

Teacher Reclassification: *De Jure or De Facto, Ex Post Facto*

Edilmar P. Masuhay
Surigao State College of Technology
Surigao City

Abstract:- The study traced issues on Teachers Reclassification thru gathering previous articles, documents, decrees, etc., displayed logical interpretation that the program constitutes total privilege for Teachers salary enhancement and satisfaction. Though, guidelines jeopardized those faculty beyond the borderline, in lieu of First, the clerical error of records inversely reciprocated resulted in impartiality. Second, the precedence on giving appointments higher than the prescribed demarcation to some none masters ruined the norms of equal protection and opportunity. Third, the essence of points allocation has outwitted the Teachers though qualified yet are none masters and doctorate degree holder.

Keywords:- NBC No. 461; Teachers Qualification Standards; CCE & QCE Guidelines.

I. INTRODUCTION

By prima facie the Constitutional mandates were constructively altered by promulgations but warrant a different procedure against the main objective specified therein under Sec. 1, Article 3, of the 1987 Philippine Constitution, which says that “Every Filipinos has the right to equal protection and opportunity”.

Teachers of the Philippines were categorized based on the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) National Budget Circular (NBC) No. 461 thru point’s allocation enclosed in section 3.0 of the NBC No. 461, June 1, 1998, (see Table 1 under Appendices) and with a prerequisite requirements equivalency itemized in the Qualitative Contribution Evaluation (QCE) of NBC No. 461 (see Table 2 under Appendices).

Leading agencies in the educational system were sanction to function and add on resolution de facto for Teachers reclassification.

However, this decree led disparities and adversely affected some of the Teachers being demarcated due to none masters and none doctorate degree holder. In fact, Teachers who were affected tried to persuade that they’re qualified for the next promotional rank and appointment though there point’s allocation excessively abundance but to some extent policies hinder the purpose, but then some were very fortunate to be appointed to the next higher tenure with reciprocated results due to clerical error. This scenario create conflicting arguments over the other especially those who experienced biases.

➤ Objectives of the Study

This study could recommends to eradicate discrimination in contrary to Teacher reclassification under DBM NBC No. 461 if not at least change its practices for improvements. Nevertheless, the study designed to *describe on how DBM NBC 461 impacted the life of Teachers*. Specifically, the study wishes to answer the following questions:

- If Teacher’s *QS* still classified, what make sense of the point’s allocation?
- How NBC 461 helped teachers be more productive, if they’re prejudices’ by a decree?
- Where to sanctions grievances against biased judgment, if policies were promulgated by authorities in the system?
- Who took the advantage, if mediocre and less fortunate were discriminated?
- Why constitution criterion were possibly altered by promulgations, as it was the precedence that all-state or organization is governed?

➤ Theoretical framework

The study employs exploratory and confirmatory research methods that traces on how Teachers were subjectively reclassified by the Points Allocation set by DBM NBC No. 461. And on how CSC *QS* integral to PASUC and CHED promulgations impacted the life of Teachers. This study adopts a structured paradigm of J.W. Turkey of his renowned work which is called the Exploratory and Confirmatory approaches. Concept of the study based on J.W. Turkey design with emphasis to “Finding the questions is often more important than finding the answer”. (Exploratory vs Confirmatory Research n.d.).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines were once exempted from the coverage of the National Position Classification and Compensation Plans which defines the manner by which government employees in the country will have to be remunerated based on a standard scale. SUCS have different schemes in upgrading the positions of the faculty which gave rise to disparities in pay and compensation among similar comparable positions. These disparities led to demoralization and contentious disagreement among the ranks of the faculty members. There are issues regarding the fairness and equity in compensation among faculty members in academic institutions, which resulted to dissension and dissatisfaction of those faculty under disproportions of subjective professional qualification requirements and inimical to sound public administration (“Facts About NBC 461,” n.d.).

Cited issues above were consonant to *jurisprudence* (Equal Pay for Equal Work | Philippine Labor Laws n.d.). The State emphasized that “person who work with substantially equal qualification, skill, effort and responsibility, under conditions, should be paid similar salaries,” This explains further that if an employer accords employees the same position and rank, the presumption is that these employees perform equal work” as “borne by logic and human experience. “ The ramification is that “if an employer pays one employee less than the rest, it is not for the employee to explain why he receives less or why the others receive more. That would be adding insult to injury. The employer has discriminated against the employee, it is for the employer to explain why the employee is treated unfairly. (International School Alliance of educators v. Quisumbing et al, G.R. No. 128845, June 1, 2000.)

