

Introduction: The SoTL Call and Response

Galia Solon Theresa Blackman

Journal Editor, *Pedagogical Inquiry and Practice*, MacEwan University

Our current publication cycle is aligned with our academic calendar, but our call is to all those engaged in scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) thinking and doing in Canadian post-secondary institutions. Our call for submissions typically goes out in October. Thanks to the authors, peer reviewers, and editors who have collaborated and nourished the responses over the last few months, culminating in this second issue. We are grateful for your commitment to growing the *teaching commons* (Huber & Hutching, 2005) and fostering a sense of community for each other.

What constitutes the SoTL call and response? The call begins in the inspiration and motivation to rigorously address a teaching and learning question, situated in disciplinary ways of knowing, with implications for other disciplines in higher education. The courage to engage in *significant conversations*, private dialogues “where university teachers continuously construct, maintain, and develop an understanding about teaching and learning” (Roxå & Mårtensson, 2009, p. 555) is the start of the response. The public SoTL response is an eclectic, plural experience because the ways educators and students take up the questions will be shaped by diverse disciplinary ways of knowing and inquiry. The response is situated in a recognition that “teaching does not happen in a vacuum; it takes place in the context of, among other things, a discipline and a departmental (or other organisational entity) culture” (Roxå & Mårtensson, 2009, p. 548). The authors in this issue have moved from private inquiries to the public discourse that is a SoTL ethic.

This summer, the *PIP* contributions show a consistent thread with the discourse on pedagogy—those engaged in teaching and learning are deeply committed to strengthening their practice by engaging in inquiry, in conversations with each other, and with you, the readers. They challenge, they provoke, and they disrupt through the intentional use of their selected conceptual frameworks, peeling back our taken-for-granted assumptions about teaching and learning. That is one way of shifting scholarly teaching into SoTL—by looking closely at the layers of teaching and learning through a commitment to inquire, interrogate, explore, study, analyze, and share. The contributions demonstrate the plurality of the SoTL response; scholarship can take many forms: conversation, study, essay, and review.

We chose to arrange our second issue starting with the SoTL Conversation, our article format that encourages authors to take up the collaborative ethos of SoTL work. Bojesen (2019) explained that “[Maurice] Blanchot’s idea of conversation as plural speech offers a unique way

of conceiving of educational research and of education as research” (p. 651). The conversation itself is a method, and it suits SoTL inquiry, because it facilitates the movement within liminal spaces of teaching and inquiry. The method resists a unifying conclusion or an extraction of an out-there, objective truth and aims for “teacher professional conversations as a mode of research and development” (Bojesen, 2019, p. 654). The SoTL Conversation interlocutors are aware of your presence as readers, coming from multiple vantage points in higher education, but they do not shy away from their own complex contexts that have given rise to the conversation.

Munro and Regis in “Can Assessment Be Kind? A Conversation About a Pedagogy of Kindness and Specifications Grading” brings to the fore the recent discourse on kindness pedagogy and extends the conceptual framework to assessment within systems thinking discourse. For educators and students who are unsure what this can look like, the exchange between faculty and student illustrates partnership in inquiry.

Gagné, Patrie, and Lorenz in “You Keep Using That Word”: Gestural Disruption as Good Vibes in Higher Education” take up a complex topic of inclusion in the academy, encouraging us to engage with our assumptions and enactments of inclusion. They do not shy away from the challenging discourse and offers critiques that urge us to rethink how we conceptualize ableism in teaching and learning practices.

The SoTL Conversation will not always present a neat finding wrapped up in a proverbial bow. You may notice that the form of the SoTL Conversation does not close off interpretations of the specific complex question into higher education pedagogies. The form encourages multiple perspectives, a hopeful hearkening to the idea of the SoTL big tent and how SoTL can make allowance for all disciplines and ways of knowing (Huber & Hutching, 2005). Considering the big tent metaphor, Hamilton and McCollum (2024) have made a case for moving from good to great SoTL, by arguing for an elaboration of Peter Felten’s principles, to include a sixth principle: “identify your research lens” (p. 11). They explained further,

By clearly articulating the ontological and epistemological foundations of their research, scholars provide a robust theoretical framework for their study. This not only strengthens the validity and reliability of the research findings but also enhances the credibility and transferability of the study. (Hamilton & McCollum, 2024, p. 13)

This is sound counsel for all SoTL practitioners.

