

REVISED RULES ON THE CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE (CES) ELIGIBILITY

CESB RESOLUTION NO. 459, OCTOBER 8, 2002, October 08, 2002

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/6ecf9904102f/>

WHEREAS, Presidential Decree No. 1 dated September 24, 1972, created the Career Executive Service Board (CESB) to serve as the governing body of the Career Executive Service (CES) and to promulgate rules, standards, and procedures on the selection, classification, compensation and career development of members of the Career Executive Service;

WHEREAS, Section 8 Paragraphs 1(c) and 2, Chapter 2, Book V of Executive Order No. 292 expressly provides that the “third level shall cover positions in the Career Executive Service” and that “entrance to the third level shall be prescribed by the Career Executive Service Board”;

WHEREAS, Paragraph 5 (a), Article IV, Part III of the Integrated Reorganization Plan, as approved under PD No. 1 provides that “a person who meets such managerial experience and other requirements and passes such examinations, as may be prescribed by the Board, shall be included in the register of career executive eligibles”;

WHEREAS, the Board issued Circular No. 1 dated December 15, 1989 which states that “CES Eligibility shall be given to any person who meets such managerial experience and other requirements, and passes the examination prescribed by the Board”;

WHEREAS, the aforesaid circular provides for the following stages of examination for the conferment of CES eligibility, namely: the Management Aptitude Test Battery; Assessment of Managerial Capability and Competence; Validation of Performance On-the-Job and a Final Interview by a Member of the CES Board;

WHEREAS, the Board issued Resolution No. 366 dated September 11, 2001 which provides that “the Final Interview Stage of the CES Eligibility Examination process shall come before the Validation of On-The-Job Performance”;

WHEREAS, there is a need to further revise the existing CES Eligibility Examination process to make it more responsive and practicable, thus, fulfilling the Board’s mandate which is to form a continuing pool of well-selected and development oriented career administrators who shall provide competent and faithful service in the CES;

WHEREFORE, foregoing premises considered, the Board RESOLVES, as it is hereby RESOLVED, to adopt the following Revised Rules on the Career Executive Service Eligibility:

ARTICLE I

Definition of Terms

SECTION 1. Definition of Terms — For purposes of these rules the foregoing words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

- 1.1 Agency — refers to any bureau, office, commission, council, administration, board, institute, government

owned or controlled corporation with original charter, and any other unit in the national government.

1.2 Applicant — refers to a person who has signified his/her intention in writing to apply for CES Eligibility.

1.3 Career Executive Service (CES) — is a continuing pool of well-selected and development-oriented career administrators belonging to the third level of the civil service who shall provide competent and faithful service.

1.4 Career Executive Service Board (CESB) — is the governing body of the Career Executive Service, hereinafter referred to as the Board.

1.5 Career Executive Service Eligibility or CES Eligibility — is the eligibility conferred to a person who passes the four-stage CES Eligibility Examination process and meets the other requirements prescribed by the Board.

1.6 Career Executive Service Officer or CESO — refers to a Career Executive Service (CES) Eligible appointed by the President to a CES rank upon the recommendation by the Board.

1.7 Career Executive Service (CES) Positions — refer to the positions of Undersecretary, Assistant Secretary, Bureau Director, Assistant Bureau Director, Regional Director, Assistant Regional Director, Chief of Department Service and such other positions of equivalent rank, as may be identified by the Board.

1.8 Department — refers to any department in the executive branch of the government or entity having the category of a department including independent constitutional commissions and bodies.

1.9 Division Chief Level — refers to a division chief position or its equivalent in the national government or government-owned or controlled corporations as certified by the personnel officer/administrative officer of the agency based on the classification of the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) and/or the Civil Service Commission (CSC).

1.10 Management Aptitude Test Battery Accreditation — is a process by which an applicant who has taken and passed the MATB administered by the Board as entrance or qualifying examination for masteral degrees, courses, and programs, shall, after the appropriate accreditation process, be exempted from the MATB.

