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**Introduction to the Knowledge Management Maturity Model – UKHSA**

The Knowledge Management (KM) Maturity Model for UKHSA is adapted from the cross-government model which was produced by a cross-government working group and which is being used by a number of government departments. We are beginning to work with the model and will continue to refine and adapt it to meet the needs of UKHSA

The aim of the tool is to help teams identify/map what they are already doing around knowledge management, what they would like to be doing, and plan ways to achieve this. It provides a benchmark, allowing you to record and review progress.

**For more information about and support to use the tool, contact:** [victoria.richardson@phe.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.richardson@phe.gov.uk) or [janet.hargreaves@phe.gov.uk](mailto:janet.hargreaves@phe.gov.uk).

**More about the KM maturity model:**

* A self-assessment tool to enable teams to map where they are now, where they want to be and how to get there. **Identify strengths and weaknesses**, and **target areas for improvement**
* Reflects the [Knowledge Principles for Government](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/information-management/knowledge-principles-for-government.pdf)
* Can be applied at organisational level, business directorate level, or team level as required
* Not a holding to account tool. An aid, something that will make it easier to **direct resource**,and **record and review progress**
* Measures / indicators show the types of activities that can be introduced to demonstrate progress against an outcome (not definitive)
* Select **one or two priority areas** / outcomes to improve on (not all at once)
* No quick fix – good KM involves **changing behaviours** and **ways of working** as well as **processes**

**How to use the tool:**

Score your teams’ current performance (maturity level) against each “sub-level outcome” using a score of 0-3 – where 0 illustrates the team doesn’t meet the standard; and 3 shows you meet maturity level 3, the most developed in term of KM practice.

Note what activities / ways of working illustrate that score – i.e. what KM related practice you are doing as evidence of that score.

Look at strengths and weaknesses (you could plot these on a graph). Look at outcomes you would like to focus on to improve. **You do not need to move all outcomes to the next level at once. Improvement should be incremental, and initially focussed on outcomes that will bring the most benefit in line with business priorities.** When you have selected one or two priority areas/outcomes to improve on – score where you would like to be in each sub-level outcome in a year’s time. Note what steps you might take to improve in this area (and reach the next level). Develop an action plan, including regular review.

Depending on the team or division, some outcomes may at first seem harder to achieve than others. However, as teams begin to work through the model delivering achievable improvements, they should start to build an evidence base which can ultimately be used to make the case for achieving these outcomes. For example, if evidence that incorporating a KM element informally into performance management conversations is having a positive effect, that begins to make a case for formalising those conversations into the performance review process.

We recommend reviewing processes regularly and completing the model annually.

**Elements of the model explained:**

* *High level and sub level outcomes* – essentially, **what we consider good KM practice looks like**. There are six high level outcomes at organisational level, and various related sub-levels
* *Indicative measures/activities* – these show the types of activities / tools / processes that can be introduced to demonstrate progress against that outcome (These measures are not a definitive list. Teams may present evidence that alternative measures deliver the intended outcomes.)
* *Overall maturity level* – a scoring system of 0-3 where 0 is low and 3 is high

**Glossary [Draft – taken from cross-government maturity model]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Awareness-level training | Basic introduction to the principles of knowledge seeking and sharing, and collaborative working, and the benefits they can bring. |
| BAU | Business as usual. |
| Benefits re-investment | Applying useful knowledge gained through KM activity to change business processes, behaviours and or ways of working for the better. |
| Board-level | Depending on the size of the organisation, this might be the top-level board, or management boards at an appropriate level. In a very large organisation, where the top-level board might be perceived as too remote, KM champions should be considered for management boards at Director-General (SCS2) or Director (SCS1) level. |
| (Board-level) KM Champion | Individuals who will actively advocate the benefits of good KM, and promote and encourage KM activity within the department/team. They will lead by example. |
| Case studies | Stories demonstrating how application of a KM technique or techniques had a positive business impact. Ideally they should be brief, with a focus on why and how the KM technique in question led to improvement. |
| Facilitator | An individual in a business unit – ideally an enthusiast – tasked with improving awareness and application of KM within that unit. Does not necessarily have to be a formal Knowledge Manager role, certainly in the initial KM improvement phase. |
| Holding to Account | Agreeing clear improvement targets and quality indicators, assessing achievement against them and reviewing (and assisting?) progress. Should be a supportive rather than punitive process. |
| KM due diligence | Seeking out useful knowledge at the start of a task or project, e.g. from earlier, similar undertakings, and learning from it. |
| Knowledge asset | Knowledge assets can be intangible – for example the intellectual capital of an organisation or business unit – or tangible. In the context of this maturity model, a knowledge asset is knowledge made tangible. Examples might include wikis, case studies, databases, stories, exit interview transcripts, outputs from project reviews, new knowledge generated from text mining, etc.  Organisations must not focus exclusively on tangible knowledge assets: good knowledge management depends on managing both tangible and intangible assets effectively. |
| Knowledge café | A conversational learning event whereby people are given a general topic for discussion and then spend around 45 minutes discussing it in small groups, before reconvening in a large group at the end to draw conclusions. Every 15 minutes the small groups should change their composition, swapping members in and out, to keep the conversation fresh. Knowledge cafes were devised and popularised by the KM consultant [David Gurteen](http://www.gurteen.com/). |
| Negative outcomes | What went wrong and why. It is much easier to focus on positive outcomes, but good KM must also identify and learn from errors and failures. |
| Post-project review | A review of all stages of a project, identifying, and where appropriate recording, what went well, what did not go so well, why, what could have been improved, useful contacts, etc. Lessons learnt should be applied where possible, for example to improve project management processes, planning etc. It should also be made available (subject to any security caveats) for use by other project teams. |
| Pre-project review | A due-diligence check specifically at the start of a new project, to discover whether anything similar has been attempted before, and if so, to acquire as much knowledge as appropriate about it, to help the incoming project team. |
| Professional communities | Communities organised around areas of professional interest. They can be topic-based or team-based, and can collaborate face-to-face and/or online. |
| Recognition | Generally non-financial reward. Can range from a simple “thank-you” to formal high-level recognition schemes such as Awards, merit certificates etc. |
| Safe to Try culture | Also known as Safe to Fail. An open learning culture where people feel able to admit to and learn from mistakes and experimentation, and to challenge others, in a constructive way, without fear of sanction or victimisation. |
| Senior leader | SCS1 or above. |
| Social communities | Communities organised around social topics, such as photography, birdwatching, parenting etc. Their value lies in helping people get used to operating in collaborative communities, network and make personal connections that can then be exploited in a professional context. |
| Toolkit | Something that brings KM assistance for staff together in one place. Could include a manual, a set of techniques, useful contacts, training videos etc. |
| Training | Can be in-house or external, formal or informal, depending on the level of available resource. At a minimum resource should be targeted at training some facilitators who can in turn cascade training to the rest of the organisation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

*For more information about the tool and how to use it contact: Victoria Richardson, Knowledge and Evidence Specialist - KM, Knowledge & Library Services* [victoria.richardson@phe.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.richardson@phe.gov.uk)