

Social Work Field Instruction Program: The Case of Leyte Normal University

Lilibeth B. Fallorina

lilibeth.fallorina@lnu.edu.ph

Social Work Department, Leyte Normal University, Tacloban City, 6500, Philippines

Abstract

The study aimed to assess the extent of implementation of the guidelines and standards set by Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No. 39 s, 2017 for Field Instruction Program of the Bachelor of Science in Social Work in Leyte Normal University with focus on: objectives, administration, field learning experiences, and facilities. Respondents of the study were the agency supervisors, faculty supervisors, and practicum students. A descriptive-normative survey using a validated, research-made questionnaire was utilized as the basic tool in gathering data. The result of the study showed that no significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents on the implementation of field instruction program policies and standards in terms of: objectives, administration, and field learning experiences. However, significant difference was noted on the area of facilities. The results implied that the Field Instruction Program of Leyte Normal University satisfied most of the policies and standards set by CMO No 39, s. 2017.

Keywords: Field Instruction, CHED Memorandum Order 39 s.2017, Extent of Implementation, Leyte Normal University, Social Work

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions across the world are mandated to adhere to the standards of the 21st century in which students are required to perform at higher levels and in which teachers are held accountable for the learning of students rather than simply for the delivery of instruction. Students' success is always the focus of educational mandates and is regarded as one of the prime agenda in every institution of higher learning. Development of skills is deemed to be relevant to the field of work that students would be engaged in. Likewise, it is believed that success is hinged on the quality of teachers and administrators and the way they had mentored and guided the students.

The International Federation of Social Workers (2014) defined Social Work as a practice-based profession and an academic discipline that promotes social change and development, social cohesion, and the empowerment and liberation of people. Beytell (2014) recommended that Social Work education should focus not only on implementing theory in practice, but also on practicing realities.

The essential feature of the BSSW curriculum is the field instruction program which requires students to spend a minimum of 1,000 hours in a social welfare institution and in a community with required documentation of the placement experience. The program provides students the opportunity to integrate classroom knowledge into practice as so stipulated in Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order No. 39, s. 2017. To this light, Bogo (2018) confirmed that field education experiences are designed to teach the students' cognitive and affective processes, and hence, the competencies as beginning social workers are developed.

In the Philippines, it is expected that colleges offering social work programs meet the following: (1) sufficient number of competent social work faculty who would supervise the students; (2) partner agencies and communities; (3) engagement with partner communities for at least three years to provide enough time for all stakeholders to achieve desired outcomes; (4) designation of a supervisor who is a licensed social worker who has completed at least half of the academic requirements for a master's degree in social work or any related fields; and (5) provision of social work facilities for field instruction to ensure that social welfare agencies and partner communities are accredited agencies with a licensed social worker willing to supervise students and that it can provide appropriate learning opportunities and workspace for students. (CHED Memorandum Order No.39 s. 2017).

However, scant evidence is seen whether the expectations are met by institutions offering Bachelor of Science in Social Work in the Philippines. Despite the guidelines set in the curriculum, no study has been conducted yet as to the extent of compliance with the standards set.

For over two decades, the BSSW course has been offered at Leyte Normal University, where the researcher is currently teaching, and the achievement of social work graduates is very satisfactory, taking into consideration the licensure examination results annually as the yardstick. However, this claim cannot be attributed solely to their performance in field instruction. Other aspects as to its implementation have to be looked into to provide a benchmark on the success or failure of the program. This have spurred the researcher's interest to conduct this study leading to the framing of a field instruction enhancement program to improve the university's existing design and meet the expectations of social work students as articulated in the guidelines.

Specifically, the study sought to determine the extent to which Field Instruction Program guidelines and standards set by CHED Memorandum Order No. 39 s, 2017 for Bachelor of Science in Social Work are implemented in Leyte Normal University in the following areas: objectives; administration; field learning experiences; and facilities.