1.11 Managerial Experience — refers to experience obtained by a person performing the functions of at least a division chief level position in the national government or government-owned or controlled corporations, or its equivalent in the private sector, including experience in an acting or Officer-in-Charge (OIC) capacity.

ARTICLE II

Career Executive Service Eligibility

SECTION 1. Conduct of CES Eligibility Examination and Conferment of CES Eligibility as a Mandate of the Board — The Board is a government agency mandated by law to conduct the CES Eligibility Examination and to confer CES Eligibility.

SECTION 2. CES Eligibility as a Requirement for Assignment to a CES Position and Original and Promotional Appointment to a CES Rank — The CES Eligibility is an appropriate eligibility for assignment to positions in the CES.

CES Eligibility shall also be one of the requirements for original appointment of a CES Eligible to CESO Rank VI and the promotional appointment of a CESO to the next higher rank both by the President.

No person shall be recommended by the Board to the President for original or promotional appointment to CES rank unless he/she has acquired the CES Eligibility conferred by the Board.

SECTION 3. Grounds for Invalidation of Application for CES Eligibility — An applicant for CES Eligibility shall make a full disclosure to the Board of any information relevant to his/her application for CES Eligibility.

When an applicant is found to have intentionally made any false statement of material fact in the application or employed any form of deception or fraud in connection with his/her application for CES Eligibility, the Board shall invalidate such application, without prejudice to the filing of appropriate administrative and/or criminal case against the applicant concerned.

SECTION 4. CES Eligibility Examination Not Equivalent to Other Government Examinations — For purposes of assignment to CES positions or appointment to CES ranks, all other government examinations administered by agencies mandated by law to conduct government examinations shall not be equivalent to the Career Executive Service Eligibility Examination conducted by the Board.

SECTION 5. Non-Compliance with the CES Eligibility Examination Requirements — The Board, in its discretion, reserves the right to discontinue the processing of application for CES Eligibility of an applicant, who is unable to comply with the requirements established in any of the stages of the CES Eligibility Examination.

SECTION 6. Additional Requirements for Conferment of CES Eligibility — An applicant for CES Eligibility shall, in addition to the requirements prescribed by the Board, be required to submit a self-certification under oath stating that he/she has no pending administrative or criminal case.

SECTION 7. The CES Eligibility Examination Process — The four-stage CES Eligibility Examination process shall consist of the following stages:

1st stage — The Management Aptitude Test Battery (MATB);

2nd stage — The Assessment of Managerial Capability and Competence through the Assessment Center or simplify the Assessment Center;

3rd stage — The Board Interview;

4th stage — The Performance Validation On-the-Job

Successful completion of each stage is a pre-requisite to the succeeding stages of the CES Eligibility Examination process.

ARTICLE III

Management Aptitude Test Battery

SECTION 1. Management Aptitude Test Battery — The Management Aptitude Test Battery (MATB) is a paper-and-pencil test given to applicants to determine their general intelligence and knowledge of management principles.

SECTION 2. Composition of the MATB — The MATB shall consist of three (3) sub-tests, namely:

Sub-Test I

1. Error Recognition
2. Reading Comprehension
3. Information

Sub-Test II

1. Data Interpretation
2. Logical Reasoning

3. Quantitative Reasoning

Sub-Test III

1. Management Concepts and Problems

SECTION 3. Conduct of the MATB — The MATB shall be conducted by the Board through the Secretariat at least once a year or as often as may be deemed necessary on such dates as may be announced from time to time.

