

Instructional Practices Inventory Categories

Student Active Engaged Learning (6)	Students are engaged in higher-order thinking and developing deeper understanding through analysis, problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, and/or synthesis. Engagement in learning is not driven by verbal interaction with peers, even in a group setting. Examples of classroom practices commonly associated with higher-order/deeper Active Engaged Learning include: inquiry-based approaches such as project-based and problem-based learning; research and discovery/exploratory learning; authentic demonstrations; independent metacognition, reflective journaling, and self-assessment; and, higher-order responses to higher-order questions.	Student Engagement in Higher-Order Deeper Learning
Student Verbal Learning Conversations (5)	Students are engaged in higher-order thinking and developing deeper understanding through analysis, problem solving, critical thinking, creativity, and/or synthesis. The higher-order/deeper thinking is driven by peer verbal interaction. Examples of classroom practices commonly associated with higher-order/deeper Verbal Learning Conversations include: collaborative or cooperative learning; peer tutoring, debate, and questioning; partner research and discovery/exploratory learning; Socratic learning; and, small group or whole class analysis and problem solving, metacognition, reflective journaling, and self-assessment. Conversations may be teacher stimulated but are not teacher dominated.	
Teacher-Led Instruction (4)	Students are attentive to teacher-led instruction as the teacher leads the learning experience by disseminating the appropriate content knowledge and/or directions for learning. The teacher provides basic content explanations, tells or explains new information or skills, and verbally directs the learning. Examples of classroom practices commonly associated with Teacher-Led Instruction include: teacher dominated question/answer; teacher lecture or verbal explanations; teacher direction giving; and, teacher demonstrations. Discussions may occur, but instruction and ideas come primarily from the teacher. Student higher order/deeper learning is not evident.	Student Engagement in Knowledge and Skill Development
Student Work with Teacher Engaged (3)	Students are engaged in independent or group work designed to build basic understanding, new knowledge, and/or pertinent skills. Examples of classroom practices commonly associated with Student Work with Teacher Engaged include: basic fact finding; building skill or understanding through practice, “seatwork,” worksheets, chapter review questions; and multi-media with teacher viewing media with students. The teacher is attentive to, engaged with, or supportive of the students. Student higher-order/deeper learning is not evident.	
Student Work with Teacher not Engaged (2)	This category is the same as Category 3 except the teacher is not attentive to, engaged with, or supportive of the students. The teacher may be out of the room, working at the computer, grading papers, or in some form engaged in work not directly associated with the students’ learning. Student higher-order/deeper learning is not evident.	
Student Disengagement (1)	Students are not engaged in learning directly related to the curriculum.	Students Not Engaged

Remember: IPI coding is not based on the type of activity in which the student is engaged, but rather how the student is engaging cognitively in the activity. Examples provided above are only examples often associated with that category. The Instructional Practices Inventory categories were developed by Bryan Painter and Jerry Valentine in 1996. Valentine refined the descriptions of the categories (2002, 2005, 2007, and 2010) in an effort to more effectively communicate their meaning. The IPI was developed to profile school-wide student engaged learning and was not designed for, nor should it be used for, personnel evaluation.

IPI Categories (PAGE 2)

The Instructional Practices Inventory Process is a set of faculty-led strategies for collecting valid/reliable student engagement data and for collaboratively studying the data with the goal of increasing and enriching learning experiences throughout the school. The process serves a school best when teacher-leaders are the data collectors and the facilitators of the faculty collaborative study of the data. When implemented with integrity, our studies indicate that the process fosters instructional change, organizational learning, and improvement in student academic performance.

Coding Reminders:

- Code the initial category upon entry into the learning setting. That is the objective point in time, not predetermined/controlled by the data collector. Remember the mental image of “taking a snapshot upon entry.”
- Do not collect a data code during the first five minutes of the learning period or the last five minutes; do not collect a code during a transition from one content area to another (this does not mean from one learning activity to another in the same content area).
- Determine the code based upon the majority of students. If there is not a majority, then the category with the highest number is the code. If there are an equal number of students engaging in two categories, then the code is the higher-numbered code. That does not make it better than the lower-numbered code; it just makes it a protocol that everyone who implements the IPI process follows and thus data collectors and teachers know that is the way a coder must code.
- While the category explanations on the opposite side of this page are valuable, there are too many subtleties and nuances in the learning setting to arbitrarily use the categories as definitive. For example, small group verbal interaction work might be a 5 if students are verbally discussing the content/issue and they are deepening their understanding through that verbal dialogue. However, it could also be a 3 or 2 if the students are talking student to student, but the discussions are not higher-order and are not causing the students to think more deeply. Or, the small groups may be not be focused on the learning and it may be a 1. Or the students may be in small groups and yet the students are working independently and the code might be a 6, 3, 2, or 1. Or the students may be in small groups and they may be listening attentively to the teacher explain a concept or fact, thus a code of a 4. In essence, most learning activities can precipitate among the students a form of engagement that could be coded as a 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. So the coder must understand how students are thinking, not what they are doing, to make a correct code.
- Remember: “The IPI does not profile the types of instructional activities in which students are engaged...the IPI Profiles how students are engaging (cognitively) during the instructional activities.”
- Below are the types of engagement that are coded as 5-6 or 2-3-4 in the IPI Process.

Higher-Order/Deeper Engagement (Categories 5-6)

Analysis
Critical Thinking
Problem Solving
Decision Making from Analysis
Reflection, Goal Setting, and Strategizing from Analysis
Evaluation, Conclusions, and Synthesis from Analysis
Creative and Innovative Thinking

Non Higher-Order/Deeper Surface Engagement (Categories 2-3-4)

Recall and Memorization
Basic Fact Findings
Simple Understanding
Knowledge/Recall of Facts, Details and Elements
Knowledge/Recall of Processes, Algorithms, Methods, Strategies
Practice to Embed/Internalize Skills or Processes