1.1. Framework of the Study

This study is anchored on the theory of praxis espoused by Paulo Freire. Praxis refers to a particular theory which means "theory plus action" (Breunig, 2005). It indicates life practice formed by both reflection and action. Praxis has its explicit goal to empower marginalized people and help them challenge their oppression and eventually transform their lives. It also involves the commitment to challenge the status quo and help people from marginalized communities understand their oppression. Freire, whose beliefs emanated from Marxist and existentialist, believed that the oppressed must not only fight for freedom from hunger but should make sure that this freedom also creates, constructs, wonders, and ventures on people. True knowledge, Freire contended emerges only through knowledge, continuing, hopeful, critical inquiry with people about their relation to the world. Therefore, he advocated that rather than learners receiving, filing, and storing knowledge taught by educators, learners should be allowed to develop an accepted practice, an inventive way of life that encourages creative reflection, and considerate action in order to change the world, even if it would mean that the learners will be transformed on the process.

Corollary to the theory of praxis is symbolic-interaction approach which explains how to build reality in people's everyday interactions with others. The theory sees institutions as arrangement of people who are interlinked in their respective actions. It analyzes society by the descriptive meanings that people have given to objects, events, and behaviors. These descriptive meanings have bearing on the behavior because people behave according to their descriptive beliefs rather than objective truths. These descriptive beliefs are interpretations created by people thus, the idea suggests that society is based on the descriptions of people. People interpret each other's behavior and a bond is created, which is grounded on this interpretation (Blumer, 1969).

This theory explains how humans develop a complex set of symbols that give meaning to the world in their perspective. The interaction of the individual with the society form these meanings. These reciprocal action are personally interpreted to suit the meaning in accordance with the existing symbols (Croteau & Hoynes, 2014). The symbolic interactionism articulates that the individuals build self-identity through these interactions with the society. The students' interactions with their supervisors, clients, and those that they meet in the field will influence how they interpret the things around them. These will be very helpful and important as they will be able to understand things not only from their perspectives but from others as well.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study was descriptive-normative which utilized questionnaires as the basic tool in gathering data. The perceptions were compared against the norms and standards for field instruction program as stipulated in the CHED Memorandum Order No. 39, s. 2017. It involved three groups of respondents: the agency supervisors; the faculty supervisors; and the practicum students.

The extent of implementation of the guidelines and standards for field instruction program as stipulated in CMO No. 39, s 2017 was statistically expressed in a Likert type scale of 4,3,2,1 where 1 is the lowest and 4, the highest. The weighted mean of the perceptions of the respondents was taken.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Extent of implementation of the BSSW Field Instruction Program guidelines and standards in the area of Objectives as perceived by the three groups of respondents

Objectives	Agency Supervisor		Faculty		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Ave. Mean	De- scriptive Rating
1.Demonstrate beginning competence in problem-solving by engaging clients' solutions to their problems	3.69	Fully Achieved	3.4	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.77	Fully Achieved	3.62	Fully Achieved
2.Encourage people to conduct advocacy with reference to pertinent societal issues	3.62	Fully Achieved	3.0	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.32	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.31	Sub-stantially Achieved
3.Generate resources for networking and partnership development	3.54	Fully Achieved	3.0	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.55	Fully Achieved	3.54	Fully Achieved
4.Demonstrate competence in critical thinking and analysis of the root causes of problems	3.46	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.4	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.75	Fully Achieved	3.53	Fully Achieved
5. Engage in social work practices that promote diversity and difference in client systems	3.62	Fully Achieved	3.6	Fully Achieved	3.75	Fully Achieved	3.65	Fully Achieved
6. Acquire practice knowledge of the helping process	3.92	Fully Achieved	3.8	Fully Achieved	3.93	Fully achieved	3.88	Fully Achieved
7. Identify, relate, and apply relevant concepts and theories to practice situation	3.85	Fully Achieved	3.2	Sub-stantially Achieved	3.80	Fully Achieved	3.61	Fully Achieved
8. Conduct oneself in accordance to	3.85	Fully	4.0	Fully	3.84	Fully	3.89	Fully

Objectives	Agency Supervisor		Faculty		Practicum Students			De- scriptive Rating
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Ave. Mean	
professional and ethical standards of the social work profession		Achieved		Achieved		Achieved		Achieved
9. Utilize supervision as a means to enhance personal and professional growth and development	3.77	Fully Achieved	3.8	Fully Achieved	3.55	Fully Achieved	3.70	Fully Achieved
10. Produce portfolio of accomplishments	3.62	Fully Achieved	4.0	Fully Achieved	3.55	Fully Achieved	3.70	Fully Achieved
Overall Mean	3.69	Fully Achieved	3.52	Fully Achieved	3.71	Fully Achieved	3.64	Fully Achieved

