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ABSTRACT

[Porter, 2002] said that nation’s competitiveness, which is defined as a country’s share of world markets for its products, comes less and less from abundant natural resources and cheap labor, and more and more from technical innovations and creative use of knowledge, or a combination of both. The ability to produce, select, adapt, commercialize, and use knowledge is critical for sustained economic growth and improved living standards. The lecturer is one of the vital elements of the higher education system.

The perceptions that job based pay systems are inappropriate when change is very fast. Competency Based Pay is compensation for individual characteristics, for skills or competencies over and above the pay a job or organizational role it self commands. The aim of this study is:

1. To identify lecture competency which could predict success job performance
2. To analyze competency based pay for lecturer regarding that competency above and to find model of competency Based Pay System in Higher Education Institution
3. Developing steps in competency Based Pay System in Higher Education Institution

Therefore, expected with the compensation system being based on competency and the compensation accepted by lecturer is really relied on its ability, especially in research to add the knowledge and its competency.

BACKGROUND

Compensation system for the lecturer applying in higher education institution in this time still embrace the conventional system which relate at compensation system at public servant of civil which is his indicator is job faction and devotion time. For a while for the composition of the compensation accepted in the form of main salary elementary, variable salary (excess of burden semester credit is obliged to), and prosperity subsidy.

Therefore, expected with the compensation system being based on the competency, accepted by the compensation of lecturer is really based on the ability storey; level of school activity, especially in doing the research to improve knowledge and his competence. Beside that expected also this compensation system can more precise and accurate, so that proportional accepted appreciation with effort the job it.

This needed to realize that the lecturer is one of the back part harpoon in course of learning the teaching for the attained of target quality of College, so that efficacy of goal achievement of quality in course of learning the teaching most influenced by lecturer performance. Meanwhile, very influenced lecturer performance by the lecturer competency.

Management of HE institution require to design the carefully each; every matter related to lecturer especially lecturer remain to with a purpose can improve the owned by competency is so that expected can assign value to add as according to requirement of university.

Compensation system applied also can have to face emulation between colleges in this global era, with the meaning can have the character of flexible and can fulfil requirement of lecturer.

As educational institutions for the development of human resources and as agents of societal change, universities need to pay critical pay attention to their human resources particularly lecturers. Many education experts, such as Richard I. Miller Edward Sallis and Higino Ables
stated that the lecturer is one of the vital elements of the education system. Hence, the lecturer is required to have the competencies that can achieve the high quality working standard, that would in turn enhance and improve the overall university-wide quality standing and thus its image.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Competency
From Spencer & Spencer (1993), five types of competency characteristics:

1. Motives. The things a person consistently think about or want that cause action. Motives drive, direct and select behavior toward certain actions or goals and away from others.
2. Traits. Physical characteristics and consistent responses to situations or information.
3. Self concept. A person’s belief that he or she can be effective in almost any situation is part of that person’s concept of self. Example: self-confidence a person’s belief that he or she can be effective in almost any situation is part of that person’s concept of self.
4. Knowledge. Information a person has in specific content areas.
5. Skill. The ability to perform a certain physical or mental task.

Causal Relationship
Motives, trait, and self concept competencies predict skill behavior actions, which in turn predict job performance outcome. As in the Motive, Trait, Behavior, outcome causal flow model shown as Figure 1.

Competencies always include an intent, which is the motives, or trait force that causes action toward and outcome. Behavior without intent doesn’t define competency. An example is “management by walking around” without knowing why a manager is walking around, you can’t know which, if any, competency is being demonstrated. The manager’s intent could be boredom, leg cramps, the monitoring of work to see if quality is high, or a desire to be visible to the troops.

Criterion reference for competencies studies
The criteria most frequently used in competency studies are:

- Superior performance. This is defined statistically as one standard deviation above average performance with the reason:

  1) Many studies shows that economic value performance concerning to organization.
  2) To increase the performance, the organization must use superior performance characteristic as a basic to selection and performance burgeoning. Failing to enforcement caused failing in ascription organization average performance level.

- Effective Performance. This usually really means a minimally acceptable level of work, the lower cut off point below which an employee would not be considered competent to do the job.