But then, an evolution of the standardization and classification system were deliberated by a decree under Chapter 7 of the Position Classification and Compensation Scheme for Faculty Positions in State Universities and Colleges. Prior to the issuance of PD No. 985, State Universities Position (SUCs) which were exempted from coverage of the National Position Classification and Compensation Plans adopted individual staff credentials and qualifications, position classification and pay plans. The disparities in pay and compensation among the similar comparable positions brought about by the different schemes adopted by the various SUCs gave rise to demoralization and dissention among the ranks of faculty members and further complicated the process of compensation administration in SUCs. When the SUCS were placed within the ambit of PD No. 985, the need to rationalize the academic ranks/salaries/advancement of faculty evaluation instruments. As early as 1982, the Philippine Association of State Universities and Colleges (PASUC), together with the DBM, started deliberating on a scheme of upgrading/promoting qualified and deserving faculty members through a process of objective evaluation. This paved the way to the development and adoption of a Common Criteria for Evaluation (CCE) across programs and disciplines which aimed to rationalize academic ranks and salaries. (National Compensation Circular No. 33, issued January 22, 1985 with retroactive effect on July 1, 1984.) (Veloso n.d.)

III. METHODOLOGY

The study is exploratory and confirmatory in nature, research sample were done by means of gathering scholarly articles, decrees, and documents correlated to the previous priority issues. Practical and critical analysis beyond the expertise of the author has its emphasis in analyzing the data. Stressed by Prado, N.P., et.al as cited by Best and Kahn (1998), this research doesn't need any Statistical analysis hence it only a data presentation of the previous events concerning a priority issues to resolve with. Nevertheless, logical interpretation were made possible based of the findings and results of the collated scholarly articles and emphases of gathered decree and facts on DBM NBC No. 461 for Teachers Reclassification.

IV. FINDINGS

DBM NBC No. 461 for Teachers Reclassification were modified by PASUC and CHED thru decree under CCE and QCE guidelines integral to CSC Qualification Standards for Teachers (see Appendix A). Which resulted to:

- None masters demarcated only up to Assistant Professor I;
- None Doctorate demarcated only up to Associate Professor V;
- Faculty with Doctorate degree but no published article demarcated only up to Associate Professor V;
- Among the four core value: Instruction, Research, Production and Extension. Instruction with emphasis to academic enhancement are priori as prerequisite among the rest of the core value. This give favor to those teacher with inclination to academic enhancement; and
- Demarcated faculty with dedication in Research, Production and Extension but unfortunate to proceed to Academic endeavor due to some extent reasons. Hence, points allocations is pending until completely finished their masters' studies and doctorate degrees prior their appointments higher than Assistant Professor II and Professorship respectively.

V. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The study by *prima facie ex post facto* described that NBC 461 impacted the life of Teachers wherein majority of the Teachers who obtained points allocations and with master's degree and doctoral degree reclassified to higher tenure of appointments based on the bracket points of allocation but delimit Teachers who are none masters or none doctorate degree.

Teachers reclassification burdens those faculty under pressured especially the less fortunate who were monetarily constraint, the teachers who were belongs to average level of IQ (mediocre) or with different line of interest divergent to academe. The guidelines were inclined to young teachers who were very able to proceed their masters and doctorate studies. Actual scenarios showcase: Teachers though none masters holder can be appointed to Instructor I up to Assistant Professor I but cannot be appointed to any higher position; Teachers with master's degree but none doctoral degree holder his promotional appointment shall be only up to Associate Professor V; in effect points allocation are not effective nevertheless the Teachers should first finish his masters studies and doctorate studies.

On the other hand, results of disparities led to demoralization and contentious disagreement among the ranks of the faculty members. There are issues regarding the fairness and equity in compensation among faculty members in academic institutions, which resulted to dissension and dissatisfaction of those faculty under disproportions of subjective professional qualification requirements and inimical to sound public administration. This revelation were probably experienced by some faculty affected adversely due to qualification standards being none master's degree holder though obtained the Points Allocations equivalency under DBM NBC No. 461 QS but prolific to fortunate one who holds positions though his points allocation were reciprocal to his promotional appointment.

Specifically, the study serve its objectives to answer those hypothetical questions stipulated therein:

- Noted that Points Allocation were subjective to the guidelines conditions. By Common sense, this prejudices faculty under pressured by situations, the mediocre and the less fortunate. Hence, Academic enhancement over the other criterion serve to be the priority from the list before point's allocation were accounted for.
- DBM NBC No. 461 were very constructive to help the Teachers in abundance but then, hierarchy in the system plotted to enhance the qualification standards that burdens the stumpy and advantageous to wanton.
- Definitely, there were those who are in agony from thereon as victims of biases judgment due to *de facto* but then, doesn't know where to go for a grievance, because the constitutions were altered only by promulgations.
- The system were indirectly politically motivated as observed, chances were goes most frequently to those who are interested to academic enhancement. And denial to faculty who are none masters and doctorate degree with inclination only to research, production and extension.
- Due to previous issues related Teachers reclassification line agencies took actions to resolve the problems and built new programs to constitute faculty satisfaction thru DBM NBC No. 461 but then recipients sub-agencies by their heads plotted guidelines to maneuver that led again to disparities.

