



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

**Report by the
Council of University Faculty (CUSF) Chair
to the USM Board of Regents
Friday, June 21, 2019**

Though the academic year has drawn to a close, much has happened since CUSF's last report to the USM Board of Regents (BOR) in April. CUSF continued to work hard on numerous topics of concern to faculty throughout the system (two of the larger initiatives are listed below) and passed a number of resolutions as well. Meanwhile, CUSF's Executive Committee went through some reconfiguration as a result of both annual elections and unexpected departures.

Academic Integrity

The long-running investigation by the CUSF Education Policy Committee into practically all facets of academic integrity continues. Elizabeth Brunn, University of Maryland University College, has successfully guided this effort from the start and has received valuable support from the USM Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation. The attached Interim Report provides a comprehensive overview of actions already taken as a result of this initiative. As the committee looks to the future, their focus will be twofold. First, the committee will examine existing BOR policy related to academic integrity and scholarly work, with the intent of recommending changes and updates to the policy where appropriate. Second, the committee continues to highlight not only the importance of academic integrity but also its ever-changing landscape. As a result, along with the Kirwan Center, the committee will continue its outreach activities to the individual institutions in order to increase awareness.

Faculty Evaluation

The examination of student evaluations of faculty teaching by the CUSF Faculty Concerns Committee resulted in a series of resolutions that were passed by CUSF. Ryan King-White, Towson University, chaired the committee which concluded that student evaluations are but one (albeit very important) measure of teaching effectiveness. The committee also concluded that student evaluation data are subject to misinterpretation. The attached Interim Report provides an overview of these findings (a comprehensive

supplemental document breaking down the findings into greater detail is available upon request). The resolutions stemming from this work are as follows:

1. Whereas current measures are somewhat improperly entitled Student Evaluations of Teaching, CUSF resolves that the language be changed to Student Perception Surveys.
2. Whereas students are currently asked to measure faculty performance on a number of points that they are not properly trained to assess, CUSF resolves that students only be asked questions on things that they can validly assess, such as respect, timeliness, punctuality, feedback, use of class time (e.g. did the course cover what is stated in the syllabus; did the course help them meet learning objectives outlined in the syllabus), and engagement between student and faculty.
3. Whereas results from properly constructed survey items should be both meaningful and actionable, the application of improper analyses to these results is problematic. CUSF resolves that methodologies used to summarize survey data be reviewed to avoid arithmetically incorrect scores.
4. Whereas student evaluations are inappropriately relied upon as a primary measure of evaluating teaching, CUSF resolves that the evaluation of teaching on campus must be based upon other data sources in addition to student surveys. These sources may include, but are not limited to: (a) peer observation (pedagogy) and evaluation (content); (b) self-evaluation surveys; (c) alumni surveys; (d) teaching awards; (e) evidence of professional development related to teaching inside and outside the institution; (f) autobiographical narrative; (g) periodic reviews of representative syllabi and confidential representative student classwork; and (h) evidence of research related to pedagogy in a faculty members field of study
5. Whereas student reporting on teaching currently appears to provide an “air of objectivity” in evaluating teaching performance, CUSF resolves that increased awareness measures of bias be made available, such that university members acknowledge inherent limitations and potential predispositions of student responses.

Executive Committee

The 2018-2019 CUSF Executive Committee members were:

Chair, Patricia Westerman, Bowie State University
Vice-Chair, Philip Evers, University of Maryland College Park
Secretary, Elizabeth Brunn, University of Maryland University College
At-Large, Karen Clark, University of Maryland Baltimore
At-Large, Nagaraj Neerchal, University of Maryland Baltimore County

On May 24, 2019, Patricia Westerman resigned her position as Chair due to her newly announced appointment as Assistant Provost for the Faculty Academic Center of

Excellence at Towson University. Consequently, the Vice-Chair has filled in on an interim basis until the new officer slate takes over in August. The 2019-2020 CUSF Executive Committee will consist of:

Chair, Robert Kauffman, Frostburg State University
Vice-Chair, Elizabeth Brunn, University of Maryland University College
Secretary, Karen Clark, University of Maryland Baltimore
At-Large, Philip Evers, University of Maryland College Park
At-Large, open

An open seat currently exists as one newly elected officer was not re-elected from the home campus; along with the departure of Patricia Westerman who had been re-elected for a second term as chair, this resulted in two special elections in late May 2019 which left a vacancy. The opening will be filled at the September 2019 meeting.

