# University of Colorado Boulder

Employee and Affiliated Respondents Statistical Report

Fiscal Year 2024-2025

## **Table of Contents**

Overview	2
Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy Complaints	
Types of Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Resolutions	
Types of Discrimination and Harassment Allegations	
Discrimination and Harassment 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
Formal Grievance Processes for Sexual Misconduct	6
Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships Policy Complaints	6

#### 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) employees and affiliates 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. The Conflict of Interest in Amorous Relationships Policy requires that persons who are involved in a consensual romantic or sexual relationship in which one party maintains a direct supervisory or evaluative role over the other party must bring that relationship to the timely attention of their supervisor so that the evaluative relationship can be removed.

OIEC is a neutral, fact-finding office responsible for addressing and investigating alleged misconduct pursuant to specific Resolution Procedures 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, as well as conflict of interest in amorous relationships complaints received by OIEC between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025. This includes cases involving respondents<sup>1</sup> who were CU Boulder employees, student employees acting in their employment role, contractors, volunteers, visitors, or other CU affiliates, even if the individual was not identified by name. Any complaint identifying a CU Boulder student acting in their *non-employment* role as the alleged offender is included in OIEC's Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Report for Student Respondents. Cases involving non-affiliated respondents (identified and unidentified) are summarized in OIEC's Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Statistical Report for Unidentified and Unaffiliated Respondents.

During the 2024-2025 fiscal year, there were 716 cases reported to the OIEC involving allegations of misconduct against 829 CU employees or affiliated respondents. 213 employee and affiliated respondents were not identified by name. An additional 5 reports to the OIEC involve individual employees or affiliates related to the Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships Policy that were documented for compliance purposes.

- 575 employee or affiliated respondents were alleged to have engaged in misconduct under the Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy.
- 117 employee or affiliated respondents were alleged to have engaged in misconduct under the Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy.
- 5 employees were alleged to have engaged in misconduct under the Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships Policy.
- 11 employee or affiliated respondents were alleged to have engaged in misconduct under more than one of the three policies administered by the OIEC.
- 149 allegations did not fall under the three policies administered by OIEC, including one involving a respondent from another CU campus, and these complaints were referred to other campus offices.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "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 Resolutions<sup>2</sup>

The 480 cases under the Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy, involving 575 employee or affiliated respondents, were addressed as follows (see Table 1):

- Allegations against 1 respondent was addressed through a formal grievance 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 33 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 72 respondents were addressed jointly by the OIEC and the respondent's supervisor or department or by the department in consultation with OIEC.
- Allegations against 34 respondents resulted in a conclusion of no basis to proceed because the complaint did not share the name(s) of the employee or affiliated respondent(s), or OIEC did not have the authority to address the complaint because the case did not fall under OIEC policies.
- Allegations against 21 respondents were closed after preliminary inquiry when it was determined that there was no basis for a formal grievance.
- Allegations against 1 respondent involved consultation with OIEC to provide information about OIEC's investigative and other processes.
- In allegations against 196 respondents, the complainant did not respond to the OIEC's outreach.
- In allegations against 99 respondents, the complainant declined an OIEC resolution or requested their concerns be documented only at that time.
- Allegations against 82 respondents were referred to another office, as the concerns reported did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Protected Class Nondiscrimination Policy.

	<u> </u>
Table 1. Discrimination and Harassment Case Resolution	# of Employee and Affiliated Respondents
Formal grievance	1
Remedies-based resolution	33
Concerns addressed with supervisor or department	72
No basis to proceed	34
Preliminary inquiry	21
Information about the investigative process only	1
Outreach and connection with support services	196
Declined resolution process/documentation only	99
Referred to another office	82
Pending	36
Total number of employee and affiliated respondents	575

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 Allegations<sup>3</sup>

Among allegations of discrimination and harassment (or related retaliation) against the 578 CU Boulder employees or affiliates, the most commonly reported allegations involved gender (136), race (116), disability (106), and national origin (66), see Table 2.

