

EXHIBIT B

March 24, 2025 Non-Promotion Letter



PennState Extension

DATE: March 24, 2025

TO: Jeffrey Hyde, Director of Penn State Extension FROM: State Promotion Review Committee

RE: Promotion of Molly Kelly

The State Promotion Committee does not recommend that Molly Kelly be promoted from Level 4 Advanced Professional Extension Educator Level 4 to Senior Professional Extension Educator Level 5. Molly is based in University Park with the Grape and Wine Team and has statewide responsibilities. She has a bachelor's degree from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, a master's degree from the University of Texas, and a PhD from Virginia Tech.

Molly's dossier does show some evidence of meeting the requirements for a Senior Professional Extension Educator Level 5, but the committee believes that the information provided in the dossier was insufficient in painting a full picture of Molly's work and ability. We provide the following rationale and constructive comments, including some areas to modify within the dossier.

Position Description

The committee understands that Molly's position is unique but seeks clarification on the position structure and found that the activities and output included in this section should be placed in other areas of the dossier where appropriate. This section is not suitable for listing activities and output.

Demographics of Audience

Good information from the needs assessment to capture demographic information and efforts to recruit outside the majority demographic. The 4th paragraph on page A4 is valuable information but would more appropriately fit in the position description section. The last paragraph is a great recommendation but is not related to audience demographics and would fit better in the leadership section.

Educational Programs

Strong financial support from grants, donations, and revenue generation was noted. A significant amount of research was conducted. However, the committee felt the write up of this section of Molly's dossier needs the most improvement –

especially for an educator striving for the rank of Senior Professional Extension Educator 5.

Good impact in section II.A. Be sure to match objectives to impact and use the same verbiage. Eg: Objective 6 – ‘change sanitation practices’ was the objective, but ‘change operating procedures’ was the impact. Are they related? Upon reflection, yes, but it wasn’t initially clear to the committee.

It was noted multiple times in Molly’s dossier that data and programs could not be included due to space restrictions. The committee noted the following:

1. A large space was left blank on page B4.
2. One and a quarter-inch margins were used instead of one-inch margins.
3. Nine supporting documents could have been submitted, but only 5 were offered for review. They lacked quantity, variety, and explanation of her role or responsibility.
4. All applicants have the same space limitations. Choose and concisely highlight the programs with the most impact.

The following comments relate to Section II.B. on pages B3 and B4:

1. The first paragraph in the needs assessment could have been placed in the leadership section to allow more space to show impact.
2. What is the status of the USDA grant? Is it in year 3 or 4?
3. Consider writing this program as workforce development and show measured knowledge gained.
4. Objective 1 – There is no measurable impact. Employment information on four out of 17 students was noted. What about the others? What knowledge or skills did they gain?
5. Objective 2 - The vineyard was established, but what was the impact?
6. Objective 3 – What was the impact of presenting these posters? What knowledge or skills did the students gain? Did viewers of these student presentations increase their knowledge?

The following comments relate to Section II.C. on pages B5 and B6:

1. What was the size of the focus groups?
2. Molly’s role in these webinars is not clearly described. It was noted that these were done in collaboration with other universities and that she invited speakers and moderated webinars, but it only lists that she co-presented one webinar.
3. The use of N and n are incorrect on page B6.

4. 27 responses out of 207 participants is low. Why? It was noted that a survey link was posted in the chat, but was a follow-up email sent to encourage participation?
5. No long-term impact is noted.

Leadership

Good partnerships and speaking activity were noted. This section could have been used to highlight the various research efforts and student development she leads. There is implied recognition, but no national or regional awards were noted which is required for rising to this rank. The committee encourages Molly to pursue and note national or regional awards and to consider getting a recommendation letter from outside of PA since her programming crosses state lines.

Educator Activity Report

Strong research activities, grants, and article writing. As noted above, no awards are reported. On page D10, the committee questioned how doing site visits and providing technical expertise to LGBTQ and Greek Orthodox-owned businesses is receiving diversity training. An effort to learn was not interpreted by the committee by reading this section. For the next dossier submission, consider expanding and

explaining such activities and/or seek other development activities. The perception is that this “checked the box.”

The Promotion Committee also recommends that, as with any educator eligible for subsequent promotion, Molly participate in future professional development offerings of goal versus objective writing, measuring and reporting impacts, and dossier writing to keep up to date with Extension requirements and best practices.

Submitted by:



Andy Hirneisen, on behalf of the promotion dossier review committee