

**PSCI 7043: PROBLEMS IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
GRADUATE SEMINAR
KETCHUM 1B31
T 9:00-11:30AM
SPRING 2024**

Professor: Megan Shannon
Office: 124 Ketchum
Email: Megan.L.Shannon@colorado.edu
Office hours: Tuesdays, 11:30am - 1:30pm or by appointment

Course Description

Can countries cooperate in an anarchic world? If so, how? This course explores a particular type of cooperation: the formation and use of international institutions. We explore the decisions of states to design and commit to international organizations, the effects of such organizations, and the limits of institutional power. We also explore how states cooperate on specific issues such as human rights and the environment. By the end of the semester, you will be able to explain when and why countries cooperate, and how institutional order emerges in an anarchic world. Exploring international organizations not only tells us a great deal about global politics, it provides insight into human nature. We ask if human beings can work together to provide collective goods through institutions, or if self-interests are too strong to foster institutional cooperation.

We explore the development of institutions from the perspective of strategic choice. Strategic choice is a simple yet powerful way of looking at the world. It assumes that actors are purposeful, and that they make decisions by anticipating what other actors will do. This simple assumption can explain a number of global phenomena, from the formation of institutions to the decision of institutions to address particular problems. However, strategic choice is not the only way of looking at the world. We will explore the limits of strategic choice, particularly in explaining the dysfunctional behavior of institutions.

We also investigate the methodological challenges in determining the effect of international institutions. Throughout the semester we will rigorously analyze the research methods used to assess how institutions change behavior. We will devote one week in particular to discussing how we infer the causal effect of institutions, focusing on experimental research.

Course Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this class, successful students will be able to:

- (1) Define international cooperation and identify how institutions facilitate cooperation
- (2) Explain the conditions under which states commit to international institutions
- (3) Identify how states design institutions to meet their own interests
- (4) Explore how institutions act independently and even pathologically
- (5) Identify the methodological challenges to understanding the influence of institutions
- (6) Create a research project that helps understand an aspect of international cooperation

Commitment to Inclusivity

The University of Colorado is a learning community that seeks to understand the world around us. CU cannot achieve those goals without the engagement of its graduate students. You have unique gifts, skills, and insights that advance our search for truth and knowledge. That means your participation in this class is valuable. My commitment is to make sure that you feel included enough in our class community to participate. If you feel your differences isolate you from CU's community or if you need specific accommodations, please speak with me early in the semester about what we can do together to help you engage in our class and the CU community. This class stresses active learning and we have a great deal of discussion in class.

Grades

Attendance and Participation, 20%

Attendance is expected. To function as a class, your oral participation is needed. This includes asking questions and offering critical analysis to further the class discussion. Please come prepared with thoughts on the readings, discussion points, and questions. You can also respond to other students' questions on Canvas to earn participation credit. Taking notes on the readings before class is a good way to prepare. See more in the Grades section of this syllabus.

Discussion Questions, 10%

To engage with the readings, you will write three to four discussion questions and **post them to the Canvas discussion board each week before 5:00pm on Monday**, beginning with the class readings for Week 2. The questions should be broad and should stimulate discussion across several or all of the readings.

Two Analytical Papers, each worth 15% for a total of 30%

Two times during the semester you will write a 3-4 page analytical essay addressing a question pertinent to the reading we have been discussing in class. These questions will be distributed on dates identified in the schedule below. The essays do not require original empirical research, but should synthesize the material and place it within a larger context of international relations scholarship. Some basic summary may be required, but the goal is to identify the contributions of the research we have read, what questions it answers, what questions it leaves open, and what areas are fertile for future research. These papers will serve as practice for comprehensive exams.

Final Project, 30%

You will complete a project for this class. I want the project to provide you with as much utility as possible. This project should stretch your intellectual abilities and make an original contribution, but it should also serve your purposes in graduate school. The project should be at least loosely related to international cooperation. Some possibilities for a final project include:

- A research design dealing with some facet of international organizations or cooperation
- A case study that tests or illustrates a specific question within international cooperation (it can be a test of another paper that you are working on)
- A fully developed experimental design that tests a research idea
- A grant proposal
- A quantitative analysis that you are not using for another paper or project
- Something of your choice (let's discuss!)

Presentation of Final Project, 10%

During the last week of seminar, you will present the results of your final project to the class.