SECTION 4. MATB Admission Requirements — An applicant for MATB must meet the following admission requirements:

4.1 He/she must be a Filipino Citizen of good moral character;

4.2 He/she must not have reached the compulsory retirement age of 65; and

4.3 He/she must be any of the following:

4.3.1 Any person, assigned or who acts as Officer-in-Charge (OIC) of a CES position for at least six (6) months;

4.3.2 An appointee or Officer-In-Charge (OIC) of a division chief position in the government with at least three (3) years managerial experience immediately preceding the filing of the MATB application;

4.3.3 Any person appointed as permanent to a position outside the coverage of the CES, with at least three (3) years managerial experience immediately preceding the filing of the MATB application provided that the applicant concerned meets the following conditions:

4.3.3 a) He/she occupies a position equivalent to or higher than a division chief level position in the government; and

4.3.3 b) He/she shall shoulder the Assessment Center cost.

4.3.4 Any person appointed to a non-career position including those holding a co-terminous or contractual status of appointment in a department or agency of the government, with at least three (3) years managerial experience, and has served the government for the same period of time immediately preceding the filing of the MATB application; provided that the applicant concerned meets the following conditions:

4.3.4 a) He/she occupies a position equivalent to or higher than a division chief level position in the government; and

4.3.4 b) He/she shall shoulder the Assessment Center cost;

SECTION 5. Admission Requirements for Applicants from the Private Sector — An applicant from the private sector shall be allowed to take the MATB, provided that the following admission requirements are met:

5.1 He/she must be an occupant of a managerial position pursuant to the provisions of the Labor Code (Presidential Decree No. 442, as amended), and has at least three (3) years managerial experience;

5.2 He/she must express his/her request in writing to be allowed to take the MATB and have it approved by the CESB Executive Director; and

5.3 He/she shall shoulder the cost of Assessment Center.

SECTION 6. Application Form and Examination Fee — An applicant for MATB shall be required to submit to the Secretariat either personally or through mail a duly accomplished application form including the supporting documents, if there are any, and an examination fee not later than fifteen (15) days before the date of the

examination.

Application forms submitted beyond the aforementioned deadline set shall be automatically considered in the next MATB schedule provided that the applicant concerned shall be informed of his/her examination schedule.

An applicant, who fails to submit to the Secretariat the required supporting documents or examination fee upon submission of the MATB application form, may be temporarily allowed to apply in the MATB, provided that the said applicant submits such documents or pays the said examination fee before or on the date of scheduled examination. No applicant shall be allowed to take the MATB without submitting the required supporting documents or payment of the required examination fee.

SECTION 7. Grounds for Disapproval of MATB Application — The MATB application shall be disapproved if the applicant:

7.1 has been dismissed from the service for cause;

7.2 has been found guilty by final judgment of a crime involving moral turpitude or other criminal offenses where the penalty imposed by the court carries with it an accessory penalty of perpetual absolute disqualification to hold public office; and

7.3 has been found guilty of offenses relative to or in connection with the conduct of any government examination.

SECTION 8. Appeal on the Disapproval of MATB Application — An applicant, whose MATB application has been disapproved, may appeal to the Board in writing within fifteen (15) days from receipt of the Secretariat's decision disapproving his/her MATB application.

The decision of the Board en banc regarding the disapproval of a MATB application shall be final and executory, and is not subject to appeal.

SECTION 9. MATB Rating — The overall passing mark for MATB shall be at least eighty percent (80%) which shall be valid for a maximum period of three (3) years from the date of conduct of the said examination. Failure on the part of the applicant to proceed to the next stage of the CES Eligibility Examination, which is the Assessment Center, within the said three (3) year period shall prevent him/her from continuing the examination process, unless he/she retakes and passes again the MATB. An applicant shall be allowed to take the MATB only once a year subject to the rules provided in Section 10 of this article.

The Veterans Preference Rating shall not be applicable in determining the applicant's MATB score.

For purposes of determining the applicant's MATB rating, the following rules shall apply:

9.1 An applicant who obtains a rating of at least eighty percent (80%) and receives a total weighted score of at least forty-five percent (45%) in each of the three (3) MATB sub-tests shall be allowed to proceed to the next stage of the CES Eligibility Examination process, which is the Assessment Center.

