



# AN EVALUATIVE STUDY OF THE MILLENNIAL FARMERS CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BY CV PENDAWA KENCANA MULTIFARM USING THE CIPPO MODEL

**Rena Suryaningsih<sup>1</sup>, R Hermawan<sup>2</sup>, Sukadi<sup>3\*</sup>**

<sup>123</sup>Politeknik Pembangunan Pertanian Yogyakarta Magelang, Indonesia.

Email: [renasurya45@gmail.com](mailto:renasurya45@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [rdnhermawan71@gmail.com](mailto:rdnhermawan71@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>, [sukadisukadi84@gmail.com](mailto:sukadisukadi84@gmail.com)<sup>3</sup>

Received : 11 May 2026

Accepted : 01 June 2026

Revised : 16 May 2026

Published : 15 June 2026

## Abstract

The agricultural sector plays a strategic role in national development, particularly in ensuring food security and supporting economic sustainability. However, Indonesia is currently facing a decline in the number of agricultural actors and a regeneration crisis among farmers, especially in the younger generation. In response to this issue, various capacity-building programs for millennial farmers have been implemented, including the program conducted by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the millennial farmer capacity development program using the CIPPO evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product, Outcome). This research employed a descriptive quantitative approach involving 42 millennial farmer respondents selected through proportional random sampling using the Slovin formula. Data were collected using questionnaires based on a 1–5 Likert scale and analyzed using descriptive statistics and the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) to measure each CIPPO component. The results show that the program is categorized as effective, with an overall IEP score of 86.87%. Each component also falls within the effective category, with scores of 85.19% for Context, 87.62% for Input, 88.24% for Process, 87.81% for Product, and 85.48% for Outcome. The highest effectiveness was found in the Process component, indicating strong participant engagement and effective implementation of participatory, practice-based learning. Meanwhile, the Context component recorded the lowest score, suggesting the need for improved alignment between program design and participants' specific needs. Overall, the program has proven effective in improving participants' knowledge, skills, and farming capacity, as well as contributing to behavioral change and farming sustainability. However, further refinement is needed in the planning stage to enhance contextual accuracy and long-term impact.

**Keywords:** program effectiveness, millennial farmers, capacity development, CIPPO, agriculture

## INTRODUCTION

The agricultural sector has a strategic role in national economic development, particularly in ensuring food security, providing employment opportunities, and contributing to national foreign exchange earnings. However, this sector is facing a serious challenge in the form of a decline in the number of agricultural business actors. Data from the Central Bureau of Statistics show that the number of Individual Agricultural Enterprises (UTP) in Indonesia reached 29,342,202 units, a decrease of 7.45 percent compared to 2013. This condition indicates the weak interest of the younger generation in the agricultural sector (Kompas.com, 2023). This phenomenon is reinforced by the results of the 2023 Agricultural Census, which showed that millennial farmers aged 19–39 years accounted for only 21.93 percent of the total national farmers. This condition indicates a farmer regeneration crisis that affects the sustainability of the national food system. From the perspective of sustainable agricultural development, farmer regeneration is a key factor in ensuring the sustainability of food production and adaptation to technological changes (Marpaung & Bangun, 2023). According to Law Number 18 of 2012 concerning Food, food security is determined not only by availability and distribution, but also by the capacity of human resources within the agricultural system. However, the reality in the field shows that the structure of Indonesian farmers is still dominated by the elderly age group, while young farmers continue to face limitations in terms of access to technology, capital, and agribusiness managerial capacity (Hasyati, 2025). In response to these challenges, the Ministry of Agriculture through BPPSDMP initiated the Millennial Farmer Program to produce 2.5 million young farmers who are advanced, independent, and modern (BPPSDMP, 2021). This program emphasizes strengthening human capital through

training, mentoring, and the development of digital technology-based agribusiness networks (BPPSDMP, 2023). Nevertheless, institutional evaluations indicate that the implementation of the program still faces challenges in the form of gaps between the training process and its application in the field. From the perspective of capacity building, improving farmers' capabilities depends not only on knowledge transfer, but also on strengthening integrated human capital and social capital (Rana et al., 2025). In addition, the success of empowerment programs is also influenced by the quality of intervention design, including contextual relevance, adequacy of inputs, and the effectiveness of the implementation process (Stufflebeam & Zhang, 2017).

