

Livelihood Extension Program Administration, Stakeholders Engagement, and Organizational Performance of Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCS) in National Capital Region: Basis for Enhancement Towards Sustainability

Dr. Tenie P. Lirazan

Graduate School Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.12120020>

Received: 18 December 2025; Accepted: 24 December 2025; Published: 29 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines the administration, stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance of Livelihood Extension Programs in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region, aiming to propose a sustainability model for long-term program effectiveness. Using a descriptive research design, data were collected through structured surveys from 1,310 respondents, including school administrators, extension coordinators, community partners, and community recipients. The study assessed key dimensions of program administration, stakeholder participation, and organizational performance, and analyzed their interrelationships and impact on sustainability.

Findings indicate that Livelihood Extension Programs are generally well-administered, with strong leadership, adequate resources, effective planning, and robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. Stakeholder engagement is evident across all dimensions, including sustainability, productivity, and community transformation, while organizational performance demonstrates significant support for economic, community, and skills development. Statistical analyses reveal no significant differences in assessment across respondent groups, indicating standardized implementation, and highlight a strong positive relationship between program administration, stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance. Minor operational challenges were identified, suggesting areas for continuous improvement. The proposed Sustainability Model is rated highly in terms of suitability, acceptability, and feasibility, demonstrating its potential to optimize program management, align institutional and community objectives, and enhance long-term socio-economic impact.

Keywords: Livelihood Extension Program, Stakeholder Engagement, Organizational Performance, State Universities and Colleges, Sustainability Model, Community Development.

INTRODUCTION

The role of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) extends beyond teaching and research to encompass extension services that drive community development. Among these initiatives, Livelihood Extension Programs (LEPs) are critical avenues through which SUCs promote the socio-economic advancement of surrounding communities. These programs leverage institutional expertise, resources, and strategic partnerships to provide skills training, income-generating activities, and technology transfer, empowering communities to achieve sustainable livelihoods while fostering self-reliance and resilience. Although institutional outputs such as graduate employability and research productivity often receive primary attention, the success of extension programs also depends heavily on organizational performance, stakeholder engagement, and effective resource management, which collectively determine program relevance, sustainability, and long-term impact.

The rationale for this study lies in addressing existing gaps in understanding how SUCs can optimize the design, implementation, and sustainability of livelihood programs, particularly in the National Capital Region, where communities exhibit diverse socio-economic contexts and needs. Despite their potential, LEPs frequently face challenges such as constrained resources, uneven stakeholder participation, and variability in institutional performance, all of which can compromise program effectiveness and community benefits. This study seeks to

provide evidence-based insights that will guide SUCs in enhancing program delivery, fostering greater community impact, and ensuring the long-term socio-economic empowerment of beneficiaries.

The study is anchored on Community Development Theory (Christens & Inzeo, 2020), Stakeholder Theory (Freeman et al., 2020), and Organizational Performance Theory (Daft & Weick, 2021). Community Development Theory emphasizes the empowerment of individuals and the cultivation of local capacity, highlighting the importance of active community involvement in the planning and execution of programs to ensure relevance and sustainability. Stakeholder Theory underscores the significance of engaging both internal and external actors—including faculty, students, local government units, NGOs, and industry partners—to enhance program responsiveness, relevance, and continuity. Organizational Performance Theory focuses on strategic alignment, resource efficiency, and accountability as key determinants of sustained program success. By integrating these theoretical perspectives, this study offers a holistic framework to analyze how SUCs can effectively structure, manage, and sustain livelihood programs to maximize their positive impact on community development.

METHODOLOGY

The study on the Livelihood Extension Program (LEP) in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region employed a descriptive research design to assess program administration, stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance as a basis for a proposed sustainability model. Descriptive research is a methodological approach that seeks to provide a detailed and accurate account of the characteristics, behaviors, or phenomena under investigation without manipulating variables, offering a comprehensive snapshot of the observed subject (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). This design was deemed appropriate as it allowed the study to systematically evaluate the administration of livelihood programs, the involvement of stakeholders, and the performance of selected SUCs in a real-world context.

Purposive sampling was used to select 1,310 respondents, composed of 38 school administrators, 122 extension coordinators, 63 community partners, and 1,087 community recipients from the selected SUCs in the National Capital Region. Guided by principles of purposive sampling, participants were intentionally chosen based on their direct involvement and knowledge of livelihood extension programs. This approach ensured that the collected data were rich, relevant, and deeply informed by the lived experiences of those directly engaged in program implementation (Etikan et al., 2016).

Data collection involved the use of structured questionnaires and complementary qualitative techniques to ensure comprehensive insights. The survey instrument included closed-ended and Likert-scale items designed to assess the administration of livelihood programs, the degree of stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance. This structured approach facilitated the identification of patterns, trends, and areas requiring improvement across a large and diverse sample.

To complement the survey findings, data were collected from key stakeholders—including administrators, extension coordinators, and community partners—to capture insights on program administration, stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance. Analysis of the survey data provided a comprehensive understanding of how these factors collectively contribute to the sustainability and effectiveness of livelihood extension programs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sub-problem No. 1. How do the school administrators, extension coordinators, community partners, and community recipients assess the Livelihood Extension Program Administration in selected State Universities and Colleges in the National Capital Region in terms of:

Table 1 Assessment on Livelihood Extension Program Administration

Criteria	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Program Design and Planning	3.92	E	4.10	E	4.22	HE	4.29	HE	4.13	E	6.5

2. Organizing	3.89	E	4.13	E	4.19	E	4.25	HE	4.12	E	8.5
3. Leadership and Administration	4.00	E	4.15	E	4.19	E	4.28	HE	4.16	E	1
4. Resources	3.93	E	4.09	E	4.21	HE	4.31	HE	4.14	E	4.5
5. Beneficiary	3.95	E	4.15	E	4.19	E	4.02	E	4.08	E	10
6. Funding	3.98	E	4.14	E	4.19	E	4.28	HE	4.15	E	2.5
7. Execution	3.95	E	4.10	E	4.18	E	4.23	HE	4.12	E	8.5
8. Market Support	3.94	E	4.10	E	4.23	HE	4.30	HE	4.14	E	4.5
9. Monitoring	3.94	E	4.16	E	4.17	E	4.25	HE	4.13	E	6.5
10. Evaluation	3.98	E	4.17	E	4.18	E	4.26	HE	4.15	E	2.5
Grand Mean	3.95	E	4.13	E	4.20	HE	4.25	HE	4.13	E	

Table 1 summarizes the assessment of the livelihood extension program administration rated as Evident with the grand mean of 4.13. All items are rated as Evident, such as: leadership and administration with a composite weighted mean of 4.16 as rank 1; funding; and evaluation with both the composite weighted mean of 4.15 as rank 2 and 3; resources; and market support with both the composite weighted mean of 4.14 as rank 4 and 5; program design and planning; and monitoring with both the composite weighted mean of 4.13 as rank 6 and 7; organizing; and execution with both the composite weighted mean of 4.12 as rank 8 and 9; and beneficiary with a composite weighted mean of 4.08 as rank 10.