9.2 An applicant who obtains a rating of at least eighty percent (80%) in the MATB but fails to meet the total weighted score of at least forty five percent (45%) in one (1) of the three (3) sub-tests fails the MATB. However, the applicant concerned shall be allowed to retake and pass only the said sub-test within one (1) year from the date of conduct of the said MATB. The Board shall allow an applicant to retake the said sub-test only once, and the score obtained therein shall be considered to be his/her final score.

9.3 An applicant who fails to meet the forty five percent (45%) total weighted score in two (2) of the three (3) MATB sub-tests fails the MATB irrespective of the MATB rating received.

SECTION 10. MATB Retake — An applicant who receives a MATB rating of fifty percent (50%) and above shall be allowed to retake the MATB within one (1) year reckoned from the date of conduct of the said examination.

An applicant who receives a MATB rating below fifty percent (50%) shall be allowed to retake the MATB after one year (1) reckoned from the date of conduct of the said examination.

An applicant who failed the MATB three (3) times shall be disqualified from taking the said examination until after five (5) years reckoned from the latest date of MATB taken.

SECTION 11. Release of MATB Results — The results of the MATB shall be released by the Secretariat within thirty (30) days from the scheduled date of the examination.

The MATB results shall be officially announced by the Secretariat through the Board's official publication. Applicants shall, likewise, be officially notified of their respective MATB ratings.

SECTION 12. Exemption from the MATB — An applicant, who took and passed the MATB administered by the Board as entrance or qualifying examination for masteral degree, courses, and programs, shall, after the appropriate accreditation process, be exempted from the MATB, provided that the following conditions are met:

12.1 The applicant obtains a passing mark in the MATB as prescribed by the Board;

12.2 The three (3) year validity of the MATB has not expired;

12.3 The applicant meets the MATB admission requirements provided in Section 4 and Section 5 of this article.

Applicants, who are exempted from the MATB as the first stage of the CES Eligibility Examination pursuant to this provision, and are interested to acquire CES Eligibility, shall be allowed to proceed to the second stage of the CES Eligibility Examination process, which is the Assessment Center.

SECTION 13. Requirements for MATB Accreditation — Applicants for MATB Accreditation shall submit to the Secretariat the following requirements:

13.1 A letter-request for MATB accreditation;

13.2 A copy of the applicant's appointment/assignment paper and service record duly certified by the personnel/administrative officer of the department, agency or office concerned.

ARTICLE IV

Assessment of Managerial Capability and Competence

SECTION 1. Assessment of Managerial Capability and Competence Through the Assessment Center — The Assessment of Managerial Capability and Competence through the Assessment Center or Assessment Center (AC) is a series of simulation exercises designed to measure the applicant's managerial capability and potential.

Unless otherwise decided by the Board, the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) shall conduct the Assessment Center, in behalf of the Board.

SECTION 2. Passing Mark — The passing mark in the Assessment Center shall be at least "Acceptable"

An applicant, who obtains a rating of at least "Acceptable" in the Assessment Center, shall proceed to the next stage of the CES Eligibility Examination process, which is the Board Interview.

SECTION 3. No Exemption Policy — All applicants, irrespective of a position or circumstance, shall be required to undergo the Assessment Center.

SECTION 4. Assessment Center Retake — An applicant shall be allowed to take the Assessment Center only three (3) times after which he/she shall be disqualified from continuing the examination process.

An applicant who takes and fails the Assessment Center for the first time, shall be allowed to retake the same only after one (1) year reckoned from the date of conduct of the said Assessment Center. If after a retake, the said applicant receives a failing mark for the second time, he/she shall be allowed another retake but only after one (1) year reckoned from the date of the second Assessment Center retake. An applicant, who fails the Assessment Center for the third time, shall no longer be allowed to continue with the examination process.

An applicant shall only be scheduled for a re-take upon payment of the Assessment Center Cost.

