Managerial Competency Standard Program Evaluation

Danny Zulkarnaen¹, R. Madhakomala², Mukhtadi³, Anis Eliyana*⁴, Muhammad Ali Ahmad⁵,

¹Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
dannyzulkarnaen_im16s3@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id
²Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
madhakomala@unj.ac.id
³Universitas Pertahanan, Indonesia
mukhtadi.harry@idu.ac.id
⁴Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
anis.eliyana@feb.unair.ac.id
⁵National College of Business Administration and Economics Lahore
aliahmadbzu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to evaluate the managerial competency standardization program for public sector employees, especially for third echelon employees in their involvement in the process of formulating policy drafts. This research uses a qualitative approach and the CIPP evaluation model. The results on the context aspect are expected to provide recommendations for the formulation of goals, legal basis, and targets in its compose. The various duties of government employees require a combination of implementing team members in the input aspect. Identifying competencies in the process aspect requires a combination of methods for obtaining data so that the information obtained becomes valid. Identification of the managerial competence of positions in Echelon III employees who are actively in the process of formulating policy drafts, showing the required scope and level of control. Managerial competence and level of mastery related to the effectiveness of employees in carrying out their work, and as a priority in training and development.

INTRODUCTION

A program is a series of activities, as a form of implementation of a policy. In terms associated with evaluation, it is defined as a unit of activities which is the realization of policy performance, a continuous process, and occurs in an organization that involves a group of people (Akbar, 2016, p. 52). Implementation is an essential stage in policy practice, after formulation, the success shown by 20% through planning, 60% application, and 20% the rest is how we control the execution (Nugroho, 2014, p. 664). Programs implemented by an organization require evaluation to determine the effectiveness of its components for the achievement of objectives. An analysis is done by collecting data, to obtain information that will be used as a basis for decision making, by knowing how the level of success to be achieved from its performance activities as planned (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 265). Human resources in an organization, is the set of efforts and skills (Joshi, 2013, p. 8), by contributing to the knowledge, skills, and abilities they have (Armstrong, 2011, p. 164). Furthermore, those are called competencies. The identification approach, in the process of making employee competency standards, is carried out through job analysis as a way of mapping. The competency-based job analysis approach is the right approach, focusing on the ability of a person who will do the job (Graham, 2009, p. 29).

In the field of policy formulation, the capability of the policymaker is expected, so the policy can be implemented effectively (Wu et al., 2017, p. 1). In the research, it is known that the managerial competence of employees during the formulation of policy designs has not received attention. Through various literature and media, it is known that various policies cannot completely be implemented, the elimination of part or even as a whole of it often occurs (Constitutional Court Verdict). More specifically, this research will answer problems including, objectives, execution legal basis, and program objectives, human resources as implementers, program goals, and the process of making employee managerial competence standardization.

LITERATURE REVIEW
1. Program evaluation

Evaluation is an activity to gather information about the work, the process of understanding, giving meaning, obtaining, and providing information, to set out the right alternative for decision-makers (Kumar, 2011, p. 286). This activity is often seen as a preventive effort, to find what is right and what is wrong, the results are used to improve future performance, through selected alternatives with rational considerations, based on information for the decision-making process (Lapan et al., 2012, p. 323).

As a process, the primary function of this activity is to provide useful information for decision-makers to determine policies based on evaluations that have been done. A qualitative approach should be used proportionally by not ignoring information in the form of numbers, presented systematically and other factors, so that the qualitative assessment is not only based on the evaluator's subjectivity. (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 200). Evaluators assess something by comparing it with criteria, directly comparing it or taking measurements then comparing it (Alkin, 2011, p. 6).

Technically it is a process of portraying, obtaining, reporting, explaining, and assessing information about the benefits, values to provide decision-making guidelines, support accountability, deliver effective implementation, and improve understanding of the phenomena that occur

(Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 313), therefore, the participation of stakeholders becomes vital to obtain the necessary explanation (Chan, 2016, p. 24).

The program as a policy implementation is the realization of a wiseness, occurs over a long period, not a single activity but plural, and sustainable, involving a group of people (Ananda & Rafida, 2017, p. 5). This work is essential to carry out so that the effectiveness of program components is known for supporting the achievement of objectives (Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, 2020, p. 6). Program evaluation is not just a theory, implemented because there is a real obstacle in practice, this activity must be practical and feasible, done ethically through procedures, taking into consideration of deadlines, resources, and political context, as the basis of decision making (U.S. Department of Human Service and Health, 2011, p. 3).

The involvement of stakeholders is essential (Franklin & Blankenberger, 2016, p. 7), considering the findings will help them to understand the program, change perceptions, and make the necessary changes (Adams et al., 2015, p. 244). The decision-making process based on the careful appeal of data obtained using certain standardized standards (Ramadhan, 2019, p. 44), for the identification of what should be, continued, corrected, or discontinued (Ananda & Rafida, 2017, p. 10).

2. CIPP evaluation model

CIPP stands for context, input, process, and product, these four words are the target of evaluation, which is a component of the program process activities (Azari & Kim, 2014, p. 587). This model offered that the purpose of the evaluation is not to prove but to improve, and not to place too much emphasis on the purpose of a program (Camilli, 2019, p. 32). Allows intervention when it is necessary, before or after the program process is running, it is possible to evaluate only one component (Hakan & Seval, 2011, p. 593). The program owner can select the evaluation at the stage deemed most suitable for coping with the situation (Molope & Oduaran, 2020, p. 2), the components of this evaluation are as follows:

a. Context Evaluation

Context evaluation is an assessment of relevant needs, problems, contextual conditions, and dynamics (Yagusta et al., 2019, p. 251). Can be implemented as an intervention before, during, or after the program is completed. Assist in planning decisions, determining needs to be achieved, and formulating goals (Frye & Hemmer, 2013, p. 17), as well as the context in which the assessment related to the program of making standard competency of this position is the objectives, legal basis, and policy of the program, as well as the program objectives.

