

University of Colorado Boulder
Student Respondent Statistical Report
Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Table of Contents

Overview 2

Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy Complaints 3

 Types of Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Resolutions 3

 Types of Discrimination and Harassment Allegations..... 4

 Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy Formal Adjudication Findings and Sanctions 4

Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy Complaints 5

 Types of Sexual Misconduct Complaint Resolutions 5

 Types of Sexual Misconduct Allegations 6

 Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking Policy Formal Grievance Findings and Sanctions 7

 Appeals of Sexual Misconduct Cases 7

Overview

The Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance (OIEC) addresses all protected-class discrimination and harassment, sexual misconduct, and related retaliation complaints against University of Colorado Boulder (CU Boulder) students pursuant to university policy. The Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy prohibits protected-class discrimination, harassment, and/or related retaliation. The Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy prohibits sexual misconduct and/or related retaliation including sexual assault (rape), sexual assault (fondling), sexual exploitation, sexual harassment, as well as intimate partner abuse (including dating and domestic violence), and stalking.

OIEC is a neutral, fact-finding office responsible for addressing and investigating alleged misconduct pursuant to specific Resolution Procedures that are updated on an annual basis. OIEC objectively reviews the facts of each case to resolve issues and to determine whether a violation of university or campus policy occurred based on a *preponderance of the evidence* standard.

This report presents data on sexual misconduct, protected-class discrimination and harassment, and related retaliation complaints received by OIEC between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025, and contains data involving complaints that identified a CU Boulder student respondent,¹ even if the individual was not identified by name. Any complaint identifying a CU Boulder employee, contractor, volunteer, visitor, or student employee acting in their *employment role* as the alleged offender is outlined in OIEC's Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Statistical Report for Employee and Affiliated Respondents. Cases involving non-affiliated respondents (identified and unidentified) are summarized in the OIEC's Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Statistical Report for Unidentified and Unaffiliated Respondents.

During the 2024-2025 fiscal year, there were 502 cases reported to the OIEC involving allegations against 557 student respondents. 187 student respondents were not identified by name.

- 239 student respondents were alleged to have engaged in misconduct under the Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy.
- 240 student respondents were alleged to have engaged in misconduct under the Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy.
 - 16 cases involved charges under both policies.
- 78 allegations did not fall under either policy, and these complaints were referred to other campus offices.

¹ "Respondent" means an individual who has been reported to be the perpetrator of misconduct.

Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy Complaints

Types of Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Resolutions²

The 216 cases under the Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy, involving allegations against 239 student respondents, were addressed as follows (see Table 1):

- Allegations against 1 respondent was addressed through a formal adjudication in which OIEC objectively reviews the facts of each case to resolve issues and to determine whether a violation of the university policy occurred based on a preponderance of the evidence standard.
- Allegations against 22 respondents were addressed through remedies-based resolutions that allow the university to tailor the response to the unique facts and circumstances of an incident and educate community members on the impacts of their actions, particularly in cases where there is not a broader threat to individual or campus safety. Often this includes conduct alleged that, even if true, would not rise to the level of a policy violation.
- Allegations against 17 respondents were addressed by an individual in a position of authority (for instance, a supervisor, faculty member, or conduct coordinator) jointly or in consultation with the OIEC.
- Allegations against 35 respondents resulted in a conclusion of no basis to proceed because the complaint did not share the name(s) of the student respondent(s), or OIEC did not have the authority to address the complaint because the case did not fall under OIEC policies.
- In 2 cases, the OIEC provided information about OIEC's investigative and other processes.
- In allegations against 103 respondents, the complainant did not respond to the OIEC's outreach.
- Allegations against 32 respondents were referred to another office, as the concerns reported did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy or Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy.
- In allegations against 19 respondents, the complainant declined an OIEC resolution or requested their concerns be documented only at that time.

Table 1. Discrimination and Harassment Case Resolution	# of Student Respondents
Formal adjudication	1
Remedies-based resolution	22
Concerns addressed by a supervisor, faculty member, or conduct coordinator in consultation with OIEC	17
No basis to proceed	35
Information about the policy and investigative process only	2
Outreach and connection with support services	103
Referred to another office	32
Declined resolution process/Documentation only	19
Cases pending a resolution process determination	7
Total number of student respondents	239

² All complainants are provided information about options for assistance and campus support and were referred to Office of Victim Assistance (OVA) or other confidential support services.

Types of Discrimination and Harassment Allegations³

Among the 216 discrimination and harassment cases involving allegations against 239 student respondents, the most commonly reported allegations involved race (62), followed by sexual orientation (48), gender, (33), national origin (31), and political affiliation (31), see Table 2.

Table 2. Types of Discrimination and Harassment Allegations	# Allegations	# Allegations Addressed by Remedies-Based or Other Resolutions⁴	# Allegations Addressed by Formal Grievance
Race	62	62	0
Sexual Orientation	48	47	1
Gender	33	33	0
National Origin	31	31	0
Political Affiliation	31	31	0
Religion	23	23	0
Gender Identity	20	20	0
Disability	13	13	0
Political Philosophy	13	13	0
Unknown Class / Provision	12	12	0
Color	4	4	0
Age	4	4	0
Gender Expression	4	4	0
Discrimination/Harassment Retaliation	2	1	0
Veteran Status	2	2	0
False or Misleading Information	1	1	0
Total	302	301	1

Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy Formal Adjudication Findings and Sanctions

There was one formal grievance against one student respondent involving allegations of protected-class harassment. The one student was alleged to have created a hostile environment for another student based on sexual orientation. The formal grievance process had not concluded and no appeals were received at the time of this report.