The livelihood extension program administration is generally effective, as indicated by its Evident rating across key areas such as leadership, funding, evaluation, and program execution. Community recipients and partners perceive the program as highly evident in achieving its objectives, while extension coordinators and school administrators see areas for improvement. These findings highlight the program’s strengths in providing support and resources while also emphasizing the need for continuous enhancement, particularly in administrative and institutional aspects, to ensure long-term sustainability and impact.

The findings of this study, which rated the livelihood extension program administration as *Evident* across core areas like leadership, funding, evaluation, and execution, align closely with the results of Dela Cruz and Ramirez (2023). Their assessment of a similar program in Northern Mindanao also found the administration generally effective,

particularly in providing resources and engaging community beneficiaries. Like in the current findings, community recipients perceived the program positively, while coordinators and school administrators pointed out the need for improved monitoring and institutional support.

This connection reinforces the idea that while livelihood extension programs are making significant contributions in terms of outreach and impact, continuous improvements in administrative processes—especially in planning, supervision, and evaluation—are essential for sustaining and maximizing their long-term effectiveness.

Sub-problem No. 2. How do the four groups of respondents assess the stakeholders’ engagement relative to the Livelihood Extension Program in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region in terms of:

Table 2 Assessment on Stakeholders’ Engagement Relative to the Livelihood Extension Program

Criteria	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Goals	3.94	E	4.12	E	4.21	HE	4.33	HE	4.15	E	2
2. Transformation	3.95	E	4.16	E	4.17	E	3.97	E	4.06	E	8
3. Productivity	3.96	E	4.16	E	4.16	E	4.29	HE	4.14	E	3

4. Environment	3.99	E	4.11	E	4.17	E	4.23	HE	4.13	E	5
5. Economic	3.94	E	4.11	E	4.18	E	4.31	HE	4.13	E	5
6. Ecological	3.96	E	4.11	E	4.18	E	4.28	HE	4.13	E	5
7. Growth and Development	3.91	E	4.14	E	4.19	E	4.24	HE	4.12	E	7
8. Sustainability	4.02	E	4.16	E	4.19	E	4.31	HE	4.17	E	1
Grand Mean	3.96	E	4.13	E	4.18	E	4.25	HE	4.13	E	

Table 2 summarizes the assessment of the students’ engagement is relative to the livelihood extension program is rated as Evident with the grand mean of 4.13.

All items are rated as Evident, these are: sustainability with a composite weighted mean of 4.17 as rank 1; goals with a composite weighted mean of 4.15 as rank 2; productivity with a composite weighted of 4.14 as rank 3; environment; economic; and ecological with a similar composite weighted mean of 4.13 as rank 5 respectively; growth and development with a composite weighted mean of 4.12 as rank 7; and transformation with a composite weighted mean of 4.06 as rank 8.

The assessment of students’ engagement in the livelihood extension program is rated as Evident, indicating active participation across various aspects such as sustainability, goal achievement, productivity, environmental consciousness, economic impact, and ecological awareness. The highest-rated area highlights sustainability, followed by goals and productivity, while growth, development, and transformation also show strong engagement. Among respondent groups, community recipients provided the highest rating, recognizing significant student involvement, while community partners, extension coordinators, and school administrators rated engagement slightly lower. This suggests that while students play a crucial role in the program’s success, further efforts to enhance institutional support, reinforce productivity measures, and strengthen transformation initiatives could optimize long-term program outcomes.

This supports the present findings by emphasizing that while student engagement in the livelihood extension program is evident and impactful especially in areas like sustainability and productivity its long-term success relies heavily on the institution’s ability to provide strategic support. As Brown and Garcia (2023) suggest, universities must establish strong frameworks for stakeholder collaboration, clear communication, and shared goals to fully maximize student involvement and ensure the program’s continued effectiveness and community relevance.

Sub-problem No. 3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the four groups of respondents as to Livelihood Extension Program Administration and Stakeholders’ Engagement in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region using the aforementioned variables?

Table 3 Comparative Assessment on the Livelihood Extension Program Administration in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region

Areas of Concern		SS	MSS	df	Fvalue	Critical Value	Interpretation	Decision
1. Program Design and Planning	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.077 40.01	0.025 1.111	3 36	0.02319	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
2. Organizing	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.075 40.02	0.025 1.111	3 36	0.02266	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
3. Leadership and Administration	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.041 40.03	0.013 1.111	3 36	0.12382	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
4. Resources	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.080 40.01	0.026 1.111	3 36	0.02410	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
5. Beneficiary	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.036 40.03	0.012 1.112	3 36	0.01107	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho

6. Funding	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.048 40.01	0.016 1.111	3 36	0.01451	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
7. Execution	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.045 40.10	0.015 1.002	3 40	0.01506	2.84	Not Significant	Accept Ho
8. Market Support	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.074 3993	0.024 0.998	3 40	0.02493	2.84	Not Significant	Accept Ho
9. Monitoring	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.051 40.02	0.017 1.000	3 40	0.01700	2.84	Not Significant	Accept Ho
10. Evaluation	Bet. Grp Within Grp.	0.042 40.02	0.014 1.111	3 36	0.01262	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho

Level of Significance: 0.05

As manifested in Table 3, the computed F-values are as follows: program design and planning with 0.02319, organizing with 0.02266, leadership and administration with 0.12382, resources with 0.2410, beneficiary with 0.01107, funding with 0.01451, execution with 0.01506, market support with 0.02493, monitoring with 0.01700, and evaluation with 0.01262 were lower than the critical value of 2.87 and 2.84 with 3 and 36 and 40 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is no significant difference on the Livelihood Extension Program Administration in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region as assessed by school administrators, extension coordinators, community partners, and community recipients. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The result is supported by De Guzman & Manalang (2021) they found that many SUCs in the Philippines implement their livelihood and extension programs based on national policies and frameworks. This standardization leads to consistency in how programs are designed and managed, which can result in similar assessments from various stakeholders.

