

REBUILDING THE TEACHING PROFESSION

A national teaching registry and assurance architecture for Pakistan's schools and universities

A WHITE PAPER

Prepared by Intelligence Lens

August 2026 | Version 1.0 | Pakistan

“The authority to teach should not be inferred from a degree, an appointment or years served. It should be supported by evidence relevant to the responsibility being granted.”

Core proposition of this white paper

DISCLAIMER

Disclaimer and Limitation of Liability

This white paper has been prepared and published by Intelligence Lens for research, discussion, policy dialogue and educational purposes. It presents independent analysis, observations and policy proposals concerning teaching, academic governance, professional standards and education-sector reform in Pakistan. It does not constitute legal, regulatory, employment, psychological, accreditation, financial or other professional advice, and it should not be interpreted as official policy or as a statement on behalf of any government department, regulator, educational institution, accreditation body or other organisation unless expressly stated.

References to the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan, federal or provincial education authorities, NACTE, STEDA, universities, schools, international organisations, foreign institutions, professional bodies or other entities are included for research, comparison, illustration or contextual purposes. Such references do not imply endorsement of Intelligence Lens or of any recommendation contained in this paper by those organisations.

Reasonable efforts have been made to use reliable and current information, but laws, regulations, policies, institutional practices and academic requirements may change. Some recommendations in this paper deliberately propose mechanisms that do not currently exist in Pakistan and should therefore be understood as policy proposals for consideration, not descriptions of existing legal or regulatory requirements. Any organisation considering adoption should undertake its own legal, technical, operational, ethical, financial and regulatory assessment before implementation.

To the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, Intelligence Lens, its founder, authors, contributors, representatives, affiliates and associated persons shall not be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, consequential, special, reputational, financial, professional, academic, employment-related or other loss, damage, claim, cost or consequence arising from or connected with the use of, reliance upon, interpretation of, implementation of, or inability to implement any information, analysis, recommendation, proposal or model contained in this white paper. Responsibility for any decision made on the basis of this publication rests with the person or organisation making that decision.

Nothing in this paper should be interpreted as a recommendation to take adverse action against any individual solely on the basis of age, academic qualification, student feedback, psychometric assessment, automated assessment, artificial intelligence output or any other single indicator. Where decisions affect employment, reputation, rights or career, appropriate safeguards, due process, independent review and applicable legal requirements should be observed.

The analysis and proposals contained in this paper represent the independent policy perspective of Intelligence Lens. By using or relying upon this publication, the reader acknowledges that it is intended to contribute to policy discussion and does not create any professional, contractual, fiduciary, statutory or other duty of care between Intelligence Lens and the reader.

PUBLICATION NOTE

About this white paper

This white paper proposes a new operating architecture for the teaching profession in Pakistan. Its central proposition is that consequential professional authority in education should be supported by evidence relevant to the authority being granted and should remain open to periodic verification. The National Teaching Registry proposed in this paper is the enabling infrastructure for that reform, not the reform itself. It would make educator-level evidence persistent, portable and regulator-observable across recruitment, teaching assignment, student feedback, professional development, academic distinction, workload delegation and periodic revalidation.

The question here is narrower and more consequential: when an established school, college or university already has classrooms, faculty positions, administrative structures, accreditation requirements and access to modern technology, what should the regulator be able to verify about the individual educator before, during and after that institution entrusts the person with learners?

The paper focuses especially on established institutions in Pakistan’s major urban centres, where the constraints of extreme teacher scarcity and basic infrastructure are less persuasive explanations for weak professional assurance. It covers school teachers and higher education faculty. Higher education can sit under HEC nationally. School-sector implementation must respect the post-18th Amendment distribution of authority, with provincial education authorities regulating school teachers under a common national data standard coordinated through federal-provincial mechanisms.

POSITION OF INTELLIGENCE LENS

Teaching should no longer be treated as a permanent status conferred by a degree and an appointment letter. Teaching should be treated as a form of professional authority. That authority should be earned through evidence, limited to the work for which competence has been demonstrated, and periodically renewed.

Suggested citation: Intelligence Lens. (2026). Rebuilding the Teaching Profession: A National Teaching Registry and Assurance Architecture for Pakistan’s Schools and Universities. Intelligence Lens White Paper, Version 1.0. Islamabad, Pakistan: Intelligence Lens.

Method and evidence base

The paper combines four sources of evidence: current Pakistani regulatory and policy documents; selected international institutional mechanisms; research on teacher selection and professional assessment; and direct professional observations that motivated the inquiry. International examples are used as design components, not as templates to copy wholesale.

The specific numerical thresholds proposed in this paper, such as assessment pass marks, panel sizes and pilot time limits, are policy design recommendations for validation through pilots. They should not be mistaken for established evidence-based universal cut-offs.

Terminology

Term	Meaning in this paper
National Teaching Registry (NTR)	A regulator-owned digital record and transaction system containing verified professional profiles for educators and routing specified hiring, feedback, development, workload, revalidation and academic-planning actions through an auditable workflow.
Teaching authority	Formal permission to teach a defined learner group, level or role after the required evidence of fitness has been

	demonstrated.
Teaching Defence	A periodic external revalidation in which an educator must defend evidence of current teaching competence before an independent panel.
Academic distinction	A title such as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor awarded through external judgement of contribution and achievement, separate from salary grade and basic employment status.
Capability closure	The point at which an identified development need has been independently assessed and the required standard has actually been demonstrated.
Approved Educator Developer	An individual authorised by the regulator to deliver training that institutions intend to claim for regulatory or professional credit.
External assessor	A trained evaluator with no disqualifying conflict of interest and no employment relationship with the institution being assessed.

CONTENTS

Contents

Section	Purpose
Executive Summary	The diagnosis, central proposition and eleven operational reforms.
1. Why Now: A Convergence Pakistan Can Use	Why the regulatory, digital, assessment and AI context makes educator-level assurance feasible now.
2. The Most Influential Job With the Lowest Bar	Why the authority to teach deserves a higher evidentiary threshold.
3. What Pakistan Already Has, and What It Still Does Not Verify	HEC, NACTE, STEDA, QEC surveys and the missing individual assurance layer.
4. From Institutional Compliance to Educator-Level Professional Assurance	The intellectual proposition that should govern the reform.
5. Where Existing Proxies Fail	Credentials, attendance, internal evidence and the limits of institutional self-assurance.
6. The National Teaching Registry: The Enabling Architecture	The digital professional record and transaction layer that makes the reform operable at scale.
7. Eleven Specific Reform Measures	Exact mechanisms for hiring, feedback, training, workload, titles, revalidation and forward planning.
8. International Mechanisms Worth Borrowing	Teacher registers, external review, professional qualification and revalidation precedents.
9. Implementation in Pakistan	Governance, pilot design, constitutional responsibilities, data architecture and transition.
10. Measurement, Safeguards and Failure Modes	How to prevent the reform itself from becoming another compliance ritual.
11. Policy Recommendations	A concise agenda for HEC, provincial authorities and institutions.
Conclusion	From assumed professional authority to verifiable professional authority.
References	Selected primary and research sources.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Executive Summary

Pakistan already has important elements of teacher quality assurance. Sindh has introduced a teaching licence. NACTE accredits teacher-education programmes against national standards. HEC establishes minimum faculty appointment criteria, operates quality-assurance systems and supports faculty development. Universities collect student evaluations and maintain extensive personnel records. These mechanisms matter, and this white paper does not suggest that Pakistan is starting from zero.

The problem is different. Much of the system still relies on proxies for professional capability and on evidence held primarily by the institution employing the educator. An academic qualification can become a proxy for teaching ability. Attendance at a training programme can become a proxy for learning. Years of service can become a proxy for professional growth. Publication counts can become a proxy for broader academic contribution. Internal student evaluations can become a proxy for independent evidence of teaching quality. An appointment made by an institutional committee can become the point after which an educator's professional authority is rarely subjected to serious external challenge.

The result is a system capable of demonstrating that procedures occurred, while being much less capable of demonstrating that professional capability was actually established, improved or maintained. Intelligence Lens therefore proposes a shift from institution-reported quality assurance to educator-level professional assurance. The central proposition is simple: teaching authority should not be treated as a permanent consequence of possessing a degree or obtaining an appointment. It should be treated as a professional authority that is earned through evidence, exercised transparently and periodically revalidated.

This principle also changes how academic credentials should be used. A PhD is an important advanced academic qualification and should remain highly significant where a role depends on advanced research, doctoral supervision, research leadership or the creation of original knowledge. But a PhD is not a teaching qualification. It does not, by itself, establish that its holder can communicate effectively, design learning, mentor students, exercise appropriate judgement or develop other human beings. Equally, an educator without a doctorate should not automatically be considered less capable of teaching merely because another colleague holds a higher research qualification. The appropriate question is not which credential ranks higher. It is what authority is being granted, and what evidence is relevant to granting that authority.

To make educator-level assurance possible at scale, this paper proposes a National Teaching Registry, or NTR. The NTR is not intended to be another database of teachers. It would be a regulator-observable professional record and transaction infrastructure. Every participating educator would have a persistent National Educator ID linked to verified qualifications, appointments, teaching-authority status, academic distinctions, recognised achievements, professional development outcomes, teaching assignments and other relevant evidence. For higher education, HEC could operate the national layer. For schools and colleges, implementation would need to respect Pakistan's constitutional structure, with provincial authorities exercising their mandates through an interoperable national architecture.