b. Input evaluation

Input evaluation helps organize decisions, determine what resources are available, what alternatives, or what plans and ways to achieve goals, how procedures work to achieve them (Frye & Hemmer, 2013, p. 17). Components can include, human resources, supporting facilities, and equipment, procedures, and rules. Input evaluation helps strategic decision-making to assess the needs of program beneficiaries, develop workable program plans, make lists of necessary procedures and resources (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 323). The input components that were assessed in this study, are program managers, and employees as beneficiaries.

c. Process evaluation

This activity is used to assess procedures or implementations during walking programs, provide information for program decisions, and as recordings or make records of procedures that have occurred (Frye & Hemmer, 2013, p. 18). Process evaluation aims to improve the program, with how to strengthen its implementation (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 321), what obstacles are encountered (Rahmatullah & Khausar, 2018, p. 30), what are the factors that influence (Riderer, 2017, p. 8).

The process component in the research program for making employee competency standards, as stipulated in national regulations, is to carry out competency mapping through a job analysis process, as well as the implementation of training and development of managerial competence.

d. Product evaluation

In general, these activities include measurement criteria that achieved, comparing them between field reality and goal formulation, and rationally arranging interpretations (Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014, p. 329). An assessment is conducted to measure success in achieving a set goal (Camilli, 2019, p. 32). This evaluation also assesses the extent to which beneficiaries as the target of the program receive benefits (Frye & Hemmer, 2013, p. 16–19). The product component that becomes the assessment in the research of the implementation of this program, is the result of the identification of managerial competencies in the involvement of Echelon III employees in policy formulation activities, with the comparison of established standards.

3. Policy implementation

In a simple understanding, the implementation is the way that a policy can achieve its goal (Nugraha, 2017, p. 22). Policy implementation is a critical stage, without an execution, a policy is only a document that is not meaningful (Abidin, 2016, p. 163). Policy is a series of interconnected decisions taken by a group of political actors, and public officials regarding a chosen goal and ways to achieve it in a situation, where those decisions are in principle still within the bounds of their authority (Jenkins, 2013, p. 30).

Policy execution is carried out in two steps, with the carry out in the form of programs or make policy formulation implementation. Policy formulation is the process of formulating policy choices by the government (Subarsono, 2016, p. 13–14), with the involvement of government organizations related to a controlled substance (Presidential Regulation number 87 of 2014 on the implementation of law number 12 of 2011 on the establishment of legislation, 2014, Article 45 Paragraph 3 letter b). Formulations are outlined in sentences in articles, verses, and explanations, but often give rise to different interpretations, and not least those that cause problems, especially in their implementation (Abdullah, 2013, p. 262).

The success of enforcement is influenced by two things, the content and context of implementation, including the extent to which the interests of the target group are contained in the content, the types of benefits received by the target group, the extent of the desired changes, whether the location of a program is appropriate, whether the executor mentioned in detail, and whether a program supported by adequate resources (Subarsono, 2016, p. 93).

4. Employment competencies standard

In government organizations, there are office competency standards. The explanation of national regulation submitted, that the standard of competence of the position is a requirement of minimal competence that must be owned by government employees in carrying out the duties. Employee competency standard is a description of

the knowledge, skills, and behavior required by an employee in carrying out their occupation.

The best organizational resources of an organization are its employees (Vathanophas, 2007, p. 46), to be able to work effectively and efficiently, therefore, the competence of the position becomes the basis for taking policies in recruitment, placement, payroll, organizational development (Sedarmayanti, 2016, p. 23). Regulation has determined the standard of position competence for government employees including technical, managerial, and socio-cultural competence with the level of mastery, related to differences as a hierarchy in positions in the organization (Rao & Palo, 2009, p. 58-59).

Competency standards are the identification of employees' essential knowledge and skills that must be possessed, and explain the level of performance they must achieve, showing competency in a particular job or function (Tripathi & Agrawal, 2014, p. 352). Competency standards are made with an organizational approach, in ensuring one's ability to achieve organizational goals, competencies will be defined and standardized as an ability required by the organization (Keston, 2013, p. 1).

5. Managerial competencies

The suitability of an individual in a group or organization in work, related to the characteristics of the individual in an organization. The focus of the manager's role at each level will be different, conformity occurs when the knowledge, skills, and other resources of the individual are following the needs of an organization (Wang & Zhu, 2018, p. 118). Certain types of competencies are closely related to the responsibilities of managers in their work (Rao & Palo, 2009, p. 59), are activities, knowledge, skills or attitudes, and also necessary personal characteristics (Szczepańska et al., 2014, p. 269).

Relevant managerial competencies are essential for managers in the implementation of work (Seate et al., 2016, p. 1), and determined at various levels of managers (Rao & Palo, 2009, p. 59), according to the role and complexity of the work (Grobler, 2005, p. 21). National regulation conveys, managerial competence is a soft competency, covering aspects of knowledge, skills, and attitudes according to the duties, and, or functions of the position.

Competency research of people involved in the policy-making process is indispensable (Langille et al., 2008, p. 34), because as managers at various levels are responsible for preparing policy proposals, various materials, identifying potential options, analyzing procedures and basis on each option, and preparing proposals as discussion material to a board (Zhang et al., 2012, p. 190). Managerial competence in government organizations is determined through government regulation, made by professionals and experts.

6. Competencies identification

To acquire competencies relevant to a job, need to be implemented competency mapping as the process of identification (Yuvaraj & Ravindran, 2011, p. 1). The identification of the necessary competencies implemented through an analysis of the work. The process of how a job is performed describes a job and shows the ability required (Mahajan, 2015, p. 149). The identification process was carried out through interviews, questionnaires, observations, and related documents (Dessler, 2014, p. 82-86). Data collection and analysis were carried out to compare the competencies obtained in the levels. Obtained competencies need validation, to be applied in an organization (Murtiadi, 2012, p. 38).