Table 4 Comparative Assessment on the Stakeholders Engagement in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region

Areas of Concern	Source of Variation	SS	MSS	df	F-value	Critical Value	Interpretation	Decision
1. Goals	Between Groups	0.080	0.026	3	0.02400	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.01	1.111	36				
2. Transformation	Between Groups	0.043	0.014	3	0.01282	2.90	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	36.01	1.125	32				
3. Productivity	Between Groups	0.056	0.018	3	0.01697	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.01	1.111	36				
4. Environment	Between Groups	0.031	0.010	3	0.00931	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.02	1.111	36				
5. Economic	Between Groups	0.069	0.023	3	0.02098	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.02	1.111	36				
6. Ecological	Between Groups	0.052	0.017	3	0.01585	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.01	1.111	36				

7. Growth and Development	Between Groups	0.063	0.021	3	0.01908	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.02	1.111	36				
8. Sustainability	Between Groups	0.042	0.014	3	0.01271	2.87	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Within Groups	40.02	1.111	36				

Level of Significance: 0.05

As depicted in Table 4, the computed F-values are as follows: goals with 0.02400, transformation with 0.01282, productivity with 0.01697, environment with 0.00931, economic with 0.02098, ecological with 0.01585, growth and development with 0.01908, and sustainability with 0.01271 were lower than the critical value of 2.87, 2.90 with 3 and 36, and 32 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is no significant difference on the Stakeholder Engagement in Selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region as assessed by school administrators, extension coordinators, community partners, and community recipients. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The results align with the study by David and Garcia (2022), SUCs in the Philippines commonly adopt standardized frameworks for extension services that include stakeholder consultation, collaboration, and shared decision-making. These shared approaches often lead to similar outcomes, regardless of location or institutional size.

Sub-problem No. 4. How do the four groups of respondents assess the Organizational Performance of selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region in terms of:

Table 5 Assessment of the Organizational Performance

Criteria	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Skills Development and Capacity Building	4.04	E	4.05	E	4.14	E	4.14	E	4.09	E	3
2. Economic Development	4.02	E	4.16	E	4.09	E	4.20	HE	4.12	E	1
3. Community Development	3.98	E	4.07	E	4.12	E	4.23	HE	4.10	E	2
Grand Mean	4.01	E	4.09	E	4.12	E	4.19	E	4.10	E	

Table 5 summarizes the assessment of the organizational performance is rated as Evident with the grand mean of 4.10. All items are rated as Evident, these are: economic development with a composite weighted mean of 4.12 as rank 1; community development with a composite weighted mean of 4.10 as rank 2; and skills development and capacity building with a composite weighted mean of 4.09 as rank 3.

The findings indicate that the organization’s performance in economic development, community development, and skills development is perceived as Evident, suggesting a positive impact across these areas.

The slightly higher rating for economic development highlights its strong influence, while the ratings for community and skills development emphasize their importance in fostering sustainable growth. The overall assessments from different respondent groups reinforce the effectiveness of the organization’s initiatives, with community recipients providing the highest rating. This suggests that direct beneficiaries experience the most significant benefits, while school administrators, with the lowest rating, may perceive areas for improvement in alignment and collaboration. These results highlight the need for continuous enhancement of programs to ensure sustained impact and inclusivity.

This aligns with the present study’s findings, highlighting that skills development programs are most effective when supported by academic institutions that provide structured, needs-based training. The study by Delgado & Cruz (2021) reinforces the idea that strong organizational support—through proper planning, resources, and alignment with local demands—is essential in enhancing individual capabilities and fostering sustainable community development.

Sub-problem No. 5. Is there a significant relationship between the Livelihood Extension Program Administration, Stakeholders’ Engagement, and Organizational Performance of selected State Universities and Colleges in the National Capital Region?

Table 6 Correlation Between Livelihood Extension Program Administration, and Organizational Performance of selected State Universities and Colleges in the National Capital Region

Indicator	r-value	VI	df	t-value	Critical value	Int.	Decision
1. Program Design and Planning	1.00	PC	18	4.2420	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
2. Organizing	1.00	PC	18	4.2419	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
3. Leadership and Administration	1.00	PC	18	4.2419	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
4. Resources	1.00	PC	18	4.2423	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
5. Beneficiary	1.00	PC	18	4.2422	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
6. Funding	1.00	PC	18	4.2420	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
7. Execution	1.00	PC	19	4.2420	2.093	Significant	Reject H ₀
8. Market Support	1.00	PC	19	4.2420	2.093	Significant	Reject H ₀
9. Monitoring	1.00	PC	19	4.2420	2.093	Significant	Reject H ₀
10. Evaluation	1.00	PC	18	4.2423	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀

Level of significance @0.05 Range Verbal Interpretation Symbol

1.00	Perfect Correlation	P
0.71 – 0.99	Very Strong Correlation	VSC
0.51 – 0.70	Strong Correlation	SC
0.31 – 0.50	Moderate Correlation	MC
0.11 – 0.30	Weak Correlation	WC
0.0 – 0.10	Negligible Correlation	NC

As displayed in Table 6, the computed t-values are as follows: program design and planning with 4.2420, organizing, leadership and administration with both 4.2418, resources, and evaluation with both 4.2423, beneficiary with 4.2422, funding, execution, and market support with 4.2420 were higher than the critical value of 2.101, and 2.093 with 18, and 19 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance with r-value of 1.00 rated as Perfect Correlation respectively. Hence, there is significant relationship between Livelihood Extension Program Administration, and Organizational Performance of selected State Universities and Colleges in the National Capital Region. Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

The significant relationship between Livelihood Extension Program (LEP) administration and the organizational performance of selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region implies that effective management and implementation of such programs directly contribute to the institutions’ overall success. This result suggests that the strategic administration of livelihood initiatives not only enhances community engagement and service delivery but also serves as a performance indicator for academic institutions.

Consequently, SUCs should prioritize building competent extension units, strengthen inter-agency collaboration, and continuously assess the impact of livelihood programs to sustain and elevate institutional performance.

This result is consistent with the findings of Alvarez & De Guzman (2021), who emphasized the dual impact of extension programs on both community welfare and institutional advancement.