More importantly, high-consequence professional transactions would pass through the system. Before a substantive teaching interview, a role-appropriate Teaching Suitability Clearance could be required, using validated methods such as situational judgement, professional ethics, communication, reasoning and relevant psychological constructs. Candidates clearing that stage would proceed to observed teaching and selection processes with meaningful external representation. New entrants could receive provisional teaching authority until observed practice and assessed induction are successfully completed. Student feedback could be administered independently of the employing institution, with protected anonymity, minimum sample rules and longitudinal reporting rather than public popularity scores.

Professional development would also operate differently. The paper proposes abolishing the assumption that attendance constitutes successful development. A recognised intervention should begin with an identified capability need, involve the people who actually need it, use an approved educator developer where regulatory credit is sought, and close only when achievement is demonstrated against a defined standard. Attendance should be recorded as attendance. Competence should be recorded only when competence is

shown. Where the standard is not met, remediation and reassessment should follow rather than automatic certification.

Every five years, educators within the proposed model could undergo an external Teaching Defence, drawing on the logic of professional revalidation and academic defence. The educator would present evidence of teaching, assessment, development and contribution before an independent panel. The paper also proposes separating employment progression from academic distinction, recording material non-teaching duties through a Workload Delegation Ledger, and requiring institutions to file an Annual Academic Delivery Plan before the next academic year so that intended courses, electives, teaching allocations, vacancies and major academic responsibilities are visible before delivery rather than reconstructed afterwards.

These reforms are designed around an essential distinction. The intellectual proposition is the move from assumed professional authority to verifiable professional authority. The technological mechanism is the National Teaching Registry that makes this assurance persistent, portable and enforceable at scale. A registry without the underlying reform would merely create another database. The reform without appropriate infrastructure would again leave evidence fragmented across institutional files. Pakistan needs both. The objective is not to make teaching punitive. It is to make the profession worthy of the influence society already gives it.

WHAT IS GENUINELY NEW

The novelty is not teacher licensing, psychometric testing, student feedback, external review, faculty development or digital profiles in isolation. Each exists somewhere already. The proposal is to make them part of one regulator-owned assurance infrastructure in which the educator has a persistent national record and specified professional transactions must pass through auditable regulatory workflows.

Eleven measures proposed by Intelligence Lens

Measure	Specific reform
1. National Teaching Registry	Create one persistent national professional record for each educator and route specified assurance transactions through it.
2. Regulator-run Student Teaching Feedback	Move verified student feedback collection from institution-only control to HEC/provincial platforms, with protected anonymity and public aggregate reporting.
3. Portal-based Teaching Suitability Clearance	No substantive teaching interview until a role-specific, regulator-approved psychometric and situational-judgement screen is cleared.
4. External Appointment and Teaching Audition	Use external-majority faculty appointment boards, regulator-assigned assessors and credential-blind live teaching auditions.
5. Provisional Teaching Authority	New entrants teach under time-limited provisional authority until observed practice is passed.
6. Regulated Educator Development and Training Closure	Only regulator-approved training for identified need, delivered by approved educator developers, assessed independently and closed only when competence is demonstrated.
7. Five-Year Teaching Defence	Teaching authority expires unless periodically renewed through external review.
8. Employment Grade and Academic Distinction Reform	Separate pay and employment grade from academic titles; award titles through external-majority distinction boards based on contribution and achievement.
9. Workload Delegation Ledger	Record every material administrative or non-teaching duty assigned to an educator, with expected hours, duration, teaching release and educator acknowledgement.
10. Annual Academic Delivery Plan	Require institutions to file and clear next year's course, elective, staffing, teaching allocation and planned-development architecture before delivery.
11. Live Regulatory Assurance and Random Audit	Replace retrospective folders and event counts with regulator-visible records, random sampling and transaction-level audit.

The proposed assurance flow

PLAN	SCREEN	APPOINT	DEVELOP	ASSIGN	LISTEN	REVALIDATE
Annual academic plan filed	Suitability clearance	External board + audition	Approved need, trainer and assessment	Workload ledger	Regulator-run student feedback	Five-year Teaching Defence

Figure 1. The National Teaching Registry turns teaching quality assurance from a periodic institutional report into a continuously observable professional system.

WHY NOW

1. Why Now: A Convergence Pakistan Can Use

The case for educator-level professional assurance is not new in principle, but the conditions for implementing it are materially different in 2026. Pakistan now has a convergence of regulatory reform, digital infrastructure, national-scale assessment capability, existing institutional data and rapid technological change. The opportunity is not to discard what already exists. It is to connect mechanisms that are currently fragmented and use them to verify the professional authority of the individual educator.

First, the regulatory foundations are already moving. Sindh's Teaching Licence Policy has established individual licensure, testing, data management and five-year validity as a domestic precedent. NACTE's revised accreditation standards, applicable to formal accreditation requests from 1 January 2026, strengthen expectations around knowledge, skills, dispositions, assessment and professional development in teacher education. Pakistan therefore does not need to invent the principle that teaching quality should be assessed or externally assured. The next step is to carry assurance beyond the programme and into the educator's professional life. [STEDA, 2023; NACTE, 2026]

Second, national-scale digital assessment is no longer hypothetical. In 2026, HEC conducted the National Skills Competency Test for more than 33,000 computing students across 165 centres in 112 cities and published university-level and individual performance information. HEC is also accelerating digital transformation and has moved degree attestation to a paperless online model. These developments demonstrate that identity-linked national assessment, digital workflows and large-scale performance data are administratively feasible. [HEC, 2026f; HEC, 2026g]

Third, much of the information needed for a more sophisticated assurance system already exists, but in fragments. Universities hold faculty and workload records. HEC collects higher education statistics and operates quality assurance processes. QECs administer course and teacher evaluations. Teacher education institutions interact with accreditation systems. Provincial school systems maintain employee data. The missing element is not data collection itself. It is a persistent professional architecture that links significant evidence to the individual educator across institutions and over time.

Fourth, the wider world of work is moving away from unquestioned reliance on credentials and job titles as complete proxies for capability. Skills-first approaches increasingly combine qualifications with direct evidence of what an individual can actually do. Education should not be exempt from the same question. If employers increasingly expect candidates to demonstrate capability rather than merely present a credential, the profession responsible for developing capability in others should be prepared to meet an equally serious evidentiary standard. [OECD, 2025c]

Fifth, artificial intelligence has changed the context in which teaching operates. This is not an AI reform paper, and AI is not proposed as a substitute for teachers. Its relevance is that information delivery, routine content generation, basic assessment support and administrative processing can increasingly be supported by intelligent systems. UNESCO's 2024 AI Competency Framework for Teachers explicitly recognises a changing teacher-AI-student relationship and the need to reconsider teachers' roles and competencies. The more routine work technology can support, the more important it becomes to define and verify the distinctive human value expected from the educator. [UNESCO, 2024]

Finally, the current policy environment is unusually receptive to evidence-based reform. The Federal Ministry of Education's 2026 Quality Education and Innovation Roadmap for Islamabad emphasises teacher capacity, measurable outcomes, data-driven governance and digital innovation. HEC's current reform agenda places strong emphasis on governance, quality assurance, transparency and digital transformation. The

architecture proposed in this paper therefore does not require Pakistan to reverse direction. It offers a way to deepen the direction already being taken. [MoFEPT, 2026b; HEC, 2026g]

Taken together, these developments create a policy window that did not exist in the same form a decade ago. Pakistan already has pieces of teacher licensing, programme accreditation, student feedback, digital assessment, quality assurance and professional development. What remains fragmented is the professional record and assurance of the individual educator. The appropriate response is not another isolated initiative. It is to connect the pieces.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

2. The Most Influential Job With the Lowest Bar

On-the-job learning is normal in most professions. It becomes dangerous when institutions use it as a substitute for proving minimum fitness before responsibility is granted. Teaching is one of those professions because the consequences of weak practice are not confined to an internal workflow or a quarterly result. They accumulate in how learners think, communicate, judge, collaborate, aspire and behave.

The authority given to an educator is unusual. A school teacher can become a daily behavioural reference point for a five-year-old. A university lecturer can influence the intellectual confidence, professional identity and ethical habits of hundreds of emerging adults. Yet the decision to grant that authority can remain administratively simple: check the degree, conduct an ordinary panel interview, verify documents, appoint.

“This is not a conversation about curriculum reform or accreditation checklists. It is a conversation about something more basic: whether the person standing in front of our children every day actually deserves to be there.”

Adapted from the Intelligence Lens article, “The Most Influential Job With the Lowest Bar”.

