

Enabling leadership using knowledge and skills in Standard 2

Elaborations and scenarios to guide your development of:

**Focus Area: Using relevant knowledge
within the Australian Professional
Standards for Middle Leaders**



Acknowledgement of Country

The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the lands, sea countries, and waterways from across Australia. We pay our respect to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and living cultures; and to Elders past and present.

AITSL acknowledges Emeritus Professor Viviane Robinson for her significant contribution to the development of *Leading through Standard 2: Elaborations and scenarios that define practice*. Emeritus Professor Robinson was a member of the Australian Professional Standard for Middle Leaders Expert Panel, which supported the development of the Middle Leader Standards. This work draws on seminal international research in educational leadership.

© 2026 Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL).

Please cite this publication as: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership 2026, *Leading through Standards 2: Elaborations and scenarios that define practice*, AITSL, Melbourne.

ISBN: 978-1-7646544-2-5

First published 2026

AITSL owns the copyright in this publication.

Other than as permitted above, or by the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth), no part of this publication may be produced, stored, published, performed, communicated or adapted, regardless of the form or means (electronic, photocopying or otherwise), without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Address inquiries regarding copyright to:

AITSL, PO Box 299, Collins Street West, VIC 8007, Australia.

AITSL was formed to provide national leadership for the Commonwealth, state and territory governments in promoting excellence in the profession of teaching and school leadership with funding provided by the Australian Government.

Focus Area: Using relevant knowledge

Definition in the *Australian Professional Standards for Middle Leaders*

The ability to use and source knowledge to enhance the attainment of improvement goals.

Elaboration of the definition

This capability requires middle leaders to be knowledgeable *and* to use that knowledge to understand and resolve problems that prevent improvement in teaching and learning. The scope of the knowledge needed for excellence in middle leadership is broadly defined as that required to lead in the four domains of practice included in Standards 3-6.

- Standard 3: Enhancing understanding and respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples
- Standard 4: Coordinating high-impact teaching and learning
- Standard 5: Leading improvement in teaching practice
- Standard 6: Managing effectively

For example, capability in Standards 4 and 5 requires leaders to have up to date evidence-based knowledge of how students learn and of how teachers promote that learning in diverse classroom contexts. The depth of knowledge required will vary depending on the responsibilities associated with a particular middle leadership role. In general, sufficient depth of knowledge is needed to know what good practice looks like and to provide educational arguments about why some pedagogical approaches are preferred over others.

As noted by Spillane and Seashore Louis, “without an understanding of the knowledge necessary for teachers to teach well, - content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, content specific pedagogical knowledge, curricular knowledge and knowledge of learners - school leaders will be unable to perform essential school improvement functions such as monitoring instruction and supporting teacher development” (2002, p. 97).

The goal is not that the middle leader knows everything, but that she knows enough to know what she does not know, and how to access the rest.

Expert capability in this standard requires understanding of underlying principles and rationales, because it is those features that allow flexible and rigorous knowledge use. Expertise is not developed by accessing bite-sized lists, bullet points, or tips, because those formats strip the material of the reasoning and argument that enables theoretical understanding and flexible application. In order to **use** knowledge in adaptive ways, leaders need to be able to apply it to their context while preserving the conditions required to make the ideas work in practice.

Why is it important that middle leaders are knowledgeable?

Demographic changes, combined with the increasing ambition of policy goals, means that the knowledge required of middle leaders is of greater scope and complexity than is often recognised.

Leaders with accomplished and expert capability on this standard are more likely to have a stronger sense of efficacy than those with lower capability, because their use of school data and of research evidence means they are more likely to understand and resolve classroom problems. They have deep knowledge, based in cognitive science, of how students learn, and use that knowledge to generate and test hypotheses about the causes of poor student outcomes. Such knowledge also enables leaders to discern between more and less valid claims about what constitutes “best practice” and to follow through on only those ideas that have been shown to have high impact on student learning and wellbeing.

Middle leaders with accomplished and expert capability use their educational knowledge to challenge beliefs about what is and is not possible. Their knowledge liberates them from the status quo by enabling them to envisage better practices and achieve better student outcomes. They can debate their point of view with those who hold diverse or even contrary views, and treat such debates as important informal professional learning opportunities.

Middle leaders who cannot give educational as opposed to compliance reasons for a preferred course of action, will be less confident and less influential than those who can use their knowledge to communicate educational rationales. Compliance reasons make reference to policy, regulations, and authority figures e.g. “The boss expects to see the intended learning outcomes on the board”. Educational reasons justify a course of action with reference to teaching and learning, often with reference to research or context- specific evidence. An educational justification for the use of intended learning outcomes is that they enable students to understand and focus on the purpose of the learning activity. They know why they are doing something rather than just what they are supposed to be doing.

Given the impact and importance of the decisions made by middle leaders, it is critical that they model evidence-based decision-making and commitment to continuous professional learning. It is equally important that systems support middle leaders in their professional learning by making high-quality, evidence-based resources readily available.