The job analysis process is carried out in six steps (Dessler, 2014, p. 80-82): a. set a goal of doing job analysis; b. review the background relevant information, through documents such as the organization chart, process chart, and job descriptions; c. choose the position that a representative that could represent the work of participants as a whole; d. analyze the work in earnest with the data based on work activities, work behavior, working conditions, nature, and abilities required to perform the work; e. review the information with stakeholders of the work, and; f. draw up a job description and job specifications.

7. Training and development

Employees are not just a bunch of people in the organization, but a group of people who contribute to the success of the organization (Mathis & Jackson, 2011, p. 5). Human resource development is performed, because every organization, whether a business or government organization wants its human resources, can contribute as much as possible in the organization (Wibowo, 2016, things. 365).

The employees though have been through the selection that is better still is always there is a lack of ability and skills (Wibowo, 2016, p. 365), because it required training both within the organization and by following a training program outside the organization. In the coaching to improve the ability of human resources, training intended to improve capabilities by increasing the knowledge and skills to run the current job, whereas education is an activity to improve the ability with how to increase knowledge and understanding about knowledge, including increased mastery of the theory and skills of taking decisions in the face of the problems of the organization in the future (Suprihanto, 2014, p. 154).

Training and development is a learning process to improve the ability of human resources in carrying out their duties (Abdurrahmat, 2014, it. 147), is an attempt to develop human resources, especially intellectual ability and personality (Notoatmodjo, 2015, p.16).

METHODS

Research is conducted through a qualitative approach to explore in-depth the attitudes, the difference in perspectives, and experiences of the informants, to find the complexity in the situation through the framework thoroughly. As an evaluation guide, the CIPP model with the criteria that are set as a comparison or measuring the implementation of the program.

The sample selected purposively, some program implementers, the support staff, team members of the work unit program managers, and leaders in the field. They were identifying managerial competencies to the employees as a recommendation of the leader, with a mastery of managerial competencies intermediate, qualified, and expert. Five (5) employees of the third echelon, who are involved in the discussion of the preparation of the draft formulation of the policy. To get other related information, the employees of Echelon III, Echelon IV, and non-echelon were selected from the work unit and sub-unit. As for considering the determination of managerial competencies, information is obtained through interviews with officials of organizations that establish the managerial competencies.

Data collected through questionnaires, interviews, observations, and related documents for analysis. Analysis performed with data reduction. They were summarizing, choosing the necessary things, focus on important things, looking for themes and patterns as well as dispose of unnecessary. Find the unit in the data that have meaning

when associated with the focus and research problem. The data collected is presented in various forms by the data obtained in the field. The conclusion is made after the necessary data is collected overall to obtain the answer to the problem formulation presented at the beginning of the study. Test the credibility of the data obtained, carried out with the technique, triangulation of sources, dig up the same data from different sources, and triangulation techniques, data collection that is different to get the data from the same source.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
A. Context
1. Objective

From the interview, known that the standard of job managerial competence is determined based on the consideration of differences in job managerial competence in each government institution, are made by involving experts and professionals, but do not involve practitioners or policy implementers. The goal of standardization is set to answer the needs of every organization, to manage the activities carried out by its employees. A goal that cannot be achieved will result in uncertainty, thereby hindering the goal achievement mechanism, which is related to the implementation to achieve it, although then there is slack in the interpretation of the uncertainty, which is beneficial, at the same time, it can be dysfunctional (Rainey & Jung, 2014, pp. 74–75).

Competency standards are the result of identifying the essential knowledge and skills employees must possess, and explaining the level of performance they must achieve, indicating competency in a particular job or function. Based on the results of interviews, observations, and document review, there are differences in the duties and functions of various government organizations, which are related to the required managerial competencies.

2. Legal basis for implementation.

Attention to the competence of government employees is indicated by the existence of various policies regarding employee management. The provision of standardization of managerial competence becomes attractive when dealing with the highest national regulations. The highest national regulations for government employee management are regulation conveying the obligation of managing employees to be fully submitted to the "Personnel Development Officer", and it is the responsibility of the personnel department to develop employee competencies. Furthermore, nationally it is conveyed that the competence needed by a government institution is related to user agencies, this explicitly touched upon, the obligation of the employee selection committee to carry out competency assessments as an employee requirement.

Ineffective policies to be implemented often occur, due to the lack of coordination and cooperation among government organizations (Dwidjowijoto, 2008, p. 447). Policies are statements made and carried out by the government (Benoit & Laver, 2007, p. 1), involving common interests and deemed necessary to be regulated, drafted, and agreed upon by the competent authorities, and for mutual compliance. The policy is a process and includes the implementation stage, the choice of what to do will expose the government to the consequences (Winarno, 2014, p. 20). Regulations as a follow-up are operationally made by involving experts and professionals, however, because policies made for the common interest, therefore, necessary to involve various stakeholders in the stages of the making process.

3. Aims

Determining employee behavior following what is required in a position, so that it is effective in carrying out work, is an aim that set in the managerial competency standardization program. The new position managerial competency standards will be used to replace the old position managerial competency standards and are used in the management of all employees.

Success in various areas of life determined by human behavior, especially work behavior. Various literature conveys the success and failure of an organization, related to employee behavior at work. Every employee has different characteristics in every respect, so the organization must know how different characteristics will affect their behavior and performance (Ivancevich et al., 2013, p. 63). Work behavior is the behavior of employees shown in the implementation of tasks at work, which is very important in every job and work situation (Ones, 2018, p. 1).

In work behavior there are indicators of individual characteristics, these indicators are things that can measure the extent to which employee work behavior can play a role in the workplace (Robbins et al., 2018, p. 96). Behavior indicators in measuring the managerial competence of positions determined in the regulations to be used according to the level of the employee's position. Behavioral indicators related to the effectiveness of employees in working and dealing with situations. As previously stated, there are different duties and functions of each ministry that require different behavior.