The results indicate that the respondents had differing opinions on the Extent of Implementation of the field instruction objectives. The faculty supervisors disagreed with the agency supervisors and practicum students when they said that items 1 “Demonstrate beginning competence in problem-solving by engaging the client in finding solutions to problems,” item 3 “Generate resources for networking and partnership development,” and item 7 “Identify, relate, and apply relevant concepts and theories to practice situation” were Fully Achieved. They believed that the students have not yet fully developed the skills in problem solving, resource generation, and the application of theories in practice. The basis could have been the documents like case studies, group, and community studies, projects, and training proposals that were submitted by the students. The faculty supervisors felt that there should have been provision of opportunities wherein students apply the knowledge they learned in the classroom, get exposed to varied activities necessary towards developing their skills in helping clients solve their problems, and that resource generation should have been in the learning plan. Both the agency and faculty supervisors agreed that item 4 “Demonstrate competence in critical thinking and analysis of the root causes of problems as basis for services” were Substantially Achieved. The perception of agency and faculty supervisors could have been based on the kind of work the students have submitted or on how they carried out the tasks given in the agency and in the classroom. The reflection papers, case studies, position papers, and other assignments gave the supervisors the opportunity to assess their critical thinking abilities.

On the other hand, faculty supervisors and students agreed that item 2 “Encourage people to conduct advocacy with reference to pertinent societal concern” was Substantially Achieved. This could have been due to the fact that most of the students were assigned in field sites that did not require them to conduct advocacy campaigns or similar activities.

It is worth noting that the average mean of Field Instruction Program objectives were Fully Achieved. The respondents believed that the program provided opportunities for students to apply the theoretical knowledge learned in the university in real practice environment.

Popouli (2014) said that in the field instruction, students are given the opportunity to discover new ideas, think about their own values, prejudices, and attitudes towards others, and to develop a sense of commitment to the profession. This is parallel to what is stipulated in the Council of Social Work Education (2015) that field education connects the theory and concepts taught in the classroom in the practice setting. Students’ attainment of field instruction objectives enables them to refine the tools and skills needed to become a social work practitioner (Virginia State University Field Instruction Manual, 2019).

Table 2. Extent of Implementation of the BSSW Field Instruction Program guidelines and standards in the area of Administration as perceived by the three groups of respondents

Procedures of Placement	Agency Supervisor		Faculty		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating
1. Scouts for partner agencies and assess their capacities to provide the students a conducive learning environment	3.85	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.75	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented
2. Makes initial arrangements with prospective agencies that meet the criteria set by the Social Work Unit	3.92	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.77	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.83	Com- pletely Imple- mented
3. Determines the students' readiness for Field Instruction	3.69	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.6	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.25	Sub-stan- tially Imple- mented	3.51	Com- pletely Imple- mented
4. Assesses and matches students and field site by ensuring congruence of interests	3.50	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.6	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.07	Sub-stan- tially Imple- mented	3.39	Sub-stan- tially Imple- mented
5. Prepares and finalizes the list of students and their agency/area of assignments	3.85	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.82	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.89	Com- pletely Imple- mented
6. Formalizes the partnership between the school and the agency through MOA	3.92	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.93	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.95	Com- pletely Imple- mented
7. A dialogue for fieldwork students, agency, and faculty supervisors is conducted before the start of the fieldwork.	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.70	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.83	Com- pletely Imple- mented
8. Formal endorsement to assigned agencies is done by unit head and faculty supervisors.	3.77	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.89	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.88	Com- pletely Imple- mented

Procedures of Placement	Agency Supervisor		Faculty		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating
9 Completion of the core subjects in each of the curricular areas and social work methods courses	3.85	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.82	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.89	Com- pletely Imple- mented
10.Satisfactory academic performance	3.92	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.84	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.92	Com- pletely Imple- mented
11. All requirements such as: parents, consent, waiver have been submitted before the fieldwork.	3.54	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.77	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.70	Com- pletely Imple- mented
Overall Mean	3.69	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.52	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.69	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.63	Com- pletely Imple- mented

