

(8 pages)

MAY 2016

P/ID 77806/PMSS5

Time : Three hours

Maximum : 100 marks

PART A — (5 × 6 = 30 marks)

Answer any FIVE questions.

1. How KM system development different from traditional systems?
2. Briefly Explain about the KM Lifecycle.
3. What are the techniques used for codifying the knowledge?
4. What is the impact of Technology on Knowledge worker?
5. What are the key differences between web 2.0 and web 3.0?
6. Briefly Explain about Knowledge Architecture.
7. Explain integrative and interactive knowledge applications.
8. Briefly write about technology components of the KM architecture.

PART B — (5 × 10 = 50 marks)

Answer any FIVE questions.

9. State and explain different types of Knowledge.
10. What is Knowledge Creation and Explain Nonaka's model of Knowledge Creation and Transformation?
11. Explain about the Knowledge Transfer Methods.
12. Describe the differences and similarities among DM, and Business intelligence. How are they related?
13. Explain the techniques of assessment of knowledge management.
14. Trace the emerging KM practices.
15. Discuss Knowledge maps to link knowledge to strategy.
16. Discuss in detail the influence of web portals, business intelligence and information architecture in implementation of KM.

PART C — (1 × 20 = 20 marks)

(Compulsory)

17. Universities are often cited as the ultimate knowledge communities as their main output relates to intellectual activity. University academics have traditionally focused on two things: teaching and research. Generally, academics worked in disciplines around which the organisational structure was framed. The academics would build strong external links with their professional and research colleagues elsewhere, and would publish widely in their chosen field of research. If they worked in a science or medical field, they would be likely to collaborate in research teams to generate research outcomes, further funding and publications. Those working in the social sciences, on the other hand, might work as individual researchers to pursue a more specialised line of enquiry. In previous years, universities received adequate funding from the federal government, and were able to access research grants that permitted ongoing research. Increasingly, funding needs to be drawn from other sources.

Academic performance remains tied to this traditional university profile. Academics seeking promotion are normally required to demonstrate their individual contribution to teaching research and service. Many academics work very hard at building their research profiles. It is widely recognised that they will be promoted based on this record. This greatly reduces their time to focus on other activities, including teaching, service and collaboration. Leadership is minimally recognised or acknowledged, and this has resulted in reluctance by many academics to accept leadership roles. Those who do accept leadership roles as department or school heads, for example, are widely noted as having damaged their careers due to a likely absence of research over the period of appointment. In some fields, the need to collaborate closely with the profession also reduces the capacity to work intensively on research, although the chance to develop commercial collaborations increases.

Those who are employed as researchers generally experience a very different work environment from those employed as standard academics. Researchers must obtain ongoing grants to remain employed. They are constantly identifying and seeking further funding to ensure their group remains funded and viable. Publications and reputation are very important to these employees, and there can be considerable tension over who receives recognition when papers are published.

The pressure to perform can also reduce the capacity to undertake development opportunities, as 'time is output'. This isolation can lead to some poor cultural practices and staff withdrawal from the broader intellectual community. There is a danger for these researchers that they will become too specialised in their field of research, and therefore limited in future career opportunities. The competitive and frenetic nature of the grants process also reduces the likelihood of collaboration between disciplines or groups.

In recent years, the nature of funding and expectations in universities has changed. Funds drawn from government have decreased markedly, and many universities have moved to develop associations overseas and interstate to increase their viability. Their entry into other state markets has been viewed anxiously by many of their competitors, however. Overseas, similar competition has been evident, with many Asian cities seeing a proliferation of Australian university campuses – often with similar courses in close proximity. New transnational commercial ventures commence regularly, making the same mistakes as their competitors, as the previous mistakes are zealously guarded as having commercial value. However, there is increasing recognition of the need to see transnational activities as encouraging what is best for Australia and its educational reputation, rather than institutional profit-seeking.

Some research collaborations between universities have occurred, but there are many examples where similar research groups are competing in small communities. Some funding by the federal government has reduced the tendency to collaborate, as it emphasises differentiated excellence. For example, the 2005 Learning and Teaching Performance Fund and the various research funding processes all distinguish between universities based on their individual performance. At the same time, teaching and research funds are also offered for collaborative ventures between universities and other organisations. These conflicting messages have been challenging for universities.

The process of shifting university cultures has sometimes been linked to descriptors such as 'herding cats' or 'shifting behemoths'. These recognise the intrinsically challenging nature of encouraging cooperation among very entrenched individuals. And yet universities are recognising the need to work more collaboratively, and to reduce the duplication and 'silos' which operate in their institutions. The appointment of chief knowledge officers in some universities has demonstrated recognition of the need for more concerted and culturally driven sharing of knowledge. But as this short overview illustrates, it won't happen overnight.

Questions :

- (a) Review the drivers which operate as either barriers to or facilitators of university knowledge management, and discuss why they may be present.
- (b) Identify the indicators of successful knowledge management that you as vice-chancellor would hope to find when reviewing the university context and outcomes.
- (c) Develop a role brief for a chief knowledge officer in a university setting. What outcomes would you hope to realistically see in place within 3 years?
- (d) The nature of academic work can simultaneously encourage and discourage knowledge practices. Identify some ways this occurs, and consider how existing practices, might be shifted towards more collaborative strategies.
- (e) There has been little research on the nature of knowledge management in universities, despite the recognition that they should be knowledge-intensive communities. Identify a research question you think should be explored, and consider how you would undertake that research. What form of investigation would you consider? What findings would you envisage?