Table 1. Context evaluation

No.	Aspect	Criteria	Findings	Analysis	Recommendation
1.	Objective	The objective of the job managerial competency standardization program	The purpose of standardization has not been answered regarding the need for compliance with employee managerial competency standards	Competency standardization is set aiming, to answer the needs of each organization, to manage the activities carried out by its employees, so that it requires consideration of user organizations	Providing recommendations as a consideration for evaluating the formulation of job competency standards to policy makers.
2.	Legal basis for implementation	There is a legal basis as a guideline for implementation.	Policy users are not involved in making national competency regulations as a follow-up policy.	Formulation on several chapters cause differences in interpretation: a. The implementing organization has the authority to determine the needs for employee managerial competence. b. Policy makers have the authority to standardize job competencies	The organization as the executor can exercise its authority in determining the required managerial competence for the job
3.	Aims	Behavioral indicators as guidelines for measuring the effectiveness of employee job behavior	Behavior measurement indicators have been established at each echelon of employee positions.	Work behavior is related to the effectiveness of work in a field of work, so that a field of work requires employees with the right behavior	User organizations can select and determine existing behavior indicators in national regulations as needed.

B. Input

1. Program manager

Government organizations formed to carry out various government affairs associated with public services. Positions in government organizations are divided into various levels and are generally called decolonization. It starts from the lowest level up to the highest level. Employees in government organizations in an echelon of positions consist of various fields of work, with competencies and qualifications according to their fields, so that they require the right behavior in carrying out their work. In coaching their careers, employees recognize transfers (Hasibuan, 2016, p. 102). Government employees can shift horizontally, vertically and diagonally, to structural and functional positions, however, in practice, several studies suggest that their implementation is not by the required capabilities (Purwanto, 2010, p. 36–37).

The design team members with the ability to blend require specific knowledge and skills, and related fields in the task of government, experienced employees with good performance, and employees who can carry out activities consistently. Team members who do not have relevant knowledge and skills, and team members who are unable to attend the activity stage, especially in the discussion stage, then being represented by inappropriate members will become obstacles, both in the smoothness and perfection of the implementation process for making job competency standards. The team requires members who have knowledge related to human character, general and specific knowledge of various disciplines, as well as insight and experience in the fields of government organization duties.

2. Employees

Employees at the research site divided into three echelons and non-echelons, have duties and functions as stipulated in several local regulations as guidelines for implementation, and are still general. There are still many old implementing regulations guidelines, which are not even known by the employees. Concerning employee colonization as previously stated, the head of the ministry's internal committee is an Echelon III employee. Echelon III employees are appointed as the chairperson of the working group, to discuss the draft policy, which in the implementation of activities is more based on the experience of each employee.

Employee performance can also be assessed by the extent to which the results of a job are achieved, as outlined through standard implementation procedures. The standard procedure for implementing this work is a guideline for employees in carrying out a job (Raju & Banerjee, 2017, p. 2). With environmental developments always occurring, periodically need job description reviews and updates, so that it is relevant to changes that occur to improve employee performance (Al-Marwai & Subramaniam, 2009, p. 247)

National employment regulations convey the appointment of employees in a position carried out based on the principles of professionalism under the competence, qualifications, work performance, and ranks assigned to a position, as well as other objective requirements regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, race or class. The organization in which the research was carried out already has an old managerial standard competency for employee management. National regulations for new managerial competency standards have not been completed. The old employee managerial competency standards used for Echelon IV and non-echelon employees, through assessment and development centers. The training and development of employee competencies are the rights of all employees, and the obligation of training and development submitted to the staffing coach.

Table 2. Input evaluation

No.	Aspect	Criteria	Findings	Analysis	Recommendation
1.	Program manager	Implementers who have the ability to implement program activities.	The executor is a formed team, and some team members are part of the problem of employee placement, not in accordance with the interests of implementing program activities.	Government organizations in an echelon of positions consist of various fields of work, which require competence and qualifications according to their fields, therefore the identification team requires the right combination of members with abilities, knowledge, insights, experience in various fields of work, at each echelon of positions.	1. Teams with members from within and from outside the organization. The team consists of employees, experts, professionals, academics. Team members need skills in the fields of psychology, organizations and institutions, management, especially human resource management, government science, law, and senior employees who have experience and understanding of the object of analysis. All team members are required to attend consistently, especially in discussion forums.
2.	Echelon III employees as program targets	1. competency requirements that must be met in occupying a position. 2. Guidelines for implementing employee duties and functions in a position.	1. Assessment, training and development of managerial competencies, while using the old managerial competency standards, are aimed at Echelon IV and non-echelon employees. 2. Echelon III employees are appointed as chairpersons in the discussion of policy formulation drafts, in carrying out their duties only based on previous work experience	1. Position managerial competency standards are requirements for use in the management of all employees, including in training and development. Managerial competency standards as behavioral requirements related to effectiveness in carrying out a job. Standards are used as a condition of assessment to obtain the right person for a position, and in training to improve the ability of employees to carry out their current jobs, and to develop them as future investments. 2. Guidelines as a standard for how a job is carried out relates to the expected behavior of employees in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. Documents relevant to the work at hand will support effectiveness in carrying out an activity or job. Employees do not only rely on their experience at work.	2. Assessment, training and development use indicators that have been set by the Ministry or the old standard, for all employees without exception 3. The need for revision and preparation of documents as a description of general guidelines.

C. Process

The program is carried out by the implementers in a joint team formed by involving other related sub-units. Relevant managerial competencies can be defined for employees at various levels, a list of required competencies is related to differences in job complexity, and can be developed according to levels (Grobler, 2005, p. 21). Managerial competency standards that are in process, guided by national regulations, by applying the managerial competencies that are determined, while a dictionary of local technical competencies used for technical competencies.