The agency supervisors believed that all items were Completely Implemented. The average mean rating for all items was 3.69. For the faculty supervisors, their perception was that all items were Completely Implemented with an average rating of 3.52. The students perceived all items as Completely Implemented except for items 3 “Determines student’s readiness” and 4 “Assesses students and field site by ensuring congruence of interests, needs, and preferences” which they rated as Substantially Implemented. The average mean rating was 3.69 described as Completely Implemented. In sum, the average mean rating of the three groups of respondents was 3.63 interpreted as Completely Implemented.

Students’ rating items 3 and 4 as Substantially Implemented was not surprising. The feeling of anxiety to go on field instruction might have been the reason why they felt that their readiness was not considered. They were at that time ready for Field Instruction because they have had taken the subjects that would equip them with knowledge needed in practice. The faculty also expressed that in assigning, they considered the students’ capacity, personality, and agency preferences. However, due to limited agencies for placements, the area of assignment was at times distant from the city that it required them to travel for hours, and as a result spend more expenses on transportation. These factors made the student’s think that it was not considered.

Table 3. Profile of agency supervisors in terms of number of students supervised

Number of Practicum Students Supervised in Four Years	f	%
1-30	10	77
30-60	2	15
60 -90	1	8

It can be gleaned from the table above that for the period of 4 years, 10 or 77% of the agency supervisors had supervised at least 1-30 students, 2 or 15% supervised at least 30-60 while 1 or 8% supervised 60-90 students.

The Leyte Normal University's tie-up with new field placement sites explains the reason why majority of the agency supervisors have handled only about 1-30 students so far.

Table 4. Profile of agency supervisors in terms of years in service

Years in Service	f	%
0-3 years	3	23
4-6 years		
7-10 years	3	23
10 years above	7	54

The table above presents the work experience of the agency supervisors. The data reveal that 10 or 54% of the field supervisors have been working as social workers for 7-10 years, 3 or 23% have worked for 4-6 years while the other 3 or 23% are new social workers who have been in the service for 0-3 years.

The foregoing data shows that more than half of the agency supervisors have been working in the field of social work for years. Their practice experience made them more than qualified to supervise field instruction students. The guidelines in the CMO requires at least two years of work experience for a social worker to be designated as agency supervisor.

Table 5. Profile of agency supervisors in terms of eligibility

Profile of Agency Supervisors	f	%
Passer of Licensure Examination for Social Worker	13	100

It can be gleaned in Table 5 that all agency supervisors are passers of the licensure examination for social workers. The provision in the CMO Number 39 s. 2017 that says an agency supervisor should be a licensed social worker was Satisfied.

Table 6. Profile of agency supervisors in terms of educational attainment

Educational Attainment	f	%
Bachelor's Degree	3	24
BS with MA Units	8	62
MA Degree	2	15

In terms of educational attainment, the above table shows that 2 or 15% of the agency supervisors finished Master's Degree while 8 or 62 % have earned MA units and three or 24% finished a Baccalaureate Degree in Social Work.

It is stated in the CMO guidelines that the designated agency supervisor must be a licensed social worker who has completed at least 50% of the academic requirements for a Master's Degree and have at least two years of work experience.

Overall, majority of the agency supervisors have met the standards set in the CMO guidelines. These findings conform to the claims of Alchauser et al. (2015) that to efficiently deliver the services in a training program for social workers, the field supervisor must be a registered social worker, preferably a Master's Degree holder in Social Work, or one with master's degree units with at least two years of work experience.

Table 7. Profile of faculty supervisors in terms of number of practicum students supervised

Number of Practicum Students Supervised within 4 years	f	%
1-30 students	3	60
30-60 students		
90 above	2	40

It can be gleaned from the table above that within 4 years, 3 or 60% of the faculty supervisors have supervised at least 1-30 students while 2 or 40% have supervised more than 90 students. The findings show that most of the faculty were new field instruction supervisors.

