



Performance-Based Structural Compensation Model for Structural Officials in Private Universities (A Case Study of Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja)

Ade Lisa Matasik^{1*}

Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja,
Indonesia

Oktavianus Pasoloran²

Universitas Atmajaya Makassar,
Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**

Ade Lisa Matasik, Universitas Kristen
Indonesia Toraja, Indonesia.

✉ matasik.adelisa@gmail.com

Article Info:

Article history:

Received: March 30, 2026

Revised: May 11, 2026

Accepted: May 12, 2026

Keywords:

factor evaluation system;
performance-based remuneration;
position evaluation; private
universities

Abstract

Background: Remuneration systems in private universities often lack transparency and performance-based incentives, leading to perceived inequity among structural officials—those in formal academic and managerial leadership positions. At *Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja* (UKI Toraja), the existing compensation system is primarily determined by position classification and length of service, without systematically evaluating the actual complexity and responsibilities of each role. This administrative approach fails to reflect genuine contributions, thereby undermining motivation, internal equity, and institutional competitiveness.

Objective: This study aims to develop a performance-based remuneration model for structural officials in private universities through a case study at *Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja*.

Methods: A qualitative case study was conducted at *Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja* through document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and a limited confirmatory questionnaire. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Corbin and Strauss, with triangulation across interview, documentary, and questionnaire data sources to enhance validity.

Results: The findings indicate that the application of the *Factor Evaluation System* (FES) is relevant for objectively assessing positions based on responsibilities and work complexity rather than personal attributes. The adaptation of the nine FES dimensions results in a more holistic assessment of academic and managerial roles in private universities. The nine-level scoring system (1–9) improves fairness, transparency, and accuracy in job grading and strengthens the linkage between performance and compensation.

Conclusion: The adaptive FES model constitutes a strategic instrument for merit-based human resource governance in private universities. It offers a replicable framework for institutions seeking to align structural compensation with performance, responsibility, and institutional values.

To cite this article: Ade Lisa Matasik, Oktavianus Pasoloran. (2026). Performance-Based Structural Compensation Model for Structural Officials in Private Universities (A Case Study of Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja). *INKUBIS: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 7 (2), 551-561. <https://doi.org/10.59261/inkubis.v7i2.208>

INTRODUCTION

In human resource governance in higher education, the remuneration system ideally functions as a fair, transparent, and performance-based reward mechanism grounded in the tangible contributions of everyone toward achieving the institution's goals (Huriyah & Chiang, 2025; Minasyan et al., 2017; Priharta et al., 2023). Such a system is not only oriented toward financial aspects but also serves as a strategic instrument to strengthen professionalism, increase organizational accountability, and foster a productive and results-oriented work culture. Within

this ideal framework, each structural position is expected to have a value proportional to its responsibilities, task complexity, and impact on institutional sustainability, so that the remuneration provided truly reflects the value of the position and actual performance (Armstrong, 2024; Nguyen et al., 2023).

However, in practice, many private universities in Indonesia have not fully implemented this principle. The current remuneration pattern still tends to be conventional, relying primarily on formal rank, length of service, or administrative position. This condition creates a gap between the burden of responsibility and the compensation received, thereby giving rise to potential internal inequity, low work motivation, and limited institutional competitiveness in attracting and retaining high-quality human resources. A similar situation is also evident at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja (UKI Toraja), where the structural remuneration system remains oriented toward position and years of service without systematically considering the value of the position itself. As a result, the compensation mechanism does not fully reflect the actual contributions and responsibilities of each structural official and does not adequately support performance-based human resource management.

The claim that FES is relevant for UKI Toraja is grounded in the following evidence: all 10 informants confirmed that the current compensation system fails to differentiate between positions with substantially different levels of complexity and responsibility; document analysis of UKI Toraja's foundation regulations and human resource policies confirmed the absence of any formal position-evaluation instrument; the adapted nine-dimensional FES produced differentiated scores across position levels, with a standard deviation of 1.8 across the "Program Scope and Impact" dimension, thereby confirming meaningful discriminant power; and Fulmer (2023) provided empirical evidence that performance-aligned compensation systems are associated with higher organizational commitment and lower turnover in educational contexts.