2.1 The evidentiary mismatch

Institutions routinely apply stronger independent verification to some academic artefacts than to the people who create the learning environment. A doctoral thesis is subjected to external evaluation because independence matters. Graduate programme relevance may be reviewed by committees containing external subject experts. Under HEC’s Tenure Track System, promotion or appointment at higher ranks can involve external technical review. The logic is obvious: high-stakes academic decisions are safer when they do not rely only on the judgement of insiders. [HEC, 2023; HEC, 2026b]

The same logic should apply before an institution grants professional authority over learners. The fact that external review is already familiar to Pakistan’s higher education system matters. The proposal in this paper is not culturally alien. It extends an existing assurance principle to the decision where it is arguably most needed.

2.2 The five substitutions that weaken assurance

What is commonly observed	What it is wrongly allowed to substitute for
Required degree held	Demonstrated ability to teach
PhD held	Superior teaching capability
Training attended	Capability acquired
Years served	Professional growth
Research papers counted	Overall academic contribution

These substitutions are attractive because they are cheap to administer. Degrees, attendance sheets, service years and publication counts are easy to document. Teaching judgement, professional maturity, intellectual vitality and development of learners are harder to measure. The administrative convenience of a proxy does not make the proxy valid.

2.3 Scope: established urban institutions

This paper deliberately does not use shortages in remote or underserved areas as the benchmark for what should be acceptable in established urban institutions. A premium school in Islamabad, Lahore or Karachi, or a large university with HR, quality assurance, technology and accreditation functions, should be capable of producing stronger evidence about the people it entrusts with learners.

A system should be judged partly by what it does when the basic resources to do better already exist. The policy question therefore becomes: what should established institutions be required to prove about the educators they hire, develop, promote and retain?

CURRENT SYSTEM

3. What Pakistan Already Has, and What It Still Does Not Verify

3.1 Higher education appointment criteria establish academic eligibility

For many disciplines covered by HEC's general faculty appointment criteria, a Lecturer requires a first-class MS/MPhil or equivalent 18-year qualification, while an Assistant Professor requires a PhD in the relevant field. The minimum criteria state nil or no required experience and nil publications at these two levels. Associate Professor and Professor criteria add experience and research publication thresholds. [HEC, 2026a]

These are minimum regulatory criteria. Universities may impose stronger requirements, and some do. The problem is conceptual: the criteria are frequently treated operationally as though they answer the teaching question. They do not. They establish academic eligibility to be considered for a role. A separate process is needed to establish fitness to teach.

3.2 HEC itself recognises a preparation gap for fresh PhDs

HEC's Interim Placement of Fresh PhDs programme and National Academy of Higher Education training explicitly aim to help fresh PhDs acquire competencies and professional characteristics required for effective teaching and research. The current programme describes teaching and learning, applied research and professional practice as separate dimensions, and identifies modern pedagogy, assessment, professional ethics and communication among expected outcomes. [HEC, 2026c; HEC, 2026d]

A USEFUL CONTRADICTION

If possession of the doctorate already established readiness for effective teaching, a separate national programme designed to prepare fresh PhDs for effective teaching would be conceptually unnecessary. HEC's own development architecture therefore supports the distinction between doctoral qualification and teaching readiness.

3.3 Sindh has already moved toward individual licensure

Sindh's Teaching Licence Policy provides an important domestic precedent. It establishes Primary, Elementary and Secondary licence categories, requires applicants to pass a licensure test administered by a third party, permits re-sitting, and gives a licence five-year validity. The policy also anticipates future use of portfolio assessment, classroom observation and recorded practicum. [STEDA, 2023]

The same policy, however, currently provides for renewal on submission of evidence of attending a minimum amount of STEDA-approved CPD. That is precisely where this white paper proposes the next step: licence renewal should eventually depend on evidence of continuing capability, not attendance alone. [STEDA, 2023]

3.4 NACTE's revised standards assess knowledge, skills and dispositions

NACTE's revised formal accreditation standards, applicable to accreditation requests from 1 January 2026, require mechanisms to monitor prospective teachers' acquisition of knowledge, dispositions and skills, and expect assessment arrangements to produce useful information for improvement. [NACTE, 2026]

This is valuable, but programme accreditation and prospective-teacher assessment are not the same thing as a career-long individual assurance system. A teacher can graduate from an accredited programme, enter employment, attend multiple workshops, accumulate service years and still avoid a serious external re-examination of whether they remain fit to teach.

3.5 Pakistan already uses externality in high-stakes academic decisions

HEC's Tenure Track guidance requires external technical review for higher-rank appointments and promotions, including positive reports from neutral foreign experts under specified conditions. HEC's graduate education policy also uses external experts in programme and relevance assessment structures. [HEC, 2026b; HEC, 2023]

The policy opportunity is therefore not to invent external review from nothing. It is to make external review a normal part of granting and renewing teaching authority, while designing the system to avoid the weaknesses that can arise when institutions control the choice of every external evaluator.

3.6 HEC already requires digital student feedback, but the institution still controls the transaction

HEC Quality Assurance Agency targets require universities to conduct online Course Evaluation by Student and Teacher Evaluation by Student surveys through an effective digital platform, analyse the results and report corrective action. HEC's institutional evaluation manual also asks whether students evaluate each course, who collects the evaluations and how they are used. [HEC QAA, 2024-25; HEC IPE, 2026]

That is an important existing mechanism, but it is institution-administered. The proposal in this paper is materially different: the regulator, not the employing institution, should own the survey instrument, distribution, response record, aggregation rules and educator-level history. The institution may receive the results and respond to them, but it should not control the collection process.

3.7 HEC already collects faculty data, but not as a live public assurance record

HEC already operates national higher-education data collection through institutional focal persons and maintains multiple digital services. It therefore does not need to invent national education data infrastructure from zero. The missing layer is a persistent educator record that follows the individual across institutions and records teaching-related decisions rather than only institutional statistics. [HEC HES, 2026]

3.8 The former HEC Approved Supervisor mechanism is a useful precedent, but it is no longer current

HEC previously maintained an e-portal and published names of HEC Approved Supervisors for defined validity periods. HEC states that the separate Approved Supervisor designation was discontinued after promulgation of the Graduate Education Policy 2023. This white paper therefore does not present it as a current programme. It uses the earlier mechanism only as proof that HEC has previously maintained an individual approval list. A comparable Approved Educator Developer Register could be created for people authorised to train teachers and faculty. [HEC, Approved Supervisors]

3.9 What remains missing

Existing mechanism	What it does	What the proposed NTR adds
Sindh Teaching Licence	Licensure and renewal for teachers within Sindh.	A cross-career professional record plus hiring, feedback, training, workload and planning transactions.
NACTE standards	Accredit teacher-education programmes and evaluate programme quality.	Individual educator assurance after graduation and throughout employment.
HEC faculty criteria/TTS	Set appointment criteria and, in TTS, structure appointment, review and research-oriented performance.	A universal individual record, direct teaching evidence, regulator-run feedback and auditable transactions across institutions.
QEC student surveys	Require institutions to collect and analyse student feedback.	Regulator-owned survey collection, educator-level history, protected public aggregates and portability across employers.
Institutional HR files	Record employment, duties and local training.	A regulator-visible national record that follows the educator and makes delegated work and professional decisions auditable.

CENTRAL PROPOSITION

4. From Institutional Compliance to Educator-Level Professional Assurance

The central reform proposed in this paper is not a new competency list, another training requirement or another accreditation standard. It is a change in the operating logic of the profession. Pakistan should move from a system in which an institution largely asserts that an educator is qualified, trained and performing adequately to a system in which specified forms of professional authority are supported by evidence that can be independently verified outside the employing institution.

The principle is role-specific. Academic qualifications should establish the knowledge claims for which they are designed. Teaching authority should be supported by evidence of teaching. Research authority should be supported by evidence of research capability. Authority to develop other educators should require separate evidence that the person can develop professionals. Leadership responsibilities should require evidence relevant to leadership. Academic distinction should reflect recognised contribution and achievement, not simply the accumulation of credentials, years and counts.

This does not require the regulator to control academic judgement. Institutions should remain responsible for employing educators, designing curricula, managing classrooms and making routine academic decisions. The regulator's role is to assure that high-consequence professional transactions meet defined standards, that evidence is authentic, that independent review is used where appropriate, and that the individual's authority remains valid over time.

The reform therefore shifts the object of assurance. Instead of asking only whether the institution has a policy, held a workshop or completed an evaluation cycle, the system asks what happened to the individual educator: how the person was screened, what teaching evidence supported appointment, what students have consistently reported, what development was prescribed, whether achievement was demonstrated, what significant duties were assigned, what academic distinction was awarded and whether teaching authority was subsequently renewed.

THE REGISTRY IS NOT THE REFORM

The reform is the shift from assumed professional authority to independently verifiable educator-level professional assurance. The National Teaching Registry is the infrastructure that makes that shift visible, portable and enforceable at scale. If the Registry were built without changing how authority is earned, developed, reviewed and renewed, Pakistan would merely have created another database.

CREDENTIAL OVERREACH

5. Where Existing Proxies Fail

The strongest weakness in the current system is not that qualifications, training, experience or institutional judgement have no value. It is that each can be allowed to answer questions it was never designed to answer. The following three areas illustrate where the proxy becomes the decision instead of evidence relevant to the decision.

The modern university has allowed a useful academic qualification to acquire meaning far beyond what it can reliably prove. The letters PhD are often read not only as evidence of doctoral study, but as evidence that the holder is more qualified to teach than someone with a master's degree. That conclusion does not logically follow.