In the context of implementation at the field level, CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm acts as a partner in developing the capacity of millennial farmers through modern cultivation training programs based on environmentally friendly microbes, farm business management, demonstration plots, industrial internships, and post-training assistance. This program integrates approaches to character building, education building, economic building, and sustainable agricultural technology. However, the results of the program implementation indicate variations in achievement. Some farmers were able to develop their businesses sustainably with increased production capacity and business management, while others experienced stagnation or business failure. This condition indicates the need to comprehensively evaluate program effectiveness, not only from the output aspect but also from long-term outcomes. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the effectiveness of the millennial farmer capacity development program at CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm using the CIPPO evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product, Outcome). This approach is expected to provide a comprehensive overview of program effectiveness while generating recommendations for a more adaptive, participatory, and sustainable millennial farmer empowerment design.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Type and Approach**

This study employed a descriptive quantitative approach using the CIPPO evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product, Outcome). This approach was used to systematically measure program effectiveness based on quantitative data obtained from respondents through structured questionnaires. The CIPPO model was used to comprehensively evaluate the program, starting from the suitability of the program to participants' needs (context), resource readiness (input), implementation process (process), direct results (product), to long-term impacts (outcome) (Purnawirawan et al., 2019).

### **Research Location and Time**

This research was conducted at CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm located in Kepuharjo Village, Cangkringan District, Sleman Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta. This location was purposively selected because CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm is actively involved in training, mentoring, and empowering millennial farmers. The research was conducted from October 2025 to April 2026, covering the stages of preparation, data collection, data analysis, and report writing.

### **Population and Sampling Technique**

The determination of the sample size in this study used the Slovin formula, since the total population was known with certainty, namely 46 millennial farmers who participated in the capacity development program in 2024 and 2025. The Slovin formula was chosen because it is simple, efficient, and relevant for survey research with small to medium populations (Sugiyono, 2023). The error tolerance used in this study was 5%, therefore the sample size calculation was carried out using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \quad (1)$$

By substituting the population value ( $N = 46$ ) and the error tolerance level ( $e = 0.05$ ), the following calculation was obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \frac{46}{1+46(0,05)^2} \\ n &= \frac{46}{1 + 46(0,0025)} \\ n &= \frac{46}{1,115} \\ n &= 41,26 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Based on the calculation results using the Slovin formula with a 5% error tolerance level, a sample size of 41.26 was obtained, which was then rounded up to 42 respondents. This number was considered sufficient to fulfill the principle of population representation and to support the validity and reliability of the research data. Furthermore, the sampling process was conducted using the proportional random sampling technique based on the year of participation of millennial farmers in the capacity development program, namely 2024 and 2025. The sample distribution was carried out proportionally according to the population size in each year, so that each group remained fairly represented.

The determination of the sample size in each group was carried out using the proportional random sampling formula, namely:

$$n_i = \frac{N_i}{N} \times n \quad (3)$$

#### Description:

$n_i$  = number of samples in the i-th group  
 $N_i$  = number of populations in the i-th group  
 $N$  = total population size  
 $n$  = total sample size

Table 1. Sampling Technique

|       | Total Population<br>( $N_i$ ) |            | Total Population              | Total Population<br>( $n_i$ ) |
|-------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2024  | 26<br>farmers                 | millennial | $(26 / 46) \times 42 = 23,74$ | 24 millennial farmers         |
| 2025  | 20<br>farmers                 | millennial | $(20 / 46) \times 42 = 18,26$ | 18 millennial farmers         |
| Total | 46<br>farmers                 | millennial |                               | 42 respondents                |

The calculation results show that the group of millennial farmers in 2024, with a population of 26 individuals, obtained a sample allocation of 24 respondents, while the group of millennial farmers in 2025, with a population of 20 individuals, obtained a sample allocation of 18 respondents. The sample distribution was in accordance with the population proportion of each group and is expected to maintain respondent representation as well as support the validity and reliability of the research data.