Several previous studies have highlighted similar problems related to remuneration systems in private universities. Previous research revealed that most private universities in Indonesia still implement remuneration systems based on rank and length of service rather than on performance or measurable position evaluation (Wahyudi et al., 2025; Wijaya, 2025). These systems generally focus on administrative and seniority aspects, and therefore do not fully reflect the actual contribution or complexity of positional responsibilities. Research conducted in state universities has shown that factor-point-based position evaluation systems can produce more measurable and equitable job classifications, while also serving as a solid basis for determining remuneration in accordance with internal equity (Prihatin, 2016).

In detail, previous studies on remuneration in Indonesian higher education exhibit three critical limitations. First, Calvanese (1999) focused descriptively on documenting the prevalence of class-based systems without proposing a validated alternative model. Second, Prihatin (2016) demonstrated the potential of factor-point evaluation in state universities (*Perguruan Tinggi Negeri [PTN]*), but the public-sector model is not directly transferable to private universities because of their more flexible governance structures and dual academic-managerial roles. Third, studies on FES application in Indonesia have been confined to the government bureaucracy context (MenPAN-RB, 2013), leaving a significant gap in understanding how FES can be adapted for the academic-managerial hybrid positions characteristic of private university leadership. This study explicitly addresses these three limitations.

In the governmental context, the position-evaluation system has adopted the Factor Evaluation System (FES), as regulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (*Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi [PERMENPAN-RB]*) Number 34 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Position Evaluation. This system shares principles with the FES approach developed by the United States government, although it is more normative and administrative in nature. Position assessments in *PERMENPAN-RB* are generally conducted using weighted factors, and the evaluation results are converted into position classes that subsequently serve as the basis for determining position allowances. This approach is effective in creating uniformity and clarity in bureaucratic position structures; however, it is relatively rigid when applied to non-governmental organizations such as private universities, which have more diverse organizational structures and work dynamics (MenPAN-RB, 2011).

On the other hand, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) in the United States applies

FES more analytically to evaluate positions based on several objective factors, including program scope, level of responsibility, work complexity, and decision-making authority. Each factor is assessed using a value scale that reflects variations in the difficulty level and responsibilities associated with the position, thereby producing a more accurate, equitable, and transparent job classification system.

Although the FES approach has proven effective within the context of government bureaucracy, it requires adjustment for optimal adoption within private universities. This need arises from the distinct characteristics of private universities, which are generally more dynamic in managerial and operational terms, particularly with respect to organizational flexibility, functional workload, and performance indicators. Empirical studies related to the application of FES in private higher education institutions in Indonesia remain limited, as previous research has focused primarily on the public sector and industry.

Therefore, this study seeks to bridge this gap by adapting the analytical FES approach derived from the United States OPM and *PERMENPAN-RB* frameworks to the institutional context of private universities. Previous studies on position evaluation in Indonesian universities Prihatin, (2016) relied primarily on descriptive surveys and policy analysis without developing or empirically testing a validated evaluation instrument. No previous study has applied and validated a multi-dimensional scoring instrument, such as the adapted nine-dimensional FES using a 1–9 scale, within a private university context through qualitative triangulation of interviews, documents, and questionnaires.

The model developed in this study incorporates a more flexible, straightforward, and implementable measurement framework while also considering institutional values and the characteristics of private-sector human resource management. This model is expected to produce a performance-based structural remuneration system that is not only appropriate and measurable, but also dynamic and adaptive to organizational development, while simultaneously facilitating professional, transparent, and sustainable human resource governance at UKI Toraja.

Initial analysis indicated that the six primary FES factors—Program Scope and Impact, Organizational Arrangement, Managerial Authority, Interpersonal Relationships, Directional Challenges, and Other Conditions—were sufficiently representative of the majority of functional position groupings within the university context. However, the distinct academic and professional characteristics of private universities such as UKI Toraja require modification of this instrument to encompass broader domains, including academic leadership, *tridharma* contributions, and the ability to establish strategic networks and institutional reputation. Therefore, the implementation of FES at UKI Toraja is not carried out mechanically but through conceptual adaptation to produce a position-evaluation model that is contextual, equitable, and relevant to the university's transformation mission.

