



Executive Summary of Feedback Received from the Policy Portal to the Nepotism Policy

During the College community comment period (January 28, 2026 to February 27, 2026), several comments were submitted regarding the proposed revisions to the Nepotism Policy. Feedback included both substantive questions and technical comments regarding the scope, language, implementation, and practical application of the revised policy. The comments and corresponding administrative responses are summarized below.

1. Scope of the Policy and Inclusion of Consensual Relationships

Several respondents expressed concern that the revised policy includes provisions related to consensual or romantic relationships in addition to traditional nepotism concerns involving family relationships.

Administrative Response

The revised policy was intentionally drafted broadly to address not only traditional nepotism concerns, but also situations involving actual or perceived conflicts of interest, favoritism, supervisory influence, and related workplace concerns that may arise from familial or personal relationships within the employment setting. The policy is also intended to align with the College's broader obligations related to maintaining professionalism, avoiding conflicts of interest, and supporting a safe and harassment-free workplace. No substantive changes were made to the policy language in response to these comments.

2. Reporting and Privacy Concerns

Several comments raised concerns regarding employee disclosure requirements and whether certain provisions could be viewed as intrusive or overly broad.

Administrative Response

The reporting expectations contained within the policy are intended to address only those situations where relationships may create actual or perceived conflicts of interest, supervisory concerns, or influence over employment decisions. The purpose of disclosure is to allow the College to appropriately assess and address potential workplace conflicts and ensure the integrity of employment-related decisions. No substantive changes were made to the policy language in response to these comments.

3. Practical Application and Scope of Relationship Definitions

Commenters questioned the practicality of some of the relationship examples and appendices included within the policy and whether certain examples may be overly expansive.

Administrative Response

The relationship examples and appendices are intended to serve as illustrative guidance rather than an exhaustive list of prohibited relationships or situations. The policy recognizes that each situation must be evaluated individually based on the existence of actual or perceived conflicts of interest, supervisory authority, or influence over employment decisions. No substantive changes were made to the policy language in response to these comments.

4. Alignment with Existing Policies and SUNY Guidance

Several respondents questioned whether the revised policy aligns with existing College policies and SUNY guidance regarding nepotism and consensual relationships.

Administrative Response

The revised policy was reviewed in consultation with legal counsel and is intended to align with applicable SUNY guidance, New York State Public Officers Law, and existing College policies related to conflicts of interest, anti-harassment, and workplace conduct. Cross references to related College policies remain included within the document for clarity and consistency.

5. Clarification of Roles and Decision-Making Authority

Comments requested clarification regarding references to “the College” and who is responsible for reviewing disclosures and determining appropriate action under the policy.

Administrative Response

The policy identifies Human Resources and Organizational Development as the responsible office for administration of the policy. Decisions regarding disclosures, conflicts of interest, supervisory relationships, and appropriate corrective measures will be reviewed and addressed through the appropriate administrative processes of the College.

6. Technical Corrections and Typographical Errors

Several comments identified typographical errors, grammatical inconsistencies, and formatting concerns within the draft policy.

Administrative Response

Minor technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections were incorporated into the revised draft for clarity and readability. These edits were non-substantive in nature and did not alter the intent or scope of the policy.

Summary

The community feedback provided valuable perspectives regarding the implementation and interpretation of the revised Nepotism Policy. The College appreciates the comments submitted during the review process. Following review of the feedback received, the revised policy remains substantially unchanged, with only minor technical and clarifying edits incorporated into the final draft.