#### Data Collection Methods

The research data consisted of primary data and secondary data, where primary data refer to data obtained directly from the first source, while secondary data refer to data obtained from other parties and reused by the researcher (Sugiyono, 2023). Primary data in this study were collected through questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaire used a closed-ended instrument based on a 1–5 Likert scale to measure respondents' perceptions of the research variables (Amruddin et al., 2022), while interviews were conducted in an unstructured manner to strengthen and complement the quantitative data obtained (Ahyar et al., 2020). Meanwhile, secondary data were obtained through documentation studies in the form of program reports, archives of CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm, as well as publications from BPPSDMP and BPS, which were used to support and enrich the research analysis (Sugiyono, 2023).

#### Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to describe the characteristics of the research data through tables, graphs, and percentage achievement calculations (Sugiyono, 2017). In this study, descriptive analysis was used to calculate the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) for each CIPPO component. The Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was calculated based on the actual scores obtained from the questionnaire data compared to the maximum possible scores for each CIPPO component. The PEI calculation formula was based on Likert scale questionnaire data (1–5), which were analyzed using the class interval formula to determine the categories of ineffective, moderately effective, and effective.

$$IEP = \frac{\text{Skor Maksimal} - \text{Skor Minimal}}{\text{Jumlah Kelas}} \quad (4)$$

With the following provisions:

Maximum Score = 100%

Minimum Score = 20%

Number of Classes = 3

$$IEP = \frac{100\% - 20\%}{3} = 26,67\%$$

Based on the calculation of respondents' achievement percentages, the categories can be classified as follows:

Ineffective category = 20.00% – 46.66%

Moderately effective category = 46.67% – 73.33%

Effective category = 73.34% – 100%

To obtain an overview of the overall program effectiveness, the total Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was also calculated by taking the average PEI value from all CIPPO components. The total PEI was calculated using the following formula:

$$IEP \text{ Total} = \frac{(IEP_C + IEP_I + IEP_P + IEP_{Pr} + IEP_O)}{5} \quad (5)$$

#### Description:

|                         |                                                 |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| IEP                     | = Program Effectiveness Index                   |
| IEP_Total_{Total} Total | = Overall Program Effectiveness Index           |
| IEP <sub>C</sub>        | = Effectiveness Index for the Context component |
| IEP <sub>I</sub>        | = Effectiveness Index for the Input component   |
| IEP <sub>P</sub>        | = Effectiveness Index for the Process component |
| IEP <sub>Pr</sub>       | = Effectiveness Index for the Product component |
| IEP <sub>O</sub>        | = Effectiveness Index for the Outcome component |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Overview of the Implementation of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program

The overview of the implementation of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program at CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm was prepared based on the results of data collection through nine questions administered to 42 respondents, thereby reflecting the participants' experiences and perceptions during their participation in the program. The program implementation began with a socialization stage conducted for young farmers in the target area, where participants were introduced to the program objectives, the benefits to be gained, and the series of activities to be carried out. From the beginning, participants showed considerable enthusiasm because the program not only focused on delivering materials, but also provided direct assistance tailored to their field needs.

The activities were then continued with training sessions conducted in stages by combining lecture methods, discussions, and direct practice. The materials provided covered technical cultivation aspects according to each commodity, farm business management, and the utilization of simple agricultural technologies. In this process, participants not only acted as recipients of information, but also actively shared their experiences and challenges, making the learning process more interactive and relevant to real field conditions. After the training, the program proceeded to an intensive field assistance stage. This stage became an important part of the program because it helped participants implement the knowledge they had acquired during the training. Mentors provided direct guidance regarding cultivation techniques, problem-solving, and decision-making in farming businesses. Through this process, participants demonstrated increased self-confidence in managing their farming activities independently.