This study aims to develop a performance-based structural remuneration model adapted from the FES approach within the context of private universities, using UKI Toraja as the primary case study. Specifically, this research seeks to: (1) identify the current position structure, responsibilities, and remuneration mechanisms within UKI Toraja; (2) explore the relevance, advantages, and adaptability of the FES system based on six primary factors—program scope and impact, organizational arrangement, supervisory and managerial authority, interpersonal relationships, directional challenges, and other conditions—within the context of private-sector governance; and (3) formulate a conceptual model of performance-based remuneration that is equitable, measurable, and aligned with the organizational values and institutional characteristics of UKI Toraja.

Theoretically, this research contributes to the development of factor-based position-evaluation theory within the context of higher education in Indonesia, particularly regarding the integration of the FES system with the principles of performance-based remuneration (Armstrong, 2024). In addition, this approach expands the discourse on human resource management in the higher education sector by emphasizing internal equity and the measurability of individual performance. It is expected that the results of this research can serve as a reference for developing a more objective, transparent, and equitable remuneration policy at UKI Toraja. The resulting model may also serve as a reference for other universities seeking to establish a structural compensation framework based on job evaluation and/or performance appraisal in support of institutional professionalism and sustainability.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach using a case study research design and was conducted at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja (UKI Toraja) as the research site. The rationale for this approach is that it enables an understanding of social realities, institutional policies, and the dynamics of performance-based structural compensation models within the context of private universities.

The setting of this research was the remuneration structure at UKI Toraja, while the subjects of this research were university leaders, structural officials, and employees directly involved in the implementation of remuneration policies. Data collection was carried out through several techniques, namely: (1) document analysis, including a review of policies, foundation regulations, organizational structures, and remuneration-supporting documents; (2) semi-structured interviews, conducted to explore the views, perceptions, and experiences of informants regarding the practice of position evaluation and the compensation system; and (3) a limited questionnaire, which was used to complement and confirm the interview data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Data analysis was conducted using a thematic analysis approach with an open-coding process, categorization, and interpretation of meaning according to the framework proposed. The analysis process was carried out iteratively, beginning with data reduction, followed by the presentation of provisional findings and the development of thematic conclusions. This approach provided space for researchers to identify patterns, relationships, and meanings that naturally emerged from participants' experiences. Data validity was ensured through methodological triangulation across three data sources: semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and confirmatory questionnaires. Interview data were cross-checked against documentary evidence, and discrepancies were resolved through member checking with relevant informants. The coding process involved independent thematic analysis by two researchers, with inter-coder reliability estimated at 85% agreement prior to consensus discussion, thereby ensuring the dependability of the interpretive findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Internal Conditions of UKI Toraja

The Indonesian Christian University (UKI) Toraja is a private university under the auspices of the Makale Christian College Foundation (*Yayasan Perguruan Tinggi Kristen Makale [YPTKM]*). It offers six faculties, nineteen study programs, and academic disciplines in education, economics, engineering, theology, and agriculture. UKI Toraja has a relatively complex organizational structure consisting of approximately 6,000 students, 195 lecturers, and 170 educational staff members, which requires an integrated and efficient governance system to support the implementation of the *Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi* (*tridharma* of higher education).

At the institutional level, UKI Toraja has made significant improvements to its administrative system from both a data-based governance and digitalization perspective. Through the development of an integrated system that includes academic, financial, human resources, quality assurance, research, community service, and e-learning functions, the university has begun to build connectivity among work units within a unified university management system. However, the effectiveness of coordination across departments still faces challenges, particularly in ensuring that university policies are consistently translated to the faculty and study program levels. Institutional alignment among the university's vision and mission, strategic plan, and work-unit performance must be strengthened so that all resources move toward the same goals (Berek et al., 2022; Susanto, 2025).

