

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board

IN THE MATTER OF THE EMPLOYES OF :  
:  
: CASE NO. PERA-U-19-27-E  
: (PERA-R-11-447-C)  
:  
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER :  
EDUCATION (INDIANA UNIVERSITY) :

**PROPOSED ORDER OF UNIT CLARIFICATION**

On January, 28, 2019, the State College & University Professional Association, PSEA/NEA (SCUPA or Association) filed a Petition for Unit Clarification with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (Board) seeking to include the Social Media Strategist, Administrative Director of Media Relations, and Assistant Director (Annual Giving) positions into an existing unit of professional employes of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, Indiana University (PASHHE or Employer) certified at PERA-R-11-447-C.

On February 28, 2019, the Secretary of the Board issued an Order and Notice of Hearing, assigning the matter to conciliation, and designating April 2, 2019, in Harrisburg, as the time and place of hearing, if necessary.

On May 30, 2019, SCUPA filed an amendment to its Petition seeking to add the additional positions of Director of Admission Operations & Technology Manager and Multimedia Producer to its original Petition. On June 5, 2019, the Secretary of the Board issued an Amended Order and Notice of Hearing designating September 19, 2019, in Indiana, Pennsylvania, as the time and place of hearing.

The hearing was held on September 19, 2019, in Indiana, Pennsylvania, before the undersigned Hearing Examiner, at which time all parties in interest were afforded a full opportunity to present testimony, cross-examine witnesses and introduce documentary evidence.

SCUPA filed a post-hearing brief in support of its petition on December 13, 2019. PASSHE filed its post-hearing brief on January 29, 2020.

The Hearing Examiner, on the basis of the evidence presented at the hearing, and from all other matters and documents of record, makes the following:

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. PASSHE is a public employer pursuant to PERA. (N.T. 5).
2. SCUPA is an employe representative pursuant to PERA. (N.T. 5).
3. SCUPA is the exclusive representative of a bargaining-unit consisting of all full-time and regular part-time professional employes classified as State College and University Administrators; and excluding nonprofessional employes, management level employes, supervisors, first level supervisors, confidential employes and guards as defined in the Act. (PERA-R-11-447-C; Joint Exhibit 1).

4. The parties were subject to a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with the term of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019. At the time of the hearing, the parties had not ratified a successor agreement and were bargaining under status quo. (N.T. 7; Joint Exhibit 2).

5. SCUPA positions are referred to by the parties as State College and University Administrators (SUAs). SUAs work at all 14 of PASHHE's state-wide campuses. In general, SUAs are professionals who are the assistant and associate directors of admissions, financial aid, student activities, residence life, judicial, registrars, tutorial and academic assistance services, career services, alumni relations, grant fund programs, and others working in student development across all 14 PASSHE campuses. Job titles for the SUAs are not consistent across the 14 campuses. (N.T. 11, 24-25; PASSHE Exhibit 9).

6. Many SCUPA positions do not work directly with students. (N.T. 27).

7. The Social Media Strategist; Assistant Director of Media Relations; Multimedia Producer; and Assistant Director, Annual Giving positions are professional and not supervisory. (N.T. 6).

8. Caitlin Aiello is the Assistant Director of Communications at Indiana University (IUP). Aiello is a salaried, full-time employe who works at the IUP campus. Aiello is in the SCUPA unit. (N.T. 49-50, 55-56, 59).

9. Aiello has had the Assistant Director of Communications positions for four years. She has a college degree and a master's degree, which were requirements for her position. (N.T. 50; SCUPA Exhibit 2).

10. In general, Aiello's position supports the Student Affairs Division in the areas of communications, social media, promotion, public relations, and marketing. In particular, Aiello manages the Office of Housing, Residential Living and Dining (OHRD) social media accounts including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Aiello creates content, monitors activity, responds to posts, and follows IUP brand guidance. Aiello chairs a committee of different communications professionals from across IUP. (N.T. 50-52; SCUPA Exhibit 2).

11. Tessa Lukesh is a Social Media Strategist at IUP. She maintains the main social media accounts for IUP. She sorts through stories and assets within IUP and decides which to share on IUP's social media platforms. She also supports the efforts of other IUP social media accounts are doing. Lukesh is salaried and works on IUP's campus. She works a full-time. (N.T. 61, 81, 90).