5.1 Credentials, roles and academic authority

Question	What a PhD can reasonably evidence	What still requires separate evidence
Does the person have advanced disciplinary exposure?	Often, yes.	Depth and currency can still vary.
Can the person undertake research?	A doctorate is intended to provide substantial evidence.	Quality and independence still need examination in context.
Can the person explain difficult ideas clearly?	Not necessarily.	Teaching audition and observed practice.
Can the person develop learners?	No automatic inference.	Mentoring, feedback and developmental evidence.
Does the person have sound professional judgement?	No automatic inference.	Situational judgement, conduct evidence and structured assessment.
Is the person emotionally mature enough for teaching?	No automatic inference.	Role-specific professional suitability assessment.
Does the person remain capable of the teaching role now?	The doctorate cannot establish current teaching performance.	Current teaching evidence and periodic revalidation.
Should the person hold a higher academic title?	Not by itself.	External contribution review.

The issue is not the PhD itself. Pakistan needs strong doctoral education, serious researchers and internationally competitive scholarship. The problem begins when one credential is allowed to establish forms of professional authority that it was not designed to verify. A PhD can be powerful evidence of

advanced study and independent research capability. But a PhD is not a teaching qualification. It does not automatically establish teaching capability, communication, mentoring, professional judgement, leadership capacity or suitability to develop students. The same principle works in the opposite direction: an exceptional teacher with a master's degree should not be treated as an inferior educator merely because another colleague holds a doctorate. If the role is primarily teaching, the strongest evidence should be evidence of teaching. If the role is research, advanced research evidence should dominate.

5.1.1 Doctoral quality is not perfectly uniform

This paper does not claim that Pakistani PhDs are inherently weak or easy. Such a claim would be unsupported and unfair. It does note that HEC itself launched a nationwide quality review of MS/MPhil and PhD programmes in December 2025 after concerns about academic rigour, supervision, governance, delivery and some part-time doctoral arrangements. [HEC, 2025]

That makes reliance on the doctorate as a universal teaching-quality proxy even less defensible. Even if every PhD were awarded perfectly, the credential would still not prove teaching capability. Variation in doctoral quality simply increases the need to assess the capability relevant to the job rather than infer it from the credential.

5.1.2 The credential boundary rule

CREDENTIAL BOUNDARY RULE

A qualification may establish eligibility for an assessment or role only to the extent that the qualification actually evidences the capability required. A PhD can carry substantial weight for research and advanced disciplinary work. It should carry no automatic exemption from independent teaching assessment.

The practical implication is not to downgrade the doctorate. It is to stop forcing all academic careers into a single vertical hierarchy in which a higher research credential is assumed to represent a higher level of teaching competence.

5.1.3 Separate role pathways

Universities should explicitly distinguish at least three faculty pathways: Teaching Faculty, Research Faculty and Practice Faculty. A person may operate across more than one pathway, but authority in one should not automatically create authority in the others.

Pathway	Primary evidence	Examples of authority
Teaching Faculty	Live teaching, assessment design, student development, course design, verified professional evidence	Undergraduate and taught postgraduate teaching, mentoring, learning design.
Research Faculty	Research quality, methods, knowledge contribution, supervision capability	Research leadership, research teams, doctoral supervision where separately authorised.
Practice Faculty	Recent professional accomplishment, applied judgement, ability to translate practice into learning	Applied modules, cases, studios, clinics, projects, entrepreneurship and professional education.

Cambridge's current Academic Career Pathways distinguish Research and Teaching, Teaching and Scholarship, and Research routes. Stanford likewise recognises distinct teaching and research professoriate lines. These systems are not identical to the proposal here, but they demonstrate that world-class universities do not need to treat every academic career as one undifferentiated ladder. [Cambridge, 2026a; Stanford, 2026]

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

5.2 Attendance-based development

The easiest thing to count in faculty development is attendance. It is also one of the least informative. A room can be full, every participant can receive a certificate, the event can be photographed and the regulatory file can be complete while nobody can demonstrate what changed.

5.2.1 Training delivered is not training learned

CURRENT RITUAL	CURRENT RITUAL	CURRENT RITUAL	CURRENT RITUAL
Nominate broadly	Attend session	Issue certificate	Report completion

Figure 2. The compliance loop that creates evidence of activity but not evidence of capability.

The proposed replacement begins before the training room exists. An institution should first identify the capability gap, identify the people who actually have the gap, define the standard to be reached, select a qualified developer, assess performance after the intervention, provide remediation where required, and verify transfer into practice.

DIAGNOSE	TARGET	DEVELOP	ASSESS	REMEDiate	VERIFY
Who needs what?	Only relevant participants	Qualified developer	Independent post-assessment	Repeat until standard	Check transfer to practice

Figure 3. The proposed capability closure sequence.

5.2.2 The Training Closure Standard

Every regulated professional development activity should have three separately reportable statuses:

Status	Meaning	Professional credit
Delivered	The institution or provider conducted the activity.	None by itself.
Attended	The participant met the attendance requirement.	None by itself.
Achieved	The participant demonstrated the defined capability standard through assessment.	Counts toward regulatory or professional assurance requirements.

For mandatory capability programmes, Intelligence Lens proposes an initial pilot rule of at least 80 percent on knowledge-based assessment, plus a pass on any required performance assessment, with critical domains able to carry their own non-compensable thresholds. A participant who does not meet the standard receives a record of attendance, not a competence credential.

The participant is then routed to remediation and reassessment. The philosophy should be “not yet competent”, not “everyone passes because everyone attended”.

5.2.3 Assessment should not be controlled solely by the trainer

If the same trainer designs an easy assessment, delivers the session, marks the assessment and reports their own success rate, the system invites gaming. For regulated or high-stakes programmes, post-assessment should therefore be standardised, externally moderated, independently marked, or sampled by an external assessor. Trainer effectiveness can then be measured without rewarding artificially easy tests.

5.2.4 Training should be prescribed by diagnosis, not calendars

A university with 70 faculty members should not automatically send all 70 to “Effective Communication”. It should assess the relevant capability first. If 31 need intervention, 31 should receive it. If 24 already exceed the standard, their time should not be consumed merely to produce a complete attendance list.

A BETTER TRAINING REPORT

31 faculty members were identified as below the communication standard. 22 achieved the standard after the first intervention. 7 achieved it after remediation. 2 remain under development. Capability closure rate: 93.5 percent. This is more useful than “communication training successfully conducted for 70 faculty members”.

5.2.5 The trainer must also be qualified

Teacher development is a separate professional capability. Seniority, academic rank, subject expertise or employment by the same institution should not automatically qualify a person to develop colleagues. England’s National Professional Qualification in Leading Teacher Development is one example of a system formally recognising teacher development as a distinct role requiring specific preparation and assessment. [DfE, 2024]

GOVERNANCE

5.3 Externality and independently controlled evidence

External evaluation is not valuable because outsiders are automatically wiser than insiders. It is valuable because it changes incentives. It reduces the ability of a department to quietly convert familiarity, hierarchy, personal preference or organisational politics into a professional judgement that appears objective.

5.3.1 The PhD defence analogy

A doctoral defence does not rely only on the student’s supervisor because the system recognises the conflict. The same principle should apply when an institution hires someone who may remain in front of students for decades. Internal colleagues know the institutional context. External assessors create independence. A robust process needs both.

5.3.2 Externality must itself be protected

An “external” reviewer chosen entirely by the candidate or institution can become ceremonial. The proposed system therefore requires an approved assessor pool, automated or rotational allocation for at least one assessor, conflict declarations and periodic auditing of assessor behaviour.

Disqualifying conflict for an external assessor	Minimum rule
Recent co-author or research collaborator	Disqualify within a defined recent period, proposed five years for pilot.
Doctoral supervisor, co-supervisor or former student relationship	Disqualify.
Immediate family or close personal relationship	Disqualify.
Current employment, consultancy or significant financial relationship with institution	Disqualify unless formally disclosed and determined immaterial by regulator.
Repeated assessor use by same institution	Cap frequency to prevent creation of friendly external circles.

5.3.3 International mechanisms demonstrate the practicality of external review

Cambridge’s promotion process uses multiple committee levels and internal and external referees. Stanford’s professoriate appointment and promotion processes use detailed evidence and external evaluation in relevant cases. University of California policy requires clearly demonstrated high-quality teaching as an essential criterion for appointment, advancement or promotion, and evaluates teaching across multiple dimensions rather than by one indicator alone. [Cambridge, 2026b; Stanford, 2026; UCOP, 2025]

The proposal here is more specific to Pakistan's assurance gap. Externality should not be reserved mainly for research distinction or senior promotion. It should enter the decision that grants teaching authority in the first place.

ENABLING ARCHITECTURE

6. The National Teaching Registry: The Enabling Architecture

The central proposal of this white paper is a National Teaching Registry (NTR). It is not a directory in the conventional sense and it is not another social-media profile. It is a regulator-owned professional record plus a transaction layer. The regulator should be able to see not only who an educator is, but how the educator was screened, appointed, trained, assigned work, evaluated by students, externally reviewed and revalidated.