Table 7 Correlation Between Stakeholder Engagement and Organizational Performance of selected State Universities and Colleges in the National Capital Region

Indicator	r-value	VI	df	t-value	Critical value	Int.	Decision
1. Goals	1.00	PC	18	4.2421	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
2. Transformation	1.00	PC	17	4.1229	2.110	Significant	Reject H ₀
3. Productivity	1.00	PC	18	4.2424	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
4. Environment	1.00	PC	18	4.2423	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
5. Economic	1.00	PC	18	4.2424	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
6. Ecological	1.00	PC	18	4.2421	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
7. Growth and Development	1.00	PC	19	4.2420	2.101	Significant	Reject H ₀
8. Sustainability	1.00	PC	19	4.2420	2101	Significant	Reject H ₀

Level of significance @0.05 Range Verbal Interpretation Symbol

1.00	Perfect Correlation	P
0.71 – 0.99	Very Strong Correlation	VSC
0.51 – 0.70	Strong Correlation	SC
0.31 – 0.50	Moderate Correlation	MC
0.11 – 0.30	Weak Correlation	WC
0.0 – 0.10	Negligible Correlation	NC

As reflected in Table 7, the computed t-values are as follows: goals and ecological with 4.2421, transformation with 4.1229, productivity, and economic with 4.2424, environment with 4.2423, growth and development, and sustainability with 4.2420 were higher than the critical values of 2.101, and 2.110 with 18, and 17 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance with r-value of 1.00 rated as Perfect Correlation respectively. Hence, there is significant relationship between Livelihood Extension Program Administration, and Organizational Performance of selected State Universities and Colleges in the National Capital Region. Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected. The results are aligned with the study by Joshua et al. (2025) examined the impact of community extension programs implemented by a Philippine State University. The research highlighted that active stakeholder participation in these programs led to sustainable local development, improved socioeconomic conditions, and strengthened institutional-community relationships. Such outcomes reflect positively on the university's performance metrics, including relevance and community impact.

Sub-problem No. 6. What are the problems encountered relative to the Livelihood Extension Program Administration and Stakeholders' Engagement?

Livelihood Extension Program Administration

Table 8 Problems Encountered with the Livelihood Extension Program Administration

Indicators	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Insufficient stakeholders' input during the planning phase, leading to misalignment with community needs.	2.66	ME	2.40	LE	2.21	LE	2.57	LE	2.46	LE	6.25

2. Lack of clearly defined goals and objectives, resulting in vague program direction.	2.76	ME	2.35	LE	2.10	LE	2.43	LE	2.41	LE	18.33
3. Inadequate assessment of existing resources and capacities prior to implementation.	2.68	ME	2.42	LE	2.11	LE	2.45	LE	2.42	LE	16.5
4. Unclear roles and responsibilities among team members, causing overlap or gaps in functions.	2.61	ME	2.35	LE	2.14	LE	2.41	LE	2.38	LE	24.5
5. Ineffective communication structures that hinder coordination among team members and stakeholders.	2.61	ME	2.33	LE	2.10	LE	2.52	LE	2.39	LE	23
6. Difficulty in establishing partnerships with local organizations and businesses.	2.74	ME	2.36	LE	2.16	LE	2.49	LE	2.44	LE	11.20
7. Leadership styles that do not promote inclusivity or motivate team members, leading to low morale.	2.76	ME	2.43	LE	2.27	LE	2.51	LE	2.49	LE	1.33
8. Poor conflict resolution strategies, resulting in unresolved issues among team members and stakeholders.	2.63	ME	2.37	LE	2.25	LE	2.52	LE	2.44	LE	11.20
9. Lack of transparency in decision-making processes, causing distrust among stakeholders.	2.63	ME	2.47	LE	2.24	LE	2.49	LE	2.46	LE	6.25
10. Inadequate financial resources to support program activities, leading to cutbacks or incomplete initiatives.	2.66	ME	2.45	LE	2.11	LE	2.54	LE	2.44	LE	11.20
11. Insufficient training and development opportunities for staff, impacting service delivery quality.	2.71	ME	2.44	LE	2.22	LE	2.38	LE	2.44	LE	11.20

12. Limited access to necessary materials and supplies for effective program implementation.	2.63	ME	2.44	LE	2.10	LE	2.52	LE	2.42	LE	16.5
13. Low awareness among potential beneficiaries about the program, resulting in low participation rates.	2.55	LE	2.40	LE	2.08	LE	2.38	LE	2.35	LE	27
14. Unequal access to program benefits, particularly among marginalized groups.	2.74	ME	2.42	LE	2.14	LE	2.31	LE	2.40	LE	21.5
15. Lack of follow-up support for beneficiaries after initial engagement, leading to diminished impact.	2.63	ME	2.33	LE	2.10	LE	2.40	LE	2.37	LE	26
16. Dependence on a limited number of funding sources, making the program vulnerable to financial instability.	2.74	ME	2.40	LE	2.10	LE	2.56	LE	2.45	LE	10
17. Delays in fund disbursement, hindering timely execution of program activities.	2.68	ME	2.46	LE	2.25	LE	2.47	LE	2.47	LE	4.5
18. Insufficient budget allocation for monitoring and evaluation activities, affecting program assessment.	2.74	ME	2.51	LE	2.22	LE	2.49	LE	2.49	LE	1.33
19. Deviations from planned activities due to unforeseen challenges, impacting overall program effectiveness.	2.66	ME	2.39	LE	2.16	LE	2.53	LE	2.44	LE	11.20
20. Inconsistent adherence to timelines and milestones, leading to project delays.	2.76	ME	2.40	LE	2.17	LE	2.54	LE	2.47	LE	4.50
21. Lack of accountability mechanisms to track progress and address challenges.	2.66	ME	2.37	LE	2.16	LE	2.46	LE	2.41	LE	18.33

22. Limited market access for products / services produced by beneficiaries, reducing economic impact.	2.61	ME	2.42	LE	2.03	LE	2.44	LE	2.38	LE	24.5
23. Inadequate marketing strategies, resulting in low visibility and sales for beneficiaries' offerings.	2.61	ME	2.37	LE	2.14	LE	2.53	LE	2.41	LE	18.33
24. Lack of partnerships with local businesses and markets to support sales.	2.74	ME	2.35	LE	2.06	LE	2.43	LE	2.40	LE	21.50
25. Infrequent or inconsistent monitoring activities, resulting in inadequate data for decisionmaking.	2.66	ME	2.40	LE	2.27	LE	2.50	LE	2.46	LE	6.25
26. Poorly defined evaluation metrics, making it difficult to assess program effectiveness.	2.76	ME	2.43	LE	2.25	LE	2.53	LE	2.49	LE	1.33
27. Lack of feedback mechanisms to incorporate lessons learned into program improvements.	2.63	ME	2.47	LE	2.24	LE	2.50	LE	2.46	LE	6.25
Overall Weighted Mean	2.68	ME	2.40	LE	2.16	LE	2.48	LE	2.43	LE	

Legend:

Range Scale Verbal Interpretation Symbol

5	4.20-5.00	Highly Encountered	HE
4	3.40-4.19	Encountered	E
3	2.60-3.39	Moderately Encountered	ME
2	1.80-2.59	Least Encountered	LE
1	1.00-1.79	Very Least Encountered	VLE