- Categorizing Competencies.
Competencies can be divided in two categories, according to the job performance as follow:

- **Threshold Competencies.** These are essential characteristics that everyone in a job needs to be minimally effective but that do not distinguish superior from average performers.
- **Differentiating Competencies.** These factors distinguish superior from average performers.

**Compensation**

Competency Based Pay is compensation for individual characteristics, for competencies (seniority, potential, creativity, entrepreneurial initiative, loyalty, institutional memory, and portability) over and above the pay a job or organizational role itself commands.

Many compensation experts are wary of pay for competence, believing, “As soon as an organization/firm begins paying for nice to have characteristics divorced from job accountabilities that measure value added to the organization.

Pay for education systems reward employees with the most seniority," the ones who have been with the company long enough to attend the most course”. Frequently these courses do not teach skills relevant to improved organisational performance.

The following issues may indicate the need for competency-based pay system, such as: The need to justify compensations of knowledge workers who don’t manage many people or assets the need for incentives to motivate employees to maintain and enhance state of the art skills.

**Steps In Developing Competency Based Compensation System in Higher Education:**

1. **Identification** Key factors, job role requirement, lecturer competencies that predict performance RESULTS. Bases for compensation can be diagrammed on 2 axes, see in Figure 2.

![Figure 2](image)

2. **Determine Relative Percentages.** Decide the relative % of total compensation the organization (HE) wants to pay for job role, lecture competence, and performance results.

Competency based pay systems consist three factors: base pay based on HE organization job or role, plus pay for lecturer competencies, plus pay for individual, team, HE organization performance results (see Figure 3).

In Figure 3, fixed pay is set by base pay for the job, plus additional pay based on the competencies a person brings to the job that predict better than average performance. Variable
pay can include additional pay for competencies demonstrated on the job (pay for skill), and for actual performance by the person, his/her team, or profit sharing based on the organization’s economic results. A general trend in compensation is to increase the variable components of pay.

This relationship can be expressed in an equation:

\[ E(v) = A \times p \times DF \]

where \( E(v) \) = the expected value of lecturer, \( A \) = amount of Economic value for lecturer’s competency may bring the higher education, \( p \) = the probability that HE will get the amount and \( DF \) = the factor used to find the present value of benefit received at some future point in time.

More complex Competency based pay also can be developed using regression equations like:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 (X_1) + \beta_2 (X_2) + \beta_3 (X_3) + E \]

\( Y \) = pay in dollars, \( \alpha \) = y intercept, \( \beta_1 (X_1) \) = job size, \( \beta_2 (X_2) \) = competence; \( \beta_3 (X_3) \) = performance; \( E \) = error variance.

Compensation is forming the given to appreciation of employees, because pertinent which have given the aid to reach the organizational purpose. Compensation needed to differentiate among salaries with fee. Compensation is widest term including salary, fee and all kind of incentives (Michael & Newman: 2002)

Compensation consist of two type that is compensation type have the character of direct be like salary, bonus, incentive, and indirect compensation type be like housing facility, food subsidy, health subsidy and other subsidies.
Table 1: Benchmarking Job-Based, Skill-Based, Competency-Based Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job-Based</th>
<th>Skill-Based</th>
<th>Competency-Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fee</td>
<td>Pursuant to position level</td>
<td>Pursuant to skill level</td>
<td>Pursuant to competency level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Increase</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Skill Increasing</td>
<td>Developing competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management focus</td>
<td>Work relation of employee</td>
<td>Exploit skill maximally</td>
<td>Memastikan kompetensi yang mempunyai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion and placement</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>nilai tambah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control of expenses by</td>
<td>Control of expenses by</td>
<td>Pengembangan kompetensi melalui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvement of budget</td>
<td>certification and assessment</td>
<td>pengembangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kesempatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendali biaya melalui sertifikasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dan penilaian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee focus</td>
<td>Higher position level</td>
<td>Find skill of superordinate</td>
<td>Find competency for more needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Job analysis</td>
<td>Skill analysis</td>
<td>Competency analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job evaluation</td>
<td>Skill certification</td>
<td>Competency certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess</td>
<td>Passed to expectation of clear</td>
<td>Continuous learning</td>
<td>Continuous learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance improvement</td>
<td>Lessen the pressure</td>
<td>Lateral movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee pursuant to performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>Bureaucracy potency</td>
<td>Bureaucracy potency</td>
<td>Bureaucracy potency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not flexible</td>
<td>Need for expenses control</td>
<td>Need for expenses control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Method

- Review of compensation system for lecturer which apply this time
- Compensation model based of competency with pay for performance approach
- Design of implementing compensation system for lecturer based of competency

Measurement of competency use the alliances method where entangling the team expert and use the media questioners propagated to lecturer as responder. Fill from questioners is the result of competency of identifying from observation of duty description; literature and result interview the team expert.