THE CENTRAL POLICY SHIFT

Move from institution-reported compliance to regulator-observable professional assurance. Institutions remain responsible for employing and managing educators, but specified high-consequence decisions become digitally visible, time-stamped and auditable outside the institution.

6.1 One educator, one persistent National Educator ID

Every teaching professional should receive a persistent National Educator ID linked to a verified professional profile. A person changing schools or universities should not start from a blank file. Verified qualifications, teaching-authority status, revalidation date, regulatory training outcomes, academic distinctions and final sanctions should follow the individual. Institutions add records; they do not own the professional identity.

6.2 The profile should have different visibility layers

Public view	Institution/employer view	Regulator/educator protected view
Name, National Educator ID, current affiliations, verified degrees, active teaching-authority scope and validity, academic distinctions, verified publications/achievements, approved educator-developer status, Teaching Defence status, aggregated student-feedback indicators.	Everything public plus suitability-clearance status, relevant assessment eligibility, teaching audition record, verified training achievements and declared teaching restrictions necessary for lawful appointment.	Raw psychometric and situational-judgement scores, confidential assessor reports, complaints under investigation, student identifiers, raw comments, remediation records, workload details and appeal material.

Raw psychometric scores should never become public. Student identities should never be disclosed to the educator. Unproven complaints should never be displayed as public facts. Transparency must concern verified professional standing, not unrestricted publication of sensitive data.

6.3 The NTR is where high-consequence transactions happen

Transaction	What the NTR records
Hiring	Vacancy, applicant identity, suitability clearance, external assessor allocation, conflict declarations, teaching-audition scores, board decision and appointment.
Student feedback	Verified enrolment, survey invitation, response rate, domain scores, protected comments, rolling educator-level aggregate and institutional response.
Professional development	Diagnosed need, approved trainer, nominated participants, baseline, approved assessment, result, remediation and capability closure.
Workload delegation	Non-teaching task, expected hours, duration, responsible

	manager, teaching release, educator acknowledgement or contest.
Academic distinction	Eligibility, dossier, panel composition, conflicts, external evaluations, decision and reasoned outcome.
Revalidation	Teaching Defence due date, evidence, panel, outcome, restrictions and next review date.
Academic planning	Next-year courses, electives, named teachers, planned hires, delivery mode, workload, training needs and material changes.

6.4 HEC can own the higher-education layer; school regulation must be federated

HEC has a national mandate over higher-education standards and faculty policy. The school sector is constitutionally different. After the 18th Amendment, the federal Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training is directly responsible for education service delivery in Islamabad Capital Territory and plays a coordination role among federating units. A national school-teacher registry therefore requires a common technical standard with provincial education departments or statutory teacher bodies acting as the legal regulators. [HEC, 2026; MoFEPT, 2026]

The design should therefore be one interoperable national registry with separate regulatory authorities: HEC for higher education, provincial authorities for school teachers, and a national coordination mechanism through the Inter-Provincial Education Ministers' Conference or an agreed successor arrangement. The public should experience one search interface even though legal authority is distributed.

6.5 The NTR should not become another reporting burden

The system should replace existing duplicate reporting rather than sit on top of it. Institutions should upload once and reuse verified data. Degree verification should connect to HEC records where available; publications should connect to persistent identifiers such as DOI/ORCID where feasible; faculty-course assignments should flow from the annual academic plan; student feedback should attach automatically to the relevant educator and course; and training results should be written directly by the approved assessment process.

DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

7. Eleven Specific Reform Measures

Measure 1. Establish the National Teaching Registry

HEC should establish the higher-education NTR as the authoritative professional record for all teaching faculty in HEC-recognised universities and degree-awarding institutions. School-sector authorities should establish interoperable records under the same national data standard. Every educator receives a National Educator ID, and institutions must link every teaching appointment to an active record before the person can be assigned a class.

Mandatory profile field	Verification source or update rule
Identity and current institutional affiliation	Verified by institution and national identity checks, with dated appointment history.
Degrees and qualifications	Verified against HEC/equivalence records where applicable.
Teaching-authority scope and validity	Issued and renewed through the regulator workflow.
Courses taught and current teaching allocation	Written from approved annual academic plans and institutional updates.
Publications and verified intellectual/professional achievements	Linked to DOI/ORCID or independently verified evidence where feasible.
Student feedback history	Generated by the regulator-run survey system, not manually

	uploaded by the institution.
Approved training achievements	Written by the approved assessment process after capability closure.
Academic distinctions and leadership terms	Written after external decisions.
Teaching Defence status	Due date, outcome and any active restriction.

Measure 2. Move student teaching feedback to the regulator

HEC already requires online teacher and course evaluation through university quality systems. Intelligence Lens proposes moving the collection transaction itself to HEC for universities and to provincial authorities for schools. The institution should not decide whether the survey was sent, who received it, which responses disappeared or how a faculty member’s historical record is assembled. [HEC QAA, 2024-25]

Proposed rule	Specification
Timing	One short mid-course diagnostic survey plus one end-course survey. The end-course survey closes before or at course completion but results are not released to the educator until final grades have been submitted.
Identity	Students authenticate through verified enrolment, but the educator never sees respondent identities.
Minimum publication threshold	No public educator-level aggregate from a course unless at least 10 responses and 40% of enrolled students respond. Small classes accumulate across courses until a safe threshold is reached.
Public display	No five-star rating and no raw comments. Display rolling three-year domain aggregates, response count, response rate and number of courses represented.
Domains	Clarity, intellectual challenge, respect and fairness, usefulness of feedback, support for learning, and whether the course developed thinking rather than merely content recall.
Comments	Raw comments visible only to regulator and educator after automated/manual moderation for threats, personal abuse, identity disclosure and irrelevant allegations.
Decision use	Feedback is one evidence stream. It cannot by itself terminate employment, block promotion or determine Teaching Defence outcome.

This safeguard is essential because research continues to show that student evaluations can contain substantial measurement error and demographic bias. Public transparency is useful only if the system does not turn professional assurance into popularity scoring. [Quansah et al., 2024; Stoesz et al., 2022]

Measure 3. Require portal-based Teaching Suitability Clearance before interview

An institution should not be able to move a candidate to a substantive teaching interview until the NTR shows an active Teaching Suitability Clearance for the relevant role family. The assessment should combine validated psychometric constructs with a profession-specific situational judgement test. It should not be a generic personality quiz.

Element	Pilot specification
Core screen	Professional judgement, emotional regulation, integrity, empathy, learning orientation, communication reasoning and conscientiousness.
Role module	Early-years/primary adds child-development and safeguarding scenarios; secondary adds adolescent and classroom judgement; university adds academic integrity, intellectual openness, student boundaries and collegial judgement.
Delivery	Administered through the NTR by HEC/provincial testing services or licensed independent providers using regulator-controlled item banks.
Initial pilot threshold	70% composite eligibility threshold, with no critical-domain score below 60%. Psychometric components that are not validly

	interpreted as pass/fail should be used as structured risk indicators within the composite model rather than arbitrary cut-offs.
Validity	Clearance valid for 18 months and portable across institutions for the same role family.
Retest	One retest after 90 days, with targeted developmental guidance.
Institutional discretion	Institutions may set a higher threshold, but may not waive the national minimum without a documented regulator exception.

Measure 4. Route appointment through external assessment and credential-blind teaching audition

For long-term university faculty appointments, the NTR should generate the appointment workflow and allocate at least one external assessor from an approved national pool. Intelligence Lens proposes a five-member board with three external members. At least one external assessor should be regulator-assigned rather than chosen by the institution. Assessors disclose conflicts through the portal before seeing candidate material.

Seat	University appointment board
1	Independent chair, external and regulator-approved.
2	External discipline specialist from another institution.
3	External teaching/learning assessor or current practitioner for strongly applied roles.
4	Dean/HoD or discipline representative from hiring institution.
5	Institutional academic/HR representative.

Candidates who meet minimum academic eligibility then complete a live teaching audition. The first teaching raters should not be shown whether the candidate holds an MS/MPhil or PhD. The academic record is reintroduced only after direct teaching scores are submitted. This creates a measurable answer to the question that current credential hierarchy assumes rather than tests.

External assessors should be paid through the portal from a fee deposited by the institution, rather than being paid directly by the hiring department. The NTR stores score sheets, panel composition, conflict declarations and the reasoned appointment outcome.

Measure 5. Issue Provisional Teaching Authority to new entrants

A fresh graduate, fresh PhD or professional entering teaching should not receive unrestricted authority on the first day of employment. The NTR should issue Provisional Teaching Authority for 12 months. During that period, the educator must complete observed practice and role-specific induction. Failure does not automatically terminate employment; it restricts or extends teaching authority until the required evidence is produced.

Checkpoint	Requirement
Month 1	Role scope recorded; mentor/supervisor named; safeguarding and conduct requirements completed.
Month 3	First independent observation plus feedback plan.
Month 6	Second observation and review of assessment/feedback artefacts.
Month 10-11	Final observed lesson or class, portfolio review and confirmation decision.
Month 12	Full authority, conditional extension up to six months, restricted role, or non-confirmation of teaching authority.