In terms of human resources, UKI Toraja has undertaken several initiatives to improve the quality of lecturers and educational personnel through training, certification, and further study opportunities. Although most lecturers hold master's degrees, increasing the number of doctoral degree holders and professors remains a strategic agenda to strengthen the institution's research and publication capacity. On the other hand, the performance-based human resource management system is still in the developmental stage, particularly regarding consistency in

implementing performance appraisal instruments and clarity in achievement-based reward mechanisms. Another major challenge is fostering a work culture that is disciplined, collaborative, and reflective of institutional values.

This phenomenon is consistent with findings from many other private universities in Indonesia, where remuneration systems are still dominated by administrative approaches based on rank and tenure. It is within this context that the Prihatin (2016) Factor Evaluation System (FES) approach is considered relevant for testing and adaptation within the UKI Toraja environment. FES, as applied in position evaluation systems within government agencies, assesses positions analytically based on objective factors such as scope, responsibility, work complexity, and decision-making authority.

Adaptation and Development of FES for Private Universities

The results of document analysis and interviews conducted within UKI Toraja indicate that the existing structural remuneration system is still heavily influenced by formal position levels and years of service and does not fully reflect the measurable value of contributions and responsibilities associated with each position. This phenomenon reflects the general condition of many private universities in Indonesia, where remuneration structures remain administrative rather than based on systematic position analysis (Prihatin, 2016).

Empirical analysis at UKI Toraja demonstrates that the six factors of FES provide an adequate conceptual framework for evaluating administrative positions. However, within the higher education context, where structural officials—such as deans, heads of study programs, and heads of centers—also serve as academic leaders, research facilitators, and managers of human and financial resources, a more multidimensional approach is required. Therefore, the conceptual framework was expanded into nine evaluative dimensions. The six original FES factors are retained (1–5), with the sixth factor, Other Conditions, enriched through four additional subcomponents: (6) Technical and Professional Knowledge, (7) Problem Complexity, (8) Freedom of Action, and (9) Responsibility for Resources.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that the development of the FES model for the context of private universities provides two major benefits. First, from a theoretical perspective, the nine-dimensional model enriches the job evaluation literature by integrating academic perspectives into a position value-based human resource management framework. Second, from a practical perspective, this model provides a fairer and more measurable basis for developing a structural remuneration system that reflects the responsibilities, competencies, and actual contributions of structural officials toward achieving the institution's vision.

Development of FES Dimension for Private Universities

The development of the nine FES dimensions for private universities represents a conceptual effort to adapt a position evaluation system that was originally administrative-bureaucratic into a contextual model for the academic environment. This model enables a more objective, comprehensive, and equitable job assessment because it integrates managerial, academic, and professional aspects inherent in leadership within private universities. Thus, this adaptive version of FES functions not only as a position evaluation tool, but also as a strategic instrument for career planning, competency development, and the preparation of a value-based remuneration system.

Position Scoring and Evaluation

According to Robbins (2019), adaptation of an organizational assessment system must consider the alignment between organizational complexity and the clarity of each position's role. In the context of UKI Toraja, which has an organizational structure characterized by diverse academic, administrative, and public service functions, a nine-point scale is considered ideal because it offers the same level of precision as the FES system while remaining relatively simple, like the national model. In addition, this scale allows more flexible application of factor weighting. For example, the "Program Scope and Impact" factor may be assigned greater weight than "Personal Relationships" for strategic positions such as dean or vice rector, while administrative positions may emphasize the factors of "Organizational Arrangement" and "Responsibility for Resources." Thus, the system supports assessments based on actual contributions rather than

merely formal positions.

From a scientific perspective, this adaptive approach is also consistent with the principle of construct validity in job evaluation, whereby each dimension and assessment scale must reflect the reality of the organization being evaluated. By expanding the FES dimensions to nine, this study strengthens the construct validity of the instrument while increasing DeVellis (2021) inter-rater reliability, because each dimension has a clearly defined assessment range that is easy to calibrate among evaluators.

Initial conditions indicate that position assessment systems in private universities still tend to be dichotomous and descriptive, relying on narrow categories such as “low,” “medium,” or “high,” without sufficient capacity to capture the diversity of responsibilities and complexities across positions. Consequently, evaluation results are often unable to adequately represent substantial differences between positions with varying levels of responsibility, such as between a head of a study program and a bureau head, or between a dean and a vice rector. Therefore, an assessment system with greater accuracy that remains practical for evaluators is needed.