From data-processing result, can be identified by the College lecturer competency dictionary along with level which consists of the competency consisting of Skill, Knowledge and Attitude. The competency dictionary can be shown as follows:
Table 2: List of Lecturers Competency and Its Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Computer &amp; Information technology application</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Directiveness(class room control &amp; discipline)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Information seeking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Basic academic knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>English language</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Analytical thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Concern for quality work</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Professional Expertise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement of competency using levelling system with 5 (five) levels, that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Behavioral Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is highest level of the competency level owned by college lecturer, where owned by the competency of it reside in at level 5. This competency level can be told by ability of college lecturer very mastering. Where lecturer show behavior of competency in handling the complex matter and context which vary which chime in with the elementary principles, and can do the complex strategy or techniques implementation at big coverage and vary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This level under mastery, at this level the competency owned by lecturer resides in at level 4. At this competency level ability of the lecturer is told master. Where lecturer show behavior of interest in handling the complex things and illegitimate context in the coverage wide. Can arrange, or instruct and or develop the others, can deeper handle and shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This level is mounting middle (middle level), where the competency owned by lecturer reside in level 3. At this competency level ability of the lecturer is told enough master. Where lecturer show behavior of interest in handling some complex thingies or illegitimate situation context. In this level tend to cockier in his work or can assist work of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This level is second lower level from 5 college lecturer competency level, where the competency owned by lecturer resides in level 2. At this competency level the lecturer is told can. Where lecturer show the competency with form behaviors which expand from elementary behavior at one particular or some situation contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is the lowest level from competency level owned by college lecturer, where the competency owned by lecturer resides in level 1. At this competency level the lecturer is told enough can. Where, lecturer show behaviors is elementary the than the competency so that can execute his duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By using factor analysis, obtained compensable factor (CF) to each lecturer interest as follows:
Thereby model the compensation system base on the competency with approach of system pay for performance as follows:

\[ C = GP + \left( \sum_{i}^{n} (Y_i \times L_i) \right) \times \text{Rp.}/\$ \]

Where:
- \( C \): the compensation value accepted by the lecturer
- \( GP \): basic salary
- \( Y_i \): compensable factor
- \( L \): the level reached competency of lecturer
- \( \text{Rp.}/\$ \): the value of price for each competency

Maximal value able to be obtained by the lecturer if 16 competencies have level maximum level (5) equal to: 1,687 point. Whereas minimum value able to be obtained by the lecturer if 16 competencies have lower level competencies (1) equal to: 0,337. So that the amount of values from 16 competencies factor will range from 0,337 - 1,687.

Rule of the competency amount of measure for implementation and also how much/many is the money of price for the competencies calculated, depend on policy of university in its implementation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

For implementation model competency based pay system, recommended by the implementation strategy as follows:

a. To be socialized/given awareness beforehand step by step to the is lecturers of him/her core give understanding of benefit of this system, is used so that can more adding of lecturer motivation is to be more have masterpiece and continue to improve the competency and him/her quality;

b. Made the policy later will become basis for compensation system implementation base on these competencies, this matter to be at the time of clear implementation of the reference used in it executing.

c. Implementation step by step, in this case depended from readiness of university to implement it, but if felt for implementation as a whole not yet can, hence can be done step by step;

d. Made the procedure along with forms supporter of implementation, so that will clearly what is and how is execution of its process, and who is be in control of the processes.

**Table 3: Compensable Factor for Each Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>CF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Computer &amp; IT application</td>
<td>KI</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Directiveness(class room controll &amp; discipline)</td>
<td>KMM</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Information seeking</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Basic Academic knowledge</td>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>English language</td>
<td>BI</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Analitical thinking</td>
<td>BAn</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td>BKn</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>SMTK</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Concern for quality</td>
<td>PMK</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>BiP</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Ks</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Professional Expertise</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>