SECTION 5. Assessment Center Cost — The following rules shall apply on the Assessment Center Cost:

5.1 The Board shall shoulder the cost of the Assessment Center of the following applicants:

5.1 The Board shall shoulder the cost of the Assessment Center of the following applicants:

5.1.1 A government official who is assigned to or acts as Officer-In-Charge of a CES position;

5.1.2 A government official who is appointed to or acts as Officer-In-Charge of a division chief position in the government.

The Board shall shoulder the Assessment Center cost of the above-stated applicants only once. If an applicant fails in the Assessment Center on his/her first take and decides to retake it, he/she shall be required to shoulder the cost of his/her subsequent attempts.

5.2 Any of the following applicants shall be required to shoulder his/her Assessment Center cost:

5.2.1 A government official of an agency outside the coverage of the CES;

5.2.2 A government official appointed to a non-career position including those holding a co-terminous or contractual status of appointment in a department or agency of the government; and

5.2.3 An applicant from the private sector.

SECTION 6. Effect of Failure to Appear on the Scheduled Date of the Assessment Center — An applicant, who fails to appear on the scheduled date of the Assessment Center without justifiable reason, shall be allowed to undergo the same on another date, provided, that he/she shall submit a written confirmation of availability on the re-scheduled date of Assessment Center, and only upon reimbursement of the cost of the previously scheduled Assessment Center.

SECTION 7. Duration of the CES Eligibility Examination Counted from the Date of Release of the Assessment Center Results — From the date of conduct of the last Assessment Center taken, an applicant shall be given three (3) years to complete the remaining stages of the CES Eligibility Examination process. Failure to comply with the three (3) year limitation provided in this provision shall constitute an invalidation of the first two (2) stages already completed by the applicant, namely: the MATB and the Assessment Center and shall bar him/her from proceeding to the other stages of the said examination process.

ARTICLE V

Board Interview

SECTION 1. Board Interview — The Board Interview is a process where a member of the Board or a panel of Board members, through a formal interview, assesses and evaluates the applicant's managerial skills and competence based on the Assessment Center results, leadership qualities, integrity, and a report on his/her

performance and office accomplishments.

SECTION 2. Board Interviewer's Recommendation — After an interview is conducted by a Board Interviewer, he/she may submit the following recommendations:

2.1 Recommend to Proceed to the Next Stage of the CES Eligibility Examination Process — A Board Interviewer, based on the interview conducted, may recommend that an applicant proceed to the Performance Validation Stage which is the next stage of the CES Eligibility Examination upon showing that the applicant concerned possesses adequate managerial capabilities and potentials, leadership qualities, sufficient office performance and accomplishments, and an unquestionable integrity.

The Board Interviewer shall make the necessary comments and observations, and indicate which particular area in the next stage should the assigned Validator focus on.

2.2 Recommend to Undergo a Panel Interview — A Board Interviewer may recommend that an applicant be subjected to a Panel Interview when there are doubts on the managerial capabilities and potentials, leadership qualities, office accomplishments and performance, and integrity of the applicant based on the interview conducted.

2.3 Recommend Not to Proceed to the Next Stage of the CES Eligibility Examination Process — A Board Interviewer may recommend that an applicant should not be conferred a CES Eligibility or the application for CES Eligibility be shelved or set aside because based on his/her evaluation the applicant concerned does not possess the necessary qualification requirements to become a CES Eligible.

The decision of the Board Interviewer shall be elevated to a Panel of Board Interviewers for appropriate action.

SECTION 3. Panel Interview — A Board Interviewer, who has doubts on the managerial capabilities and potentials, leadership qualities, office accomplishments and performance and integrity of an applicant, may recommend that an applicant be subject to a Panel Interview.

There shall be a Panel of Board Interviewers which are composed of three (3) Board Members appointed by the CESB Chairperson primarily tasked to deliberate and decide on the issues submitted before them for consideration. The said Panel of Board Interviewers shall elect among themselves a Chairperson.

The majority of the members of the Panel of Board of Interviewers shall decide within thirty (30) days from receipt of the findings of the Board Interviewer whether to affirm or reverse the decision of the Board Interviewer.

