

I am writing this statement on November 9, 2016, and I feel despair because of yesterday's election. From my perspective, my country has given its approval to a presidential ticket that promises to institutionalize policies that make me, as a gay person, subhuman or defective, not to mention the misogyny and racism espoused during this election cycle. Reasonable people can disagree about how the country should use its limited resources or even what it should be trying to accomplish, and I hope that most of the people who voted for this ticket did so for these kinds of reasons. But the election doesn't conclude with a list of these values and reasons; it culminates in the selection of a ticket, along with its platform and all of the associations made with the candidates along the path that led to the vote. Regardless of intentions, people elected a symbol, and that symbol brings with it all of its meanings, not just the intended ones.

It is time that we in the community of mathematics educators who teach with inquiry similarly acknowledge that the legacy of RL Moore is a symbol that includes racism and misogyny - even if every member of this community comes to it because they find value in teaching with inquiry and proactively rejects the bigoted elements of this symbol. As in my political example above, our intention to reject this part of the legacy cannot remove these symbolic meanings. I have talked with mathematicians and mathematics education researchers who do not participate in the inquiry community because Moore's name communicates to them these parts of his legacy. Some of these colleagues are people of color - and so I believe that using Moore's name is at odds with our goal of spreading inquiry as widely as possible. Some of these colleagues research teaching and learning - and so I believe that using Moore's name is at odds with our goal of improving and sharing inquiry teaching using careful research done within the community. Neither of these groups is completely absent from the community, but I do think that their involvement in the community is diminished because the colleagues who join us have had to work around the negative elements of Moore's legacy rather than being offered an open and unobstructed entrance.

I'm not suggesting that all mention of Moore be eliminated from discussion as though he never existed. I think it is completely appropriate to have conference sessions that use historical methods to study Moore as a person and agent of change. I think it is appropriate to have sessions that discuss particular educational artifacts or practices from Moore. I even think it is appropriate to have sessions that explore and critique Moore's legacy. What is not appropriate is equating teaching with inquiry, or the community of practitioners who do it, with Moore's legacy. The kind of despair I feel about yesterday's election is, for me, more than enough reason to make a change to address unwanted symbolic meanings.

But there are two more reasons I think we should not use Moore's name broadly to describe our classrooms: it confuses our discussions and thinking about both *teaching* and *learning*. Considering teaching first, it is often said in this community that only Moore could use a "Moore Method" because this approach interacts with instructors to create their own methods. As a result, labeling our teaching as Moore Method or even Modified Moore Method is to knowingly give it a label that is inaccurate and that hides the diversity of approaches used in the community. Indeed, one of the central pillars of the set of approaches currently used by the community, collaboration, was explicitly rejected by Moore, so his methods would be unusual in the community at this point. Moreover, Moore selected the students in his courses, but our current evidence indicates that inquiry experiences are important and effective for all students, so this practice would be considered unethical by many today.

The name "Moore Method" also causes communication difficulties for two important groups of educators. First, this label means absolutely nothing to instructors who are interested in active learning but unfamiliar with the inquiry community and its practices, so it erects a barrier for

potential new community members. Second, this label is almost completely unusable from a research perspective as we try to generalize claims about outcomes or mechanisms that create them, so it undermines education research efforts about the community. There are interesting, open questions about defining teaching with inquiry, whether we will ever identify core, common methods or even if we should be defining shared methods or a theory of learning, but “inquiry” is a term that helps both new users and researchers move forward.

In addition to this mismatch between using Moore’s name and the teaching in this community, using Moore’s name to describe our classrooms implicitly frames the work of our students as artificial, which is a mismatch with our discussions of learning. Before I can explain this claim, I need to tell you how I think about mathematics. I believe that mathematics is an expression of the human experience, a byproduct of consciousness powered by the human capacities for language and abstraction. If you ask me why I do mathematics, I will tell you about the joy of working in its abstract, crystalline beauty and will compare participating in mathematics with making music, which we should do because it moves us. This human propensity to create symbols may be our defining characteristic. From this perspective, the transitions from, for example, quantity to number to arithmetic to algebra are a natural outgrowth of human nature, not unnatural thinking that we impose on the minds of children. This progression is not easy or automatic, but I think it is a natural reaction of people to their experiences.

In this framing, then, we are doing something epistemologically violent to students if we convince them that math is unnatural: a person is lopping off part of their humanity when they say they are “not a math person”. I see inquiry as the natural response of students to uncertainty and curiosity, a response that causes learning. From this perspective, inquiry describes the work of each individual student, and so it should be named for each student’s methods, not the instructor’s, Moore’s or otherwise. Naming this kind of learning for the teacher suggests to me that it is created artificially by the teacher rather than naturally by the students. Moreover, each student inquires differently and should be supported differently, so teaching with inquiry can never be less than a collection of different methods, not something singular. That is, for me, teaching with inquiry requires differentiated instruction, and this aspect should be reflected in the labels we use for it.

Naming our community after a person creates a symbol that we cannot control and hence is dangerous. Yet there is a person whose legacy I think the community could agree to celebrate, that of Harry Lucas. I have seen him build this community out of his own generosity, be gracious and open in the face of tough changes, and demonstrate respect for others. Without his influence, I think I would feel much more isolated as an educator and would certainly have had far fewer opportunities to grow as a teacher. Should this community entitle its yearly conference and workshop the *Symposium on Inquiry-Based Learning in honor of Harry Lucas*? Perhaps.

However, our work for inclusivity does not end with a name change. Removing a barrier that keeps people out of the inquiry community is an important step, but we must also make the community proactively inclusive. Even this language is problematic because it suggests that the goal is simply to bring people into our community so that they can learn from us; instead, a proactive stance toward inclusivity will help us see that there are things to learn from people who are currently outside this community and will cause the community to evolve through this shared learning. I am hopeful that we are ready for this work because of the changes I have seen in the last five years. When I discovered this community, much of the public discussion focused on intellectual and instructional lineages, but this discussion has been replaced with a big-tent understanding of the community and an increased focus on evidence-based decisions. Moreover, the evidence that access to inquiry experiences is beneficial for all students, especially those who are historically not served well by educational systems and our discipline, has made justice one of the central themes of this

community.

The inquiry community has become a relatively safe space to discuss questions of equity, inclusivity, and justice, but it must become a brave space where we expect to participate in challenging but respectful dialog about diversity. In the end, all teaching is political, even teaching mathematics. Our narratives of the discipline frame certain contributions as central and others as peripheral; our classroom practices validate some ways of thinking while invalidating others; and our community's discourse has implications for what it means to teach and who gets to do it. Fortunately, I think that the inquiry community is well positioned to take a brave and proactive stance toward these questions. A central element of our teaching involves shifting the centralized authority of instructors toward distributed, communal authority among students, and I believe that this habit can transfer to the way we grow as a community.

Suggested Citation:

Katz, B.P. (2017). *Personal Statement on the Future of the IBL Community*. Retrieved from <http://www.colorado.edu/eer/research/IBLcommunity.html>