12. Lukesh has a bachelor's degree in English with a minor in communications. (N.T. 62).

13. Lukesh had been in the position for approximately three months before the hearing date. She is the first person to hold the position. (N.T. 62).

14. Lukesh spends 80%-90% of her time performing social media management. Social media management entails the daily review of all of IUP's social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn, Instagram,

Snapchat, and emerging platforms). The review includes responding to messages on those platforms and monitoring any mentions or tags of IUP. (N.T. 64-65).

15. Lukesh spends her remaining time performing social media strategy development and analytics reporting. Before Lukesh's arrival at IUP, IUP hired a third-party marketing firm to create a strategy for social media. Lukesh has been working off of that strategy and was told she had some liberty to decide when and how to tweak the social media strategy. Whenever Lukesh changes or tweaks the social media strategy, or creates new guidelines, she must get approval from Mike Powers, the Executive Director of marketing and Communications. (N.T. 66, 69, 91-92).

16. In early September 2019, an IUP student posted a racist video on his Snapchat account. The video spread quickly through social media and the video was being connected to IUP. Lukesh became aware of the issue and immediately went to Powers. Powers took Lukesh to the Michelle Fryling, the Director of Media Relations. Fryling addressed the issue and created a message that would be used for the IUP response. The message was approved by Fryling, Chris Noah (Director of Marketing), and the University President. Fryling sent the message to Lukesh, and Lukesh began posting it on IUP's social media accounts. (N.T. 77-79, 154).

17. Stephanie Keppich is the Assistant Director of Media Relations at IUP. She had been in the position for approximately six months at the time of the hearing. Previous to her current position, Keppich worked as an adjunct temporary faculty at IUP. (N.T. 94).

18. Keppich works on IUP's campus. She is a full-time employe (N.T. 95; Joint Exhibit 5).

19. Keppich generally is responsible for discovering stories at IUP that would play in the traditional media. She finds stories and pushes them out to the media. Keppich finds stories that fit predetermined editorial priorities. Keppich does not herself determine editorial priorities at IUP. When determining which stories to use, Keppich uses her skills as a journalist. (N.T. 94, 107-109, 116, 120-121).

20. Brian Henry is the Multimedia Producer at IUP. He works on IUP's campus. His position is full-time (N.T. 122; Joint Exhibit 6).

21. Henry's position subsumed the previous position of University Photographer. The position was renamed to Multimedia Producer. (N.T. 123).

22. Henry fulfills requests from marketing or media relations for pictures or video to be taken of IUP events and subjects. Henry uses his skills as a photographer to select subjects and settings. (N.T. 123, 129-130).

23. The core leadership team of the Marketing Department is Chris Noah (Chief Marketing Officer), Powers, Fryling and Simon Stuchlik. Noah was hired by the President of IUP to be responsible for implementing a new and updated brand strategy at IUP. Noah reports on the progress of brand implementation to the IUP President. (N.T. 142-148).

24. Matthew Gueguen is the Assistant Director of Annual Giving in the Department of Annual Giving at IUP. He works on IUP's campus. His position is full-time. (N.T. 164, 171; Joint Exhibit 7).

25. Gueguen spends approximately 40% of his time administering the IUP Phone-a-Thon. He also works with the Student Philanthropy Council with the Student Gift. Finally, he is responsible for IUP crowdfunding for IUP constituents such as GoFundMe pages. (N.T. 165-167; Joint Exhibit 7).

26. Gueguen's tasks are assigned to him by Stephanie Sell, the Director of Annual Giving. His tasks all existed prior to him coming into the position. (N.T. 196).

27. For his Student Gift work, Gueguen works with different organizations on campus to drive student giving towards IUP's student giving project. (N.T. 168).

28. With respect to the Phone-a-Thon, Gueguen is responsible for hiring students and assigning calls to them analyzing statistics on giving through the Phone-a-Thon. Gueguen is responsible for addressing student-employees of the Phone-a-Thon who miss scheduled work. Gueguen has responsibly for determining the best time to call donors, determining strategies for request amounts, and determining the scripting for callers to follow. (N.T. 169, 173-174, 187).