Over time, positive changes began to appear among participants, both in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes toward farming. Some participants started applying the innovations obtained during the training, while others showed improvements in business management and production planning. In addition, the program also encouraged the establishment of networks among young farmers who support one another and share information. Overall, the program implementation proceeded well and produced tangible impacts on the participants. The participatory and sustainable approach became one of the key factors in the success of this program in improving the capacity of millennial farmers, while also supporting farmer regeneration efforts in the agricultural sector.

### Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program

The analysis of program effectiveness was conducted using the CIPPO evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product, Outcome). This model was used to comprehensively evaluate the program, starting from its suitability to participants' needs, the readiness of resources, the implementation process, short-term results, and the long-term impacts experienced by program participants.

### Analysis of the Context Component

Evaluation of the context component in the CIPPO model aimed to assess the suitability of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program implemented by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm with participants' needs, agricultural sector problems, and the characteristics of millennial farmers. This component was measured through 10 indicators (P11–P20) involving 42 respondents using a 1–5 Likert scale.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents Based on Commodity Type

| Component         | Number of Respondents | Number of Items | Maximum Score | Actual Score |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Context (P11–P20) | 42                    | 10              | 2100          | 1789         |

To determine the effectiveness level of the context component, the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was calculated by comparing the actual score with the maximum possible score. The maximum score was obtained from the multiplication of the number of respondents, the number of items, and the highest score on the Likert scale, namely:

$$\text{Maximum score} = 42 \times 10 \times 5 = 2100$$

Thus, the PEI value for the context component is as follows:

$$IEP_{\text{Context}} = \frac{1789}{2100} \times 100\% = 85,19\% \quad (6)$$

Based on the results of data processing, an actual score of 1789 was obtained from the maximum score of 2100, resulting in a Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) value of 85.19%. This value falls into the effective category because it is within the range of 73.34%–100%. These results indicate that the program was aligned with participants' needs and relevant in addressing the issue of young farmer regeneration. The program, which integrated training, demonstration plots, internships, and farming business assistance, was considered capable of meeting the needs of millennial farmers who tend to prefer practice-based learning and direct field experience. This finding is in line with Marpaung and Bangun (2023), who stated that farmer regeneration would be more effective if programs were designed based on the needs and characteristics of young farmers. In addition, Bahagia et al. (2024) explained that millennial farmers are more interested in programs that are applicative, innovative, and participatory.

### Analysis of the Input Component

The evaluation of the input component in the CIPPO model aimed to assess the quality of resources used in the implementation of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm. This component included mentor competence, the quality of training materials, learning media, the availability of practice tools and materials, demonstration plot facilities, and farming business assistance. The measurement was conducted through 10 indicators (P21–P30) involving 42 respondents using a 1–5 Likert scale.

Table 3. Recapitulation of Input Component Scores (P21–P30)

| Component       | Number of Respondents | Number of Items | Maximum Score | Actual Score |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Input (P21–P30) | 42                    | 10              | 2100          | 1840         |

To determine the effectiveness level of the input component, the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was calculated by comparing the actual score with the maximum possible score.

The maximum score was obtained from the multiplication of the number of respondents, the number of items, and the highest score on the Likert scale:

$$\text{Maximum score} = 42 \times 10 \times 5 = 2100$$

Thus, the PEI value for the input component is as follows:

$$IEP_{\text{Input}} = \frac{1840}{2100} \times 100\% = 87,62\% \quad (7)$$

The calculation results show that the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) value for the input component was 87.62%. Based on the assessment criteria used in this study, this value falls within the range of 73.34%–100%, and is therefore included in the effective category. These results indicate that the quality of resources and supporting facilities of the program were considered good by the participants and were able to optimally support the learning process of millennial farmers. The availability of practice facilities, learning media, and technical assistance was considered to play an important role in improving training effectiveness. This finding is in line with Rana et al. (2025), who stated that mentor competence, practice facilities, and technical assistance have a major influence on the success of farmer capacity development. In addition, Stufflebeam and Zhang (2017) explained that the input



component in the CIPPO model serves as an important foundation in ensuring the effectiveness of program implementation.