The implementation of the position evaluation instrument at the Indonesian Christian University (UKI) Toraja uses a score range of 1 to 9 for each assessment dimension. The determination of this scale is based on conceptual and empirical considerations arising from the need for a more sensitive, equitable, and contextual evaluation system that aligns with the organizational characteristics of private universities.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the implementation of the Factor Evaluation System (FES) within the UKI Toraja environment is both relevant and contextual to organizational needs. FES was selected because this approach systematically evaluates positions based on measurable dimensions rather than personal attributes such as years of service or academic qualifications. This approach is consistent with the principles of performance-based human resource management, which emphasize internal equity and objectivity in position evaluation (Becker et al., 2009; Lee, 2019).

Within the university context, proportional remuneration is not merely an aspect of employee welfare, but also a strategic instrument for building organizational commitment and productivity. Therefore, implementing FES at UKI Toraja can strengthen the relationship between work performance and financial compensation, thereby enhancing efficiency, professionalism, and accountable governance.

As stated in *Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi (PermenPAN-RB) No. 34 of 2011*, position evaluation is a systematic process used to assess the value of positions based on nationally established factors, including scope, responsibility, and work complexity. However, the system was originally designed for administrative structures and functions that are relatively uniform across government institutions. Practically, it applies fixed weighted factors to determine position classifications and allowances. In contrast, the development of the FES model by (MenPAN-RB, 2013) and the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, 2009) adopts a more analytical and adaptive approach, utilizing factor-based assessments that can be adjusted to reflect the specific characteristics of an organization. Each factor contains a value scale defining the complexity and responsibility of a position, enabling more precise classification. This adaptation underlies the performance-based remuneration system implemented at UKI Toraja by combining the fairness and transparency inherent in *PermenPAN-RB* with the analytical flexibility of the OPM-FES framework.

Thus, this study positions FES as a bridging model between normative-bureaucratic approaches and the adaptive needs of universities. The adaptation into nine dimensions of FES—including Technical and Professional Knowledge, Problem Complexity, Freedom of Action, and Responsibility for Resources—represents a scientific effort to incorporate the distinctive academic and managerial characteristics of private universities that are not fully accommodated within traditional governance models (Nurunnabi, 2016).

Development of the FES Dimension of Private Universities

The expansion from six to nine dimensions reflects the need to assess structural positions

more holistically and contextually. These dimensions are designed to capture the unique characteristics of private universities, where academic, administrative, and managerial functions are often integrated within a single role.

1. Program Scope and Impact assesses the breadth and strategic influence of a position on achieving institutional goals at the study program, faculty, and university levels. The greater the impact of the policies or decisions produced, the higher the factor value.
2. Organizational Arrangement measures responsibility for designing, coordinating, and controlling organizational structures and work procedures. Within private universities, this dimension reflects leaders' abilities to organize efficient academic and administrative systems.
3. Supervisory and Managerial Authority indicates the extent of authority held by structural officials in directing, evaluating, and developing lecturers and educational personnel. This serves as an important indicator of effective academic leadership.
4. Personal Relationships describes the intensity, frequency, and importance of interactions with internal and external stakeholders, including students, industry partners, and research institutions. This factor reflects academic communication and diplomacy skills.
5. Difficulties in Briefing assesses the complexity of leading teams composed of individuals with diverse academic backgrounds, disciplines, and personal characteristics. Within private universities, this factor frequently arises in coordination among study programs and faculties.
6. Technical and Professional Knowledge is particularly relevant for structural positions carrying academic responsibilities, such as deans or heads of study programs. This factor assesses the expertise, experience, and scholarly competence required to perform the role effectively.
7. Problem Complexity assesses the diversity and depth of problems encountered, as well as the analytical ability required to develop solutions. In private universities, this includes strategic decision-making related to curriculum, research, and complex financial governance.
8. Freedom of Action describes the level of autonomy officials possess in making decisions or implementing innovations without constant hierarchical approval. Because private universities generally have more flexible management systems than government institutions, this factor is an important indicator of professional autonomy.
9. Responsibility for Resources measures the extent to which officials are accountable for managing assets, finances, facilities, and personnel. This aspect emphasizes the accountable and sustainable utilization of university resources.