Measure 6. Regulate professional development through the same portal and abolish automatic competence certificates

Institutions should remain free to run informal learning, seminars and internal discussions without regulator permission. However, any training that the institution intends to count toward regulatory compliance, faculty development obligations, promotion evidence or Teaching Defence must be registered and approved before delivery.

Stage	Required NTR record
1. Need case	What problem was identified, by what evidence, and which educators actually need the intervention.
2. Participant approval	Named educators selected because the baseline shows a relevant gap or because the role requires the capability.
3. Developer approval	Trainer must appear on the Approved Educator Developer Register for the relevant domain.
4. Assessment approval	Assessment method, pass threshold, critical fail conditions and remediation route approved before training begins.
5. Delivery	Attendance recorded as attendance only.
6. Independent assessment	Assessment administered or moderated through the regulator platform, not solely by the person who delivered the training.
7. Closure	Only participants who meet the standard receive a Certificate of Demonstrated Competence. Others receive remediation and reassessment.

For knowledge-heavy modules, the pilot may use an 80% pass threshold plus a practical task. For safeguarding, professional ethics or other critical areas, designated critical errors may constitute failure regardless of total score. The exact thresholds should be validated by domain rather than imposed universally.

Approved Educator Developers should be listed publicly in the NTR with domain, approval date and validity. Initial approval should last three years and require subject expertise, an assessment of adult-learning and facilitation capability, one observed training demonstration, one valid assessment design and three supervised or audited deliveries. Seniority, title or employment by the same institution should confer no exemption.

Measure 7. Require a five-year external Teaching Defence

The NTR should automatically flag teaching authority six months before expiry. Renewal requires a Teaching Defence every five years. The educator submits recent teaching evidence, one class is independently observed, and a three-person external panel conducts a 75 to 90 minute viva. The panel contains a discipline or age-level specialist, a teaching/learning specialist and an independent regulator-approved chair.

Outcome	Consequence
Renewed	Teaching authority renewed for five years.
Conditionally renewed	Authority continues for up to 12 months with named remediation and reassessment.
Restricted	Specified teaching, assessment or supervisory authorities removed until demonstrated.
Not renewed	Teaching authority lapses. Employment may continue in a legitimate non-teaching role subject to institutional rules.

The Teaching Defence uses the educator's actual NTR history rather than a newly assembled ceremonial file: course assignments, student-feedback aggregates, approved development outcomes, observation records, assessments designed, material curriculum changes, mentoring evidence, verified contributions and any substantiated conduct findings.

Measure 8. Separate employment progression from academic distinction through external governance

Employment grade, salary progression and academic distinction should be separated, but governed in one reform. Service, improved qualifications, responsibility and sustained performance may justify higher employment grade and pay. They should not automatically generate the titles Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor.

Decision	Proposed mechanism
Employment grade	Institution decides pay grade under a transparent scale using responsibility, performance, experience, qualifications and market scarcity.
Assistant Professor distinction	Three-person board, at least two external, with regulator-recorded decision.
Associate Professor distinction	Five-person board, at least three external, including two relevant experts.
Professor distinction	Five-person board, at least four external, including one international or globally recognised reviewer where practical.
Evidence	Selected Contribution Dossier of no more than five significant contributions, plus teaching/research/practice evidence relevant to the candidate's pathway.
Rule	Years served, PhD status and publication count create eligibility evidence only. No single one automatically confers a title.

For HoD, Dean and comparable academic leadership roles, the stronger reform is fixed tenure rather than age-based retirement. Intelligence Lens proposes a three-year leadership term, renewable once after external review. A person should not remain HoD or Dean indefinitely because of seniority, nor should an excellent educator be forced out solely because of chronological age.

Pakistan does use age limits in several public frameworks. HEC's Model Tenure Track Statutes state a retirement age of 60, and federal civil servants generally retire on completion of their sixtieth year. HEC programmes and senior appointments also use varying age ceilings. This white paper does not recommend imposing a universal private-sector retirement age. Doing so would contradict its central principle: do not use an easy proxy when actual fitness can be verified. Any retired public-sector academic re-entering teaching in a private institution should simply require active NTR teaching authority like everyone else. [HEC TTS; Civil Servants Act 1973]

Measure 9. Put every material non-teaching assignment on a Workload Delegation Ledger

The current problem is not merely that educators are busy. It is that regulators cannot see how institutions are using academic labour. Every material non-teaching duty delegated to an educator should therefore be recorded against the educator's NTR profile.

Trigger	Required record
Any non-teaching assignment expected to exceed 20 total hours or four weeks	Task title, purpose, assigning authority, start/end date, expected hours per week, deliverable and whether teaching release is provided.
Standing roles such as programme coordinator, committee chair, accreditation focal person, admissions lead or event lead	Automatic workload ledger entry for the full term.
Educator response	Accept, accept with workload concern, or contest within five working days.
Institutional action	Manager must resolve contested workload or record reason for proceeding.
Regulatory view	HEC/provincial authority can see aggregate administrative load by department, institution, rank and individual.

The purpose is not to obtain HEC permission for every meeting. It is to make material delegation visible and attributable. Over time the regulator can identify institutions where faculty are systematically being used as

clerical or administrative substitutes and can compare administrative load with student feedback, research output and teaching quality indicators.

Measure 10. Require an Annual Academic Delivery Plan before the next academic year begins

A major weakness in academic management is retrospective administration. Institutions should be required to show, in advance, how the next academic year will actually be delivered. For universities, the Annual Academic Delivery Plan should be filed through the NTR at least 120 days before the start of the relevant academic year. School-sector plans can use a simplified version aligned to provincial calendars.

Required plan component	What must be specified
Programme delivery	Programmes and cohorts to be taught, section sizes and delivery mode.
Course and elective map	Every compulsory course and elective planned for the year, including courses proposed to be added, suspended or materially redesigned.
Named teaching allocation	National Educator ID of the proposed instructor for every planned course/section, with teaching-authority status checked automatically.
Teaching load	Expected contact hours, supervision and major assessment responsibility by educator.
Staffing gaps	Positions that must be recruited before delivery, with expected recruitment date.
Visiting/adjunct faculty	Named or planned visiting roles and the scope of teaching authority required.
Development plan	Regulatory-credit training proposed for the year, need basis, target participants and intended outcomes.
Administrative assignments	Known major non-teaching roles to be delegated during the year.

The system should use automated regulatory clearance rather than requiring a human HEC officer to approve thousands of routine entries. Green items that satisfy existing rules are automatically cleared. Amber items, such as unusually high load or an educator whose Teaching Defence will expire mid-year, require confirmation. Red items, such as an unverified instructor, expired teaching authority, unauthorised new programme or missing staffing requirement, are blocked until resolved.

Material changes after approval must be logged within five working days. At the end of the year, the regulator can compare planned delivery with actual delivery. Planning therefore becomes a measurable institutional capability rather than an accreditation narrative.

Measure 11. Replace document-heavy accreditation evidence with live assurance and random audit

Once the NTR exists, the regulator should stop asking institutions to repeatedly reconstruct evidence that already exists digitally. Training photographs, attendance sheets, hand-built faculty lists and selected showcase cases become secondary. The regulator can sample directly from the national record.

Current-style assurance	NTR-based assurance
Institution supplies faculty roster	Regulator samples directly from verified educator records.
Institution supplies student-feedback report	Regulator already owns the underlying verified survey transaction.
Institution supplies training certificates	Regulator sees baseline, approved trainer, assessment, remediation and closure.
Institution explains faculty workload	Regulator sees the workload delegation ledger.
Institution presents next-year intentions verbally	Regulator already has the approved Annual Academic Delivery Plan.
Institution selects “best” faculty for meetings	Regulator randomly selects educators from the active roster.

Quality visits then become verification exercises: examine exceptions, investigate unexplained patterns, observe randomly selected classes and test whether digital records match actual practice. This reduces both ceremonial compliance and the opportunity to curate a temporary accreditation performance.

COMPARATIVE DESIGN

8. International Mechanisms Worth Borrowing

No foreign system reviewed for this paper combines all the functions proposed here. That matters. Public teacher registers already exist, external academic review already exists, professional revalidation already exists, and central teacher-record systems already exist. The proposed contribution is their integration with student feedback, hiring, training, workload delegation and forward academic planning in one educator-level assurance architecture.

System	Existing mechanism	What Pakistan can borrow
Scotland, GTC Scotland	Public register shows registration status, categories/subjects and Fitness to Teach restrictions.	Public verification of active professional standing and restrictions.
England, Department for Education / Teaching Regulation Agency	Central teacher record shows QTS, induction, professional qualifications and sanctions for authorised employer checks.	Persistent regulator-owned teacher record used before appointment.
New South Wales, Australia	Public teacher register confirms active accreditation.	Simple public verification that the person is professionally authorised.
University of Cambridge	External referees, multi-level committees and differentiated academic career pathways.	Externality and evidence-based distinction decisions.
Stanford / University of California	Appointment and promotion review using multiple evidence sources and external review in relevant cases.	Do not reduce academic standing to one credential or metric.
Singapore teacher preparation	Suitability is tested through an untrained teaching stint before full preparation.	Provisional authority and observed suitability before unrestricted responsibility.
England NPQs	Professional qualifications include formal assessment; teacher development is itself a specialist domain.	No competence credential merely for attendance; approve educator developers separately.
UK medical revalidation	Continuing professional authority is periodically revalidated.	Five-year external Teaching Defence rather than indefinite teaching status.