29. Gueguen works on Crowdfunding at IUP. People and organizations at IUP can come to Gueguen and request help with setting up a Crowdfunding for certain causes on campus. Gueguen comes up with a plan and creates a webpage that allows the IUP party to push the Crowdfunding request out through social media. (N.T. 169-171, 176).

#### **DISCUSSION**

SCUPA seeks to include the following positions into an existing unit of professional employees: 1. Social Media Strategist; 2. Administrative Director of Media Relations; 3. Assistant Director (Annual Giving); 4. Director of Admission Operations & Technology Manager; and 5. Multimedia Producer. At the Hearing, SCUPA withdrew its request with respect to the Director of Admission Operations & Technology Manager. (N.T. 5).

The parties agree that the remaining four positions are professional and not supervisory according PERA. (N.T. 6). The dispute in this matter is whether the four positions share an identifiable community of interest with the other professional employees in SCUPA's unit and, if there is an identifiable community of interest, whether the four positions are nevertheless excluded from the unit because they meet PERA's definition of management level employe.

It is the burden of the petitioning party, in this case SCUPA, to show an identifiable community of interest. Section 604 of PERA provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The [B]oard shall determine the appropriateness of a unit which shall be the public employer unit or a subdivision thereof. In determining the appropriateness of the unit, the [B]oard shall:

(1) Take into consideration but shall not be limited to the following: (i) public employees must have an identifiable community of interest, and (ii) the effects of over fragmentation.

43 P.S. § 1101.604.

When determining whether employees share an identifiable community of interest, the Board considers such factors as the type of work performed, educational and skill requirements, pay scales, hours and benefits, working conditions, interchange of employees, grievance procedures, bargaining history, and employees' desires. West Perry School District v. PLRB, 752 A.2d 461, 464 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000). An identifiable community of interest does not require perfect uniformity in conditions of employment and can exist despite differences in wages, hours, working conditions, or other factors. Id.

In addition, the Board has long favored a policy of certifying broad-based units. In the Matter of the Employees of University of Pittsburgh, 16 PPER ¶ 16205 (Order Directing Amendment of or Request to Withdraw Petition for Representation, 1985) citing Athens Area School District, 10 PPER ¶ 10128 (Order and Notice of Election, 1978).

Differences among employees in a unit may reflect the division of labor at an employer and do not destroy a clearly identifiable community of interest. See In the Matter of the Employees of Wissahickon School District, 47 PPER 26 (Order Directing Submission of Eligibility List, 2015); In the Matter of the Employees of Temple University Health System Episcopal Hospital, 41 PPER 177 (Order Directing Submission of Eligibility List, 2010), citing Pennsylvania State University v. PLRB, 24 PPER ¶ 24117 (Court of Common Pleas of Centre County, 1993) (holding that the Board need not find an identical community of interest but merely an identifiable community of interest).

The general policy of the Board is "to certify units as broadly as possible in order to avoid the deleterious effects of over fragmentation." Berks County, 27 PPER ¶ 27110 (Final Order, 1996). The Board favors unit descriptions that use "including" language "so that unit clarification petitions need not be filed whenever an employee within the coverage of the unit is hired." Beaver County Community College, 23 PPER ¶ 23070 (Final Order, 1992), aff'd 24 PPER ¶ 24110 (1993).

Section 301(7) of PERA provides as follows:

"Professional employee" means any employee whose work: (i) is predominantly intellectual and varied in character; (ii) requires consistent exercise of discretion and judgment; (iii) requires knowledge of an advanced nature in the field of science or learning customarily acquired by specialized study in an institution of higher learning or its equivalent; and (iv) is of such character that the output or result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time.

43 P.S. § 1101.301(7). The test is conjunctive, and all four parts must be met in order for an employee to be deemed professional under PERA. In the Matter of the Employees of Luzerne County Community College, 37 PPER 47 (Final Order, 2006). The same factors (such as work performed, educational and

skill requirements) that support professional status also support the conclusion that the employees in a proposed professional bargaining unit share an identifiable community of interest with the existing professional employees in the unit. In the Matter of the Employees of Temple University, 47 PPER 54 (Order Directing Submission of Eligibility List, 2015); In the Matter of the Employees of Temple University Health System Episcopal Hospital, 41 PPER 177 (Order Directing Submission of Eligibility List, 2010); In the Matter of the Employees of Riverview Intermediate Unit, 37 PPER 106 (Final Order, 2006).