VI. CONCLUSION

“The Teacher’s Reclassification procedurally prolific though discriminant among to less fortunate” Findings evidently convinced that logically DBM NBC No. 461 for Teacher Qualification Standards constructively constitute total privilege for the Teachers. However, professional expectancies barter to deprive the rights of faculty behind the borderline. Eventually, the study lead to resolve issues on discrimination, the essence is humanitarian, and the purpose is for equal protection and opportunity. Content analysis has its revelations that there were three (3) main factors that derailed Teachers’ reclassification guidelines: *First*, the clerical error of records inversely reciprocated resulted to impartiality. *Second*, the precedence on giving appointments prescribed demarcation to none masters and none doctorate degree holder ruined the norms of equal protection and opportunity. *Third*, the essence of points allocation were outwitted for none master’s and none doctorate degree holder but prolific to faculty with educational advancement. The results of the study illustrates “with guts, with glory” as is was on emphasis that “the wealthy, seems to be the wealthiest”.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

This is to give prestige and honor of the Commission who are in one way or another longing for the salary enhancement and satisfactions of the Teachers. By de jure DBM NBC No. 461 is a common privilege for all the Teachers but then, integral guidelines barter its purpose for quality education. Actually, point’s allocation brings satisfactions to all the Teachers in all level of education. Thus, it is wise to impose fairness, nor by discretion and the imposition of demarcation. It is therefore significant if a separate confirmatory research on DBM NBC No. 461 for Teachers reclassification previous cycle’s findings should be look over, for retroactive resolutions to regain uprightness. Thru this publication chances would be at stake to bring forth the message therein, it could be much better to resolve issues concerning biases on reclassification. And to eradicate conditions on the guidelines that negates the essence of point’s allocation, if this could be realize disparities can be eliminated.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Facts About NBC 461 N.d.<https://income-wages-earning-power.knoji.com/facts-about-nbc-461/>, accessed November 23, 2018.
- [2]. www.scribd.com/doc/122520170/Manual-QCE-of-NBC-461.
- [3]. Equal Pay for Equal Work | Philippine Labor Laws N.d.<http://www.laborlaw.usc-law.org/2010/12/13/equal-pay-for-equal-work/>, accessed November 24, 2018.
- [4]. Chapter – 7 DBM. <https://www.dbm.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Manual-on-PCC-Chapter-7.pdf>
- [5]. Exploratory vs. Confirmatory Research N.d. Auto Discovery Automatic Intelligent Exploratory Data Analysis Software. <http://www.butlerscientifics.com/single-post/2014/10/08/Exploratory-vs-Confirmatory-Research>, accessed November 26, 2018.

- [6]. Veloso, Aaron N.d.Towards Enhancing the Merit Systems in Public Higher Education: A Research on the Development of a Career System for State Universities and Colleges.

https://www.academia.edu/24657471/Towards_Enhancing_the_Merit_Systems_in_Public_Higher_Education_A_Research_on_the_Development_of_a_Career_System_for_State_Universities_and_Colleges, accessed November 28, 2018.

- [7]. Prado, N.I., et.al. (2011).Methods of Research, page 142.

APPENDICES

Faculty Rank	Sub-Rank	Salary Grade	Point Bracket
Instructor	I	12	65 below
	II	13	66-76
	III	14	77-87
Assistant Professor	I	15	88-96
	II	16	97-105
	III	17	106-114
	IV	18	115-123
Associate Professor	I	19	124-130
	II	20	131-137
	III	21	138-144
	IV	22	145-151
	V	23	152-158
Professor	I	24	159-164
	II	25	165-170
	III	26	171-176
	IV	27	177-182
	V	28	183-188
	VI	29	189-194
College University Professor		30	195-200

Table 1:- Points Allocation of the Department Budget and Management, Common Criteria Evaluation of NBC 461, s. 1998

Source:- (NBC-No.Pdf n.d.). National Budget Circular No. 461, <https://int.search.myway.com/search/GGmain.jhtml>.

SUB RANK		MINIMUM POINTS
Instructor	II	80
	III	82
Assistant Professor	I	84
	II	86
	III	88
Associate Professor	IV	90
	I	91
	II	92
	III	93
	IV	94
	V	95

Table 2:- QCE Minimum points prerequisite-equivalency of CCE for Teachers Qualification Standards, NBC No. 461.