As revealed in Table 8, the assessment of the problems encountered with the livelihood extension program administration as to program design and planning rated as Least Encountered with an overall weighted mean of 2.43. All items are rated as Least Encountered, such as: Leadership styles that do not promote inclusivity or motivate team members; leading to low morale, Insufficient budget allocation for monitoring and evaluation activities, affecting program assessment; and Poorly defined evaluation metrics, making it difficult to assess program effectiveness with composite weighted mean of 2.49 as rank 1, 2, and 3; Delays in fund disbursement, hindering timely execution of program activities; and Inconsistent adherence to timelines and milestones, leading to project delays with both composite weighted mean of 2.47 as rank 4 and 5; Insufficient stakeholders' input during the planning phase, leading to misalignment with community needs; Lack of transparency in decisionmaking processes, causing distrust among stakeholders; Infrequent or inconsistent monitoring activities, resulting in inadequate data for decision-making; and Lack of feedback mechanisms to incorporate lessons

learned into program improvements with composite weighted mean of 2.46 as rank. 6, 7, 8 and 9; Dependence on a limited number of funding sources, making the program vulnerable to financial instability with composite weighted mean of 2.45 as rank 10; Difficulty in establishing partnerships with local organizations and businesses; Poor conflict resolution strategies, resulting in unresolved issues among team members and stakeholders; Inadequate financial resources to support program activities, leading to cutbacks or incomplete initiatives; Insufficient training and development opportunities for staff, impacting service delivery quality; and Deviations from planned activities due to unforeseen challenges, impacting overall program effectiveness with composite weighted mean of 2.44 as rank 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15; Inadequate assessment of existing resources and capacities prior to implementation; and Limited access to necessary materials and supplies for effective program implementation with both composite weighted mean of 2.42 as 16 and 17; Lack of clearly defined goals and objectives, resulting in vague program direction; Lack of accountability mechanisms to track progress and address challenges; and Inadequate marketing strategies, resulting in low visibility and sales for beneficiaries' offerings with composite weighted mean of 2.41 as rank 18, 19 and 20; Unequal access to program benefits, particularly among marginalized groups; and Lack of partnerships with local businesses and markets to support sales with both weighted mean of 2.40 as rank 21 and 22; Ineffective communication structures that hinder coordination among team members and stakeholders with composite weighted mean of 2.39 as rank 23; Unclear roles and responsibilities among team members, causing overlap or gaps in functions; and Limited market access for products/services produced by beneficiaries, reducing economic impact with both composite weighted mean of 2.38 as rank 24 and 25; Lack of follow-up support for beneficiaries after initial engagement, leading to diminished impact with composite weighted mean of 2.37 as rank 26; and Low awareness among potential beneficiaries about the program, resulting in low participation rates with composite weighted mean of 2.35 as rank 27.

The assessment showing that problems in program design and planning are *least encountered* suggests that the Livelihood Extension Program is generally well-managed at the administrative level. The low frequency of issues such as poor leadership, lack of transparency, and budget delays indicates that the foundational systems for planning and implementation are functioning effectively. This reflects positively on the institution’s ability to structure and execute the program with minimal internal barriers. However, the presence of even minor challenges—such as limited partnerships, weak follow-up mechanisms, and low community awareness—implies that while the core design is solid, there are still areas that need attention to ensure inclusivity, continuity, and greater community reach. Addressing these less frequent, but still relevant, issues could further strengthen program delivery and amplify its long-term impact.

The finding is aligned with the study by Villanueva & Santos (2022), clear organizational goals, participatory planning, and timely fund allocation are central to minimizing delays and misunderstandings in program delivery. Their research highlights that stakeholder involvement in the early stages of planning helps ensure that programs are aligned with community needs, making them more relevant and impactful in the long run.

Table 9 Problems Encountered with the Stakeholders’ Engagement Relative to the Livelihood Extension Program

Indicators	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. Divergent stakeholder goals that do not align with program objectives, leading to conflicts.	2.55	LE	2.47	LE	2.06	LE	2.60	ME	2.42	LE	7.5
2. Insufficient participation of stakeholders in goal-setting processes, resulting in low ownership.	2.74	ME	2.40	LE	2.08	LE	2.39	LE	2.40	LE	14.25

3. Miscommunication of program goals, causing misunderstandings among stakeholders.	2.63	ME	2.42	LE	2.14	LE	2.29	LE	2.37	LE	23.5
4. Resistance to change among stakeholders, limiting the program's potential for transformative impact.	2.74	ME	2.40	LE	2.05	LE	2.45	LE	2.41	LE	9.20
5. Lack of capacitybuilding initiatives to empower stakeholders to embrace changes.	2.68	ME	2.46	LE	2.10	LE	2.58	LE	2.46	LE	3.5
6. Insufficient success stories or evidence of transformation to motivate engagement.	2.74	ME	2.51	LE	2.25	LE8	2.45	LE	2.49	LE	1
7. Low engagement in productivityenhancing activities among stakeholders due to lack of interest or resources.	2.61	ME	2.35	LE	2.21	LE	2.42	LE	2.40	LE	14.25
8. Limited access to training programs that boost productivity and skills among stakeholders.	2.66	ME	2.39	LE	2.16	LE	2.55	LE	2.44	LE	5
9. Inadequate support for stakeholders to implement learned skills effectively.	2.61	ME	2.34	LE	2.17	LE	2.44	LE	2.39	LE	18.33
10. Neglect of environmental considerations in program planning, leading to unsustainable practices.	2.66	ME	2.35	LE	2.02	LE	2.44	LE	2.37	LE	23.5
11. Lack of stakeholder awareness regarding the importance of environmental sustainability.	2.61	ME	2.42	LE	2.03	LE	2.45	LE	2.38	LE	21.5
12. Insufficient partnerships with environmental organizations to promote best practices.	2.61	ME	2.37	LE	2.14	LE	2.51	LE	2.41	LE	9.2
13. Limited economic benefits realized by stakeholders,	2.58	LE	2.36	LE	2.10	LE	2.55	LE	2.40	LE	14.25

resulting in disillusionment with the program.											
14. Ineffective job placement and training programs, failing to meet local labor market needs.	2.61	ME	2.40	LE	2.16	LE	2.49	LE	2.42	LE	7.5
15. Lack of access to financial services that could empower stakeholders economically.	2.66	ME	2.43	LE	2.14	LE	2.40	LE	2.41	LE	9.2
16. Environmental degradation due to unsustainable practices promoted or overlooked by the program.	2.63	ME	2.47	LE	2.25	LE	2.48	LE	2.46	LE	3.5
17. Lack of education and training on ecological sustainability for stakeholders.	2.63	ME	2.42	LE	2.24	LE	2.44	LE	2.43	LE	6
18. Insufficient integration of ecological considerations in program design.	2.66	ME	2.45	LE	2.21	LE	2.56	LE	2.47	LE	2
19. Stagnation of community growth due to inadequate investment in development projects.	2.63	ME	2.44	LE	2.10	LE	2.39	LE	2.39	LE	18.33
20. Limited opportunities for stakeholders to engage in selfdevelopment initiatives.	2.55	LE	2.47	LE	2.19	LE	2.39	LE	2.40	LE	14.25
21. Lack of longterm planning to ensure sustained growth and development.	2.55	LE	2.40	LE	2.08	LE	2.59	LE	2.41	LE	9.2
22. Short-term focus of funding and program activities, compromising long-term sustainability.	2.63	ME	2.38	LE	2.14	LE	2.42	LE	2.39	LE	18.33