Job analysis is carried out by distributing questionnaires, collecting existing documents, and interviewing. The

primary information is obtained from questionnaires, and through interviews, if needed. The information obtained is combined with existing documents, used to carry out evaluations. It is used to review what work, what knowledge, skills, and abilities are needed to carry it out (Royer, 2011, p. 7). The information contained in this analysis will show the complexity of occupation and other essential things for conducting job evaluations (Sharif & Karim, 2017, p. 1221).

Various theories and research convey the steps to analyze that must be fulfilled to compile information so that the information obtained becomes valid. It is aimed at obtaining description and specification information, related to the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed so that performance is effective (Dessler, 2014, p. 80). Through the analysis, descriptions, and specifications will be obtained. Descriptions describe the duties and responsibilities, while specifications are information about qualifications, conditions, equipment, and other things needed (Caldwell, 2018, p. 9).

Questionnaires, interviews, and participant involvement are important in carrying out analysis, obtaining information that cannot be observed, and information that has not been standardized in a document (Ashraf, 2017, p. 4). Questionnaires and interviews were carried out to obtain various information, regarding the work and what daily employees do so that analysis was carried out immediately (Yildiz & Caylan, 2017, p. 35).

The old employee competency standards were used since the establishment of the assessment center in 2013. Until this research is completed, assessment, training, and competency development focused on managing Echelon IV and non-echelon employees. As previously stated, the training aimed to improve current work performance, while development aimed at increasing work performance in the future. The training aimed at helping employees to do better at their current jobs, the development represents a future-oriented development investment.

From interviews and observations, training and competency development were carried out in the classroom through a combination of methods involving several facilitators. The participants conveyed that they were satisfied after training attend because they gained new knowledge and experiences to use in their work. At this stage, discussions were held to share the experiences of each participant. There was a discussion on every issue that was raised in the implementation of daily activities, but it did not touch on the activities in terms of how to carry out the draft policy formulation activities. In the interview, the resource person conveyed that a specific method is often needed in the interaction of the discussion of the policy formulation and relates to experience.

Training and development with successful experiential learning models not only involve students in activities, but they help students to bring out the meaning of these activities (Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center, 2012, p. 3). All experiences can cause learning, they can even cause change. The last goal of the learning process is that students have learned, so it is hoped that they can transfer the knowledge they get to real situations in their daily activities (Kolb, 2015, p. 5).

Table 3. Process evaluation

No	Aspect	Criteria	Findings	Analysis	Recommendation
1.	Program manager	1. Guidelines in the process of making job competency standards.	1. The implementation of job analysis through questionnaires, interviews and observations has not been carried out properly.	1. Questionnaires, interviews, and observations as well as documents are important aspects of job analysis. Questionnaires need to be combined with interviews and observations to clarify and verify information. Obtaining data apart from employees, also through documents. Obtaining this data will determine the accuracy of information regarding descriptions and specifications in preparing the correct knowledge, skills and work attitudes of employees in a position.	1. Job analysis is carried out completely and properly, through questionnaires, interviews, observations, and data collection from relevant documents
		2. The existence of supporting facilities in the use of managerial competency standards in employee managerial management	2. Training and development uses an experience-sharing model, but it is not yet related to policy design formulation activities	2. The method of carrying out the interaction, in the formulation of policy designs, relates to one's experiences. Competence is obtained not only through formal education or training, but is located between formal education, training and experience, obtained as a collection of what is learned in formal and informal experiences, and in some cases related to the abilities resulting from one's life experiences.	2. Managerial competency training and development, by involving experienced employees in the policy formulation process stages

D. Product

1. Managerial competence of Echelon III employees as head of the working group to discuss the formulation of policy drafts.

From the results of questionnaires, interviews, and observations, known the process of how a work was done, describing a job, and showing the necessary skills, by obtaining a description of the duties of Echelon III employees, as the chairman of the ministry's internal committee to draw up a draft policy formulation. Description of the task and stages of implementation of activities, then faced with the dictionary of competencies of national regulation 2017, so that it is known the scope of competence, which will help in carrying out activities, in a group or organization, is expected to be useful when doing work, so that the resulting products become good.

From the identification of the level of competency mastery of Echelon III employees, through the stages of job analysis, it is found that managerial competencies are at the level of mastery of "proficient" and "expert". This level of mastery when traced, using the Dreyfus model, and widely used in various studies with behavioral indicators indicates the level of competency mastery, with the following criteria (Lester 2005, p.5):

Level 1 Novice, mastery is limited to simple concepts and general implementation, with characteristics:
a. rigid adherence to rules or plan
b. understanding of a situation is very limited
c. in assessing not through various considerations

Level 2 Advanced beginner, mastery of basic concepts, and their implementation independently, with the characteristics:

a. guidelines based on general situation characteristics with some previous experience
b. Perception of a situation is still limited
c. Has not been able to determine priority in all aspects
Level 3 Competent, mastery of complex concepts and optimal implementation, with characteristics:
a. Able to overcome various situations by conducting various activities or understanding the various information provided
b. Actions taken, in the perception of achieving goals
c. Always plan before carrying out activities
d. Standardize/make standards and carry out a procedure
Level 4 Proficient, mastery of complex concepts, effective, and efficient implementation, with characteristics:

a. Looking at a situation not only on certain aspects but holistically
b. Consider what is most important in a situation
c. Able to know when there is a deviation from a normal state or should be
d. Good in decision-making
e. Paying attention to directions, by adapting to the situation
Level 5 Expert, mastery of the overall concept and become a role model for others with the characteristics:
a. No longer rely on guidelines, rules, and directives
b. Understand a situation based on a deep understanding
c. Using an analytical approach when facing a situation that has recently experienced or occurred a problem
d. Have a vision only of what might be achieved.