Source: <https://www.scribd.com/doc/122520170/Manual-QCE-of-NBC-461>

APPENDIX A

❖ CCE and QCE Guidelines

CCE and QCE guidelines under section IV, V, VI, and VII of the Implementing Guidelines for National Compensation Circular, constitute to regulate conditions to jeopardize none masters and doctorate teachers to be reclassified to the higher position, beneath:

A. Appointment to the Higher Sub-Rank of the Instructor and the Assistant Professor Positions

➤ Appointment to the position of Instructor II and Assistant Professor IV be subject to the following requirements:

- CCE points of at least 66 points for the higher sub-rank of the Instructor position and at least 88 points for the Assistant Professor position.
- Earned MA degree for Assistant Professor II or IV.

- Qualitative contributions in instruction, otherwise known as Teaching Effectiveness. Annex includes the standards and guidelines for the appropriate evaluation of the same.

B. Appointment to the Position of Associate Professor

➤ Appointment to the position of Associate Professor shall be subject to the following requirements:

- CCE points of at least 124
- Earned MA degree
- Qualitative contributions in instruction, extension and production. (Must have contributed significantly in at least two of the four functional areas.)

C. Appointment to the Position of Professor

➤ Appointment to the position of professor shall be subject to the following requirements:

- CCE points of at least 159
- Earned doctorate for professor 4 to 6.
- Qualitative contribution in instruction, research, extension and production. (Must have at least three of the four functional areas.)
- In cases where a doctorate is not normally part of career preparation, or where such doctoral program is rare, the doctorate requirement may be waived provided that the candidate has an appropriate master's degree, has at least 159 CCE points (including educational qualification) and has earned at least 20 points in the following areas;
 - ✓ Books, monographs, compendiums, and major bodies of published work scientific articles in publications of international circulation, and other works in similar nature
 - ✓ Discoveries, inventions and other significant original contributions
 - ✓ Research recommendations transformed to public policy benefitting the country
 - ✓ Supervision, tutoring, or coaching of graduate scientists and technologies
 - ✓ Research results applied or utilized in industrial and/or commercial projects or undertaking.

- Accreditation by a committee of experts duly constituted by PASUC for candidates entering the rank for the first time. N. B. The members of the accreditation committee are recognized experts in the area of specialization of the faculty applying for accreditation. An applicant who fails in the accreditation process shall be appointed to the position of Associate Professor 5.

➤ Limitations

- Quota – 20% of the total number of the faculty positions
- The rank is not applied in TESDA and CHED supervised schools except those offering graduate programs

D. Appointment to the Position of College and University Professor

➤ Coverage

The following are deemed qualified for entitlement to appointment as College Professor and University Professor.

- Deserving faculty members occupying Professor position duly accredited by the PASUC Accreditation Committee who have complied satisfactorily with all the requirements stated in the Part V hereof.
- SUC/CHED/TESDA executives who opt to receive their basic salary pertaining to their assigned academic rank

under the CCE, provided that they complied with the requirement mentioned under part V hereof and those who opt to return to the academic due to their resignation/retirement, not for cause before the expiration of their fixed terms of office.

➤ Requirements:

- CCE Points
- ✓ University Professor 198-200
- ✓ College Professor 195-197

- Earned Doctorate
- A pass from a screening committee duly constituted by PASUC
- Professional accreditation in case of the faculty
- Qualitative contributions in instruction, research, extension and production. (Must have at least 3 out of 4). N.B. A candidate who fails to satisfy all the requirements shall be appointed to the position of Professor 6.

➤ Limitation

- Only one (1) position of College Professor per College, shall be authorized for every six (6) years, the total of which shall not exceed the number of authorized colleges and external campuses of the respective SUC/CHED-Supervised and TESDA Schools.
- Only one (1) position of University Professor per University shall be authorized for every six (6) years, the total of which shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the total number of accredited full professor in the University concerned.

➤ Mechanics and process

Upon recommendation by the institution head concerned, all candidates for the rank of College Professor and University Professor shall undergo screening by an independent body, to be organized by PASUC.

➤ Qualifications for Accreditation as College/University Professor

- He must be an outstanding scholar and scientist shown in the quality of his publications and researches in his principal field of study and in allied fields, or he must have manifested performance of his executive leadership role.
- He must have expert knowledge in one field or division and familiar with at least one other subject within another division.
- He must be known for intellectual maturity and objectivity in his judgment.
- He must have a high reputation among his colleagues and other scholars for his mastery of the subject of his specialization. Recognition and esteem could be manifested in any of the following ways:
 - ✓ His contribution to the advancement of his field of specialization are recognized by colleagues, here and abroad.
 - ✓ He is published in the most respected learned journals in his field of specialization.
 - ✓ His works are widely acclaimed and provoke spirited discussions among scholars, often from various disciplines.
 - ✓ He is often invited to other universities and scholarly gatherings for the originality of his thoughts.
 - ✓ He is accorded various forms of honors (awards, chairs, titles, etc.).