ROADMAP

9. Implementation in Pakistan

9.1 Start with a regulator-owned pilot, not nationwide legislation

The NTR should first be built and piloted in established urban institutions where infrastructure is not a credible excuse for weak assurance. The objective of the pilot is to validate the assessment instruments, workflow burden, data protections, public-feedback design and institutional planning rules before legal compulsion is widened.

9.2 Proposed 24-month pilot

Element	Pilot recommendation
Geography	Islamabad/Rawalpindi, Lahore and Karachi.
Institutions	5 universities and 10 established schools, including public and private institutions.
Population	All new teaching hires plus approximately 500 existing educators whose records are migrated into the NTR.
Core transactions	Profile verification, student feedback, suitability screening, external appointment assessment, training approval/closure, workload ledger, academic planning and sample Teaching Defences.

Public interface	Searchable educator standing plus protected aggregate feedback for educators who meet publication thresholds.
Evaluation	Independent validation of fairness, reliability, predictive value, cost, data protection, institutional burden and user trust.

9.3 Regulatory ownership must reflect Pakistan's constitutional structure

Actor	Role
HEC	Own and operate the higher-education NTR layer; set data standards; approve assessment providers; maintain external assessor and approved educator-developer pools; govern Teaching Defence and academic-distinction workflows.
Provincial school education authorities / statutory teacher bodies	Own legal authority for school-teacher records and licences within provinces; use the common national architecture and data standard.
MoFEPT / IPEMC coordination	Coordinate interoperability, minimum common data standards and public search across federating units without displacing provincial legal authority.
Universities and schools	Maintain accurate appointments and course allocations; initiate hiring, training, workload and planning transactions; respond to feedback and audit findings.
Independent assessment providers	Deliver validated tests and assessments under regulator-controlled specifications and audit.
Educators	Maintain identity and evidence, acknowledge workload assignments, access results, challenge errors and complete required revalidation.

9.4 Build the Annual Academic Delivery Plan into the pilot from the beginning

Participating institutions should file the next academic year's delivery plan 120 days in advance. In a 2026 pilot, institutions should therefore be required to lodge their 2027 delivery architecture during 2026. The pilot should test whether course-level forward planning exposes staffing gaps, expired teaching authority, unrealistic teaching loads, unplanned elective changes and late hiring early enough to correct them.

9.5 Transition existing educators without pretending everyone starts from zero

Existing educators should receive a verified record first. Their degrees, appointments, teaching allocation and historical achievements are migrated. Student feedback begins prospectively through the regulator. Existing faculty are not required to retake entry screening unless they change role category or are selected in a validation sample. Their first Teaching Defence is staggered across three years so that the system does not create an artificial cliff.

9.6 Data protection and due process are design requirements, not later additions

The NTR should use role-based access, immutable audit logs, correction rights, appeal routes and clear separation between public information and protected assessment data. A teacher should be able to see who changed a professional record and when. An institution should not be able to delete negative regulator-owned feedback. A student should not fear retaliation because a teacher cannot identify the respondent. A disputed allegation should not appear publicly until due process is complete.

INTEGRITY OF THE REFORM

10. Measurement, Safeguards and Failure Modes

10.1 The reform must be judged by predictive validity, not by elegance

The biggest risk is that Pakistan creates another elaborate compliance architecture that produces new forms, new committees and new certificates without better educators. Every component must therefore be evaluated against whether it improves selection, identifies real development needs, predicts later teaching performance, changes practice and protects learners.

Metric	What it should reveal
Suitability Screen reliability and subgroup outcomes	Whether the assessment is stable and whether it creates unexplained adverse impact.
Audition score versus Year 1 observed teaching	Whether the selection process predicts actual practice.
Training achievement rate	Whether participants actually reach the required standard.
Remediation success rate	Whether the system develops people rather than merely filters them out.
Transfer-to-practice rate	Whether assessed learning appears in teaching practice.
Teaching Defence outcomes	Whether revalidation identifies meaningful variation rather than renewing everyone automatically.
Clerical workload share	Whether teacher time is actually being reallocated.
Student learning and experience evidence	Whether the system improves what learners experience, without reducing evaluation to popularity scores.
Assessor variance and reversal rate	Whether external assessors are calibrated and whether appeals reveal inconsistent judgement.

10.2 Safeguards against psychometric misuse

- No single psychometric or personality test should determine appointment.
- Use profession-specific, locally validated instruments and structured situational judgement, not entertainment-style online personality tools.
- Publish the professional domains being assessed and the appeal route.
- Monitor subgroup outcomes for adverse impact and recalibrate instruments where necessary.
- Do not assess political, religious, social or other views unrelated to legitimate professional responsibilities.
- Human panels retain final responsibility. Automated systems may score standardised items, but should not make final employment or teaching-authority decisions.

10.3 Safeguards against external-review capture

- At least one external assessor allocated by rotation or randomisation from an approved pool.
- Conflict declarations mandatory before access to candidate materials.
- Assessor frequency caps for the same institution.
- Calibration exercises using sample cases.
- Periodic blind audit of assessor decisions.
- Right to appeal procedural irregularity or demonstrable conflict, but not simply an unfavourable academic judgement.

10.4 Safeguards against title politics

If titles become honours, they can become political. The remedy is not to return to automatic title progression. It is to make the distinction process evidence-heavy, external-majority, conflict-controlled and auditable. The candidate should know the criteria. The panel should provide a reasoned decision. Reapplication should be permitted after a defined period.

10.5 Safeguards against teaching becoming performative

A live audition or observed class can itself be gamed. The system therefore requires multiple evidence types: live teaching, course artefacts, assessment design, professional growth, independent observation and sustained practice. Student evaluation can contribute, but should never become a popularity contest or a single decisive metric.

10.6 Safeguards for regulator-run student feedback

Student feedback should be collected centrally but interpreted conservatively. Public reporting should use minimum-response thresholds, rolling aggregates and domain-level scores rather than league tables. The regulator should monitor demographic and course-level bias. Raw comments should not be published. Feedback can trigger inquiry or development, but no single semester's score should independently determine dismissal, title or Teaching Defence outcome.

10.7 Safeguards against centralised bureaucracy

The NTR becomes a failure if every routine activity requires manual permission from Islamabad or a provincial capital. The system should therefore use rules-based automatic clearance for compliant transactions and reserve human regulatory review for exceptions, red flags and high-consequence decisions. Institutions may run unapproved development activities freely; they simply cannot claim regulatory competence credit for them. The objective is visibility and assurance, not micromanagement.

ACTION AGENDA

11. Policy Recommendations

What should change first

No.	Recommendation
1	HEC should commission a National Teaching Registry pilot for all faculty in participating HEIs and define a common educator data standard capable of later federation with provincial school-teacher systems.
2	Provincial education authorities, coordinated nationally through MoFEPT/IPEMC, should design the school-teacher layer rather than creating a constitutionally unrealistic single federal school regulator.
3	HEC should move Teacher Evaluation by Student for pilot universities from institution-controlled collection to regulator-controlled collection, with protected anonymity and limited public aggregate reporting.
4	No participating institution should call a candidate for substantive teaching interview without an active Teaching Suitability Clearance generated through the NTR.
5	Long-term university faculty appointments should use external-majority boards and credential-blind teaching auditions, with at least one external assessor allocated by the regulator.
6	New entrants should receive 12-month Provisional Teaching Authority and must pass observed practice before full confirmation.
7	Any professional-development activity claimed for regulatory credit

	should require an approved need case, approved educator developer, named participants, independent assessment, remediation and capability closure. Attendance alone should receive no competence credit.
8	Teaching authority should expire every five years unless renewed through an external Teaching Defence.
9	Employment grade and academic distinction should be governed separately but within one reform: salary can progress for service and responsibility, while Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor are conferred by external-majority distinction boards based on contribution and achievement.
10	Every material administrative or non-teaching assignment to faculty should be recorded in the NTR Workload Delegation Ledger and acknowledged by the educator.
11	Every participating institution should file an Annual Academic Delivery Plan at least 120 days before the next academic year, naming courses, electives, instructors, loads, planned hires, visiting faculty and regulatory-credit development activity.
12	Regulatory review should use live NTR data and random sampling rather than treating photographs, attendance folders and institution-selected showcase cases as primary evidence.
13	Academic leadership roles such as HoD and Dean should have fixed three-year terms, renewable once after external review. A universal private-sector retirement age should not be introduced as a substitute for actual fitness assessment.

If Intelligence Lens had to reduce the entire paper to three immediate moves, they would be: build the National Teaching Registry, move entry and student feedback transactions into regulator-controlled workflows, and use the resulting record to govern training and five-year revalidation. Once the data layer exists, the other reforms become enforceable rather than aspirational.

FINAL PROPOSITION

Conclusion

Pakistan does not need another statement declaring teachers important. It needs institutional mechanisms that behave as though teachers are important.