Moving to this matter, it is clear that all four of the requested positions share an identifiable community of interest with the other members of SCUPA's bargaining unit of professional PASSHE employees. The four requested positions are all employees of PASSHE, work at IUP with other members of SCUPA, are salaried, work full-time, and are professional employees.

PASSHE argues that the four positions in this matter do not share an indefinable community of interest with the other members of SCUPA's bargaining unit. PASSHE's argument in its Brief focuses on the differences between the four requested positions and the other members of SCUPA's unit. (PASSHE's Brief at 14-21). However, differences among employees in a unit may reflect the division of labor at an employer and do not destroy a clearly identifiable community of interest. The Board need not find an identical community of interest but merely an identifiable community of interest. It is clear in this case, as discussed above, that there is an identifiable community of interest: the four requested employees are all full-time, professional employees of PASSHE that work on a campus with other SCUPA members.

PASSHE specifically makes an argument that the four requested positions do not share an identifiable community of interest with the other SCUPA members because they are not "student centric". PASSHE argues in its Brief:

Finally, the SCUPA unit bargaining history indicates that the bargaining unit membership is "student centric". As classified, the unit comprises "all full-time and regular part-time professional employees [of the State System] classified as State College University Administrators..." (PERA-R-11-447-C.) In its roughly 40-year history, there is no evidence that SCUPA has included positions that were not focused on providing student services, support or counseling. Indeed, the Board has opined that administrative employees of a university (i.e., SUAs) are those whose "duties include coordinating and implementing a wide range of student programs, services and activities relating to such areas as student government, cultural affairs, off-campus housing, orientation and student discipline, among others." In the Matter of the Employees of Pennsylvania State University, 19 PPER ¶ 19156 (Final Order, 1988).

Significantly, the Union concedes that all SUA positions are "student centered", and specifically identifies membership as those professional administrators "who are the Assistant and Associate Directors of Admissions, Financial Aid, Student

Activities, Residence Life, Judicial, Registrars, Tutorial and Academic Assistance Services, Career Services, Alumni Relations, grant funded programs, and others working in student development." (N.T. 23, Ex. R-9.)

Consistently, SCUPA membership has been limited to exactly those positions that provide student services, as opposed to support for the ongoing viability of the University as an entity. The SCUPA classification manual supports this interpretation of the community of interest.

(PASSHE's Brief at 18-20). In response to this argument, I find that the differences and clear lines between SUAs in the SCUPA unit and the four requested positions argued by PASSHE do not exist on this record.

PASSHE above claims that "bargaining history indicates that the bargaining unit membership is "student centric". The record in this matter shows that bargaining unit as certified includes all full-time and regular part-time professional employees classified as State College and University Administrators (SUAs). There does not exist on this record any Board document or opinion which limits the SCUPA bargaining unit to "student centric". Moreover, the Board has its own agenda of defining and classifying bargaining units and would not be bound by parties' definitions. Even if I were to credit the term "student centric", I would be hamstrung attempting to use it as the term does not provide me with much direction or basis of analysis, as the entire mission of the University is dedicated to students and their education. The record indicates that the SUA classification includes a broad swath of professional employees of PASSHE who work in various aspects of its administration including some who do not work directly with students. The record shows that professional employees in PASSHE do have differences in their job functions and roles, however, to the extent these differences exist among the four requested positions and the existing SCUPA bargaining unit, the differences among employees in a unit reflect the division of labor at PASSHE and do not destroy a clearly identifiable community of interest.

I have reviewed PASSHE's citation to In the Matter of the Employees of Pennsylvania State University (Penn State), 19 PPER ¶ 19156 (Final Order, 1988). I find that case distinguishable from these facts. The board in Penn State was dealing with a petitioned for "unit comprised of all full-time and regular part-time college health nurses employed by Pennsylvania State University" Id. The union in Penn State was thus seeking for a unit comprised nurses, and it included in its petition the position of "Campus Health Nurse/Student Services Coordinator. Id. With respect to that position, the Board held it should not be included and, using the language cited by PASSHE in its brief, held that:

The record reveals that the Campus Health Nurse/Student Services Coordinator spends 75% of her time in the non-health related functions as a Student Services Coordinator. These duties include coordinating and implementing a wide range of student programs, services and activities relating to such areas as student government, cultural affairs, off-campus housing, orientation and student discipline, among others. These

duties are substantially different from those of the nurses included in the bargaining unit and are more closely akin to the duties normally thought of as being performed by administrative employees of a university. As the Employer correctly points out, the Board has previously held that bargaining unit placement of a dual function employe will be based upon the primary duties performed by that employe. New Castle Transportation Authority, 14 PPER ¶ 14144 (Final Order, 1983), aff'd on other grounds sub nom. Amalgamated Transit Union v. PLRB, 92 Pa. Commonwealth Ct. 144, 498 A.2d 485 (1985) (janitor/dispatcher included in blue-collar bargaining unit since primary duties are those of a janitor). Since the primary duties of the Campus Health Nurse/Student Services Coordinator bear no relationship to the health-related duties of the employes in the bargaining unit, the position is more appropriately included in a bargaining unit of other University administrators.

Id. Thus, in Penn State, the Board chose not to include an "administrator" into a bargaining unit strictly defined as nurses by the petition. I do not agree therefore that the holding in Penn State supports PASSHE's argument that the four positions petitioned for in this matter cannot be included with the other members of the SCUPA unit because they lack an identifiable community of interest. SCUPA's unit description in its certification is broad enough (unlike Penn State) to include the four petitioned-for positions and the positions share an identifiable community of interest with the other members of SCUPA's unit. In reaching this conclusion, I have in mind the Board's charge from PERA to avoid the over-fragmentization of units and the Board's broad-based bargaining unit policy.

As I have found that the four positions in this matter share an indefinable community of interest with the employes of the existing unit, the burden in this matter moves to the employer asserting that the positions meet a category of employe that is excluded from the unit by statute. PASSHE argues that all four of the positions in this matter should be excluded from the professional unit because they are management level employes.

The party arguing for the exclusion of an employe from a unit on a statutory ground bears the burden of proving a basis for the exclusion. School District of Philadelphia v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, PLRB, 719 A.2d 835 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1998).

Section 301(16) of PERA states:

"Management level employe" means any individual who is involved directly in the determination of policy or who responsibly directs the implementation thereof and shall include all employes above the first level of supervision.

43 P.S. § 1101.301(16). Under this provision, a position is at the management level if the employe holding that position (1) is involved directly in the determination of policy; (2) directs the implementation of policy; or (3) is above the first level of supervision. Pennsylvania Association of State Mental Hosp. Physicians v. PLRB, 554 A.2d 1021 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1988); Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Attorneys Examiner I), 12 PPER ¶



12131 (Final Order, 1981). In Pennsylvania Association of State Medical Hospital Physicians v. Commonwealth, PLRB, 554 A. 2d 1021 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1989), the Commonwealth Court adopted the Board' s definition of the first part of Section 301(16) of PERA as set forth in Horsham Township, 9 PPER 9157 (Final Order, 1978):

An individual who is involved directly in the determination of policy would include not only a person who has authority or responsibility to select among options and to put proposed policies into effect, but also a person who participates with regularity in the central process which results in a policy proposal and a decision to put such proposals into effect. Our reading of the statute does not include a person who simply drafts language for the statement without meaningful participation in the decisional process, nor would it include one who simply engaged in research or the collection of data necessary for the development of a policy proposal.

Id.

The Board's policy is that the use of independent judgment and discretion by the employe when implementing the employer's policies is necessary to satisfy the second prong of the statutory test for management level employe under Section 301 (16) of PERA. Id.; Municipal Employees of Borough of Slippery Rock v. PLRB, 40 PPER 64 (Proposed Order of Unit Clarification, 2009), 40 PPER 122, (Final Order, 2009), aff'd 14 A.3d 189 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2011). In order to be considered a management level employe, the employe must be responsible for not only monitoring compliance with a policy, but also for taking action in situations where noncompliance is found. Slippery Rock, 14 A.3d 189 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2011).