Table 8. Profile of faculty supervisors in terms of number of years in service

Years in Service	f	%
1-3 years	3	60
4-6 years		
7-10 years		
10 years above	2	40

In terms of teaching experience, 3 or 60% are new faculty members who have been in the university for 1-3 years while 2 or 40% have been with the university for more than 10 years. The hiring of new faculty members due to the increasing number of students enrolling in the social work course and the retirement of a senior faculty explain the reason why majority are new field supervisors.

Table 9. Profile of faculty supervisors in terms of number of years in service

Eligibility of Faculty Supervisors	f	%
Passer of Licensure Examination for Social Worker	5	100

The table above shows that all faculty supervisors are licensed social workers. The provision in the CHED CMO Number 39 s. 2017 that requires a social work faculty to be a licensed social worker was Complied.

Table 10. Profile of faculty supervisors in terms of educational attainment

Educational Attainment	f	%
Bachelor's Degree in Social Work		
BSSW with MA Units	3	60
MSW Degree		
MA with Doctoral Units	2	40

For educational attainment, 3 or 60 % of the faculty supervisors finished BS Social Work with MA units while 2 or 40% are Masters in Social Work graduates with doctorate units.

The findings are partly not able to meet the CHED Memorandum Order No. 39 s. 2017 which requires a faculty member to be a licensed social worker, a holder of Master's Degree in Social Work or a Master of

Arts/Science degree in any field related to social work. CHED emphasizes that supervision is well-carried out if the social work supervisors are appropriately trained and with a high level of educational qualification. In order to qualify teaching in social work, the three faculty supervisors should have had finished their Master's degrees as mandated in the CMO guidelines.

Table 14. Extent of Implementation of the BSSW Field Instruction Program guidelines and standards on the area field learning experiences as perceived by the three groups of respondents

Field Learning Experiences	Agency Supervisor		Faculty		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Ave. Rating	De- scriptive Rating
1. Orientation to the agency- includes staff, office procedures, programs, and services provided	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.82	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.87	Com- pletely Imple- mented
2. Experiences in developing and managing interventive relationships	3.69	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.8	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.50	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.66	Com- pletely Imple- mented
3. Recording experience- making eligibility studies, case studies, case summaries, referral letters, minutes	3.54	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.75	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.76	Com- pletely Imple- mented
4. Administrative experiences – participation in staff meetings, planning, evaluation, budgeting, coordinating.	3.46	Sub- stantially Imple- mented	3.2	Sub- stantially Imple- mented	3.55	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.40	Sub- stan- tially Imple- mented
5. Experiences in referral management - orientation of services available to clients being served	3.77	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.6	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.52	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.63	Com- pletely Imple- mented
6. Interviewing experiences –conducting interviews for variety of purposes	3.92	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.98	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.96	Com- pletely Imple- mented
7. Experiences with individuals – includes case studies, counselling, observing/conducting therapy sessions	3.23	Sub- stantially Imple- ment ed	3.0	Sub- stantially Imple- ment ed	3.20	Substan- tially Imple- ment ed	3.14	Substan- tially Imple- ment ed

Field Learning Experiences	Agency Supervisor		Faculty		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Ave. Rating	De- scriptive Rating
8. Experiences working with groups – assisting groups in problem solving, facilitating group meetings, conducting trainings	3.77	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.4	Sub- stantially Imple- mented	3.73	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.63	Com- pletely Imple- mented
9. Experiences in community activities- helping communities solve problems, organizing and strengthening community groups.	3.54	Com- pletely Imple- mented	4.0	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.89	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.81	Com- pletely Imple- mented
Overall Mean	3.66	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.65	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.66	Com- pletely Imple- mented	3.65	Com- pletely Imple- mented

The findings revealed that the agency and faculty supervisors agreed that administrative experiences and experiences with individuals were Substantially Implemented while the students perceived it as Completely Implemented. The difference in responses could have been due to the fact that the agency and faculty supervisors felt that the exposure given to the students in terms of planning and budgeting was limited since they did not participate in the planning and budgeting activities of the agency and the university. On the part of the students, they regarded their experiences in conducting planning workshops with clients, making of project proposals as administrative experiences. In field instruction, the agencies were encouraged to provide opportunities for students to experience how to make plans, budget, project proposals, and other administrative activities. Although they were conducting planning sessions with their clients, the experience of joining actual planning sessions with the agency staff should have exposed the students to the real world of work.