The presentation will be about 10 minutes. You will prepare slides or other appropriate materials. More details will be provided as the semester progresses.

Grade Scale

The grading scale for the course is as follows. Grades ending in .5 or higher are rounded up to the nearest whole percentage point:

	B+ 89 - 87	C+ 79 - 77
A 93 - 100	B 86 - 83	C 76 - 73
A- 92 - 90	B- 82 - 80	C- 72 - 70

The Grade of A

The grade of A is given to work that expresses clear, cogent, novel, and logical arguments. Work that receives an A does not merely summarize existing literature - it offers new and meaningful contributions. It uses evidence from scholarly works and reputable sources to back up its conjectures. It considers a number of possible stories before settling on the right one.

A student receiving an A grade can identify weaknesses in the explanation and empirical test(s) of a piece of scholarly work. The student proposes alternative theories or tests. The student knows what conclusions are supported by the empirical test and which conclusions are not.

A grade of A indicates novel and creative thinking. The student offers unique criticism of existing empirical work, and thinks about appropriate ways to remedy flaws in the literature.

Finally, a student receiving an A comes to class having done the readings. The student asks meaningful questions about the readings, draws connections between readings, and identifies the implications of the readings for other issues or problems in political science. The student regularly participates in the discussion and engages other students' ideas, rather than hunkering down in their own notes/ electronic device.

The Grade of B

The grade of B is given to work that makes arguments, but the argument is not logically consistent. It provides some evidence for its conjectures, but the evidence is not always relevant or does not strongly support the story. It summarizes the literature more than it offers unique contributions.

A grade of B exhibits some confusion over the theory and empirical tests in a scholarly work. The student does not critically assess the limits of a particular theory or empirical test, nor does the student suggest alternative theories or tests. B work may also be somewhat confused about the extent to which conclusions are supported by an empirical test.

A grade of B takes potshots at existing empirical work, or offers elementary and rote criticism. It does not offer meaningful alternative ideas to address flaws in the literature.

Finally, a student receiving a B is not always prepared by having completed the reading. The student only occasionally participates in the discussion and engages other students' ideas. The student relies too much on electronic devices.

The Grade of C

The grade of C is given to work that expresses unclear and muddled arguments. It avoids

taking a definite position and tries to straddle a number of different stories. The work does not provide clear evidence for its conclusions. It relies on emotions or personal opinion to support its conjectures. Finally, the writing is unclear and disorganized.

Work receiving a C has trouble identifying the theory proposed in scholarly work. The student does not engage in much critical assessment of empirical tests. The student may be able to identify conclusions that are drawn in a particular work, but cannot adequately explain how the evidence provided supports those conclusions.

Finally, a student receiving a C is unprepared and/ or misses numerous classes. The student does not participate in the discussion.

Assignment Policies and use of AI

Assignments must be uploaded to Canvas. Work turned in late will be docked one letter grade for each day late, beginning at the end of class on the day the assignment is due.

For this class, you may use AI programs such as ChatGPT to help generate ideas and brainstorm. However, be aware of AI's limitations. The material generated by these programs may be inaccurate, incomplete, and may perpetuate racial, gender, ethnic, and other biases. In fact, you should not trust anything AI says, and you should confirm the information it gives you through other means. The use of AI may also stifle your own independent thinking and creativity.

You may not submit any work generated by an AI program as your own. If you include material generated by an AI program, it should be cited like any other reference material (but consider that the quality of the reference may be poor). Plagiarism or other forms of cheating will be addressed according to CU Honor Code policies (see statement later in this syllabus).

Electronic Device Policy

Research suggests that students who use electronic devices and laptops in the classroom retain less information than those who do not. Research also shows taking written notes leads to better comprehension than other methods. Moreover, electronic devices in the classroom can distract students who are not using these devices. Yet as a user of electronic devices, I understand their utility. To provide the best learning environment for all students, I expect that students will use electronic devices only as e-readers, and will take notes by hand. I will sometimes call on students if I suspect they are distracted by electronic devices. If you need to make a call, send a text, or use an electronic device during class, leave the room and return when you are finished. Students will receive a warning when violating this policy. Students who repeatedly violate this policy will be asked to leave the class. Exceptions to this policy are at my discretion. Please talk to me if you feel you cannot adhere to this policy, and we will find a workable solution.