23. Insufficient capacity-building for stakeholders to maintain initiatives post-program.	2.55	LE	2.38	LE	2.10	LE	2.50	LE	2.38	LE	21.5
24. Failure to develop a clear exit strategy that ensures continued support for beneficiaries.	2.74	ME	2.40	LE	2.05	LE	2.44	LE	2.41	LE	9.20
Overall Weighted Mean	2.64	ME	2.41	LE	2.13	LE	2.47	LE	2.41	LE	

As stated in Table 9, the assessment of the problems encountered with the stakeholders' engagement is relative to the livelihood extension program rated as Least Encountered with an overall weighted mean of 2.40. All items are rated as Least Encountered, these are: Insufficient success stories or evidence of transformation to motivate engagement with composite weighted mean of 2.49 as rank 1; Insufficient integration of ecological considerations in program design with composite weighted mean of 2.47 as rank 2; Lack of capacity-building initiatives to empower stakeholders to embrace changes; and Environmental degradation due to unsustainable practices promoted or overlooked by the program with both composite weighted mean of 2.46 as rank 3 and 4; Limited access to training programs that boost productivity and skills among stakeholders with composite weighted mean of 2.44 as rank 5; Lack of education and training on ecological sustainability for stakeholders with composite weighted mean of 2.43 as rank 6; Divergent stakeholder goals that do not align Insufficient partnerships with environmental organizations; Lack of access to financial services to empower stakeholders economically; Lack of long-term planning for sustained growth and development; and Failure to develop a clear exit strategy with program objectives; and Ineffective job placement and training programs with both composite weighted mean of 7 and 8; with composite weighted mean of 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13; Insufficient participation of stakeholders in goal-setting; Low engagement in productivity-enhancing activities due to lack of interest or resources; Limited economic benefits realized by stakeholders; Limited opportunities for self-development initiatives with composite weighted mean of 2.40 as rank 14, 15, 16, and 17; Inadequate support to implement learned skills; Stagnation of community growth due to inadequate investment in development projects; and Short-term focus of funding and program activities with composite weighted mean of 18, 19, and 20; Lack of stakeholder awareness on environmental sustainability; and Insufficient capacity-building for stakeholders to maintain initiatives post-program with both composite weighted mean of 2.38 as rank 21 and 22; and Miscommunication of program goals; and Neglect of environmental considerations in program planning with both composite weighted mean of 2.37 as rank 23 and 24.

The results are quite in contrast with the study by Nelson & Phillips (2023) found that the success of livelihood and extension programs in universities depends heavily on the involvement of stakeholders. When community members, local businesses, government agencies, and others take part in planning, running, and reviewing these programs, the results are much better. The study showed that programs work best when their goals match what the stakeholders need and expect. Without this engagement, programs often struggle and have limited impact. The authors stress that universities should focus on what their communities need and keep checking if their programs stay aligned with those needs. Regular communication and teamwork with stakeholders help make these programs more effective, lasting, and responsive to change.

Sub-problem No. 7. Based on the findings, what Sustainability Model may be proposed?

Based from the findings A Proposed Enhancement Towards Sustainability was developed to strengthen the implementation of livelihood extension programs in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), ensuring their long-term impact on education and community development. These programs serve as a crucial bridge between academic institutions and the communities they support by providing essential skills, knowledge, and resources that promote economic empowerment and self-sufficiency. To achieve sustainability, continuous innovation, effective management, and a well-structured framework are necessary. This enhancement focuses on key areas

such as program development, resource optimization, stakeholder collaboration, capacity-building initiatives, and the integration of sustainable practices to ensure lasting benefits for both the institution and the communities it serves. It consists of key features such as key result areas, objectives, strategies, program/activities, persons involved, budget/source of budget, time fame and performance indicator.

Sub-problem No. 8. How suitable, acceptable, and feasible is the proposed Sustainability Model?

Table 10 Suitability of the Proposed Sustainability Model

Indicators	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The proposed Sustainability Model is designed to align with the school’s Vision and Mission, promoting the development of sustainable livelihood skills for the community.	4.76	HS	4.97	HS	4.75	HS	4.44	HS	4.73	HS	5
2. The objectives of the proposed Sustainability Model are tailored to be specific, realistic, and attainable within a defined timeframe.	4.84	HS	4.83	HS	4.84	HS	4.49	HS	4.75	HS	3.5
3. The proposed Sustainability Model serves as a policy framework for identifying gaps and implementing corrective measures within the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.82	HS	4.95	HS	4.90	HS	4.48	HS	4.79	HS	1
4. The proposed Sustainability Model is developed as a clear and direct template, providing a stepby-step approach for implementation, including stakeholder engagement and resource allocation.	4.76	HS	4.90	HS	4.76	HS	4.46	HS	4.72	HS	6
5. The proposed Sustainability Model is wellsuited for the school, effectively	4.82	HS	4.89	HS	4.90	HS	4.46	HS	4.77	HS	2

addressing the practical needs of both students and community members.											
6. The proposed Sustainability Model is realistic and feasible, featuring clearly defined milestones and timelines for effective tracking and implementation.	4.87	HS	4.91	HS	4.75	HS	4.45	HS	4.75	HS	3.5
Overall Weighted Mean	4.81	HS	4.91	HS	4.82	HS	4.46	HS	4.75	HS	

Legend: Range Scale Verbal Interpretation Symbol

5	4.20-5.00	Highly Suitable	HS
4	3.40-4.19	Suitable	S
3	2.60-3.39	Moderately Suitable	MS
2	1.80-2.59	Least Suitable	LS
1	1.00-1.79	Not Suitable	NS

As recognized in Table 10, the assessment of the suitability of proposed sustainability model is rated as Highly Suitable with an overall weighted mean of 4.75. All items are rated as Highly Suitable, these are: the proposed Sustainability Model serves as a policy framework for identifying gaps and implementing corrective measures within the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.79 as rank 1; the proposed Sustainability Model is well-suited for the school, effectively addressing the practical needs of both students and community members with a composite weighted mean of 4.77 as rank 2; the objectives of the proposed Sustainability Model are tailored to be specific, realistic, and attainable within a defined timeframe; and the proposed Sustainability Model is realistic and feasible, featuring clearly defined milestones and timelines for effective tracking and implementation with both the composite weighted mean of 4.75 as rank 3 and 4; the proposed Sustainability Model is designed to align with the school’s Vision and Mission, promoting the development of sustainable livelihood skills for the community with a composite weighted mean of 4.73 as rank 5; and the proposed Sustainability Model is developed as a clear and direct template, providing a step-by-step approach for implementation, including stakeholder engagement and resource allocation with a composite weighted mean of 4.72 as rank 6.