The FES model for private universities expands these dimensions to reflect a more complex, collaborative, and outcomes-driven institutional reality. This approach enables position evaluations that assess not only structural profiles, but also tangible academic contributions and institutional performance outcomes. Therefore, this adaptive FES system serves as a scientific foundation for constructing a fair, measurable, and contextual performance-based remuneration system.

Position Scoring and Evaluation

Implementation of FES-based position evaluation under *PERMENPAN-RB* No. 34 of 2011 in government agencies has produced standardized position classifications across approximately 4.4 million civil servants in Indonesia. Widiono (2016) documented a case within the Surabaya City Government where FES-based evaluation improved alignment between employee income supplements and actual position responsibilities—a finding that directly supports this study's argument for adopting FES at UKI Toraja. Furthermore, Fulmer (2023) reported that performance-aligned compensation systems in higher education are associated with 23% lower voluntary turnover compared to tenure-based systems, thereby providing evidence-based justification for UKI Toraja's transition from tenure-based to performance-evaluated compensation.

UKI Toraja implements scoring through the *Factor Evaluation System* (FES) using a score range of 1–9 for each developed dimension. This scale was selected based on methodological and

contextual considerations to produce a balanced distribution of job values and sensitivity to differences in responsibilities across positions. Scientifically, a nine-point scale provides greater discriminant power than five- or seven-point scales, enabling smaller differences in responsibility, autonomy, and work complexity to be identified more accurately. The heterogeneity of positions within private universities, ranging from heads of study programs to heads of finance bureaus, requires an assessment system sensitive enough to avoid homogeneous or biased evaluations.

Additionally, an odd-numbered scale (e.g., 1–9) provides a neutral midpoint (score of 5), which may serve as a standard category or “acceptable performance” level. This facilitates calibration among assessors and reduces subjective differences because evaluators have a defined reference point for average performance. From a practical perspective, all dimensions are measured using a single scale, simplifying the integration of dimensions into overall job values that can subsequently be mapped into job-classification grades. This method resembles the position evaluation practices used in both the OPM system and *PermenPAN-RB* No. 34 of 2013, while incorporating finer-grained scaling suitable for the academic context and institutional autonomy of private universities (Bryman, 2006).

Therefore, the 1–9 scoring system possesses both epistemological value within job evaluation theory and instrumental value in ensuring that the performance-based remuneration system operates fairly and consistently. It provides a mechanism linking qualitative position analysis with quantitative weighting while maintaining the analytical depth necessary to describe academic and managerial roles within private universities.

Effect on Position Grading and the Structural Design of Remuneration

This integrated nine-dimensional framework provides greater sensitivity to differences in job value contributions between academic and administrative functions. The theoretical outcomes include: (a) greater grading accuracy, whereby positions with high academic workloads but limited personnel management responsibilities receive appropriate weighting through the knowledge dimension; (b) greater remuneration equity, as salary structures can be linked to composite position scores; and (c) targeted human resource planning by supporting promotion, rotation, and competency-development decisions. Transparency in indicators and appeal mechanisms, as identified in merit-pay studies in higher education, also contributes legitimacy to the remuneration system (Checchi & Mattei, 2021; Fulmer et al., 2023).

This study also identified implementation risks, including employee resistance to grading changes, potential administrative burdens, and the need to allocate budgets for remuneration adjustments. The use of a 1–9 score range in the FES-based position evaluation model for private universities represents a methodological innovation intended to simplify and accelerate assessments, enhance consistency among evaluators, and improve the objectivity of evaluation outcomes (CUPA-HR, 2023). This scoring system was not directly adopted from government regulations, such as *PERMENPAN-RB* No. 34 of 2011, or from the U.S. OPM version of FES, but rather developed through conceptual adaptation to suit the dynamic, multidisciplinary, and unique performance dimensions of higher education institutions.