Table 2. Types of Discrimination and Harassment Allegations		# Allegations Addressed by Remedies-Based or	# Allegations Addressed by Formal
	# Allegations	Other Resolutions <sup>4</sup>	Grievance
Gender	136	136	0
Race	116	116	0
Disability	106	106	0
National Origin	66	66	0
Unknown Class or Provision <sup>5</sup>	54	54	0
Age	42	42	0
Religion or Creed	37	37	0
Political Affiliation	27	27	0
Gender Identity	26	26	0
Discrimination/Harassment Retaliation	23	23	0
Color	20	20	0
Sexual Orientation	15	14	1
Veteran Status	13	13	0
Political Philosophy	12	12	0
Pregnancy	8	8	0
Gender Expression	7	7	0
Failure to Report	2	2	0
Marital Status	1	1	0
Interference with Reporting	1	1	0
Providing False or Misleading Information	0	0	0
Total	711	710	1

#### Discrimination and Harassment Formal Adjudication Findings and Sanctions

There was one protected-class discrimination and harassment formal grievance against one employee initiated during the 2024-2025 fiscal year. A determination has not been rendered in this on-going case and no appeals were received at the time of publication of this report.

٠

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Many cases involved allegations of a violation of more than one policy provision and/or related to multiple protected classes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 36 cases were still pending a determination of the resolution process at the time of this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> In these cases, complainants did not identify a specific protected class.

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

#### Types of Sexual Misconduct Complaint Resolutions<sup>6</sup>

There were 110 cases under the Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking Policy involving 117 employee or affiliated respondents that were addressed as follows (see Table 3):

- Allegations against 3 respondents were addressed through a formal grievance process 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 12 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 20 respondents were addressed jointly by the OIEC and the respondent's supervisor or department or by the department in consultation with OIEC.
- Allegations against 11 respondents resulted in a conclusion of no basis to proceed because the complainant did not share the name(s) of the respondent(s), or OIEC did not have the authority to address complaints that did not fall under OIEC policies.
- Allegations against 2 respondents were closed after preliminary inquiry when it was determined that there was no basis for a formal grievance.
- In allegations against 34 respondents, the complainant did not respond to the OIEC's outreach.
- Allegations against 10 respondents were referred to another office, as the information reported was outside the OIEC's jurisdiction.
- In allegations against 22 respondents, the complainant declined an OIEC resolution or requested their concerns only be documented at that time.

Table 3. Sexual Misconduct Complaint Resolution	# of Employee or Affiliated Respondents
Formal grievance	3
Remedies-based resolutions*	12
Concerns addressed with supervisor or department	20
No basis to proceed	11
Preliminary Inquiry	2
Outreach and connection with support services	34
Referred to another office	10
Declined resolution process/documentation only	22
Pending	3
Total number of resolutions	117

<sup>\*</sup>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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> 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 117 sexual misconduct complaints made against CU employees or affiliated respondents, the most commonly reported allegations included hostile environment sexual harassment (72), followed by stalking (13), sexual assault (fondling), (8), and dating or domestic violence (7). See Table 4:

Table 4. Types of Sexual Misconduct Allegations	# Allegations	# Allegations Addressed by Remedies-Based or Other Resolutions <sup>7</sup>	# Allegations Addressed by Formal Grievance
Hostile Environment <sup>8</sup>	72	72	0
Stalking <sup>9</sup>	13	13	0
Sexual Assault (fondling)	8	8	0
Dating or Domestic Violence	7	7	0
Failure to Report	6	4	2
Sexual Assault (rape)	5	5	0
Sexual Exploitation	5	4	1
Unknown Provision / No Details	5	5	0
Sexual Misconduct Retaliation	5	3	2
Interference with Reporting	4	2	2
Quid Pro Quo <sup>10</sup>	0	0	0
False or Misleading Information	0	0	0
Total	130	123	7

#### Formal Grievance Processes for Sexual Misconduct

There were two separate cases involving three different respondents addressed through the formal grievance process. The three formal grievance processes are still in progress at the time and no appeals have been received as of the publication of this report.

## Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships Policy Complaints

There were five cases reported related to the Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships Policy. All five of these cases were addressed to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships Policy, including documenting the report and removing evaluative authority when required.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 3 cases were still pending a determination of the resolution process at the time of this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Hostile Environment and/or Title IX Hostile Environment allegations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Stalking and/or Title IX Stalking allegations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Quid Pro Quo and/or Title IX Quid Pro Quo allegations.