While the SoTL Conversation advances philosophical, dialogic inquiry, the research paper and research briefs present early or advanced findings from SoTL studies. Saccucci and Saccucci’s research paper, “Teaching Through TikTok, YouTube, and Moodle: The Instructional Design and Learner Engagement of Educational Nano-Videos,” examines microlearning as an instructional intervention and the implications for student engagement. By exploring student preferences and the qualities that make nano-videos effective, the article offers insights that educators can apply in their own course designs with instructional videos.

While science skepticism has long been a concern for health practitioners, the COVID-19 pandemic, the growing influence of informal media, and more recently, AI-generated misinformation make it difficult for individuals to discern legitimate knowledge from fabrications. In “Research Brief: A Class-Based SoTL Investigation of Senior Nursing Student Perceptions, Beliefs, and Behaviours Regarding Health Misinformation and Science Skepticism,” Nelson, McKendrick-Calder, and Su investigate students’ awareness of misinformation, a topic that has far-reaching implications for information literacy and health care. Their study of student preconceptions and the impact of classroom experience on learning indicates conservative shifts in students’ perceptions, and that there is room for further inquiry on the topic.

As a high-impact practice, WIL is integral to high-quality undergraduate learning. Garner and Wilson in “Creative WIL as Pedagogical Proof of Concept: A Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Research Brief on Non-Placement, Course-Embedded Work-Integrated Learning” introduce a model that expands the possibilities for WIL. Their study addresses institutional challenges with limited placements in conventional WIL, showing how creative WIL connects classroom learning to professional contexts.

The essays delve into detailed interrogations of philosophies and practices about teaching and learning through close-up views that invite you to take a similar approach to your own pedagogical engagement as a scholar-instructor, student, or staff. Early descriptions of SoTL included the recognition that “modest efforts to document and reflect on one’s teaching and share what one has learned” are part of the big tent (Huber & Hutching, 2005, p. 4). The essays in this issue go further and situate their inquiries in relevant conceptual frameworks, attending to Hamilton and McCollum’s (2024) call for a “research lens” in SoTL.

Ntibinyane situates “Crippling the Deadline: Disrupting Academic Ableism and Industrial Time in Journalism Pedagogy” within critical disability studies, showing that journalism competence can be reimaged through a reconsideration of journalism pedagogies. Although the discourse arises from the disciplinary context of journalism, the questions, provocations, and strategies explored in this article encourage all disciplines to rethink ableism in the academy and what might be liberatory access in teaching and learning.

Jindal applies an autoethnographic lens in “From Mentee to Mentor: Mentorship as a Relational and Transformative Practice in Undergraduate Education,” moving from their own learner experience of mentorship to how it unfolds in their teaching practice. Using several conceptual frameworks to explore mentorship, the article moves from a retelling of experience to offer a framework for mentorship that can offer educators a structure for their own mentorship pedagogy.

This issue closes with a book review that invites us to respond to the SoTL call by engaging with new releases that inform our hopes for scholarly teaching practice. Lenart and Adlington’s review of *What Is Wisdom and Can It Be Taught? Philosophical, Psychological, and Pedagogical Perspectives* is a timely inclusion when the academy is still working out how to make space for alternative epistemologies. This is of interest to the *PIP* community, as a young

journal, imagining a space for inclusion of alternative methodologies and representations of SoTL.

This issue comes at a time when educators and students are highly sensitive to the shifts that are impacting higher education, while educators are preoccupied with remaining current and innovative in teaching, whilst ensuring that students have meaningful educational experiences. The authors' choices to respond to the SoTL call, through courageous inquiry into how higher education is experienced and reimagined, disrupting taken-for-granted perceptions of normalcy, are the antidotes to uncertainty and trepidation. How will you take up the SoTL call in your practice, in your responses to these authors' contributions to the field?

References

- Bojesen, E. (2019). Conversation as educational research. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 51(6), 650–659. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2018.1508995>
- Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 1(1) 121–125. <https://doi.org/10.2979/teachlearningqu.1.1.121>
- Hamilton, M., & McCollum, B. (2024). Moving from “good” to “great” SoTL: The importance of describing your research epistemological and ontological traditions in your SoTL scholarship. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 12, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.12.31>
- Huber, M., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. Jossey-Bass.
- Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2009). Significant conversations and significant networks – exploring the backstage of the teaching arena. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(5), 547–559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597200>