also caused genuine harm, regardless of her intent and regardless of who made it public. And with regard to the harm caused, it is not an exaggeration to describe the post as causing a crisis on the UC Davis campus.

Although many people have raised concerns about Professor [REDACTED] ability to speak freely, the question here is not the content of a post made privately by someone in their non-professional capacity. Fundamentally, it is not acceptable for a UC Davis professor to publicly post something that could reasonably be interpreted to be antisemitic and as either a call to, or encouragement of, violence. Twenty-four of the witnesses stated that the October 10 post was, at a minimum, an example of poor judgment, with many of them much more forcefully condemning it.

Twelve witnesses described the post as antisemitic, while eight others noted that they knew others who perceived the post that way or understood how it could be interpreted as antisemitic. Six witnesses expressed that the post was not at all problematic. Multiple witnesses expressed that if a student had written something like this it would not be acceptable and felt that it was even more problematic for a member of the faculty (who teaches undergraduate students) to make such statements in a public forum. We recognize of course that people have a right to express political views, and that a sharply worded political post (for example, condemning Israel's actions) without any threat of violence, would not have led to this investigation. But the October 10 post had violent elements, in that it specifically talked about finding people in their homes, and it implies that attacks against children would be justified.

Given that the post was made in a public forum, it reached a much broader audience and ended up causing true fear, anxiety, hurt, and anger within the University population, especially among Jews and journalists. A message that causes such consequences simply is not consistent with an “environment conducive to sharing, extending, and critically examining knowledge and values, and to furthering the search for wisdom.” When people are afraid for their safety or feel that they are being attacked for their ethnicity or political and/or religious beliefs, that is not an environment in which they will be comfortable learning or sharing their ideas.

That leaves the question of whether this is conduct subject to discipline, or, put another way, whether this conduct was not justified by the Ethical Principles outlined in the policy. We asked most of the witnesses to share their thoughts on this question, to the extent they were comfortable doing so, and several of them struggled with this question as well. Fifteen witnesses said that Professor [REDACTED] should face some consequence, with eight of them calling for termination. By contrast, ten individuals said that she should not face any consequence. Four others expressed that it was a complex issue and did not give an answer one way or another. We understand that these numbers are not dispositive, especially given the number of witnesses with whom we spoke from the Jewish community (given that this investigation was commenced in response to expressions of fear); however, six of the witnesses who said some discipline was appropriate did not identify as Jewish, and represent members of the administration, staff, and other faculty.

After talking to 36 witnesses, reviewing the documents, and thinking deeply about this together, we conclude that this conduct should not be without consequence. [REDACTED]

VI. CONCLUSION

Our investigation has shown that there was widespread anxiety, fear, and anger on the campus in response to the October 10 post, and that the post caused significant disruption to the campus. Our investigation also showed that Professor [REDACTED] did not intend for this to happen, and that she wrote the post to be interpreted as a sarcastic response to distressing geopolitical events. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] She also has failed to reckon with the

suffering of others that the post caused. Taking all of the factors into account, we conclude that Professor [REDACTED] violated policy by engaging in unacceptable conduct subject to discipline. [REDACTED]

Dated: June 26, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

[REDACTED]
ELLEN LONDON
Shareholder

Dated: June 26, 2024

[REDACTED]
KEVIN JOHNSON
Dean of the UC Davis
School of Law



Name	University Affiliation	Method of Interview	Date(s) Interviewed
		Zoom	12/[REDACTED]/23
		In-person	12/[REDACTED]/23
		In-person	12/[REDACTED]/23
		In-person	12/[REDACTED]/23
		Zoom	12/[REDACTED]/23
		Zoom	12/[REDACTED]/23
		Zoom	12/[REDACTED]/23
		In-person	12/[REDACTED]/23
		Zoom	12/[REDACTED]/23
		Zoom	12/[REDACTED]/23
		In-Person	1/[REDACTED]/24
		Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24
		Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24
		Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24
		In-person	1/[REDACTED]/24
		Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24
		Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24
		Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24

Zoom	1/[REDACTED]/24
In-person	2/[REDACTED]/24
In-person	2/[REDACTED]/24
Zoom	3/[REDACTED]/24
Zoom	3/[REDACTED]/24
In-person	4/[REDACTED]/24
In-person	4/[REDACTED]/24
In-person	4/[REDACTED]/24
Zoom	5/[REDACTED]/24





