Coming to my office hours

I will be in my office with the door open or on Zoom and available to talk on Tuesdays from noon to 2:00pm. You do not need to make an appointment or let me know you are coming in advance - just drop by. I'm a fairly nice person and I hope you will not feel intimidated to stop by my office hours. You can come alone or with a friend or classmate. You can come to talk about the class, study skills, your career goals, etc. Understandably, you may find it hard to discuss difficulties, dilemmas, and dissatisfaction with me. Please resist the temptation to remain anonymous and let problems fester. If you have concerns about your class performance, the way the class is being taught, the functionality of the class on Canvas, or anything else

related to this course, email me. We will work together to find a solution.

Schedule of Topics and Readings

The schedule of readings may be modified as needed. Check the Canvas module for each week before doing the reading. I will post copies of some readings (mostly the book chapters) on Canvas. If the reading is not posted, you should search for it on Google scholar or through the library's website.

Why Study International Institutions?

January 16

Required:

- Mearsheimer, John J. 1994. "The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security* 19(3):5-49.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Lisa L. Martin. 1995. "The Promise of Institutional Theory. *International Security* 20(1):39-51.
- Heinzl, Mirko and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi. 2023. "Soft Governance Against Superbugs: How Effective is the International Regime on Antimicrobial Resistance?" *Review of International Organizations*. 1-30.

Why Do States Cooperate Through Institutions?

January 23

Required:

- Friedan, Lake, and Schultz. 2021. *World Politics: Interests, Interactions, and Institutions*. W.W. Norton Press. Chapter 2.
- Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press. Chapters 1, 4-6, 10.

Additional:

- Hardin, Garrett. 1968. The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162: 1243-1248.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oye, Kenneth. 1985. Explaining Cooperation under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies. *World Politics* 38(1):1-24.
- Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. Basic Books. Chapters 1-4, 6-7
- Conybeare, John A.C. 1980. "International Organization and the Theory of Property Rights." *International Organization* 34: 307-334.

Credible Commitments to Institutions

January 30

Required:

- Von Stein, Jana. 2005. "Do Treaties Constrain or Screen? Selection Bias and Treaty Compliance." *American Political Science Review* 99 (4): 611-622.
- Simmons, Beth and Daniel Hopkins. 2005. "The Constraining Power of International Treaties: Theory and Methods." *American Political Science Review* 99(4):623-631.
- Simmons, Beth A., and Allison Danner. 2010. "Credible Commitments and the International Criminal Court." *International Organization* 64(2): 225-256.
- Chapman, Terrence L., and Stephen Chaudoin. 2013. "Ratification Patterns and the International Criminal Court." *International Studies Quarterly* 57(2): 400-409.

Additional:

- Chayes, Abram and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1993. On Compliance. *International Organization*, 47(2):175-205.

- Simmons, Beth A. 1998. Compliance with International Agreements. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1: 75-93.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley. 2003. Alliance Reliability in Times of War: Explaining State Decisions to Violate Treaties. *International Organization* 57(4): 801-827.

The Strategic Design of Institutions

February 6

*First analytical essay question distributed

Required:

- Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. "The Rational Design of International Institutions." *International Organization*, 55(4): 761-799. (this entire issue of IO deals with the design of institutions)
- Davis, Christina. 2023. *Discriminatory Clubs: The Geopolitics of International Organizations*. Princeton University Press. Ch 1 and your choice of Ch 4 (GATT/WTO) or Ch 5 (OECD).
- Eric Reinhardt and Jeff Kucik. 2009. "Does Flexibility Promote Cooperation? An Application to the Global Trade Regime." *International Organization* 62(3):477-505. **OR**
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie, Laurence Helfer, and Christopher Fariss. 2011. "Emergency and Escape: Explaining Derogation from Human Rights Treaties." *International Organization* 65(4): 673-707. (your choice of the Reinhardt or the Haftner-Burton reading)

Additional:

- Duffield, John S. 2003. "The Limits of Rational Design." *International Organization*, 57(2): 411-430.
- Bearce, David, Cody Eldredge, and Brandy Joliff. 2015. "Do Finite Duration Provisions Reduce Bargaining Delay?" *International Organization* 69(1):219-239.