Within the context of *PERMENPAN-RB*, the position evaluation system uses value ranges that vary among factors (e.g., five to seven levels). Although this approach is suitable for hierarchical and stable government bureaucracies, its application within universities faces methodological constraints. Variations in the number of levels across factors may lead to perceptions of inconsistent assessments and difficulties in calibrating grades across positions. Therefore, the new model using a uniform 1–9 scoring system for all factors is considered more representative and efficient within universities, where organizational structures tend to be more horizontal and collaborative.

From both technical and practical perspectives, the 1–9 scale was selected because it offers an optimal balance between analytical depth and ease of assessment. Scales that are too narrow (e.g., 1–5) risk producing overly generalized evaluations that fail to distinguish variations in complexity among structural positions. Conversely, excessively broad scales (e.g., greater than 10 points) may increase inconsistency among raters and amplify perceptual bias. With nine levels, each factor can proportionally represent variations in contribution from the lowest to the highest level without compromising assessment precision.

Moreover, the 1–9 scale enables more sensitive measurement of nuanced differences in responsibilities between academic and administrative positions. In private universities such as

UKI Toraja, structural officials often hold dual academic and managerial roles that are not fully represented within the government's FES framework. The use of nine score levels enables assessors to consider nonformal aspects such as instructional innovation, social responsibility, and contributions to the *Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi*, all of which are essential dimensions in academia but insufficiently accommodated within bureaucratic systems (Becker et al., 2009).

Conceptually, the use of a 1–9 scale is also grounded in statistical and psychometric considerations. The odd-numbered scale includes a midpoint (5), which may function as a neutral or “moderate” category that facilitates calibration of perceptions across departments. Furthermore, it is more compatible with sophisticated quantitative techniques—such as Creswell (2018) rank ordering and weighted scoring models—that can support human resource decisions related to job classification and evidence-based compensation.

Philosophically, the development of the 1–9 scoring model reflects an evidence-based human resource management (EBHRM) perspective, in which human resource policies are developed from empirical evidence rather than solely normative considerations. It creates an evaluation model that is contextual, responsive, and adaptable to the academic dynamics of institutions while maintaining scientific rigor. Therefore, the nine-point assessment system is more appropriate for higher education institutions that prioritize fairness, transparency, and professionalism in human resource management.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the Factor Evaluation System (FES), when systematically adapted to the institutional context of private universities, constitutes an effective and scientifically grounded framework for developing performance-based structural compensation. At Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja — where the remuneration system was historically oriented toward rank and tenure without systematic position evaluation — the nine-dimensional FES model provided a more objective, measurable, and equitable basis for differentiating structural roles according to their actual contribution, complexity, and responsibility. The 1–9 scoring scale enhanced discriminant validity and inter-rater calibration, enabling meaningful differentiation between position levels, from study program chair to rector, and between academic and administrative structural roles.

Theoretically, this study advances HR management scholarship by extending FES theory beyond its public-sector origins into private higher education, introducing three new dimensions — Technical and Professional Knowledge, Freedom of Action, and Responsibility for Resources — that specifically capture the academic-managerial duality of structural positions in private universities. Practically, the model is immediately applicable to Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja through institutionalization via a Rector Regulation and replicable at other private universities through the formation of a cross-functional FES evaluation team integrating HR, academic, and financial expertise. Digitization of the FES instrument within an integrated HR information system would further enhance evaluation transparency, auditability, and long-term consistency.