If teaching is one of the most influential forms of professional authority in society, then the evidentiary threshold for receiving and retaining that authority should be commensurate with its consequences. A degree should open the door to assessment. It should not finish the assessment. A training room should create an opportunity to learn. It should not guarantee a competence certificate. Years of service should create experience. They should not automatically create distinction. A PhD should be respected for what it evidences. It should not be used to answer questions it was never designed to answer.

The proposal in this white paper is therefore not “more teacher training”. It is a change in the operating logic and information architecture of the profession: from institution-held files to a regulator-owned National Teaching Registry; from trust by credential to trust by evidence; from internal discretion to controlled externality; from institution-run feedback to regulator-run learner voice; from permanent status to renewable authority; from attendance to capability closure; from invisible administrative burden to logged delegation; and from retrospective academic administration to forward, course-level planning.

“Professional authority in teaching should not disappear into an institutional file. It should be visible, verifiable and periodically justified.”

That principle is demanding. It is also proportionate to the responsibility society gives an educator every time a child or young adult enters a classroom.

SELECTED SOURCES

References

- Cambridge, 2026a.** University of Cambridge. Academic Career Pathways overview, including Research and Teaching, Teaching and Scholarship, and Research pathways. <https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/academic-career-pathways-acp-overview>
- Cambridge, 2026b.** University of Cambridge. Guidance for Referees, Academic Career Pathways Promotion to Grades 10 to 12, including committee levels and internal/external references. <https://www.acp.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/academic-career-pathways-promotion-grades-10-12/guidance-referees>
- DfE, 2024.** UK Department for Education. Leading Teacher Development National Professional Qualification. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/leading-teacher-development-national-professional-qualification>
- Fitriyah et al., 2023.** Fitriyah, I. et al. Broad vs. narrow traits: a scoping review of measuring personality traits in teacher selection using the situational judgment test. *Frontiers in Psychology* / PubMed. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37842695/>
- GMC, 2026.** General Medical Council. Revalidation guidance, including annual appraisal and revalidation normally every five years. <https://www.gmc-uk.org/registration-and-licensing/managing-your-registration/revalidation/what-is-revalidation>
- HEC, 2023.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Graduate Education Policy 2023 and related provisions for external evaluation and relevance assessment. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/policies/Pages/GEP.aspx>
- HEC, 2025.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan. HEC Launches Nationwide Quality Review of MS/MPhil and PhD Programmes, 13 December 2025. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/news/Pages/HEC-Launches-Nationwide-Quality-Review.aspx>
- HEC, 2026a.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Eligibility conditions for appointment of faculty in all disciplines excluding specified professional disciplines, current document surfaced in 2026. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/universities/QA/Documents/All%20Disciplines%20Excluding%20Engineering%2C%20IT%2C%20Medical%2C%20Law%20and%20Arts%20and%20Design.pdf>
- HEC, 2026b.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Tenure Track System guidelines and external Technical Review Panel requirements. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/universities/tts/Pages/default.aspx>
- HEC, 2026c.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan, National Academy of Higher Education. Interim Placement of Fresh PhDs Professional Development Program. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/NAHE/IPFP-Trainings/Pages/default.aspx>
- HEC, 2026d.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan, National Academy of Higher Education. IPFP Phase-II Training Program Outcomes. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/NAHE/IPFP-Trainings/Pages/Program-Outcomes.aspx>
- HEC, 2026e.** Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Policy Guidelines for Appointment of Professor of Practice by HEIs in Pakistan. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/policies/Pages/Guidelines-APP.aspx>
- Klassen and Kim, 2019.** Klassen, R. M. and Kim, L. E. Selecting teachers and prospective teachers: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 26, 32-51. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X18302173>
- NACTE, 2026.** National Accreditation Council for Teacher Education Pakistan. Revised National Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs, effective for requests received from 1 January 2026. <https://www.nacte.org.pk/Documents>
- OECD, 2025a.** OECD. Results from TALIS 2024, The Demands of Teaching. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/results-from-talis-2024_90df6235-en/full-report/the-demands-of-teaching_0e941e2f.html
- OECD, 2025b.** OECD. Results from TALIS 2024, Developing Teacher Expertise. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/results-from-talis-2024_90df6235-en/full-report/developing-teacher-expertise_f95ff343.html
- Stanford, 2026.** Stanford University. Faculty Handbook, Chapter 2, Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions in the Professoriate, updated January 2026. <https://facultyhandbook.stanford.edu/index/chapter-2-appointments-reappointments-and-promotions-professoriate>

STEDA, 2023. Sindh Teacher Education Development Authority. Teaching Licence Policy, Sindh 2023.

<https://steda.gos.pk/tlicense.aspx>

UCOP, 2025. University of California Office of the President. Academic Personnel Manual APM 210, Review and Appraisal Committees, revised October 2025.

https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-210.pdf

UNESCO, 2024. UNESCO. AI Competency Framework for Teachers. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers?hub=365>

Civil Servants Act 1973. Pakistan Code, section 13, retirement on completion of the sixtieth year where no earlier direction applies. <https://www.pakistancode.gov.pk/>

DfE, 2025. Department for Education, England. Check a teacher's record, including QTS, induction, professional qualifications and sanctions. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/check-a-teachers-record>

GTC Scotland, 2026. Search the Register, public teacher-registration and Fitness to Teach status. <https://mygtcs.gtcs.org.uk/home/search-the-register-public.aspx>

HEC Annual Report 2023-24. Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Description of TTS and the 2022 change under which university statutory bodies determine TTS appointments, tenure and promotions without subsequent HEC endorsement. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/AnnualReports/Annual-Report-2023-24.pdf>

HEC Approved Supervisors. Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Search engine and notice that the separate HEC Approved Supervisor designation was discontinued after the Graduate Education Policy 2023. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/scholarshipsgrants/ASA/Pages/APS-EPORTAL.aspx>

HEC HES, 2026. Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Higher Education Statistics data collection and institutional focal persons. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/universities/hes/Pages/HEIs-FP-2026.aspx>

HEC IPE, 2026. Higher Education Commission Pakistan, Institutional Performance Evaluation Manual, faculty evaluation and student course evaluation questions.

<https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/universities/QAA/Documents/IPES%20Manual%20for%20Universities%2011%20standards.pdf>

HEC QAA, 2024-25. Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Targets for Quality Enhancement Cells, requiring online Course Evaluation by Student and Teacher Evaluation by Student surveys and analysis. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/services/universities/QAA/Documents/Targets%20for%20QECs%20for%20the%20assessment%20year%202024-25.pdf>

MoFEPT, 2026. Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. Federal Secretary message noting that after the 18th Amendment the Ministry is directly responsible for education services in Islamabad Capital Territory and plays a coordination role among federating units. <https://www.mofept.gov.pk/>

NSW NESA, 2026. New South Wales Education Standards Authority. Public Register of Teachers, confirming active teacher accreditation. <https://www.nsw.gov.au/education-and-training/nesa/teacher-accreditation/resources/find-a-teacher/public-register-of-teachers>

Quansah, F. et al., 2024. Validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 9.

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2024.1329734/full>

Stoesz, B. M. et al., 2022. Bias in Student Ratings of Instruction: A Systematic Review of Research from 2012 to 2021. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*.

<https://journalhosting.ualgary.ca/index.php/cjeap/article/view/73769>

HEC, 2026f. Higher Education Commission Pakistan. National Skills Competency Test 2026, Result and University-Wise Performance. The test assessed 33,000+ computing students across 165 centres in 112 cities. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/HECAnnouncements/Pages/NSCT-Result.aspx>

HEC, 2026g. Higher Education Commission Pakistan. Higher Education Reforms Underway to Strengthen Sector, Says Chairman HEC, 20 May 2026. Governance, digital transformation, accreditation and national assessment reforms. <https://www.hec.gov.pk/english/news/news/Pages/Higher-Education-Reforms-Underway-to-Strengthen-Sector%2C-Says-Chairman-HEC-.aspx>

MoFEPT, 2026b. Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. Quality Education and Innovation Roadmap 2026, Islamabad Capital Territory, including teacher capacity, measurable outcomes, data-driven governance and digital innovation.

<https://www.mofept.gov.pk/SiteImage/Policy/Final%20Quality%20Education%20Roadmap-2026.pdf>

OECD, 2025c. OECD. Empowering the Workforce in the Context of a Skills-First Approach, including discussion of moving beyond qualifications and job titles as complete proxies for capability.

https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/empowering-the-workforce-in-the-context-of-a-skills-first-approach_345b6528-en.html

Note on evidence and interpretation

This white paper distinguishes current requirements from Intelligence Lens proposals. The National Teaching Registry, regulator-run feedback history, Workload Delegation Ledger, Annual Academic Delivery Plan, integrated hiring and training workflows, panel compositions and pilot thresholds are design recommendations for testing, not statements of existing Pakistani law or universal international standards. Its claimed contribution is the integration of these functions into one regulator-owned educator assurance system, not the claim that every individual function is unprecedented.

INTELLIGENCE LENS

REBUILDING THE TEACHING PROFESSION

A national teaching registry and assurance architecture for Pakistan's schools and universities

White Paper | Version 1.0 | August 2026 | Pakistan