The decision of the Panel of Board Interviewers shall be automatically submitted to the Board en banc for review and deliberation. The decision of the Board en banc shall be final and executory. No request for reconsideration or appeal shall be entertained by the Board.

SECTION 4. Failure or Refusal to Undergo or Comply with the Requirements of the Board Interview Stage — An applicant shall be required to submit or comply with the requirements prescribed by the Board in the Board Interview Stage within the maximum period of one (1) month reckoned from the date of release of the Assessment Center results. The Board has the right to disqualify an applicant or discontinue, as the case may be, the conduct of the Board Interview stage of any applicant who fails or refuses to undergo or comply with the requirements in the Board Interview Stage.

ARTICLE VI

Performance Validation on the Job

SECTION 1. The Performance Validation On-the-Job or the Performance Validation Stage — The Performance

Validation On-the-Job is a process where a Validator assigned by the Board looks into the applicant's personal qualifications particularly his/her managerial capabilities and potentials, leadership qualities, integrity, and the performance record and accomplishments. It shall be the fourth and final stage of the CES Eligibility Examination process. There are four (4) areas of personal qualifications and interest that are looked into when Performance Validation Stage is conducted by a Validator. These are:

1.1 The managerial capability and potential of an applicant shall be determined pursuant to the six (6) managerial dimensions, namely:

1.1.1 Management of Work — the ability to plan and prioritize office activities, assign work properly, set appropriate work standards, establish monitoring systems, streamline office operations and make prompt and sound decisions;

1.1.2 Management of People — the ability to promote the career and professional growth of subordinates, observe fairness and impartiality, maintain discipline, motivate staff for productivity, and give effective feedback on their performance;

1.1.3 Management of Resources — the ability to ensure proper disbursements of funds and the proper use and maintenance of office equipment and other facilities;

1.1.4 Management of Linkages — the ability to work effectively with other officials/units in the department, other government agencies, local government units, political representatives and non-government organizations towards the accomplishment of office goals and objectives or the effective delivery of service;

1.1.5 Management of Constraints — the ability to overcome office difficulties and problems; and

1.1.6 Innovativeness — the ability to initiate and implement new or improve policies/programs/projects/activities other than those already identified and pursued by his/her office and take risks in program implementation.

1.2 Leadership Qualities — focuses on the applicant's leadership style, his/her strengths and weaknesses as a leader, which can be ascertained through citations of office situations and community events in recent past during which leadership qualities were demonstrated.

1.3 Performance Record/Office Accomplishments — refers to the applicant's significant accomplishments in the office such as, but not limited to successful programs and projects initiated, improvements made in systems and procedures, policy initiatives, and other contributions personally made during the last year or two.

1.4 Integrity — refers to any report, or information which questions the applicant's integrity. This includes any data on administrative or criminal case/s filed against him/her.

SECTION 2. Procedures in the Conduct of the Performance Validation Stage — The performance Validation stage involves three (3) steps, namely:

2.1 Entry Interview — the Validator focuses on the applicant's demonstration of his/her managerial capabilities and potential, leadership qualities, performance and accomplishments, and other personal qualifications through a presentation of past incidents that would best demonstrate his/her managerial and leadership qualities.

2.2 Confirmatory Interview — the Validator interviews the applicant's immediate superior, subordinates and peers to confirm the claimed critical incidents that ably demonstrated his/her managerial competence, leadership qualities, integrity and accomplishment. Other than confirming the truthfulness of the applicant's claims, the confirmatory interview also aims to get other people's assessment of the applicant's actions in response to a given situation and the result of his/her actions. Interviews may also be conducted with the applicant's clients,

resident ombudsman and as far as practicable, civil society groups or members of the CES organizations in case the need arises or when there are negative reports on the applicant's integrity.

