

[PRC RESOLUTION NO. 628, S. 1999, September 13, 1999]

LIFTING OF THE ORDER OF DEBARMENT OF EXAMINEES FOUND TO HAVE COMMITTED IRREGULARITIES IN THE OCTOBER, 1993 LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS FOR ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS AND MASTER ELECTRICIANS

WHEREAS, the examination papers of the examinees in the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examinations who were found to have committed irregularities by violating the rule on anonymity in licensure examinations were cancelled and said examinees were also debarred from taking future licensure examinations in Resolution No. 96-466 dated December 12, 1996.

WHEREAS, while a number of debarred examinees filed their petitions/motions for reconsideration on Resolution No. 96-466, s. 1996, said Resolution has already become final when said petitions/motions were filed.

WHEREAS, through their petitions/motions for reconsideration, several examinees confessed their guilt and accepted their participation in the irregularities during the 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examinations.

WHEREAS, the Chairman and Members of the Board of Electrical Engineering, in their letter to the Chairman and Members of the Commission dated August 30, 1999, interceding in behalf of the examinees, requested the Commission, as an act of compassion, to lift the debarment order of the said examinees from taking future licensure examinations pointing out that the period of more than five (5) years is more than enough for them to suffer the consequences of their misdemeanor and that the talents of these debarred examinees will be wasted unless they will be allowed to take licensure examinations for electrical engineers and master electricians.

WHEREAS, the Commission finds merit in the grounds set forth in the petition of the Chairman and Members of the Board of Electrical Engineering for the lifting of the debarment order.

WHEREAS, the Commission resolved as it hereby RESOLVES to grant the petition of the Chairman and Members of the Board of Electrical Engineering as an exception to the strict policy of the Commission on irregularities in licensure examinations as an act of compassion to the examinees in the 1993 Electrical Engineering examinations who were found to have violated the rule on anonymity in licensure examinations. Accordingly, the Commission hereby ORDERS the lifting of the debarment order in its Resolution No. 96-466 and allows said examinees to take future licensure examinations. However, their examination papers in that examination shall remain cancelled.

In view of certain incidents peculiar only to TERRENCE A. HIMAN and LUISITO B. FORTICH, their cases shall be dealt with by the Commission separately.

SO ORDERED.

Adopted: 13 Sept. 1999

(SGD.) HERMOGENES P. POBRE
Commission Chairman

(SGD.) ALFONSO G. ABAD
(SGD.) AVELINA DE LA REA-TAN
Associate Commissioners

Attachment:

RESOLUTION NO. 96-466
December 12, 1996

FACT FINDING INVESTIGATION OF THE PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
REPORTED IRREGULARITY IN THE OCTOBER 1993 ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING
LICENSURE EXAMINATIONS

This refers to the Report of the Committee of Prosecutors created to conduct a fact-finding investigation of the persons responsible for the reported irregularity in the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination.

As a background information, during the October, 1993 licensure examination in Electrical Engineering, the Board of Electrical Engineering created under R.A. No. 184 is composed of Engr. Paul J. Woo, incumbent Chairman, and Engrs. Rafael Florentino and Baylon Tolentino, incumbent members.

The licensure examinations in Electrical Engineering were given simultaneously in the cities of Manila, Bacolod and Davao on October 22, 23 and 24, 1993.

The subjects for examination where the anomalies/irregularities were allegedly committed and the corresponding examiners are as follows:

I. Professional Electrical Engineer

- a) Mathematics — Examiner: Engr. Rafael Florentino
- b) Electrical Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo
- c) Electrical Design and Construction — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo
- d) General Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino

II. Associate Electrical Engineer

- a) Strength of Materials — Examiner: Engr. Rafael Florentino
- b) General Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino
- c) Electrical Machineries — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo

III. Assistant Electrical Engineer

- a) General Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino
- b) Electrical Engineering — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo
- c) Mathematics — Examiner: Engr. Rafael Florentino

IV. Master Electrician

- a) Application of Ohm's Law — Examiner: Engr. Baylon Tolentino
- b) Phil. Electrical Code — Examiner: Engr. Paul J. Woo

The alleged irregularity was brought to the attention of the Chairman of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in the joint letters dated May 6, 1994 and June 6, 1994 of Mr. Jose T. Prado and Ms. Priscilla C. Reyes, both of the PRC, pointing out their observations on the answer sheets of a number of -examinees in the said licensure examination as follows:

1. Rampant questionable erasures of shaded answer blocks, a clear violation of instruction to examinees that erasures are not allowed.
2. Shaded answer blocks of the answer sheets are totally different from the other shaded blocks of the same answer sheets. Indication that it was done by another person other than the examinee.
3. Two kinds of pencils of different shade and make are used in the shading of answers a departure from the officially required Mongol No. 1.
4. One answer sheet in the subject strength of materials part II was overrated.
5. Shaded blocks after erasures were made, generally revealed that answer sheets in the subjects of general engineering and electrical engineering have the same pattern of answers.
6. Concerned examinees received unusually very high grades in the subjects electrical engineering and general engineering, in contrast with the very low grades they obtained in the subject mathematics."