### Analysis of the Process Component

The evaluation of the process component in the CIPPO model aimed to assess the implementation process of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program carried out by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm. This component included participant involvement during the activities, the effectiveness of learning methods, interaction between mentors and participants, the implementation of discussions and field practices, the continuity of mentoring, as well as the suitability of the program implementation with the planned activities. The measurement was conducted through 10 indicators (P31–P40) involving 42 respondents using a 1–5 Likert scale.

The recapitulation of the data processing results showed the following total scores:

Table 4. Recapitulation of Process Component Scores (P31–P40)

| Component         | Number of Respondents | Number of Items | Maximum Score | Actual Score |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Process (P31–P40) | 42                    | 10              | 2100          | 1853         |

To determine the effectiveness level of the process component, the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was calculated by comparing the actual score with the maximum possible score.

The maximum score was obtained from the multiplication of the number of respondents, the number of items, and the highest score on the Likert scale, namely:

$$\text{Maximum score} = 42 \times 10 \times 5 = 2100$$

Thus, the PEI value for the process component is as follows:

$$IEP_{Process} = \frac{1853}{2100} \times 100\% = 88,24\% \quad (8)$$

The calculation results show that the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) value for the process component was 88.24%. Based on the assessment criteria used in this study, this value falls within the range of 73.34%–100%, and is therefore included in the effective category. These results indicate that the program implementation process was carried out well and in accordance with the planned objectives. The high level of participant involvement, opportunities for discussion, and continuous assistance demonstrate that the participatory and field practice-based approach was able to create an effective learning process for millennial farmers. This finding is in line with the study by Purnawirawan et al. (2019), which stated that participatory and practice-based learning can increase participant involvement and learning effectiveness. In addition, the experiential learning approach in agricultural training is considered capable of improving participants' understanding through direct field experience.

### Analysis of the Product Component

The evaluation of the product component in the CIPPO model aimed to assess the direct results obtained by participants after participating in the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program implemented by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm. This component reflects changes in aspects such as knowledge, skills, understanding of materials, practical abilities, self-confidence, perspectives toward modern agriculture, interest in technological innovation, ability to solve field problems, application of materials in farming businesses, and the level of satisfaction with the program.

In this study, the product component was measured through 10 indicators consisting of P41 to P50 involving 42 respondents. The measurement was conducted using a 1–5 Likert scale, so that each respondent provided an assessment for all indicators describing the direct results of program implementation. Based on the data collection results, variations in scores were obtained across each indicator. In general, most respondents provided assessments in the agree to strongly agree categories. This indicates that the program had a positive impact on improving participants' capacities, both in terms of knowledge and skills in the agricultural sector.

Table 5. Recapitulation of Data Processing Results for the Product Component (P41–P50)

| Component         | Number of Respondents | Number of Items | Maximum Score | Actual Score |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Product (P41–P50) | 42                    | 10              | 2100          | 1844         |

The maximum score was obtained from the multiplication of the number of respondents, the number of items, and the highest score on the Likert scale, namely:

$$\text{Maximum score} = 42 \times 10 \times 5 = 2100$$

Thus, the PEI value for the product component is as follows:

$$IEP = \frac{1844}{2100} \times 100\% = 87.81\% \quad (9)$$

Based on the results of data processing, an actual score of 1844 was obtained from the maximum score of 2100, resulting in a Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) value of 87.81%. This value falls into the effective category because it is within the range of 73.34%–100%. These results indicate that the program successfully improved participants' capacities in terms of both knowledge and skills. The participatory and practice-based training methods were considered capable of improving participants' understanding and encouraging the application of agricultural technology in farming activities. This finding is in line with Stufflebeam and Zhang (2017), who stated that the product component is used to assess the direct changes obtained by participants after participating in a program. In addition, Hasyati (2025) explained that improving the capacity of agricultural human resources is an important factor in supporting farmer regeneration and increasing farming productivity.