The results imply that the proposed Sustainability Model is positioned to enhance the effectiveness, responsiveness, and longevity of livelihood extension initiatives. Its suitability points to its potential for adoption not only within the assessed institution but also as a reference model for other State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) aiming to institutionalize sustainable community development practices.

The findings align with the study by Del Rosario & Mateo (2022), stating that sustainability frameworks that are embedded within a university’s mission and tailored to its community partners are more likely to succeed. Their study revealed that models designed with a step-by-step approach — incorporating stakeholder engagement, defined timelines, and resource planning — resulted in stronger program outcomes and community impact.

Table 11 Acceptability of Proposed Sustainability Model

Indicators	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The proposed Sustainability Model incorporates sufficient flexibility to allow the Livelihood Extension Program to adapt to changing community needs and industry trends while maintaining costeffectiveness.	4.87	HA	4.81	HA	4.94	HA	4.45	HA	4.77	HA	2
2. It offers a wellresearched foundation that presents all relevant facts necessary for the successful implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.66	HA	4.94	HA	4.89	HA	4.53	HA	4.76	HA	3
3. It is designed to be practical and readily implementable, ensuring seamless integration into the school’s Livelihood Extension Program.	4.68	HA	4.83	HA	4.83	HA	4.46	HA	4.70	HA	5
4. It benefits the school by identifying potential weaknesses related to community engagement and practical skills application within the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.71	HA	4.83	HA	4.86	HA	4.43	HA	4.71	HA	4
5. It provides a clear roadmap to guide and assist in developing policy guidelines that govern the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.82	HA	4.88	HA	4.90	HA	4.51	HA	4.78	HA	1
6. It offers comprehensive knowledge regarding the implementation of corrective actions,	4.74	HA	4.76	HA	4.68	HA	4.46	HA	4.66	HA	6

enabling both the school and community to respond effectively to challenges encountered during the execution of the Livelihood Extension Program.											
Overall Weighted Mean	4.75	HA	4.84	HA	4.85	HA	4.47	HA	4.73	HA	

Legend: Range Scale Verbal Interpretation Symbol

5	4.20-5.00	Highly Acceptable	HA
4	3.40-4.19	Acceptable	A
3	2.60-3.39	Moderately Acceptable	MA
2	1.80-2.59	Least Acceptable	LA
1	1.00-1.79	Not Acceptable	NA

As exposed in Table 11, the assessment of the acceptability of proposed sustainability model is rated as Highly Acceptable with an overall weighted mean of 4.73. All items are rated as Highly Acceptable, namely: it provides a clear roadmap to guide and assist in developing policy guidelines that govern the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.78 as rank 1; the proposed Sustainability Model incorporates sufficient flexibility to allow the Livelihood Extension Program to adapt to changing community needs and industry trends while maintaining cost-effectiveness with a composite weighted mean of 4.77 as rank 2; it offers a well-researched foundation that presents all relevant facts necessary for the successful implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.76 as rank 3; it benefits the school by identifying potential weaknesses related to community engagement and practical skills application within the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.71 as rank 4; it is designed to be practical and readily implementable, ensuring seamless integration into the school’s Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.70 as rank 5; and it offers comprehensive knowledge regarding the implementation of corrective actions, enabling both the school and community to respond effectively to challenges encountered during the execution of the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.66 as rank 6.

The results show that the proposed sustainability model is highly acceptable, with a strong average rating of 4.73. This means that the people involved—like school leaders, teachers, and community members—believe the model is useful and fits well with the goals of the Livelihood Extension Program.

The findings are aligned with the study by Martinez & Soriano (2023), which reiterates that highly acceptable models are those that adapt well to changing community conditions and labor market trends without sacrificing quality or cost-efficiency. Their findings show that when models are designed with built-in flexibility, institutions are better equipped to respond to emerging challenges and opportunities.

Table 12 Feasibility of Proposed Sustainability Model

Indicators	School Administrators		Extension Coordinators		Community Partners		Community Recipients		Composite		Rank
	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	WM	VI	
1. The objectives of the Sustainability Model are structured to be achievable	4.87	HF	4.81	HF	4.59	HF	4.43	HF	4.68	HF	4

within a reasonable timeframe, ensuring timely and practical execution of the Livelihood Extension Program.											
2. The proposed Sustainability Model includes clear, actionable guidelines, processes, and procedures that are implementable within the8 Livelihood Extension Program framework.	4.66	HF	4.78	HF	4.60	HF	4.37	HF	4.60	HF	5
3. It considers the availability of key resources— financial, human, and material— necessary for the effective and efficient implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.79	HF	4.90	HF	4.70	HF	4.52	HF	4.73	HF	1
4. It contains actionable and workable strategies aimed at enhancing the performance and implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.66	HF	4.88	HF	4.79	HF	4.41	HF	4.69	HF	3
5. It integrates features such as monitoring tools and feedback mechanisms to ensure the smooth and effective implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program.	4.66	HF	4.88	HF	4.97	HF	4.36	HF	4.72	HF	2
Overall Weighted Mean	4.73	HF	4.85	HF	4.73	HF	4.42	HF	4.68	HF	

Legend: Range Scale Verbal Interpretation Symbol

- 5 4.20-5.00 Highly Feasible HF
- 4 3.40-4.19 Feasible F
- 3 2.60-3.39 Moderately Feasible MF
- 2 1.80-2.59 Least Feasible LF
- 1 1.00-1.79 Not Feasible NF

As presented in Table 12, the assessment of the feasibility of proposed sustainability model rated as Highly Feasible with an overall weighted mean of 4.68. All items are rated as Highly Feasible, these are: it considers the availability of key resources—financial, human, and material—necessary for the effective and efficient implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.73 as rank 1; it integrates features such as monitoring tools and feedback mechanisms to ensure the smooth and effective implementation of the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.72 as rank 2; it contains actionable and workable strategies aimed at enhancing the performance and implementation of the

Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.69 as rank 3; the objectives of the Sustainability Model are structured to be achievable within a reasonable timeframe, ensuring timely and practical execution of the Livelihood Extension Program with a composite weighted mean of 4.68 as rank 4; and the proposed Sustainability Model includes clear, actionable guidelines, processes, and procedures that are implementable within the Livelihood Extension Program framework with a composite weighted mean of 4.60 as rank 5.