Table 4. Acquisition of the scope, level of mastery, and ownership interests

Managerial Competencies	Job analysis and Echelon III employees opinion		1st Superintendence Confirmation		2nd Superintendence Confirmation		Focus Group Discussion	
	Whilst Level	Importance	Level	Importance	Level	Importance	Level	Importance
Integrity (M.01)	4	Important	4	Very Important	5	Very Important	4	Very Important
Cooperation (M.02)	5	Important	5	Very Important	5	Very Important	4	Very Important
Communication (M.03)	5	Very Important	5	Very Important	5	Very Important	5	Very Important
Result Orientation (M.04)	4	Important	5	Very Important	5	Very Important	4	Very Important
Public service (M.05)	4	Important	3	Moderately Important	5	Moderately Important	4	Moderately Important
Self-development and others (M.06)	5	Important	4	Very Important	5	Very Important	4	Moderately Important
Manage change (M.07)	4	Very Important	4	Very Important	5	Important	4	Important
Decision-making (M.08)	5	Important	5	Very Important	5	Important	5	Important

2. Comparison of the acquisition of managerial competence with the establishment of managerial competency standards for Echelon III employees
The determination of the level of mastery in the 2017 national regulatory competency standards:
a. Level 5 for employees in Echelon I
b. Level 4 for employees in Echelon II
c. Level 3 for employees in Echelon III.
d. Level 2 for employees in Echelon IV.
e. Level 1 for Non-Echelon Positions

Managerial competency standards are the stipulated provisions. The research was carried out by giving

questionnaires, interviews, collecting relevant documents, observing. Confirmation to headship and validation through focused group discussion. Level 3, as stipulated by national regulation, becomes irrelevant to the organizational competency needs of echelon III employees, as can be seen in table 4 above.
Validation through focus group discussion shows the real need for managerial competence for Echelon III employees as chairman of the policy formulation working group. The determination level of mastery of managerial competence scattered for Echelon I and II employees.

Table 5. Product evaluation

No	Aspect	Criteria	Findings	Analysis	Recommendation
1.	Managerial competency standards for Echelon III employee positions	Determination of the scope and level of mastery of the managerial competence of employees	There are differences in the level of mastery of managerial competence in Echelon III employees, as chair of the ministry's internal committee, with the stipulation in national regulations.	1. The scope of managerial competence and the level of mastery of managerial competence are related to the effectiveness of employees in carrying out work. The scope of managerial competence and the level of mastery of managerial competence, from the identification results, show the level of competence and expertise, not at the intermediate or competent level. 2. Identification of managerial competence, especially in Echelon III as committee chairman in the working group in formulating policy drafts, shows the scope of managerial competence and level of mastery needed, but is a determination that is spread across Echelon I and II employees.	1. The use of managerial competence as a result of research, in the managerial competency standards of employee positions 2. Data collection of Echelon III employees who have the ability according to the results of the research, to be appointed as the head of the policy formulation working group 3. Appointment of Echelon II staff, as chairperson of the working group on policy formulation

CONCLUSION

1. Context.

The employee managerial competency development program is the implementation of national policies as a standardization of the competence of government employees. Formulation of determination arrangements, and management of competencies in national regulations, need to be reviewed, considering that every government organization, especially where research carried out has differences in the implementation of tasks.

The submission of the proposed revision, on target in achieving the goal achievement of the expected conditions, the expected behavior of each employee at each grade, need to be submitted with primary research, and discussion with other stakeholders. Joint discussion expected to attract the red thread of managerial competencies, considering the various duties, functions, and responsibilities at each echelon, and every government organization.

2. Input.

a. Program manager.

Government employees in the development of their career, get to know the mutation in the horizontal, vertical, and diagonal in scope and out of the organization. Employees in such mutations can work as an employee of the general staff, field operations, services, particular tasks, and so on. With a career pattern like this, the implementers of the program of standardization, as a team requires the knowledge, skills, insight into the various related fields, with the support of experts or professionals.

b. Employees.

The national policy regarding government employees does not exclude government employees in terms of essential qualifications, competence, in a fair and reasonable regardless of political background, race, color, religion, origin, gender, marital status, age, even the condition of the disability. In the fulfillment of the terms, the organization must carry out the assessment, training, and development for all employees, without exception.

Some of the activities are outlined more as a guideline in the implementation, however, most require renewal. Echelon III official is the primary executor, in the discussion process of the draft formulation of the policy. In general, this activity is arranged in the process of discussing the draft policy formulation, therefore follow-up guidelines are needed as standard work procedures.

3. Process.

A job analysis will reveal the fact work, to produce information for various management purposes, through a systematic process to assign tasks and skill demands, as well as individuals such as what employed on the job. Data collection is critical to implemented through questionnaires, job analysis, direct observation, and interviews with employees so that the obtained information of the work process.

Interview as one of the stages in the clarification of information, not just about complement with the consideration necessary or unnecessary. Observation is conducted to see how they work without intervention, to note about what, why, and how the various parts of the work were done.

Training and development of managerial competencies, it is crucial to implement in all echelons of employees. The results of the study show success in changing the behavior of participants as expected, and it is a necessity for the successful application of it to all employees.

4. Product

The final validation of managerial competence was carried out through focus group discussion; the acquisition of managerial competencies faced with the determination of managerial competence in national regulations. The FGD was held by involving functional officials who are responsible for compiling standard managerial competence positions, assessors, and Echelon III employees who are involved in the policy drafting working group. There are significant differences in the level of mastery of managerial competence with the establishment of national regulations. The results of the validation show the managerial competence needed in policy formulation activities, pointing to the determination of managerial competence spread among Echelon I and II employees. Thus, data collection of competent Echelon III employees can be carried out to be appointed as chairman in the policy formulation activities, or given to Echelon II employees