Chancellor Search Committee

On the topic of openings, during its May 16, 2019 meeting, CUSF was informed of the Chancellor's decision not to seek a contract extension. In response to this announcement, CUSF passed the following resolution regarding the upcoming search committee:

1. As CUSF members tend to be highly knowledgeable about higher education trends and are representatives of the faculty across the System, and as CUSF and the Board of Regents have worked hard over recent years to collaborate on important goals, we respectfully request that the Board of Regents consider adding a CUSF member as a member of the search committee for the new Chancellor of the USM.

2019-2020 Agenda

The incoming Executive Committee has established an ambitious agenda for the 2019-2020 academic year. Numerous tasks have been categorized into five general goals. The five goals (not arranged in any particular order) are shown below:

Goal #1: increase communications and advocacy with its constituents.

This involves tasks ranging from Annapolis Day to the CUSF newsletter, a possible column in the Faculty Voice, and social media platforms.

Goal #2: strengthen shared governance with the USM institutions.

This includes such tasks as updating the shared governance survey process and pursuing interprofessional/interdisciplinary activities.

Goal #3: advise and work with USM on major policy initiatives.

Pending final approval of the proposed workload policy, a review of the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure policy may be in order.

Goal #4: advocate for faculty welfare.

In addition to the Academic Integrity and Faculty Evaluation initiatives discussed above, the recommendation process for the Regent's Award and CUSF's continuing speaker series on the changing scope of faculty and education are examples.

Goal 5: strengthen CUSF's organizational structure and increase its visibility.

This runs the gamut from council membership and membership apportionment through orientation and mentoring to CUSF elections and MHEC Faculty Advisory Council recommendations.

As can be seen, CUSF was very active during the 2018-2019 academic year, and a large share of the credit goes to the chair, Patricia Westerman, for her steady leadership. The 2019-2020 academic year looks to be no less engaged, and the incoming chair, Robert Kauffman, a long-time representative and past-chair of CUSF, will undoubtedly maintain the productive pace. CUSF will continue to provide a forum for faculty voice to the Board of Regents and a means of information dissemination from the Board to the faculty.

On behalf not only of the CUSF members but of all USM faculty, thanks for your leadership and support.

Sincerely,



Dr. Philip T. Evers
Interim Chair, Council of University System Faculty
Associate Professor of Supply Chain Management
Robert H. Smith School of Business
University of Maryland College Park
301-405-7164
pevers@rhsmith.umd.edu



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

**Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)
An Interim Report to the USM BOR
On the Academic Integrity Initiative**

May 16, 2019

The following interim report summarizes CUSF’s activities regarding its Academic Integrity initiative since its inception in Spring of 2017. This report is divided into the following sections:

- The first section will provide a history of the CUSF action plan and its results.
- The second section summarizes the goals for CUSF’s Academic Initiative and action plan as currently envisioned by the Education policy committee for the 2019-2020 academic year.

Section 1: Actions Taken

In Spring of 2017, CUSF identified academic integrity as an action plan item for the 2017-2018 CUSF calendar year. The following chart outlines the history

Actions Fall 2017	Actions Spring 2018	Actions Fall 2018	Actions Spring 2019
<p>CUSF Chair/ Ed Policy Committee Commentaries October awareness commentaries* from CUSF Chair brought reaction from BOR requesting USM to present a panel discussion in December 2017.</p> <p>*Commentaries listed below table</p>	<p>CUSF final commentary presented. 1801.1: Academic Integrity Panel Follow Up (January 2018)</p> <p>USM determined that a convening would be useful and appointed the Kirwan Center to work with CUSF to provide it.</p>	<p>CUSF and USM/Kirwan Center postponed the convening to the Spring of 2019 to provide time to increase awareness of the issue among USM institutions.</p>	<p>Webinar for all teams attending the convening in March - featured same format and awareness talking points from November Joint Council Meeting and same panel members and moderator.</p>
<p>CUSF Presentation by</p>	<p>Full CUSF meeting with</p>	<p>November</p>	<p>March 26th Convening -</p>