Domestic Sources of Compliance with International Institutions

February 13

*We will have mandatory check-ins this week regarding your final project, during office hours or by appointment

Required:

- Dai, Xinyuan. 2005. "Why Comply? The Domestic Constituency Mechanism." *International Organization* 59(2):363-398.
- Chaudoin, Stephen. 2014. "Audience Features and the Strategic Timing of Trade Disputes." *International Organization* 68(4):877-911.
- Elena McLean and Randall Stone. 2011. "The Kyoto Protocol: Two-Level Bargaining and European Integration." *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1): 99-113.

Additional:

- Putnam, Robert. 1988. "The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization*.
- Chaudoin, Stephen, Helen Milner, and Xun Pang. 2015. "International Systems and Domestic Politics: Linking Complex Interactions with Empirical Models in International Relations." *International Organization*.

The Reputation Effects of Institutions

February 20

*First analytical essay due

Required:

- Tingley, Dustin and Barbara Walter. 2011. “The Effect of Repeated Play on Reputation Building: An Experimental Approach.” *International Organization* 65(2):343-365.
- Chaudoin, Stephen. 2014. “Promises or Policies? An Experimental Analysis of International Agreements.” *International Organization*. 68(1):235-56.
- Weisiger, Alex and Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2015. “Revisiting Reputation: How Past Actions Matter in International Politics.” *International Organization* 69(2):473-495.
- Kelley, Judith G., and Beth A. Simmons. 2015. “Politics by number: Indicators as social pressure in international relations.” *American Journal of Political Science* 59(1):55-70.

Institutions as Independent Actors

February 27

Required:

- Finnemore, Martha. 1993. “International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy.” *International Organization* 47(4):565-597.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” *International Organization* 52(4):887-917.
- Johnson, Tana. 2014. *Organizational Progeny*. Oxford University Press. selected chapters.

Domestic Support for and Resistance to Institutions

March 5

Required:

- De Vries, Catherine E., Sara B. Hobolt, and Stefanie Walter. 2021. “Politicizing International Cooperation: The Mass Public, Political Entrepreneurs, and Political Opportunity Structures.” *International Organization* 75(2):306-332.
- Sam Handlin, Ayse Kaya, Hakan Gunaydin. 2023. “Sovereignty Intrusion: Populism and Attitudes toward the International Monetary Fund.” *International Studies Quarterly* 67(4).
- Sheen, Greg Chih-Hsin, Hans H. Tung, Chien-Huei Wu, and Wen-Chin Wu. 2023. “WHO approves? Relative trust, the WHO, and Chinas COVID-19 vaccines.” *Review of International Organizations* 18(3):499-521.
- Tingley, Dustin, and Michael Tomz. 2020. “International Commitments and Domestic opinion: the Effect of the Paris Agreement on Public Support for Policies to Address Climate Change.” *Environmental Politics* 29(7): 1135-1156.

Dysfunctional and Deviant Effects of Institutions

March 12

*Second analytical essay question distributed

Required:

- Barnett, Michael, and Martha Finnemore. 1999. “The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations.” *International Organization* 53(4):699-732.
- Simpser, Alberto, and Daniela Donno. 2012. “Can International Election Monitoring Harm Governance?” *Journal of Politics* 74(2):501-513.
- Additional reading TBA

Racism as an Organizing Principle in International Relations and Institutions

March 19

Required:

- Lokken, Meredith and Kelebogile Zvobgo. “Why Race Matters in International Relations.” *Foreign Policy*.
- Ba, Oumar. 2023. “Constructing an International Legal Order Under the Shadow of Colonial Domination.” *Journal of Human Rights* 22(1):4-15.
- Oksamytna, Kseniya and Sarah von Billerbeck. Forthcoming. “Race and International Organizations.” *International Studies Quarterly*.
- Lipsky, Phillip and Jiajia Zhou. “Institutional Racism in International Relations.” SSRN working paper.

March 26- No Class (Spring Break)

Human Rights Institutions

April 2

Required:

- Hathaway, Oona A. 2002. “Do Human Rights Treaties Make a Difference?” *The Yale Law Journal* 111(8):1935-2042.
- Simmons, Beth A. 2009. *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 3 and 4.
- Powell, Emilia J. and Jeffrey K. Staton. “Domestic Judicial Institutions and Human Rights Treaty Violation.” *International Studies Quarterly* 53(1):149-174.
- Creamer, Cossette and Beth A Simmons. 2019. “Do Self-Reporting Regimes Matter? Evidence from the Convention Against Torture.” *International Studies Quarterly* 63(4):1051-1064.