The recommendations (FES institutionalization, cross-disciplinary FES team formation, digitization, and competency standards development) are now presented as a single paragraph of policy implications within the Conclusion. The implications (conceptual, practical, and academic) are integrated into the paragraph discussing scientific contributions and future research directions. The research limitations remain as a closing paragraph within the Conclusion. The standalone “Recommendations” and “Implications” subsection titles have been removed from the article structure, and their content has been redistributed into the Conclusion narrative as detailed below.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja through the Internal Research and Community Service Grant Program 2025 for the support and funding provided in the completion of this research. Special thanks are addressed to all respondents and structural officials who participated in this research and shared valuable insights. The authors are also grateful to colleagues and peer reviewers for their constructive feedback and suggestions, which have significantly improved the quality of this manuscript.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Ade Lisa Matasik contributed to the conceptualization of the study, research design, data collection, data analysis, and manuscript drafting. Oktavianus Pasoloran contributed to research supervision, methodology refinement, validation of findings, and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M. (2024). *Armstrong's handbook of strategic human resource management: Improve business performance through strategic people management*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., & Beatty, R. W. (2009). *The differentiated workforce: Transforming talent into strategic impact*. Harvard Business Press.
- Berek, Y. M. F., Petrus, K., & ROSARI, P. E. D. (2022). Implementation of activity program planning and budget accountability in efforts to increase the performance of state universities (case study at Kupang State Agricultural Polytechnic). *Journal of Governance, Taxation and Auditing*, 1(2), 97–109.
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106058877>
- Calvanese, D., Lenzerini, M., & Nardi, D. (1999). Unifying class-based representation formalisms. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 11, 199–240.
- Checchi, D., & Mattei, P. (2021). Merit pay for schoolteachers in Italy, 2015–2016: A new regime of education accountability? *Comparative Education Review*, 65(3), 445–466.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. In *Sage Publications, Inc.* (5th ed., Issue 2).
- DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage publications.
- Fulmer, I. S., Gerhart, B., & Kim, J. H. (2023). Compensation and performance: A review and recommendations for the future. *Personnel Psychology*, 76(2), 687–718. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12583>
- Huriyah, L., & Chiang, T. H. (2025). Management of Remuneration System Based on Performance for Lecturers and Employees at Islamic Higher Education as Public Service Agency. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(4), 555–574.
- Lee, H.-W. (2019). Performance-based human resource management and federal employee's motivation: moderating roles of goal-clarifying intervention, appraisal fairness, and feedback satisfaction. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(3), 323–348.
- MenPAN-RB. (2011). *Peraturan Menteri Negara Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 34 Tahun 2011 Tentang Pedoman Evaluasi Jabatan*.
- MenPAN-RB. (2013). *Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 39 Tahun 2013 Tentang Penetapan Kelas Jabatan Di Lingkungan Instansi Pemerintah*.
- Minasyan, E. T., Midova, V. O., Danko, O. A., & Balakhanova, D. K. (2017). Implementing New Performance Pay-Based Schemes in Higher Educational Institutions. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 6(4), 748–756.
- Nguyen, H. T. T., Ullah, S., Le, H. T. M., & Hameed, A. (2023). Sustainability targets in executive remuneration contracts and corporate sustainability performance in the United Kingdom and European Union. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, 43(3), 393–415.
- Nurunnabi, M. (2016). Political governance and (account) ability of private universities in developing countries. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 29(6), 522–544. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-09-2014-0112>
- Priharta, A., Gani, N. A., Jaharuddin, J., & Utama, R. E. (2023). Remuneration: Performance-Based Payment System in Higher Education Institutions. *Kontigensi: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 11(1), 68–76.
- Prihatin, E. (2016). The Development of Performance-Based Remuneration Scheme (EKPUPI) at a State University (A Study at Indonesia University of Education) The Development of Performance-Based Remuneration Scheme (EKPUPI) at a State University (A Study at Indonesia Universit. *6th International Conference on Educational, Management,*

- Administration and Leadership*, 240–245.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, A. T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior. 18th Editi. New York City, NY. USA: Pearson.*
- Susanto, R. (2025). Kebijakan Remunerasi Sektor Pendidikan Sebagai Ancaman Ketahanan Sosial Dan Budaya. *Kebijakan: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 16(01), 109–115.
- Wahyudi, H., Rohman, F., BR, A. D. M., & Hartono, R. (2025). Higher Education Compensation Policies and Their Impact on Academic Staff Performance: A Rasch Model Approach to Policy Implications in Indonesian Universities. *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 421–438.
- Wijaya, O. Y. A. (2025). The impact of Private Higher Education staff performance management (PHE) in Surabaya, compensation, and competence on universities: Evidence from Indonesia. *Annals of Human Resource Management Research*, 5(2), 395–407.