<p>Ed Policy Committee November Presentation designed to create faculty awareness Ed Policy member listed below</p>	<p>Kirwan Center Director to determine the convening purpose and topics</p>	<p>CUSF Ed Policy Committee presented a panel discussion at the Joint Council Meeting to kick off the discussions around the institutions.</p>	<p>CUSF and Kirwan Center</p>
<p>BOR Panel Discussion The primary purpose of the panel discussion was to bring to the Board's attention the issue of academic integrity and what the institutions were doing to address this issue.</p>	<p>Ed Policy Committee would continue researching integrity issues and present the findings to CUSF members to heighten faculty awareness.</p>		
<p>Action Outcomes Fall 2017</p>	<p>Action Outcomes Spring 2018</p>	<p>Action Outcomes Fall 2018</p>	<p>Action Outcomes Spring 2019</p>
<p>1) CUSF tasked to lead the institutions and USM to address the issues raised by the panel. 2) CUSF Ed Policy Committee tasked with how to lead the approach 3) Kirwan Center on behalf of the USM worked with CUSF to help create strong academic integrity in the classroom</p>	<p>1) CUSF Ed Policy committee developed talking points and topics for raising faculty awareness. 2) USM and CUSF would host a convening in Fall 2018</p>	<p>Panel Discussion 1) Brought the topic to university communities. 2) Survey of participants revealed that they had not been aware of the pervasiveness of the problem. 3) Survey confirms need for change in all member universities. 4) all attendees said the information presented needed to be brought to the institutions for further conversation.</p>	<p>Outcomes Discussed Below</p>

Academic Integrity Convening. Co-sponsored by CUSF and the USM Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation, a Convening was conducted at the Maritime Conference Center in Linthicum Heights on Tuesday, March 26, 2019. The title of the Convening was: “**Reframing Academic Integrity: Creating a Shared Institutional Approach.**” USM institutions assembled teams of five to six team members, including senior academic administrators, CUSF representatives, faculty governance representatives or other faculty thought leader(s), student government/organization leader(s), student affairs staff members associated with conduct processes, and learning design/teaching and learning center representative(s). The objectives of the convening were:

- To create teams that would address academic integrity on the individual system campuses by beginning the conversation on the need for change and to start identifying the people who can make real cultural change.
- To identify ways that the Kirwan center can help faculty create learning experiences which will engage and encourage academic integrity.
- To have the teams understand the need to make this a true university conversation, not just faculty and students.
- To identify the role technology is playing and will continue to play in the learning process.
- To help the teams understand the process behind creating a culture of academic integrity on their campuses.

Outcomes of the Convening include the following:

- The current academic integrity systems on most USM campuses are predicated on the assumption that faculty and students are the stakeholders responsible for its success. This assumption, while historic, is proving insufficient to handle the rising technological challenges to learning with integrity.
- For USM institutions to transition successfully to integrity-based cultures each will need to ramp up resources significantly to effectively combat the disruptive influences that Third-party interlopers (big-business, paper mills, tutoring services, etc.) are having on authentic learning. The scale upon which these resources are needed will obligate USM and its collective institutions to work together to meet this challenge.
- Establishing an academic integrity philosophy and institutional culture that is integrated into academic policies, processes, and procedures is mandatory for holding students, faculty, and institutions across USM to standards of excellence.
- Faculty and students should engage in classroom conversations on the need for ethical learning.
- The Kirwan Center offered to support faculty in teacher training. learning design, assessment creation, and the use of technology in the classroom for the purpose of helping faculty to create and complete assignments that encourage academic honesty.
- Institutions should be responsible, with the help of shared governance groups, for creating conversations among the students, faculty and administrators on identifying what constitutes academic integrity and misconduct, and the processes and procedures of enforcement as part of the efforts to promote institutional cultures of integrity. This could include training for faculty and students.