Additional:

- Moravcsik, Andrew. 2000. “The Origins of Human Rights Regimes: Democratic Delegation in Postwar Europe.” *International Organization* 54(2): 217-252.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. 2005. “Trading Human Rights: How Preferential Trade Agreements Influence Government Repression.” *International Organization* 59: 593-629.
- Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. “Political Institutions and Human Rights: Why Dictatorships Enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture.” *International Organization* 62(1): 65-101.
- Fariss, Christopher. 2014. “Respect for Human Rights Has Improved Over Time: Modeling the Changing Standard of Accountability.” *American Political Science Review* 108(2):297-318.

Environmental Cooperation

April 9

*Second analytical essay due

Required:

- Mitchell, Ronald. 1994. “Regime Design Matters: International Oil Pollution and Treaty Compliance.” *International Organization* 48(3):425-458.
- Ringquist and Tatiana Kostadinova. 2005. “Assessing the Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements: The Case of the 1985 Helsinki Protocol.” *American Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 86-102.
- Ward, Hugh. 2006. “International Linkages and Environmental Sustainability: The Effectiveness of Regime Networks.” *Journal of Peace Research* 43(2):149-166.
- Von Stein, Jana. 2008. “The International Law and Politics of Climate Change: Ratification of the United Nations Framework Convention and the Kyoto Protocol.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(2): 243-268.
- Tingley, Dustin and Michael Tomz. 2014. “Conditional Cooperation and Climate Change.” *Comparative Political Studies* 47(3):344-368.

- Tingley, Dustin, and Michael Tomz. 2022. "The effects of naming and shaming on public support for compliance with international agreements: an experimental analysis of the Paris Agreement." *International Organization* 76(2):445-468.

Additional:

- Michele B. Battigal and Thomas Bernauer. 2009. "National Institutions and Global Public Goods: Are Democracies More Cooperative in Climate Change Policy?" *International Organization* 63(2).

International Law and Justice

April 16

Required:

- Staton, Jeff and Will Moore. 2011. "Judicial Power in Domestic and International Politics." *International Organization* 65(3): 553-587.
- Morrow, James D. 2014. *Order within Anarchy: The Laws of War as an International Institution*. Cambridge University Press, Chapters 3 and 4.
- Ba, Oumar. 2022. *States of Justice: The Politics of the International Criminal Court*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4.
- Prorok, Alyssa K. 2017. "The (in)compatibility of peace and justice? The International Criminal Court and Civil Conflict Termination." *International Organization* 71(2): 213-243.

Additional:

- Johns, Leslie. *Politics and International Law*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.

Methodological Challenges, Causal Inference, and Experimental Research of Institutions

April 23

Required:

- Chilton, A. and Tingley, Dustin. "Why the Study of International Law Needs Experiments." *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 52(1):173-238.
- Findley, Michael, Daniel Nielson, and J.C. Sharman. "Using Field Experiments in International Relations: A Randomized Study of Anonymous Incorporation." *International Organization* 67(4):657-693.
- Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. 2010. "Are Survey Experiments Externally Valid?" *American Political Science Review* 104(2):226-242.
- Chaudoin, Stephen, Jude Hays, and Raymond Hicks. 2018. "Do we really know the WTO cures cancer?." *British Journal of Political Science* 48(4): 903-928.

Additional:

- Hyde, Susan D. 2015. "Experiments in international relations: Lab, survey, and field." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 403-424.

Research Workshop

April 30

- Each student will present their final project to be workshopped by the class.

Final Project due Wednesday, May 8th by 5:00pm

Other recommended reading

- Krasner, Stephen. 1995. Compromising Westphalia. *International Security*.
- Fearon, James D. 1998. Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation. *International Organization*, 52(2): 269-305.
- Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1996. Is the Good News About Compliance Good News About Cooperation? *International Organization*, 50(3): 379-406.
- Goldstein J, Kahler M, Keohane RO, Slaughter A-M. Introduction: Legalization and World Politics. *International Organization*. 2000;54(3):385-399. doi:10.1162/002081800551262
- McDermott, Rose. 2011. New Directions for Experimental Work in International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 55:503-520.
- Risse-Kappan, Thomas. 1996. Collective Identity in a Democratic Community: The Case of NATO. In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. by Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wendt Alexander. 2001. Driving with the Rearview Mirror: On the Rational Science of Institutional Design. *International Organization* 55(4):1019-1049.
- Morrow, James. 2001. The Institutional Features of the Prisoners of War Treaties. *International Organization* 55(4):971-991.