SECTION 3. Deferment of the Conduct of the Performance Validation Stage — An applicant may request for the deferment of the conduct of the Performance Validation stage before the scheduled date provided that such request shall be made in writing containing therein the specific reasons for such deferment and, provided further, that the three (3) year limitation provided in Section 7, Article IV of this resolution is observed. On the basis of such request, the Executive Director shall determine whether there is a reasonable ground to defer the conduct of the applicant's Performance Validation Stage.

SECTION 4. Contents of the Performance Validation Report — A Performance Validation Report prepared and submitted by the Validator shall contain an evaluation of the applicant's managerial capabilities and competence, leadership qualities, performance record/office accomplishments, integrity, and such other relevant information including the Validator's recommendation to the Board.

SECTION 5. A Validator's Recommendation — The Performance Validation Report of the Validator shall contain the following recommendations:

5.1 Recommend for Conferment of CES Eligibility — A Validator may recommend an applicant for conferment of CES Eligibility if he/she is found to possess adequate managerial/leadership skills and performance record/office accomplishments and found to have no derogatory report on his/her integrity;

5.2 Recommend for Revalidation — A Validator may recommend an applicant for a revalidation of his/her performance on-the-job if the applicant concerned is found to possess inadequate managerial/leadership skills or performance record/office accomplishments or has a questionable integrity, the Board may require that a revalidation of his/her performance on the job be conducted within six (6) months to one (1) year reckoned from the time the Board decided en banc to subject the applicant concerned to a revalidation.

5.3 Not to Recommend for Conferment of CES Eligibility — A Validator may recommend that an applicant may not be recommended for conferment of CES Eligibility if he/she is found to have poor managerial/leadership skills, has shown mediocre performance or has a highly questionable integrity.

SECTION 6. Effect of the Validator's Recommendation — The name of an applicant recommended by the Validator for conferment of CES Eligibility shall be submitted to the Board en banc for an issuance of an appropriate resolution conferring upon him/her CES Eligibility.

Conversely, the case of an applicant, who was recommended by the Validator for a revalidation of his/her performance on-the-job or was not recommended by the Validator for conferment of CES eligibility, as the case may be, shall be automatically submitted to the Board en banc for deliberation and appropriate action.

The decision of the Board en banc to subject the applicant for a revalidation of his/her performance on-the-job or not to confer upon him/her CES Eligibility shall be final and executory. No request for reconsideration or appeal shall be entertained by the Board.

SECTION 7. Effect on Non-Conferment of CES Eligibility — A decision of the Board en banc affirming the decision of the Validator not to recommend an applicant for conferment of CES Eligibility shall result in the disqualification of the applicant concerned from completing the CES Eligibility Examination process and be conferred a CES Eligibility.

ARTICLE VII

Conferment of Career Executive Service Eligibility

SECTION 1. Conferment of CES Eligibility by the Board — A CES Eligibility shall be conferred to any person who passes the four stage CES Eligibility Examination, and meets such other requirements as may be prescribed by the Board.

The CES Eligibility shall be conferred by the Board through a formal resolution approved by majority of its members in a regular or special meeting or by virtue of a referendum.

Upon approval by the Board of the resolution, the applicant is considered a full-fledged CES Eligibles and his/her name shall be registered in the Board's Roster of CES Eligibles and a corresponding certificate of CES Eligibility shall be issued in testimony of his/her newly acquired qualification. The CES Eligibility conferred by the Board shall not prescribe.

SECTION 2. Formal Notice of Conferment of CES Eligibility — The Board shall formally inform the CES Eligible and his/her Department Secretary or Head of Agency of his/her conferment of CES Eligibility.

SECTION 3. Effect of Pendency of an Administrative Case on Conferment of CES Eligibility — An applicant, who has a pending administrative case, shall be allowed to complete the CES Eligibility Examination process. However, an applicant, who is formally charged of a grave offense where the imposable penalty ranges from six (6) months and one (1) day suspension to dismissal from government service, shall not be conferred a CES Eligibility unless the applicant concerned has been cleared or exonerated of the charges filed against him/her in the courts of law or any quasi-judicial body, provided, however, that an applicant who is formally charged of a less grave or light offenses where the imposable penalty ranges from one (1) day to six (6) months suspension from government service, shall be conferred a CES Eligibility by the Board.