On the basis of the findings and observations of the employees of the Rating Division of the Commission who initially examined the answer sheets of the examinees, there are 478 examinees who appear to have been involved in the irregularity or anomaly broken down as follows:

- a) Professional Electrical Engineer 44 Examinees
- b) Associate Electrical Engineer 63 Examinees
- c) Assistant Electrical Engineer 275 Examinees
- d) Master Electrician 96 Examinees

TOTAL 478 Examinees

In view of the large number of examinees involved in the irregularity and the limited number of examinees who testified during the fact-finding investigation as shown in the Report of the Special Committee, the Commission decided to examine individually the answer sheets of all the examinees involved to determine, on the basis of the identifying marks/signs or codes written by the examinees on their answer sheets and the grades obtained, who among the said examinees were able

to establish their link or connection with the examiners and were benefited by such link or connection.

As shown in all the answer sheets, the irregularity consists of marks/signs written by the examinees on their answer sheets designed to identify themselves or disclose their identities to the examiners. These marks which are clear and visible on the answer sheets violate the Rule on Anonymity and other pertinent rules provided in the General Instructions to Examinees.

Before the adoption of full computerization in licensure examinations, the examination in a particular subject is partly computerized and partly manual. In the computerized portion, the examinee enters his answers in the answer sheets by blackening the answer box or block pertaining to the answer of his choice. The answer sheet is corrected by the computers. In the manual portion which is usually problem solving and therefore calls for computation, the examinee answers the questions in writing and his answers are corrected manually by the examiners.

A close scrutiny of the answer sheets involved in the irregularity would show that all of the answer sheets bore marks or signs that are clear and visible to the naked eyes.

The markings that generally appear on the questioned answer sheets consist of double shading or blackening of the answer blocks or boxes in the computerized portion of the examination sheet as follows:

a) Two (2) answer boxes or blocks in one number of the answer sheet are shaded or blackened such that one box or block is lightly shaded or blackened while the other box or block is blackened or shaded heavily, indicative of the fact that somebody who has access to the examination papers other than the examinee has also shaded or blackened the answer boxes of the answer sheets.

b) Two (2) answer blocks or boxes in one number of the answer sheet are shaded or blackened such that one block or box is completely shaded while the other is not completely shaded or blackened or the shading or blackening consists of a single or sometimes double strokes of the pencil used usually uneven and heavy or goes beyond the area of the box, indicative of the fact that somebody who has access to the examination papers other than the examinee has also shaded or blackened the answer blocks of the answer sheets.

Aside from the above markings, there are other marks or signs written by the examinees on their answer sheets whose obvious purpose is to identify themselves to the examiners.

Such identifying marks or signs are the following:

1. The manner by which the letter "E" was written in the answer sheet of the subject "MATHEMATICS" and the first letter "E" in the words "GENERAL", "ELECTRICAL" and "ENGINEERING" in the Professional Electrical Engineer, Assistant Electrical Engineer and Associate Electrical Engineer examinations.

In the word "MATHEMATICS", the lower horizontal line in the letter "E" is short while the upper and middle horizontal lines are longer and sometimes written closely.

The same method of writing the first letter "E" in the answer sheet of the subjects "ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING" and "GENERAL ENGINEERING" was used although at times the examinee wrote the first letter "E" of the said words heavily and the lower horizontal line is as long as the other two.

There are a total of 104 examinees who wrote the identifying mark letter "E" on their answer sheets, either in the subject "MATHEMATICS" only or in the subjects "GENERAL ENGINEERING" and "ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING" or in all of these three subjects.

2. Eight (8) examinees wrote their initials and two (2) examinees wrote their names on the answer sheets.

3. Eleven (11) examinees appear to have intentionally misspelled the word "SOLUTION" by omitting the letter "I".

4. Five (5) examinees placed or wrote dots in the box of the word "SET".

5. There are other examinees who used different kinds of identifying marks or signs such as name is written on space for subject, unnecessary computation, writing name on answer sheet, unnecessary mark/sign.

We cannot perceive of any reason or purpose why an examinee would place or write unnecessary marks or signs on his/her answer sheet/s, considering that this act is prohibited by the General Instructions to Examinees, except to identify himself to the examiner of the subject where he placed or wrote such unnecessary marks or signs in order that the examiner, upon identifying the examinee through the marks or signs, could do or perform whatever he undertook to do, presumably with valuable consideration, to make the examinee pass in his subject.

This perception or conclusion has been confirmed/substantiated by examinees who testified before the Special Committee which conducted the fact-finding investigation on the alleged irregularity.

Mr. Renato P. Maceda, an examinee in the Associate Electrical Engineering examination (ID No. 11000658) when he testified stated that there was an irregularity during the October, 1993 Electrical Engineering Licensure Examination. He admitted having written the capital letter "E" With a short bar at the bottom in the subjects "Strength of Materials", "General Engineering" and "Electrical Engineering". He likewise admitted that the letter "E" with a short bar at the bottom was given to him by Engr. Rolando Caballero for purposes of identification. He further admitted that he paid Engr. Rolando Caballero the amount of P17,500.00 the night before the examination.

This admission has been corroborated by Mr. Lemuel D. Cacdac, Mr. Arsenio M. Estrada and Mr. Graciano T. Pata, all examinees in Assistant Electrical Engineering.

In his letter dated January 25, 1995, Mr. Cacdac stated as follows:

"I admit that I had done something wrong during the said exam. I promised to pay him, Engr. Aquino and Engr. Evaristo if I pass the