All respondents were one in saying that the experiences with individuals specifically on the conduct of counseling and therapy sessions was Substantially Implemented. This could have been explained by the fact that some students were assigned in agencies where counseling and therapy sessions were not part of their services or they were given limited opportunities to counsel clients since they were not yet skilled in counselling or if the cases were sensitive.

Moreover, both agency supervisors and students agreed that experiences with groups was Completely Implemented but the faculty supervisors expressed that it was Substantially Implemented. The basis of the faculty rating could have been the weekly plan and accomplishment reports submitted by students. It reflected that students have seldom conducted group work activities in their area of assignment.

This finding implies that the respondents have had a firm conviction that most of the learning experiences and activities provided to them in the field practicum were appropriate, enriching, and helpful in the development of practical skills.

This concurs with the study of Apao (2014) which emphasized that provision of engaging learning experiences where learners are given amount of work to do in a specific length of time will cultivate their innate potentials and develop their life skills.

As an implication, LNU Social Work Department should have had strategized ways on how it can provide holistic learning opportunities and experiences deemed necessary for students to acquire beginning competence in social work.

Table 15. Extent of implementation of the BSSW Field Instruction Program Guidelines and standards on the area of facilities as perceived by the three groups of respondents

Facilities	Agency Supervisor		Faculty Supervisor		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Ave. Mean	De- scriptive Rating
1. The college selects accredited welfare agencies with a social worker; supervisor to student ratio is 1:5	3.69	Very Ade- quate	2.4	Partially Adequate	3.64	Very Adequate	3.24	Sub- stantially Adequate
2. Provisions of work space for students	3.54	Very Adequate	2.2	Partially Adequate	3.09	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.94	Sub- stantially Adequate
3. Availability of books, magazines, FI reading materials etc.	2.92	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.4	Partially Adequate	2.77	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.7	Sub- stantially Adequate
4. Provision of technology in the workplace for FI activities such as:								
a. overhead projector	2.69	Sub- stantially Adequate	1.8	Partially Adequate	3.14	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.5	Sub- stantially adequate
b. LCD projector	3.62	Very Adequate	2.4	Partially Adequate	3.16	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.06	Sub- stantially Adequate
c. Laptop	2.62	Sub- stantially Adequate	1.6	Partially Ade-quate	2.77	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.33	Partially Adequate
d. camera	2.85	Sub- stantially Adequate	1.4	Partially Adequate	2.39	Partially Adequate	2.21	Partially Adequate
e. microphone	3.69	Very Adequate	2.0	Partially Ade-quate	3.32	Sub- stantially Ade-quate	3.0	Sub- stantially Adequate
g. computer	3.0	Sub- stantially Adequate	1.6	Partially Adequate	2.58	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.39	Partially Adequate
h. TV	2.54	Sub- stantially Adequate	1.6	Partially Ade-quate	2.32	Partially Adequate	2.15	Partially Adequate
i. exhibit boards	3.08	Sub- stantially Adequate	1.8	Partially Ade-quate	2.66	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.51	Subs- stantially Adequ
5. Provision of display boards for:								
a. organizational set-up	3.62	Very Adequate	3.0	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.52	Very Adequate	3.38	Sub- stantially Adequate
b. statement of mission, goals, and services of the agency	3.77	Very Adequate	3.0	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.68	Very Adequate	3.48	Sub- stantially Adequate

Facilities	Agency Supervisor		Faculty Supervisor		Practicum Students			
	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Mean	De- scriptive Rating	Ave. Mean	De- scriptive Rating
c. essential forms used by the agency	3.77	Very Adequate	2.8	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.39	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.32	Sub- stantially Adequate
d. flow of communication in the agency	3.69	Very Adequate	2.8	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.32	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.27	Sub- stantially Adequate
e. chart on the procedures of helping processes	3.77	Very Adequate	2.8	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.34	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.30	Sub- stantially Adequate
f. other information essential for the accomplishment of students' learning goals	3.85	Very Adequate	2.8	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.41	Sub- stantially Adequate	3.35	Sub- stantially Adequate
Overall Mean	3.29	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.23	Partially Adequate	3.05	Sub- stantially Adequate	2.85	Sub- stantially Adequate