Scenarios illustrating increasing capability in Standard 2

Scenario: Developing an instructional framework

Last year, the senior leadership team at Norcross Catholic College achieved its strategic goal of developing a whole school framework for quality teaching. Senior leaders based the framework on the instructional principles set out by Barack Rosenshine (2012) because they had already been widely discussed in the diocese and had a sound theoretical and evidence base. Senior leaders recognised, however, that the framework would need to be elaborated and adapted by each subject department. That is the job that Robert, the new head of English, has made a priority for the year.

Proficient

At the first meeting, Robert planned to check how his team understood the Rosenshine principles before discussing what elaborations might be needed if they were to provide clear guidance about good teaching practice in English. He was dismayed by the wide range of understandings and attitudes expressed by his teachers. Some were convinced their teaching already exemplified all the principles, and that no further detail was needed. Others were opposed to the type of pedagogy that the principles required. In their view, the emphasis on explicit teaching undervalued the independent project work that was the bedrock of creative expression in English. One or two teachers were

supportive of developing the framework as requested by senior leaders. Robert soon realised that despite the professional learning and resources that the diocese had already provided, many of his teachers misunderstood the Rosenshine principles. While no expert himself, he believed that some teachers misunderstood such terms as explicit teaching and direct instruction and were confused about how independent work fitted into the framework. Without attributing blame, he disclosed his beliefs about the possible confusions, carefully explaining why he thought some of the discussion had misunderstood the principles. He then suggested that everyone revisit the original Rosenshine article and reflect on its implications for their own practice before the next meeting. Everyone agreed that there was no point elaborating the framework if there was confusion about the principles on which it was based.

Accomplished

Robert realised he would have to set aside quite a bit of time to prepare for the next departmental meeting. He needed to not only prepare a clear explanation of the Rosenshine principles but also respond to the specific objections and misunderstandings he had heard in the last meeting. He recognised that, having asked the team to reflect on their own practice, he needed to model such reflection by identifying what he currently did that was and was not consistent with the principles. One example was that he probably set independent practice before students had experienced success through sufficient guided practice. Another was that he was too often calling on a few students who volunteered rather than finding ways to check all students' responses.

Robert checked at the start of the meeting that everyone had reviewed the Rosenshine article and had reflected on the match between their practice and the instructional principles. He then presented his summary of the article, paying particular attention to the misunderstandings he had detected in the previous meeting, and to deepening teachers' understanding of the principles. When teachers were ready, he offered to start the reflection process by modelling his evaluation of his own practice. Teachers found this helpful and then offered their own reflections. The team discussion of the matches and mismatches turned out to be a fruitful way of identifying how to elaborate the framework so that it provided a practical guide to quality teaching of English.

Expert

While Robert was pleased with the progress the team had made, he was well aware that if he was more up to date with his professional reading, he could offer more guidance about how the team could resolve some of the concerns that they frequently discussed. He knew enough now to know, for example, that the research on retrieval practice would help teachers design better homework, that rich background knowledge and vocabulary were keys to better comprehension, that they all needed to teach writing in a more structured way and not assume that literacy was a primary school responsibility. He decided he needed to help the team establish some priority goals and then locate a few high-quality professional resources so that everyone could contribute to the quality teaching framework in an informed and evidence-based way. He would tell the team that he wanted a framework that was consistent with the Rosenshine principles, adapted to the teaching of English, and practical enough to guide unit planning. He needed to disclose his view that, rather than a paper exercise, this was a way of improving the consistency and effectiveness of teaching across the English department. Would they be willing to join him?

Discussion Starters

1. What opportunity have you had to stay up to date with your professional reading? How important is it to you to keep up to date with topics that are relevant to your job?
2. In what aspects of your job do you think that your knowledge base is weaker and stronger? How do these differences in your knowledge base affect the way you do your job?

References

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school* (Expanded ed.). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Spillane, J. P., & Seashore Louis, K. (2002). School improvement process and practices: Professional learning for building instructional capacity. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 83-104). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.


Willingham, D. T. (2021). *Why don't students like school? A cognitive scientist answers questions about how the mind works and what it means for the classroom.* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ.: Jossey Bass.

Core Reading

Ashman, G. (2023). *Cognitive load theory: A little guide for teachers*: Corwin.

The logo for the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) features the lowercase letters 'aitsl' in a sans-serif font. The letters are filled with a vertical gradient that transitions from a light green at the top to a darker teal at the bottom.

Australian Institute
for Teaching and
School Leadership
Limited

A decorative graphic at the bottom of the page consists of two overlapping triangles. A teal triangle on the left points towards the right, and a lime green triangle on the right points towards the left, meeting at a central point.

aitsl.edu.au

Telephone: +61 3 9944 1200

Email: info@aitsl.edu.au

AITSL is funded by the Australian Government