- USM and or its institutions should consider joining the International Center on Academic Integrity (ICAI).
- CUSF, will seek to find opportunities to support faculty like shared practices discussions among campuses and Senate Chairs. The opportunities could include policy development as well as faculty and/or student training on the issues.
- The USM should become more involved in combating the threats presented by outside digital intruders. Among other things it should develop cyber protection, and possible legal interventions.
- The Kirwan Center and CUSF should continue to work with System schools to help enhance the process of developing a culture of academic integrity which works for each institution. The Convening is not the end but a converging point in the process. Each campus is expected to provide to the conveners (CUSF and the Kirwan Center) an initial action plan in the next several weeks. Campuses will be reminded via email to the campus lead about their obligations under the plan, and follow-up phone conversations with each campus will commence in June 2019 to discuss the status of the items
- The Kirwan Center, CUSF and USM should create a plan of action to advance the work of the institutional teams in the 2019-2020 academic year.

Section 2: CUSF Ed Policy Committee Action Plan 2019-2020

Item 1- Presentation of two revised versions of BOR Policy III 1.0 and 1.1 in Early Spring 2019.

Presentation of new BOR policy recommendations in the form of changes to BOR III- 1.0 Policy on Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity and the creation of guidelines for implementation as additional provisions to existing BOR III-1.1 Policy to Misconduct in Scholarly Work.

Current work to be completed in Fall 2019 focuses on BOR III- 1.0 Policy on Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity. Additions and revision topics under discussion currently include

- 1) The addition of USM to the rights and responsibilities stakeholder list to provide systemwide support in addressing the corporate interests working to undermine intellectual honesty and the ability for USM schools to create a culture of integrity in their institutions; and to offer faculty, students and institutions in classroom design, teaching techniques and class material development which will help to promote academic honesty and a strong learning environment for students; and
- 2) The need for shared governance action to keep all parties committed to the changes now and in the future.
- 3) Greater institutional involvement beyond the administration of enforcement.
- 4) Establishment of community expectations for the establishment of a culture of integrity.

New policy work for Fall 2019 will include the creation of guidelines for implementation as additional provisions to existing BOR III-1.1 Policy to Misconduct in Scholarly Work. This policy would be new or an addition to existing 1.1 policy.

- 1) Revision of current potential academic infractions
- 2) Application of provisions to classroom examinations, assignments and projects as well as formal scholarly work and research.

Action Plan Item 2- Continued work with System Councils, BOR and Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation

Entering the 2019-2020 academic year, the unified effort of the Councils, System, the BOR and the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation needs to continue. Each group can and should continue to play a valuable complementary role in addressing the changing academic integrity landscape. CUSF will continue to take leading role in this work. Specific tasks MAY include the following.

- The campus conversations need to continue. Increasing awareness and changing the culture toward academic integrity is still needed. CUSF needs to do follow-up activities with the campus teams. These can include the recommendations presented in the section on the Convening.
- Working with the campuses and in conjunction with CUSF, the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation will help develop curriculum and educational materials that will foster academic integrity.
- A second panel discussion updating the BOR may be appropriate. Along with providing an update of activities, it might include a focus on strengthening BOR policy.
- There may be a need for System and the BOR to take an increased role in addressing the changed landscape of academic integrity, particularly the impact of companies that are seeking to undermine academic integrity. With the Convening completed, CUSF can focus on working with the constituent groups to develop recommended BOR policy changes. Accompanying the policy changes, campus guidelines can be developed next year.

Contributors to Various Action Items Referenced in the Table

CUSF Chair/Commentaries

Dr. Robert Kauffman, Chair, Council of University System Faculty

1710.1: Academic Dishonesty in the Digital Age (October 2017)

1711.1: A Potpourri on Academic Integrity (November 2017)

1712.1: Academic Integrity and the Silent Conspiracy (December 2017)

1712.2: Academic Integrity – A Blueprint (December 2017)

November CUSF Presentation Members and

Fall-Spring 2017-18 CUSF Ed Policy Committee Members

**Chair: Elizabeth Brunn, MS, JD Program Chair of Management Studies and Collegiate Faculty
UMUC**

Sabrina Fu MS, Collegiate Faculty, UMUC

Ronna Schrum, Dr. Nursing Faculty, FSU
Mary Crowley-Farrell MS, Collegiate Faculty, UMUC
Julie Simon, Professor Director, B.A. Digital Communication, UB

December BOR Panel Members

Representing the BOR Panel:

Dr. MJ Bishop, Director, Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation;
Dr. Andrea Goodwin, Director, Office of Student Conduct—UMCP;
Dr. Douglas Harrison, Associate Dean Graduate School—UMUC;
Dr. Robert Kauffman, Chair, Council of University System Faculty- FSU;
Dr. Darlene Smith, Executive Vice President and Provost— UB;
Mr. Caden Fabbi, President, University System of Maryland Student Council

Fall-Spring 2018-2019 CUSF Ed Policy Members

Chair: Elizabeth Brunn, MS, JD Program Chair of Management Studies and Collegiate Faculty UMUC

Mary Crowley-Farrell MS, Collegiate Faculty Communications, UMUC, Julie Simon Professor Director, B.A. Digital Communication, UB, Dr. Erica Covington Assistant Professor CSU, Marcia Shofner, Ph.D. Assistant Director, Biological Sciences Program UMCP, Ellen Shaefer-Saliens Assistant Professor of Social Work SU, Jennifer Jewell, Ph.D. Program Chair of Graduate Studies in Social Work SU, John Lombardi, Ph.D. Professor of Mass Communication FSU, Robert Kauffman, Ph.D. Professor, Parks and Recreation Management , FSU

November Joint Council Panel:

Elizabeth K. Brunn, MS. JD Collegiate Faculty and Program Chair for Management Studies, UMUC and CUSF Secretary and Ed Policy Chair
Langston O. Frazier, Student Regent Salisbury University
Kevin Joseph Senior Director, Business Intelligence Division of Information Technology UMBC
Dr. Robert Kauffman, Professor, Parks and Recreation Management. FSU
Mark Freeman Price, Vice Chair of CUSS UMUC Academic Specialist
Dr. Alison Goodrich, Collegiate Faculty and Program Chair, Criminal Justice UMUC
James Bond, J.D. Assistant Director Office of Student Conduct UMCP
Annie Rappoport, Graduate Student, Studying the Ethics of Academic Integrity UMCP

March 26th Convening

MJ Bishop, Dr. MJ Bishop, Associate Vice Chancellor and Director, William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation
Nancy O'Neil, MA, M.Ed Associate Director, William E. Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation
Dr. Patricia Westerman, Professor Clinical Psychology, CUSF Chair, -BSU
Elizabeth K. Brunn, MS Ed, JD Collegiate Faculty and Program Chair for Management Studies, UMUC and CUSF Secretary and Ed Policy Chair
Dr. Douglas Harrison, Associate Dean Graduate School, Kenote Speake—UMUC;
Dr. Alison Goodrich, Collegiate Faculty and Program Chair, Criminal Justice UMUC
James Bond, J.D. Assistant Director Office of Student Conduct UMCP
Annie Rappoport, Graduate Student, Studying the Ethics of Academic Integrity UMCP
CUSF Ed Policy Committee Members (2018-2019 referenced above)



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY

Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) An Interim Report to the USM BOR On the Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Initiative

May 16, 2019

CUSF Review of Teaching Evaluation Practices – University System of Maryland

In 2014-2015, Elizabeth Barre, Rice University, conducted a review of research on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs). Her work resulted in the publication of an oft-cited blog post (2015a), screencast (2015b), and follow-up blog post that traced the further conclusions that had been drawn based upon SET research (2018). Barre discovered that, all too often, SET research was being mischaracterized in the popular press to sensationalize findings regarding bias, validity, and reliability. As John Oliver so vociferously outlined on his television show *Last Week Tonight* (2016), this practice by the popular press often serves to obfuscate the complex and careful research that has been conducted in the academy. What Barre argued is that studies on SETs are multifaceted and contradictory, but that she ultimately advocates for the use of these measures if careful administration and readings of SETs are utilized¹.