The findings revealed that the respondents have had varied perceptions on the extent of implementation of the CMO guidelines on field instruction facilities. The agency supervisors and students found item 1 "Selection of accredited agency with a supervisor-student ratio of 1:5" to be Very Adequate but the faculty said it was Partially Adequate. In answering the item, the faculty supervisors considered the field placements of students not only on the covered year of the study but also of those in the past. Accordingly, there were instances that in their community placements, the agency supervisor handled 10 to 15 students. This was because most of the Local Government Units where students were assigned only had one social worker.

On item 2 "Provisions of appropriate work space for students," the agency field supervisors said it was Very Adequate, the faculty field supervisors found it Partially Adequate while the students said it was Substantially Adequate. The Very Adequate rating of the field supervisors was based on the fact that in most field placement sites, the students were given a particular working area. For the faculty, the Partially Adequate rating could be attributed to the university's limit on the students' access or use of the classroom for field instruction only during the time allotment while the Substantially Adequate rating of the students must have been based on their experiences both in the agency and in the university.

On item 3 "Availability of a library with updated books and magazines" both agency supervisors and students rated it as Substantially Adequate. Since the agencies do not have library, the agency supervisors and students considered the library of the university in rating the item. For the faculty supervisors, the library facility is perceived as Partially Adequate, for them, although there are available updated social work books in the university library, books for field instruction are limited.

On the provision of technology for FI activities, the agency supervisors and students rated LCD projector, laptop, camera, computer, TV, and exhibit boards as Substantially Adequate while the faculty supervisors rated the items as Partially Adequate. The basis of the agency supervisors in rating was the availability of these technologies in their respective offices. For the faculty supervisors, their perceptions were based on the availability of technologies for field instruction in the university. In LNU there are available overhead projectors, laptops, computer, LCD, microphone, printer, and TV. However, these technologies are intended for classroom use. The students cannot borrow and bring them outside the university. When students are conducting activities in the field they use their own laptops, borrow the sound system, microphone, and LCD projector of Junior Social Workers Association of the Philippines (JSWAP) organization. Since students are assigned in different areas, there are times that their activities are scheduled on the same date. If these happen, they take the

initiative of borrowing equipment's from their assigned agency or if they are assigned in the Local Government Units, they borrow from the LGU offices.

On the provision of display boards, all the sub-items were rated Very Adequate by the agency supervisors. The faculty supervisors rated all sub-items as Substantially Adequate while the students believed that except for the sub-items "organizational set-up" and "statement of vision, mission, and goals of the agency" which was rated as Completely Adequate, all other sub-items were Substantially Adequate. The Very Adequate ratings of the agency supervisors were attributable to the very visible organizational set-up, VMGO, and charts that were displayed at strategic locations in their respective offices.

For the faculty, they said that there was a display board intended for field instruction; however, essential information were not within it like FI organizational set-up, goals of FI, field sites, names of faculty and agency supervisors and their respective supervisees, procedures of the helping process, etc. This must have prompted the faculty supervisors and graduates to convey the Substantially Adequate rating.

The deterrence why the facilities for field instruction was perceived by the respondents as Substantially Adequate could have been the limited budget of the university for facilities and technologies solely for field instruction program. This prevalence is believed to be due to the implementation of RA 10931 or the Universal Access to Quality Education Act in which there is cessation of fee collections for Field Instruction laboratory fees.

The study of Dhembha (2012) as cited by Shokane et al. (2016) supports these findings. It was revealed that all students placed in the five districts in Africa experienced the same problems and challenges which included inadequate resources and no provisions for additional costs in understanding work-based learning in most of the social work agencies. This is also parallel to the study conducted by Schmidt and Rautenbach (2015) which described that one of the challenges that field instruction is currently facing in the Eastern Cape is the lack of resources within agencies that can be used for field instruction. Pawar's study (2017) likewise noted that agency facilities on field instruction are valuable in carrying out the teaching-learning process. Continual learning takes place when students are actively involved in direct encounter with different laboratory instruments, actual manipulation of apparatus, being hands-on with the chemicals, and utilizing preserved specimens and organisms (Tura, 2016). It is the developed instructional system headed by the teacher and assisted by adequate instructional materials and facilities that can positively influence the production of high caliber graduates at all levels of educational system (Mbagha et al., 2014) Hence, it is critical for educators to provide these fundamental experiences (Berk et al., 2014) because facilities and instructional materials are important in the actualization of the educational goals (Figueroa, 2018).