### Analysis of the Outcome Component

The evaluation of the outcome component in the CIPPO model aimed to assess the long-term impacts of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program implemented by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm. This component included the application of training results, improvement in productivity and business efficiency, increase in income, farmer independence, business motivation, and network expansion. The measurement was conducted through 10 indicators (P51–P60) involving 42 respondents using a 1–5 Likert scale. The recapitulation of the data processing results showed the following total scores:

Table 6. Recapitulation of Outcome Component Scores (P51–P60)

| Component         | Number of Respondents | Number of Items | Maximum Score | Actual Score |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Outcome (P51–P60) | 42                    | 10              | 2100          | 1795         |

To determine the effectiveness level of the outcome component, the Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was calculated by comparing the actual score with the maximum possible score.

The maximum score was obtained from the multiplication of the number of respondents, the number of items, and the highest score on the Likert scale, namely:

Maximum score =  $42 \times 10 \times 5 = 2100$

Thus, the PEI value for the outcome component is as follows:

$$IEP_{Outcome} = \frac{1795}{2100} \times 100\% = 85.48\% \quad (10)$$

Based on the results of data processing, an actual score of 1795 was obtained from the maximum score of 2100, resulting in a Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) value of 85.48%. This value falls into the effective category because it is within the range of 73.34%–100%. These results indicate that the program had a positive impact on changes in participants' behavior and farm business management. The application of training outcomes in the field, increased productivity, and the improvement of farmers' motivation and independence indicate that the program not only provided short-term benefits, but also contributed to the sustainability of farming businesses. This finding is in line with Rana et al. (2025), who stated that sustainable capacity development can improve productivity and the sustainability of farming businesses. In addition, Stufflebeam and Zhang (2017) explained that the outcome component is used to assess the long-term impacts of a program on behavioral changes and participants' conditions.

### Overall Program Effectiveness Analysis (CIPPO)

To obtain a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program implemented by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm, the total Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) was calculated. The total PEI was obtained by averaging the PEI values from all components of the CIPPO evaluation model, namely Context, Input, Process, Product, and Outcome. The CIPPO model was used to comprehensively evaluate the program, starting from the suitability of the program to target needs, the quality of resources, the implementation process, direct results, and the long-term impacts experienced by participants. Furthermore, to determine the overall effectiveness of the program, the following formula was used:

$$IEP_{Total} = \frac{IEP_C + IEP_I + IEP_P + IEP_{Pr} + IEP_O}{5} \quad (11)$$

The recapitulation of the PEI values for each CIPPO component is as follows:

Table 4.7 Recapitulation of IEP Values for CIPPO Components

|         | IEP (%) |
|---------|---------|
| Context | 85,19%  |
| Input   | 87,62%  |
| Process | 88,24%  |
| Product | 87,81%  |
| Outcome | 85,48%  |

Based on Table 4.6, the total PEI was calculated by substituting the values of each component into the previous formula, namely:

$$IEP_{Total} = \frac{85.19 + 87.62 + 88.24 + 87.81 + 85.48}{5} = 86.87\% \quad (12)$$

The calculation results show that the overall Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) value was 86.87%. Based on the assessment criteria used in this study, this value falls within the range of 73.34%–100%, and is therefore included in the effective category. These results indicate that the implementation of the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program carried out by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm has been well implemented overall. This can be seen from the consistency of the results across each CIPPO component, all of which showed values within the effective category.

Furthermore, the analysis results indicate that the component with the highest value was Process (88.24%), which illustrates that the implementation of the program in the field was carried out very well, as reflected by the active involvement of participants, practice-based learning methods, and intensive mentoring. Meanwhile, the component with the lowest value was Context (85.19%), indicating that although the program was relevant to the needs of millennial farmers, there is still room for improvement, particularly in identifying participants' specific needs more precisely and adjusting the program to variations in field conditions. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program implemented by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm has been effective overall and has contributed to improving the capacities of millennial farmers in terms of knowledge, skills, learning processes, as well as long-term impacts on farming businesses.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis using the CIPPO evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product, Outcome), the Millennial Farmer Capacity Development Program implemented by CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm was generally categorized as effective, with a Program Effectiveness Index (PEI) score of 86.87%. All evaluation components achieved scores within the effective category, with the highest score in the process component (88.24%) and the lowest score in the context component (85.19%). The results of the study indicate that the program has been implemented well in terms of execution, supported by adequate input quality and a participatory, practice-based learning process. The program has also proven to improve the knowledge, skills, and self-confidence of millennial farmers (product), as well as provide positive impacts on farming practices, independence, and business development motivation (outcome).