For purposes of this resolution, an applicant for CES Eligibility is considered to have a pending administrative case when a formal charge has been issued against him/her by an appropriate disciplining authority or, in the case of a complaint filed by a private person, a prima facie case is found to exist by the disciplining authority.

Being cleared or exonerated of administrative charges under this resolution refers to the decision of a quasi-judicial body to dismiss with finality a complaint filed against the applicant concerned.

SECTION 4. Effect of Pendency of a Criminal Case on Conferment of CES Eligibility — An applicant, who has a pending criminal case filed against him/her in any court, shall be allowed to complete the CES Eligibility Examination process, provided, that no applicant shall be conferred a CES Eligibility unless the complaint or information filed against him/her has been dismissed by the court by final judgment.

For purposes of this resolution, an applicant shall be considered to have a pending criminal case after a complaint or information has been filed in court where the case is assigned for trial in accordance with the Revised Rules on Criminal Procedure, as amended dated December 1, 2000.

SECTION 5. Effect of Finality of Judgment in an Administrative Case where the Penalty Involved is Dismissal from the Service — The Board shall have the right to revoke the CES Eligibility of a CESO or CES Eligible who has been found guilty by final judgment of an administrative offense where the penalty involved is dismissal or permanent separation from the service.

ARTICLE VIII

Separability, Repealing and Effectivity Clauses

SECTION 1. Separability Clause — If any section or part of this resolution shall be held to be invalid, the remaining provisions shall be given full force and effect as completely as if the part held invalid had not been included therein.

SECTION 2. Repealing Clause — All existing Career Executive Service Rules and Regulations, Circulars and Memoranda inconsistent with this resolution are hereby repealed or amended accordingly.

SECTION 3. Effectivity — This resolution shall take effect fifteen (15) days after publication in the Official Gazette or a newspaper of general circulation in the Philippines.

Adopted: 8 Oct. 2002

(SGD.) KARINA CONSTANTINO-DAVID
Chairperson

(SGD.) ELISA C. ALEJO
Member

(SGD.) MA. CONCEPCION C. ALFILER
Member

(SGD.) GODOFREDO C. DE GUZMAN
Member

(SGD.) RAMON F. NIEVA
Member

(SGD.) MA. THERESA C. NICOLAS
Acting Board Secretary

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

The Philippine bar review and law-school companion built around how your brain actually remembers.

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

More than 100,000 Supreme Court decisions, Republic Acts, and executive issuances - full-text searchable, browsable by category and year, and always free. No paywall, no login. This PDF came from it.

Audio case-brief lectures.

Any decision becomes a podcast-style lecture - facts, issues, ruling, and doctrine - with read-along highlighting and a hands-free presentation mode. Study while commuting, working out, or resting your eyes.

Bar review built on the science of memory.

Complete, sequenced courses for all eight bar subjects, narrated like podcasts and reinforced with retrieval practice and spaced review - the study techniques with the strongest evidence behind them.

The full law-school curriculum.

One subscription unlocks the entire J.D. curriculum - every subject, every lesson, with your progress tracked down to the paragraph so you can pick up exactly where you left off, on any device.

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

Timed multiple-choice exams graded instantly, with per-subject score breakdowns and focus suggestions that point you at your weakest topics first.

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

Set your schedule and BATAS tells you every day whether you are on track for bar day - and exactly which lesson to take next.

Start free at <https://batas.org>

The law library is free forever - and your first lesson is one click away.

The text of this document is an official public record and remains in the public domain. Formatting, presentation, and compilation © 2026 batas.org.

Downloaded free from the batas.org Law Library. Share it freely - the library is free for every law student, bar reviewee, and practitioner.