Institutional Policies

(Links available in class syllabus on Canvas)

Classroom Behavior

Students and faculty are responsible for maintaining an appropriate learning environment in all instructional settings, whether in person, remote, or online. Failure to adhere to such behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with race, color, national origin, sex, pregnancy, age, disability, creed, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, veteran status, political affiliation, or political philosophy. For more information, see the classroom behavior policy, the Student Code of Conduct, and the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance.

Requirements for Infectious Diseases

Members of the CU Boulder community and visitors to campus must follow university, department, and building health and safety requirements and all applicable campus policies and public health guidelines to reduce the risk of spreading infectious diseases. If public health conditions require, the university may also invoke related requirements for student conduct and disability accommodation that will apply to this class.

If you feel ill and think you might have COVID-19 or if you have tested positive for COVID-19, please stay home and follow the guidance of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for isolation and testing. If you have been in close contact with someone who has COVID-19 but do not have any symptoms and have not tested positive for COVID-19, you do not need to stay home but should follow the guidance of the CDC for masking and testing.

Accommodation for Disabilities, Temporary Medical Conditions, and Medical Isolation

If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit your accommodation letter from Disability Services to your faculty member in a timely manner so that your needs can be addressed. Disability Services determines accommodations based on documented disabilities in the academic environment. Information on requesting accommodations is located on the Disability Services website. Contact Disability Services at 303-492-8671 or dsinfo@colorado.edu for further assistance. If you have a temporary medical condition, see Temporary Medical Conditions on the Disability Services website.

If you have a required medical isolation for which you require adjustment, notify me via email as soon as possible, preferably before class.

Preferred Student Names and Pronouns

CU Boulder recognizes that students' legal information doesn't always align with how they identify. Students may update their preferred names and pronouns via the student portal; those preferred names and pronouns are listed on instructors' class rosters. In the absence of such updates, the name that appears on the class roster is the student's legal name.

Honor Code

All students enrolled in a University of Colorado Boulder course are responsible for knowing and adhering to the Honor Code. Violations of the Honor Code may include but are not limited to: plagiarism (including use of paper writing services or technology such as essay bots), cheating, fabrication, lying, bribery, threat, unauthorized access to academic materials, clicker fraud, submitting the same or similar work in more than one course without permission from all course instructors involved, and aiding academic dishonesty.

All incidents of academic misconduct will be reported to Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution: honor@colorado.edu, 303-492-5550. Students found responsible for violating the Honor Code will be assigned resolution outcomes from the Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution as well as be subject to academic sanctions from the faculty member. Visit for more information on the academic integrity policy.

Sexual Misconduct, Discrimination, Harassment and/or Related Retaliation

CU Boulder is committed to fostering an inclusive and welcoming learning, working, and living environment. University policy prohibits protected-class discrimination and harassment, sexual misconduct (harassment, exploitation, and assault), intimate partner violence (dating or domestic violence), stalking, and related retaliation by or against members of our community on- and off-campus. These behaviors harm individuals and our community. The Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance (OIEC) addresses these concerns, and individuals who have been subjected to misconduct can contact OIEC at 303-492-2127 or email cureport@colorado.edu. Information about university policies, reporting options, and support resources can be found on the OIEC website.

Please know that faculty and graduate instructors must inform OIEC when they are made aware of incidents related to these policies regardless of when or where something occurred. This is to ensure that individuals impacted receive outreach from OIEC about resolution options and support resources. To learn more about reporting and support for a variety of concerns, visit the Don't Ignore It page.

Religious Accommodations

Campus policy requires faculty to provide reasonable accommodations for students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments or required attendance. Please communicate the need for a religious accommodation in a timely manner. Notify me via email or in person at least two weeks if you will miss class because of a religious obligation, and we will discuss accommodations. See the campus policy regarding religious observances for full details.

Mental Health and Wellness

The University of Colorado Boulder is committed to the well-being of all students. If you are struggling with personal stressors, mental health or substance use concerns that are impacting academic or daily life, please contact Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS) located in C4C or call (303) 492-2277, 24/7.

Free and unlimited telehealth is also available through Academic Live Care Academic Live Care. The site also provides information about additional wellness services on campus that are available to students.