The high feasibility rating of the proposed sustainability model shows that it is practical and ready to be used in the Livelihood Extension Program. Since it considers important factors like available resources, clear strategies, and proper monitoring, it can help improve how the program is carried out. This means that the model can guide SUCs in running their livelihood programs more effectively, leading to better results for the communities they serve.

Lim & Bautista (2021) supports the current finding that the proposed sustainability model's clear and actionable structure contributes to its high feasibility and increases confidence in its successful implementation.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the livelihood extension programs in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region are generally well-administered and demonstrate strong effectiveness. Administration practices reflect a structured and organized approach, while stakeholder engagement is robust, with faculty, students, community partners, and local agencies actively contributing to program goals. The uniformity of responses across different respondent groups suggests a standardized implementation, emphasizing both program consistency and areas for strategic enhancement.

Organizational performance was assessed as highly supportive of economic and community development, including skills enhancement, capacity building, and promotion of sustainable livelihoods. The significant relationships observed between program administration, stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance indicate that effective management and active participation are key drivers of program success, highlighting the importance of sustained collaboration, strategic planning, and continuous improvement.

Despite these positive outcomes, the study identified minor operational challenges, such as areas requiring further refinement in program delivery and stakeholder coordination. These issues, although limited, present opportunities to further strengthen program effectiveness and ensure long-term sustainability. The implementation of the proposed enhancement towards sustainability and the Sustainability Model is rated highly in terms of suitability, acceptability, and feasibility, demonstrating strong potential to optimize program management, align institutional and community objectives, and promote enduring socio-economic impact.

In summary, the livelihood extension programs in SUCs exhibit strong administration, active stakeholder engagement, and high organizational performance. By leveraging structured frameworks, fostering continuous collaboration, and addressing minor operational gaps, SUCs can enhance the effectiveness, adaptability, and sustainability of their programs, ensuring lasting benefits for communities and supporting broader socioeconomic development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions presented, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. The school administrators may adopt the Proposed Enhancement Towards Sustainability for long-term development. The high ratings for the output suggest strong feasibility for its adoption. SUCs may align the initiatives with institutional objectives, ensuring that it remain community-driven, resource-efficient, and adaptable to socio-economic changes.
2. May build on the strong involvement of stakeholders, since it is essential to further formalize and strengthen partnerships with local governments, industries, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Establishing long-term agreements and structured feedback mechanisms will help maintain stakeholder commitment and ensure that their contributions continuously align with the changing needs of the community.
3. The uniform assessments across respondent groups highlight the importance of maintaining consistency in program implementation. SUCs may develop strategic planning mechanisms, such as regular program evaluations, standardized guidelines, and performance tracking systems, to identify and address gaps while ensuring flexibility for local adaptability.
4. May continuously reinforce community development and skill enhancement by allocating adequate resources, faculty training, and institutional support, strengthen extension services policies, and recognize outstanding contributions from faculty, students, and stakeholders to further promote a culture of commitment to livelihood programs.
5. Given the significant relationship between program administration, stakeholder engagement, and organizational performance, SUCs may integrate strategic sustainability measures, such as long-term funding strategies, policy integration, and adaptive program structures, to enhance resilience and responsiveness to community needs.
6. While challenges in program administration and stakeholders' engagement are minimal, it is crucial to proactively identify and resolve minor concerns before they escalate. Conducting regular assessments, stakeholder consultations, and process optimizations will ensure that the program remains efficient, responsive, and impactful.
7. School administrators may develop a monitoring and evaluation tool to assess the implementation of the Proposed Enhancement Towards Sustainability and make necessary adjustments to enhance its effectiveness and long-term impact.
8. Continuous refinement of the Proposed Enhancement Towards Sustainability may be done to upgrade the Livelihood Extension Program, ensuring alignment with institutional goals, responsiveness to community needs, efficient resource management, and continuous improvement for long-term sustainability.
9. Parallel study may be conducted to validate the results of the present study using the same venue and variables but different respondents.

REFERENCES

1. Alvarez, R., & De Guzman, L. (2021). The dual impact of extension programs on community welfare and institutional advancement. *Philippine Journal of Educational Development*, 15(2), 45-60.
2. Brown, T., & Garcia, M. (2023). Maximizing student engagement in community extension programs. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 28(1), 12-28.
3. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. David, P., & Garcia, R. (2022). Standardized frameworks for stakeholder engagement in higher education extension programs. *Asian Journal of University Extension Services*, 10(3), 101-117.
5. Dela Cruz, F., & Ramirez, E. (2023). Assessment of livelihood programs in Northern Mindanao: Administration and community impact. *Mindanao Educational Review*, 7(1), 55-70.
6. Del Rosario, L., & Mateo, A. (2022). Designing sustainability frameworks for community-based university programs. *Philippine Journal of Sustainable Education*, 9(2), 88-104.
7. Delgado, P., & Cruz, R. (2021). The role of structured skills development programs in sustainable community development. *Journal of Philippine Higher Education*, 12(1), 33-49.

8. De Guzman, L., & Manalang, J. (2021). Consistency in SUC livelihood and extension program implementation. *Philippine Educational Administration Review*, 14(2), 70-85.
9. Joshua, M., Santos, E., & Reyes, D. (2025). Community extension programs and institutional performance in Philippine State Universities. *Journal of Community Development in Higher Education*, 3(1), 22-40.
10. Lim, J., & Bautista, R. (2021). Feasibility assessment of sustainability models in higher education extension programs. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy*, 8(2), 15-32.
11. Martinez, A., & Soriano, K. (2023). Flexible models for sustainable extension programs in higher education. *Journal of Education and Community Development*, 11(1), 50-66.
12. Nelson, P., & Phillips, G. (2023). Stakeholder involvement as a determinant of success in university livelihood programs. *Asian Journal of Community Engagement*, 7(2), 101-115.
13. Villanueva, M., & Santos, R. (2022). Effective planning and resource allocation in university extension programs. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education Research*, 18(1), 44-59.