Further, the Commonwealth Court has opined that an employe's decisions are not managerial if they are part of the employe's routine discharge of professional duties. Borough of Slippery Rock, 14 A.3d 189 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2011). The Board has held that making decisions that effectuate the responsibilities of the position is not synonymous with managerial policy formulation or implementation. Pennsylvania State University (Penn State), 19 PPER ¶ 19156 (Final Order, 1988). The Penn State Board held that a nurse practitioner's formulation of medical protocols was the result of professional expertise and not indicative of managerial authority. The Penn State Board relied on General Dynamics Corp., 1013 NLRB 851 (1974) and opined as follows:

Judgments of professional employes which transcend the technical discipline of professionals should be distinguished from those instances where the natural and normal performance of professional duties may affect the employer's policy merely by the specialized nature of the professional's normal tasks.

Penn State, 19 PPER at 378. When the only policies developed by the person holding the position in question are policies entirely within the expertise of the position and applicable to the duties of the position, such policies are not considered managerial, even though there may be some indirect impact on operations or managerial policy. Id.

Turning to this matter, I will examine each of the four positions separately. First, the record in this matter supports the conclusion that the Multimedia Producer, Brian Henry, is not a management level employe pursuant to PERA. Henry uses his professional expertise in his work and is not involved in the determination or implementation of policy.

Second, the record shows that the Social Media Strategist, Tessa Lukesh, is not a management level employe pursuant to PERA. Lukesh spends 80%-90% of her time performing social media oversight. These activities fall well within the routine discharge of her professional expertise. Lukesh does spend time reviewing IUP's social media policies, however, whenever Lukesh changes or tweaks the social media strategy, or creates new guidelines, she must get approval from Mike Powers, the Executive Director of marketing and Communications. She thus does not have the independence in judgment necessary to be a management level employe pursuant to PERA.

Third, the record shows that the Assistant Director of Media Relations, Stephanie Keppich, is not a management level employe pursuant to PERA. The record shows that Keppich is responsible for discovering stories at IUP that would play in the traditional media. Keppich finds stories that fit predetermined editorial priorities and Keppich does not herself determine editorial priorities at IUP. When determining which stories to use, Keppich uses her skills as a journalist. The facts show that Keppich uses her professional expertise to discharge her duties and has no independent judgment to determine or implement IUP policies.

Fourth, the record in this matter shows that the Assistant Director of Annual Giving, Matthew Gueguen, is not a management level employe pursuant to PERA. The record shows that Gueguen has three primary responsibilities: he administers the IUP Phone-a-Thon; he works with the Student Philanthropy Council with the Student Gift; and he is responsible for IUP crowdfunding for IUP constituents such as GoFundMe pages. Importantly for this matter, all of Gueguen's tasks are assigned to him by Stephanie Sell, the Director of Annual Giving and all of his tasks existed prior to him taking up the position. In other words, the record in this matter does not support a conclusion that Gueguen had any role in the determination or implementation of the projects he works on. The record does indeed show that Gueguen's work is predominantly intellectual and varied in character and requires consistent exercise of discretion and judgment. These are the hallmarks of a professional employe under PERA, however, and not sufficient to meet the definition of management level employe.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The Hearing Examiner, therefore, after due consideration of the foregoing and the record as a whole, concludes and finds:

1. PASSHE is a public employer within the meaning of Section 301(1) of PERA.
2. SCUPA is an employe organization within the meaning of Section 301(3) of PERA.
3. The Board has jurisdiction over the parties.

4. The Social Media Strategist, Assistant Director of Media Relations, Multimedia Producer, and Assistant Director, Annual Giving positions are professional employees and share an identifiable community of interest with the other members of the bargaining unit and are properly included in the bargaining unit.

5. The Social Media Strategist, Assistant Director of Media Relations, Multimedia Producer, and Assistant Director, Annual Giving positions are not supervisory or management level employees.

**ORDER**

In view of the foregoing and in order to effectuate the policies of PERA, the Hearing Examiner

**HEREBY ORDERS AND DIRECTS**

that the bargaining unit is amended to include the positions of Social Media Strategist, Assistant Director of Media Relations, Multimedia Producer, and Assistant Director, Annual Giving.

**IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED AND DIRECTED**

that in the absence of any exceptions filed with the Board pursuant to 34 Pa. Code § 95.98(a) within twenty (20) days of the date hereof, this order shall be and become absolute and final.

SIGNED, DATED and MAILED at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, this twenty second day of May, 2020.

PENNSYLVANIA LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

s/ Stephen A. Helmerich  
STEPHEN A. HELMERICH, Hearing Examiner