However, although the program was overall effective, there is still room for improvement, particularly in the context aspect, namely in adjusting the program to the diverse specific needs of participants. This indicates that program effectiveness is determined not only by proper implementation, but also by the accuracy in identifying the initial needs of the target participants. Therefore, this program has strong potential to support farmer regeneration and the capacity development of millennial farmers, but improvements are still needed in the planning stage to make the program more adaptive, contextual, and well-targeted.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express the deepest gratitude to Mr. Ir. RM. H. Gembong Danudiningrat as the President Director of CV Pendawa Kencana Multifarm for his permission, support, and role as a support system in the implementation of this research. The author also extends gratitude to Politeknik Pembangunan Pertanian Yogyakarta Magelang for providing financial support so that this research could be carried out properly



## REFERENCES

- Ahyar, H., Andriani, H., Sukmana, D. J., et al. (2020). Buku metode penelitian kualitatif & kuantitatif.
- Amruddin, Priyanda, R., Agustina, S. T., Ariantini, S. N., Rusmayani, A. L. G. N., & Aslindar, A. D. (2022). Metode penelitian kuantitatif. Pradina Pustaka.
- Badan Penyuluhan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pertanian. (2020). Rencana strategis Badan Penyuluhan dan Pengembangan SDM Pertanian tahun 2020–2024. Kementerian Pertanian Republik Indonesia.
- Badan Penyuluhan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pertanian. (2023). Laporan kinerja BPPSDMP tahun 2023. Kementerian Pertanian Republik Indonesia.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023). Hasil sensus pertanian 2023: Usaha pertanian perorangan di Indonesia. BPS.
- Bahagia, R., Wibowo, R., Susetyo, B., Al-Wahid, A., Teniro, B., & Saripudin, U. (2024). Peran pemuda petani mewujudkan pembangunan pertanian berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat dan Riset Pendidikan*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v4i1.2410>
- BPPSDMP. (2021). Program petani milenial. Kementerian Pertanian.
- BPPSDMP. (2023). Laporan pengembangan sumber daya manusia pertanian. Kementerian Pertanian.
- Hasyiyati, Z. (2025). Regenerasi petani: Dampak ageing farmers dan modal manusia terhadap produktivitas padi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pertanian Unimal*, 8(2), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.29103/jepu.v8i2.26039>
- Indonesia. (2012). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 18 Tahun 2012 tentang Pangan. Pemerintah Republik Indonesia.
- Kementerian Pertanian. (2021). Strategi pembangunan pertanian berkelanjutan. Kementerian Pertanian RI.
- Kompas.com. (2023). Penurunan jumlah petani di Indonesia dan tantangan regenerasi. <https://www.kompas.com>
- Marpaung, N., & Bangun, I. C. (2023). Pentingnya regenerasi petani dalam modernisasi pertanian. *Jurnal Kajian Agraria dan Kedaulatan Pangan (JKAKP)*, 2(2), 27–33. <https://doi.org/10.32734/jkakp.v2i2.14195>
- Purnawirawan, O., Paramita, C., & Sholihah, M. (2019). The application of CIPPO evaluation model in evaluating the performance of School for Producing Entrepreneurs programs in vocational high school. Dalam *Proceedings of the International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET 2019)* (Vol. 443). Atlantis Press.
- Rana, M., Islam, M., & Karim, R. (2025). Capacity building and agricultural sustainability: The role of human and social capital. *Journal of Agricultural Development*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). The CIPP evaluation model: How to evaluate for improvement and accountability. Guilford Press.
- Sugiyono. (2017). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2023). Metode penelitian kuantitatif. Alfabeta.