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, M. (2013). Membangun kembali kesantunan bahasa hukum dalam perundangan-undangan RI. *Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Diponegoro*, *42*(2), 261–267. https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.42.2.2013.261-267
2. Abdurrahmat, F. (2014). *Organisasi dan manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Rineka Cipta.
3. Abidin, S. Z. (2016). *Kebijakan publik*. Salemba Humanika.
4. Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education. (2020). Glossary of terms. An *ACGME* (15). acgme.org. http://www.acgme-i.org
5. Adams, A. E., Nnawulezi, N. A., & Vandenberg, L. (2015). "Expectations to change" (E2C): A participatory method for facilitating stakeholder engagement with evaluation findings. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *36*(2), 243–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214014553787
6. Akbar, M. F. (2016). Evaluasi kebijakan program pemberian dana bantuan operasional sekolah. *Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan dan Pelayanan Publik*, *2*(1), 47–64.
7. Al-Marwai, S. A., & Subramaniam, I. D. (2009). A review of the need for writing & updating job descriptions for 21st-century organizations. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *12*(2), 241–251.
8. Alkin, M. C. (2011). Evaluation essentials: From a to z. In *Climate Change 2013 - The Physical Science Basis*. The Guilford Press.
9. Ananda, R., & Rafida, T. (2017). Pengantar evaluasi program pendidikan. In *Medan: Perdana Publishing* (Vol. 53, Nomor 9). Perdana Publishing.
10. Armstrong, M. (2011). *Armstrong's handbook of strategic human resource management* (5th ed.). KoganPage.
11. Ashraf, J. (2017). Examining the public sector recruitment and selection, in relation to job analysis in Pakistan. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1309134
12. Azari, R., & Kim, Y. W. (2014). Development and validation of a framework for evaluation of integrated design teas of sustainable high-performance building. *Construction Research Congress*, 584–593. https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784413517.176
13. Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2007). Estimating party policy positions: Comparing expert surveys and hand-coded content analysis. *Electoral Studies*, *26*(1), 90–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2006.04.008

14. Caldwell, C. (2018). *Job analysis: The building block of human resource management* (17). researchgate.net.
15. Camilli, S.-A. (2019). Big shoes to fill: An evaluation journey in the footsteps of Daniel L. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, *15*(33), 30–36.
16. Chan, K. C. M. (2016). A critical analysis of a program evaluation: A case study on the effectiveness of a teacher training program. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, *4*(5), 24–33.
17. Dessler, G. (2014). *Fundamentals of human resource management*. Pearson Education Limited.
18. Dwidjowijoto, R. N. (2008). *Public policy*. Elek Media Komputindo.
19. Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center. (2012). *Experiential learning* (9). Northern Illinois University. https://doi.org/10.1300/j036v02n01_11
20. Franklin, D., & Blankenberger, B. (2016). Program evaluation of community college learning assistance centers: What do LAC directors think? *Community College Review*, *44*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552115609998
21. Frye, A. W., & Hemmer, P. A. (2013). Program evaluation models and related theories. In *AMEE Guide* (1–22). Association for Medical Education in Europe (AMEE).
22. Graham, C. R. (2009). *Developing a competency for a 21st century* (387). Ohio State University.
23. Grobler, S. W. (2005). *Organisational structure and Elliot Jaques' stratified systems theory* (1–97). University of South Africa.
24. Hakan, K., & Seval, F. (2011). CIPP evaluation model scale: Development, reliability and validity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 592–599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.146
25. Hasibuan, M. S. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. PT. Bumi Aksara.
26. Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, M. R., & Matteson, M. T. (2013). *Organizational behaviour and management* (Tenth). Mc Graww-Hill.
27. Jenkins, B. (2013). Policy analysis, models and approaches. In *The Policy Process: A Reader* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
28. Joshi, M. (2013). *Human resource management* (1st ed.). bookboon.com.
29. Keston, G. (2013). *What is competency management system* (1–6). Faulkner Information Services. http://www.kmworld.com/Articles/Editorial/What-Is/What-is-a-Competency-Management-System-87130.aspx
30. Kejaksaan RI. (2019). *Putusan mahkamah konstitusi*. kejaksaan.go.id; Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. https://www.kejaksaan.go.id/produk_hukum.php?id_prod=2&jud=putusan mahkamah konstitusi
31. Kementerian Hukum dan HAM. (2009). Penafsiran undang-undang dari perspektif penyelenggara pemerintahan. In *ditjenpp.kemenkumham.go.id*. Media Publikasi Peraturan perundang-undangan dan Informasi Hukum. http://ditjenpp.kemenkumham.go.id/htn-dan-puu/231-penafsiran-undang-undang-dari-perspektif-penyelenggara-pemerintahan.html
32. Kolb, D. A. (2015). Experiental learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. In *Experiential learning : experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
33. Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step by step guide for beginners* (3rd ed.).
34. Langille, L., Romanow, P., Bull, A., & Williams, P. (2008). Building collaborative capacity for research and influencing policy: The rural communities impacting policy project 1. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, *3*(3), 23–55.
35. Lapan, S. D., Quartaroli, M. T., & Riemer, F. J. (2012). *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and design* (Vol. 3, Nomor 2). Jossey-Bass.
36. Lester, Stand. (2005). *Novice to expert: The dreyfus model of skill acquisition* (4). Stand Lester Development. http://www.sid.demon.co.uk/dreyfus.pdf
37. Mahajan, R. (2015). The key role of communication skills in the life of professionals. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *20*(12), 36–39. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-201223639
38. Mathis, R. L., & Jakson, J. H. (2011). *Human resources management* (13th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.
39. Molope, M., & Oduaran, A. (2020). Evaluation of the community development practitioners' professional development programme: CIPP model application. *Development in Practice*, *30*(2), 194–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2019.1650894
40. Murtiadi, A. H. (2012). Membaca wajah sistem kepegawaian yang berbasis sistem merit. *Kebijakan dan Manajemen PNS*, *6*(1), 31–48.
41. Notoatmodjo, S. (2015). *Pengembangan sumber daya manusia*. PT. Rineka Cipta.
42. Nugraha, I. A. (2017). Proses formulasi kebijakan penanggulangan kemiskinan. *Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, *8*(2), 19–29.
43. Nugroho, R. (2014). *Public policy: Teori, manajemen, dinamika, analisis, konvergensi, dan kimia kebijakan*. PT. Elex Media Computindo.
44. Ones, D. S. (2018). Counterproductive work behaviors 2.0: Assessment or consequences. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *26*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12205
45. Peraturan Presiden RI nomor 87 tahun 2014 tentang peraturan pelaksanaan undang-undang nomor 12 tahun 2011 tentang pembentukan peraturan perundang-undangan, 52 (2014).
46. Peraturan Menteri PAN dan RB nomor 38 tahun 2017 tentang standar kompetensi jabatan aparatur sipil negara, 108 (2017).
47. Peraturan Kepala BKN nomor 7 tahun 2013 tentang pedoman penyusunan standar kompetensi manajerial pegawai negeri sipil, 45 (2013).
48. Peraturan Menteri Pertahanan nomor 20 tahun 2018 tentang penyelenggaraan assessment dan development center di lingkungan Kementerian Pertahanan, 16 (2018).
49. Peraturan Menteri Pertahanan nomor: 19 tahun 2014 tentang tata cara mempersiapkan rancangan peraturan perundang-undangan di lingkungan kementerian pertahanan dan tentara nasional Indonesia, 22 (2014).
50. Purwanto, E. A. (2010). Meninjau kembali remunerasi sebagai instrumen untuk mewujudkan profesionalisme PNS: Perspektif motivasi internal dan eksternal. *Kebijakan dan manajemen PNS*, *4*(2), 36–51.