³ Many cases involved allegations of a violation of more than one policy provision and/or related to multiple protected classes.

⁴ 7 cases were still pending a determination of the resolution process at the time of this report.

Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy Complaints

Types of Sexual Misconduct Complaint Resolutions⁵

The 226 cases involving complaints against 240 student respondents under the Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy were addressed as follows (see Table 3):

- Allegations of sexual misconduct against 22 respondents were addressed through the formal grievance process and 12 of these cases were still in process at the time of this report. In a formal grievance, OIEC objectively reviews the facts of each case to resolve issues and to determine whether a violation of the university policy occurred based on a preponderance of the evidence standard.
- Allegations against 30 respondents were addressed through remedies-based resolutions that allow the university to tailor the response to the unique facts and circumstances of an incident and educate community members on the impacts of their actions, particularly in cases where there is not a broader threat to individual or campus safety. Often this includes conduct alleged that, even if true, would not rise to the level of a policy violation.
- Allegations against 2 respondents were addressed by someone in a position of authority in a different campus office (for instance a supervisor, faculty member, or conduct coordinator) in consultation with OIEC.
- Allegations against 31 respondents resulted in a conclusion of no basis to proceed because the complaint did not share the name(s) of the respondent(s), or OIEC did not have the authority to address the complaint because the case did not fall under OIEC policies.
- In 3 cases, the OIEC provided information about OIEC's investigative and other processes.
- In allegations against 102 respondents, the complainant did not respond to the OIEC's outreach.
- Allegations against 10 respondents were referred to another office, as the concerns reported did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy or Discrimination and Harassment Policy.
- In allegations against 30 respondents, the complainant declined an OIEC resolution or requested their concerns only be documented at that time.

Table 3. Sexual Misconduct Complaint Resolution	# of Student Respondents
Formal grievances*	22
Remedies-based resolutions, including Policy Compliance Resolutions	30
Concerns addressed by a supervisor, faculty member, or conduct coordinator in consultation with OIEC	2
No basis to proceed	31
Information about the policy and investigative process only	3
Outreach and connection with support services	102
Referred to another office	10
Declined Resolution Process/Documentation Only	30
Cases pending a resolution process determination	10
Total number of student respondents	240

*The OIEC recognizes that complainants may not want a formal grievance process to resolve their concerns, and whenever possible, the OIEC respects how a complainant would like a case resolved.

⁵ All complainants are provided information about options for assistance and campus support and were referred to Office of Victim Assistance (OVA) or other confidential support services.

Types of Sexual Misconduct Allegations

Among the 273 sexual misconduct allegations against 239 student respondents, the most reported allegations included hostile environment sexual harassment (70), followed by sexual assault (rape) (55), stalking (53), dating or domestic violence (34), and sexual assault (fondling) (24), see Table 4:

Table 4. Types of Sexual Misconduct Allegations	# Allegations	# Allegations Addressed by Remedies-Based or Other Resolutions⁶	# Allegations Addressed by Formal Grievance
Hostile Environment ⁷	70	70	0
Sexual Assault (rape)	55	45	9
Stalking ⁸	53	49	4
Dating or Domestic Violence	34	25	9
Sexual Assault (fondling)	24	21	4
Sexual Exploitation	21	18	3
Unknown Provision / No Details	8	8	0
Sexual Misconduct Retaliation	4	4	0
Providing False or Misleading Information	2	2	0
Failure to Comply with Directives, Orders or Sanctions	2	1	1
Failure to Report	0	0	0
Interference with Reporting	0	0	0
Quid Pro Quo	0	0	0
Total	273	243	30

⁶ 10 cases were pending a determination of resolution process at the time of this report.

⁷ Hostile Environment and/or Title IX Hostile Environment allegations.

⁸ Stalking and/or Title IX Stalking allegations.

Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking Policy Formal Grievance Findings and Sanctions

Of the 21 cases involving formal grievance processes (one case includes a cross-complaint with two respondents), 12 cases continue to be in progress at the time of this report. Three cases were dismissed because the respondent either left or graduated from CU Boulder before the conclusion of the formal grievance process.

Findings and sanctions for the 21 formal cases against students are presented in Table 5:

Table 5. Formal Grievance Findings and Sanctions	# of Student Respondents
Pending	12
Case dismissed	3
No policy violation	3
Found responsible for a policy violation	3
<i>Action Taken</i>	
Expulsion	2
Suspension ⁹	0
Probation ¹⁰	1
Exclusion from all or specific areas of campus	2
Behavioral assessment and Completion of Recommendations ¹¹	1
No-Contact Order	2

Appeals of Sexual Misconduct Cases

Appeals of decisions in sexual misconduct cases are reviewed at the CU System level in coordination with trained appellate officers from the other CU campuses. There was 1 post-decision appeal brought by a respondent. In that case, the policy violation decision and sanctions were upheld in their entirety.

⁹ Suspensions often include additional sanctions such as exclusion from campus during the relevant time period, removal from the residence hall, mandatory behavioral assessments, educational sanctions, and meeting prior to re-admission with the Title IX Coordinator or designee.

¹⁰ Probation often includes educational sanctions.

¹¹ Behavioral assessments can include alcohol and drug evaluations, sex offender evaluations, or other violence risk assessments, along with associated compliance requirements.