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ABSTRACT

Lecturer is one of the essential components of a system in higher education. Lecturers have a role, duties and responsibilities in realizing the goal of national education. So that the lecturer is the most important component in the college. The main task is Tridarma college lecturers are arranged in standard faculty workload. Career systems lecturer in private universities is not only contained in the Act's regulations No. 14 2015 on teachers and lecturers. Professional development of lecturers through functional or academic position, while career development in a structural position of secretary courses starting up the post of rector. For private colleges in the determination of structural positions is done without seeing the competency of a person to be served, but it generally is someone who has an emotional connection, meaning not based on seniority, rank, and functional academics. Based on this, we need a system of career paths / career path for lecturers in a structural position to be more focused and measurable so that governance and academic atmosphere in the college better.
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1. Introduction

Lecturer is one of the essential components of a system in higher education. Lecturers have a role, duties and responsibilities in realizing the goal of national education. So that the lecturer is the most important component of higher education have a very significant role for the PT.

The main task is to carry out Tridharma faculty college with a workload that has been set in the standard faculty workload (BKD). Career Systems lecturers in private universities (PTS) is not only contained in the regulations of Law No. 14 Year 2015 on Teachers and Lecturers as well as lecturers of state universities (PTN) associated therein the professional development of lecturers through functional or academic position of assistant experts to professors but how can develop his career in the structural position starting from the secretary of program of study or the department secretary to the structural position as Rector. It is also to improve the aspect of leadership for the professors during these basic competencies that must be owned lecturers namely: pedagogical, professional competence, personal competence and social competence. The structural position not merely as an additional leadership, extra income but serves as a driving force of atmospheric processes of academic and governance of private colleges better by putting the human resources (HR) in accordance with the desired criteria.
Some researchers have proven that career development related to structural positions for lecturers can run smoothly but is not caused by having an existing bureaucracy, especially in the foundation. The Rector only has the authority to present the results of a request under the authorized and approved by the Senate, and the result is only carried out (John, 2014). Raras and Sri (2012) researchers from ITS that in his research in terms of bureaucratic reform and reform of the organization by using the method of calculation load perjabatan tasks and methods of job description. By combining these two methods can determine competency mapping of employees based on job description and classification of competence, so that the corresponding positions of competency mapping each position. Endang (2009) used the decision support system with AHP method to examine the promotion process in the selection of the employee, where the employee later elected in accordance with the criteria of a given office.

2. Research Methodology

Cooper and Schinder (2001) states that the explanatory research is research that explains the causal relationship and correlation between variables through hypothesis testing. Explanatory research aims to clarify the relationship between the variables through hypothesis testing based on field data on the contribution of the competence of lecturers and faculty performance against the promotion of structural lecturer at a private university in Bandar Lampung. Flowcharts developed in this study are presented in Figure 1 below.
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Figure 1. Diagram Path

The model in Figure 1 shows the constructs of exogenous and endogenous as follows:

a. Constructs Exogenous

The construct is exogenous sale lectureship contributed by the competence of lecturers and professors performance.

b. Constructs Endogenous

The first is the construct of endogenous competence of lecturers who contribute to the promotion of lecturers and professors influenced by the performance. The second is the construct of endogenous faculty performance that contributes to the promotion of lecturers and also influenced by the competence of lecturers.

Many criteria in determining the policies of career lecturer in structural positions in addition to the criteria of the three responsibilities as an indicator of
the workload of teachers so need to be equipped with other indicators that should have lecturers career in structural positions for the purpose of sourcing and assign human resources lecturer in structural position more targeted and measurable that governance and academic atmosphere in the college better.

In this chapter are presented descriptive data profile from this study was followed by analysis of statistical data used to answer the research problem by testing hypotheses have been proposed. Data analysis tool used is descriptive statistics to describe the index of respondents from various constructs developed and diferencial statistics for hypothesis testing, in particular by using the analysis in the model of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

3. Results And Discussion

General Description of Research Object

General Description of Respondents by Gender

Of the 146 respondents drawn, the composition of respondents by sex is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>∑</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed in the study (2016)

Based on the above data it is clear that male respondents are the most respondents ie 131 respondents or 89% of the total 146 respondents who participated in this study. While female respondents as many as 15 respondents is 11% of total respondents.

General Description of Respondents Based on the Old Works

Of the 146 respondents drawn, the composition of respondents by old works are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Period (Years)</th>
<th>∑</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 – 5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 – 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed in the study (2016)

According to the table above, it can be seen that respondents with tenure of less than or equal to 3 years as many as 90 people or 61%, of respondents with a tenure of more than 3 to 5 years as many as 29 people or 19%, of respondents with a tenure of more than more than 5 to 8 years as many as 24 people or 16%, of respondents with a tenure of more than 8 years as many as 3 or 4% of the total population.

General Description of Respondents by Age

Of the 146 respondents drawn, the composition of the faculty respondents by age is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Year)</th>
<th>∑</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumlah</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed in the study (2016)
According to the table above, it can be seen that most respondents were in the age 20 to 25 years as many as 85 people or 58%, ages 25 to 30 years as many as 54 people or 36%, while for respondents aged over 30 years only 7 or 6 percent of all respondents as many as 146 people.

**General Description of Respondents Based on Latest Education**

Of the 146 respondents drawn, the composition of the respondents based on recent education are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latest Education</th>
<th>∑</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed in the study (2016)

Based on the above data it appears that respondents with recent education S1 is the most respondents ie 138 respondents or 94% of the total 146 respondents who participated in this study. While respondents to the recent education S3 and S1 as many as six respondents, amounting to 6% of the total respondents.

**Analysis Questionnaire Results**

In this study tries to examine the relationship between constructs competence of lecturers and faculty performance against the promotion of structural lecturer at a private university in Bandar Lampung.

**Step Analysis: Establish Causality Relations Line Diagrams**

**Figure 2. Causality Relationship Diagram Model Linepath Diagram**

4. **Conclusions And Recommendations**

**Conclusion:** This research has not received the results of a comprehensive because it still requires discussion in this seminar more depth to determine whether the indicator on any variables relating to the promotion of structural lecturer at PTS is appropriate. Based on the library we have developed in four research hypothesis is:

- H1: The higher the competence of lecturers will improve performance. H2: The higher the level of competence of the higher faculty for promotion of lecturers. H3: The higher the level of competence that would enhance the promotion lecturership. H4: The higher the level of competence and performance will improve the promotion of lecturers.
**Suggestion:** This study can not be separated from the limitations and weaknesses. On the other hand, the limitations and flaws found in this study can be a resource for future research. The limitations of this study is that the study conducted on PTS in London so that these results can not be generalized to PTS nationally due to the different characteristics of PTS, work culture prevailing in the area, the level of competition and management supervision.
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