51. Rahmatullah, & Khausar. (2018). Evaluasi model CIPP terhadap layanan E-KTP pada program pengembangan dan evaluasi kebijakan sistem administrasi kependudukan di dinas Kependudukan dan pencatatan sipil Provinsi DKI Jakarta. *Jurnal Genta Mulia*, *7*(2), 21–51.

52. Rainey, H. G., & Jung, C. S. (2014). A conceptual framework for analysis of goal ambiguity in public organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *25*(1), 71–99. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu040

53. Raju, K. K., & Banerjee, S. (2017). A Study on job description and its effect on employee performance: Case of some selected manufacturing organizations in the city of pune, India. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science*, *VI*(II), 2278–2540. www.ijltemas.in

54. Ramadhan, S. (2019). Penerapan model empat level kirkpatrick dalam evaluasi program pendidikan dan pelatihan aparatur di pusdiklat migas. *Forum Diklat*, *6*(1), 43–54.

55. Rao, M. K., & Palo, S. (2009). Identification of managerial competencies for establishing a conceptual framework for HRD practitioners. *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, *V*(4), 56–69.

56. Riderer, L. (2017). *Junior rocket owls* (1–17). Glendora Unified School District.

57. Robbins, S. p, Judge, T. A., & Breward, K. E. (2018). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. Pearson Canada Inc.

58. Seate, B. M., Raborale, & Chinomona, R. (2016). The relative importance of managerial competencies for predicting the perceived job performance of Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment verification practitioners. *Human Resource Management*, 1–11.

59. Sedarmayanti. (2016). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia, reformasi birokrasi dan manajemen pegawai negeri sipil*. PT. Refika Aditama.

60. Sharif, A. M., & Karim, M. (2017). Influence of job analysis program on employees: A study on selected companies of bangladesh. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, *8*(5), 1221–1225.

61. Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

62. Subarsono, A. (2016). *Analisis kebijakan publik: Konsep, teori dan aplikasi*. Pustaka Pelajar.

63. Suprihanto, J. (2014). *Manajemen*. Gajah Mada University Press.

64. Szczepańska, K., Woszczyna, Zdzisława, D., & Pikiewicz. (2014). Managerial competencies and innovations in the company-The case of enterprises in Poland. *Business, Management and Education*, *12*(2), 266–282. https://doi.org/10.3846/bme.2014.240

65. Taylor, J. (2013). Goal setting in the australian public service: Effects on psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Public Administration Review*, *73*(3), 453–464. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12040

66. Tripathi, K., & Agrawal, M. (2014). Competency based management in organizational context: A literature review. *Global Journal of Finance and Management*, *6*(4), 349–356.

67. Undang-undang nomor 5 tahun 2014 tentang aparatur sipil negara, 66 (2014).

68. US Departmen of Human Service and Health. (2011). Introduction to program evaluation for public health ptograms: A self study guide. In *Program Performance and Evaluation Office (PPEO)* (hal. 103). Office of Strategy and Innovation.

69. Vathanophas, V. (2007). Competency requirements for effective job performance in the Thai public sector. *Contemporary Management Research*, *3*(1), 45–70. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.7903/cmr.49

70. Wang, Y., & Zhu, X. (2018). Personal-organization matching literature review. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *199*, 118–122. https://doi.org/10.2991/saeme-18.2018.22

71. Wibowo. (2016). *Manajemen kinerja* (Kelima). PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

72. Winarno, B. (2014). *Kebijakan publik: Teori, proses, dan studi kasus*. Center of Academic Publishing Service.

73. Wu, X., Ramesh, M., & Howlett, M. (2017). Policy capacity : A conceptual framework for understanding policy competencies and capabilities. *Policy and Society*, *34*, 165–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2015.09.001

74. Yagusta, R. A. B., Widiastuti, Puspitorini, W., & Pradityana, K. (2019). Evaluasi program gala desa tahun 2017 di kementerian pemuda dan olahraga. *Journal Sport Area*, *4*(1), 248–257.

75. Yildiz, R. O., & Caylan, D. O. (2017). A Critical approach to the job analysis practices of Turkish container ports. *Gazi Journal of Economics & Business*, *3*(3), 17–37.

76. Yuvaraj, & Ravindran. (2011). Competency Mapping. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, *2*(8).

77. Zhang, Y., Lee, R., & Yang, K. (2012). Knowledge and skills for policymaking: Stories from local public managers in Florida. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *18*(1), 183–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2012.12001677