Current University of Maryland College Park Initiative

A committee of the University of Maryland College Park Senate is currently concluding a thorough review of the existing course evaluation system used at that campus. Working from the

¹ In our supplemental document we outline a number of concerns, weaknesses and strengths driven by Barre's research.

presumably self-evident premise that providing a forum for learning is paramount at USM institutions, an argument can be made that student satisfaction is not equivalent to student learning, and that student satisfaction evaluation and student learning evaluation are two different things entirely. Research suggests that student learning can be influenced by factors like prior knowledge, individual differences and instructor effectiveness. Currently, student surveys are trying to measure learning without accounting for satisfaction. The best source of data to measure each of these goals varies. Content experts are the best data sources for devising evaluations of course content, whereas teaching experts are the best data sources for creating evaluations of pedagogy. Likewise, learning assessments best measure the satisfaction of learning objectives, and instructor self-reflections can provide evidence of longitudinal improvement efforts. And the best sources of data relating to the learning experience are students. Table 1 demonstrates these measures:

Table 1 - Sources of data mapped to suggested course evaluation purposes

	Summative	Formative	Informative	Outcome
Content experts	X	X		
Teaching experts		X		
Learning assessments				X
Self-reflection	X	X		
Students	X	X	X	

Three of the most significant recommendations currently being proposed by the committee to the College Park Senate are: 1.) Results from the individual survey items should

not be averaged to derive an overall teaching score; 2.) Items should focus on assessing baseline and best practices; and 3.) Results from most of the survey items should be made available to both administrators and students. With regard to the averaging of individual survey items, there is no objective basis for using the mean survey responses as a measure of teaching effectiveness. The items should indeed be viewed as individually important; aggregating these results leads to misinterpretation. Moreover, the items themselves should reflect either baseline expectations that all instructors should meet (such as timely feedback and clear grading expectations) or aspirational expectations that all instructors should seek to achieve (such as cognitive engagement/rigor and scaffolding).

CUSF Resolutions for Teaching Evaluations at USM Institutions

In review, the CUSF Faculty Concerns Committee has evaluated the USM Policies for faculty performance in the classroom, specifically BOR II-1.20 Policy on Evaluation of Performance of Faculty and ART II-1.00 Policy on Appointment Rank and Tenure of Faculty. We have found that neither policy talks about student evaluations, and, as such, the committee would like the following to be considered for inclusion into the policies and/or at campuses in the USM:

1. Whereas current measures are somewhat improperly entitled Student Evaluations of Teaching, CUSF resolves that the language be changed to Student Perception Surveys.
2. Whereas students are currently asked to measure faculty performance on a number of points that they are not properly trained to assess, CUSF resolves that students only be asked questions on things that they can validly assess, such as respect, timeliness, punctuality, feedback, use of class time (e.g. did the course cover what is stated in the syllabus; did the course help them meet learning objectives outlined in the syllabus), and engagement between student and faculty.
3. Whereas results from properly constructed survey items should be both meaningful and actionable, the application of improper analyses to these results is problematic. CUSF resolves that methodologies used to summarize survey data be reviewed to avoid arithmetically incorrect scores.
4. Whereas student evaluations are inappropriately relied upon as a primary measure of evaluating teaching, CUSF resolves that the evaluation of teaching on campus must be based

upon other data sources in addition to student surveys. These sources may include, but are not limited to: (a) peer observation (pedagogy) and evaluation (content); (b) self-evaluation surveys; (c) alumni surveys; (d) teaching awards; (e) evidence of professional development related to teaching inside and outside the institution; (f) autobiographical narrative; (g) periodic reviews of representative syllabi and confidential representative student classwork; and (h) evidence of research related to pedagogy in a faculty members field of study

5. Whereas student reporting on teaching currently appears to provide an “air of objectivity” in evaluating teaching performance, CUSF resolves that increased awareness measures of bias be made available, such that university members acknowledge inherent limitations and potential predispositions of student responses.

References

- Barre, E. (2015a). Do student evaluations of teaching really get an F?. Retrieved May 14, 2019 from <http://www.elizabethbarre.com/blog/studentevaluations>
- Barre, E. (2015b). Rice teaching and course evaluation subcommittee: Literature review. Retrieved May 14, 2019 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DEOruot_gcM.
- Barre, E. (2018). Research on student ratings continues to evolve. We should too. Retrieved May 14, 2019 from <https://cte.rice.edu/blogarchive/2018/2/20/studentratingsupdate>
- Oliver, J. (2016). Last week tonight: Scientific studies. Retrieved May 14, 2019 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Rnq1NpHdmw>.