

MAJOR REQUIREMENT #2 (Group 2)

Submitted by: Ayella Czarina Cariño

CASE #1

Executive Summary

Mr. Reyes, an education graduate, feels disappointed that he cannot yet apply to teach in a public school because he lacks eligibility. This situation is explained by Republic Act No. 7836, or the Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994, which requires all teachers to pass the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) before they can practice the profession.

Key Issues & Legal Basis

The issue centers on the requirement for teacher eligibility. Under RA 7836, passing the LET is mandatory to ensure that teachers are qualified and competent. This law upholds Article XIV of the 1987 Constitution, which promotes quality education by ensuring that only licensed teachers serve in schools.

Analysis and Evaluation

Requiring licensure protects students and upholds the standards of the teaching profession. However, graduates like Mr. Reyes often face challenges such as financial limitations, lack of review opportunities, or limited guidance after graduation. Schools and government agencies should help bridge these gaps by offering support programs, LET review assistance, and mentorship for aspiring teachers.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Mr. Reyes's case shows the importance of maintaining high standards for teachers through licensure. While RA 7836 ensures quality and professionalism, it also reminds institutions and the government to guide and support new graduates so they can become eligible and confident educators who contribute meaningfully to the country's education system.

CASE #2

Executive Summary

A teacher was accused of administrative misconduct, and the newly appointed school official handling the case is unfamiliar with the proper process. Both parties must comply with DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2004 and DepEd Order No. 49, s. 2006, which outlines the correct procedures for filing, investigating, and resolving administrative complaints. These are consistent with the 1987 Constitution, Article III, Section 1 and Republic Act No. 6713, ensuring due process and ethical conduct in public service.

Key Issues & Legal Basis

The issue focuses on due process and adherence to DepEd administrative procedures. Under DepEd Orders No. 35 and 49, complaints must be written, verified, and supported by evidence before any formal investigation. The teacher must also be informed of the charges and allowed to respond. These safeguard fairness and accountability in accordance with R.A. 6713 and constitutional due process.

Analysis & Evaluation

Following proper procedure ensures fairness and prevents abuse of authority. Hence, the school official should consult the Schools Division Office (SDO) or DepEd Legal Service for guidance, while the teacher should respond formally and exercise their right to due process.

Conclusion & Recommendations

Both parties must observe DepEd's established rules to ensure transparency and fairness. The school official should review DepEd Orders No. 35 and 49, coordinate with the SDO Legal Office, and the teacher must cooperate and assert their rights. Observing due process promotes professionalism and public trust in the education system.

CASE #3

Executive Summary

A teacher has an existing unpaid loan from a lending company and failed to respond to several demand letters. Consequently, the company threatened to file for the revocation of the teacher's professional license.

Key Issues & Legal Basis

The issue focuses on whether the non-payment of personal debts can be a valid ground for the revocation of a teacher's professional license. It examines if such financial delinquency constitutes a violation under the laws and regulations governing the teaching profession in the Philippines.

Analysis & Evaluation

Under Republic Act No. 7836, particularly Section 23, a teacher's license may only be revoked for immoral, unprofessional, or dishonorable conduct, incompetence, or gross negligence. Unpaid debts are civil matters governed by the Civil Code of the Philippines (Articles 1156–1159) and do not constitute professional misconduct. Thus, the lending company's threat has no legal basis under PRC regulations.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Revoking a teacher's license due to unpaid debts is not valid under R.A. 7836. It is recommended that the teacher seek financial counseling and attend financial literacy programs to manage future obligations responsibly./

CASE #4

Executive Summary

The teacher-in-charge was not present at the time when a student suffered chemical burns after an acid spilled on her arm during a laboratory experiment. The parents seek to determine whether the teacher and the school can be held liable for the expenses and damages.