If Leyte Normal University Social Work Department envisions to produce high-caliber graduates who possess the skills necessary for a professional social worker, it should be aggressive in advocating administrative support from the university and agencies for the acquisition of field instruction facilities.

V. CONCLUSIONS

From the results and findings of this study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. There is consensus on the full achievement perceptions of the three groups of respondents on the objectives set by the CMO No 39, s. 2017.
2. On the administration of the field instruction program, all respondents agree that it is completely implemented except for the assessment and matching of students' needs and interest and in determining their physical, emotional, and economic well-being to go on Field Instruction.
3. Some faculty supervisors failed to meet the provision that requires them to be holders of a master's degree.
4. The exposure of students to learning experiences and activities are limited in terms of administrative and individual experiences.
5. The field instruction facilities are substantially adequate.

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from this study, the researcher puts forward the following recommendations:

1. Strengthened collaboration between Leyte Normal University Social Work faculty, government and non-government agencies for more avenues in field instruction;

2. Instilling of resourcefulness, initiative, and innovativeness of agency and faculty supervisors to tap sources where materials can be loaned out or borrowed;
3. Collaboration between the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and National Association of Social Work Education Inc. (NASWEI) in assessing the compliance of Social Work schools with the mandated CMO guidelines.

REFERENCES

- Beytell A. (2014). Fieldwork education in health contexts: Experiences of fourth-year BSW students. *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk*, 50(2).
- Bogo, M. (2018). *Social work practice: Integrating concepts, processes, and skills*. (2nd Ed.) Columbia: Columbia University Press.
- Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order no.39, s. 2017. Manila: Commission on Higher Education. Retrieved August 5, 2019 from ched.gov.ph/cmo-39-s-2017-2
- Breunig, M. (2005). Turning experiential education and critical pedagogy theory into praxis. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 2(28), 106-122.
- Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and methods*. US: Prentice Hall.
- Croteau, D., & Hoynes, W. (2014). *Experience sociology*. USA: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Popouli, E. (2014). Field learning in social work education: Implications for educators and instructors. *The Field Educator*, 2(4), 1-15. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/y6fwj6q8>
- Virginia State University Field Instruction Manual. (2019). Virginia: Virginia University. Retrieved from <http://www.sola.vsu.edu>
- Alschuler, M., Silver, T., & McArdle, L. (2015). Strengths-based group supervision with social work students. *Groupwork*, 25(1), 34-57.
- Apao, L. (2014). *Alternative earning system accreditation and equivalency program: Quality of life beyond poverty*. (Unpublished thesis). Cebu Normal University, Cebu City.
- Shokane, A., Nemutandani, V., & Ngodiseni, J.B. (2016). Fourth year social work students during fieldwork practice at a rural-based university. *AFFRIKA: Journal of Politics, Economics and Society*, 6 (1), 133-163.
- Schmidt, K., & Rautenbach, V. (2016). Field instruction: Is the heart of social work education still beating in the eastern cape?. *Social Work Journal*, 52 (4).
- Pawar, M. (2017). Reflective learning and teaching in social work field education in international contexts. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 47(1), 198-218.
- Tura, M.B. (2016). *The science curriculum in the K-12 program: Initial assessment*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Cebu Normal University, Cebu City.
- Figueroa, M. (2018). *What implementers say about the senior high school program: Challenges and prospects*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Cebu Normal University, Cebu City.
- Mbaga, E., Quahha, D., Duhu, P., & Danzaria, L. (2014). The perception of electrical engineering trade teachers on the use of information and communication technology for teaching in technical colleges in Adamawa and Gombe states of Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 10 (13).
- Figueroa, M. (2018). *What implementers say about the senior high school program: Challenges and prospects*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Cebu Normal University, Cebu City.