Key Issues and Legal Basis

The issue is whether the teacher's absence constitutes negligence and if the school is vicariously liable, considering teachers' and schools' parental responsibility (in loco parentis) and who bears medical expenses. Under Article 2176 of the Civil Code (R.A. 386), negligence causing harm requires liability, while Article 2180 holds teachers and school heads responsible for students under their supervision unless due diligence is shown. Additionally, the Family Code (E.O. 209, Arts. 218–219) grants teachers special parental authority, and R.A. 9155, Sec. 7, requires school heads to ensure a safe learning environment.

Analysis and Evaluation

The teacher's failure to supervise the laboratory activity shows negligence and a lack of due diligence. Since the teacher was not present when the accident occurred, she breached her duty of care. The school, on the other hand, may also be held vicariously liable for failing to enforce safety policies and ensuring proper supervision. Both parties share accountability: the teacher for direct negligence, and the school for institutional oversight.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The teacher and the school can both be held liable for the student's injuries. The teacher's negligence in leaving the class unsupervised and the school's lack of preventive measures violated their legal and ethical duties. However, the school should shoulder the student's medical expenses, assist the family, and enforce stricter laboratory safety policies. Simply put, teachers must always be present during experiments and participate in safety training to prevent future incidents.

References

CASE 1

Philippine Congress. (1994). *Republic Act No. 7836: Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994*. *Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1994/12/16/republic-act-no-7836/>

Republic of the Philippines. (1987). *The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines, Article XIV – Education, Science and Technology, Arts, Culture and Sports. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.*
<https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/>

CASE 2

Department of Education. (2006). *DepEd Order No. 49, s. 2006: Revised Rules of Procedure of the Department of Education in Administrative Cases.* Department of Education Philippines.
<https://www.teacherph.com/deped-administrative-cases-comprehensive-guide/>

Republic of the Philippines. (1987). *The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines, Article III – Bill of Rights.* Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
<https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/>

CASE 3

Republic Act No. 7836. (1994, December 16). *Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994.* Supreme Court E-Library. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/>

CASE #4

Republic Act No. 386. (1949). *An Act to Ordain and Institute the Civil Code of the Philippines.* Articles 2176, 2180. Retrieved from <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/53360>

Department of Education. (2012). *DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012: Policy and Guidelines on Protecting Children in School from Abuse, Violence, Exploitation, Discrimination, Bullying and Other Forms of Abuse.* Retrieved from https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/DO_s2012_40.pdf

Reflection:

Case 1 – Reflection

Mr. Reyes’s experience shows that the licensure requirement is not just a legal formality but a measure to maintain quality and professionalism in teaching. While R.A. 7836 protects students by ensuring only competent educators enter the profession, it also exposes the challenges that aspiring teachers face, such as financial constraints and lack of review support. This calls for greater assistance from schools and government agencies to help graduates become licensed teachers who are confident and ready to serve.

Case 2 – Reflection

This case highlights the importance of following due process in resolving administrative issues within schools. DepEd Orders No. 35 and 49 ensure fairness, transparency, and respect for both teachers and administrators. When procedures are followed, it prevents abuse of authority and builds trust in the system. School leaders must therefore be well-informed about these policies to uphold professionalism and safeguard the rights of everyone involved.

Case 3 – Reflection

The teacher’s unpaid debt illustrates that personal financial problems should not be grounds for revoking a professional license. Under R.A. 7836, license revocation only applies to moral or professional misconduct, not civil matters like debt. Still, the situation reminds teachers to practice financial responsibility, as good money management reflects integrity and reliability—qualities expected from those who serve as role models to students.

Case 4 – Reflection

The incident involving the student’s chemical burns emphasizes the teacher’s duty of care and the school’s shared accountability in ensuring safety. The teacher’s absence during the experiment reflects negligence, while the school’s lack of preventive measures also shows institutional failure. This case reinforces that teachers must always supervise students closely, especially in risky activities, and that schools must enforce strict safety protocols to protect every learner’s well-being.