Number of instances of staff reporting their KM capacities improved, by type

Indicator Number:
12

Logic Model Component:
Processes

Data Type(s):
Count, qualitative

Short Definition:
Captures the number of instances where project staff members report an improvement in their KM knowledge, skills, or abilities

Definition and Explanation (Long):
This indicator captures the number of instances in which project staff members report an improvement in their KM knowledge, skills, or abilities. At the organizational level, trends in the results of KM audits can be studied.

Data Requirements:
Number of instances of staff reporting KM capacities improved, type of improvement

Qualitative information should also be reported wherever possible.

Data Sources:
KM audits; performance reviews; pre/post tests; training evaluations; observations by other staff, that is, asking staff members if they think their colleagues’ KM capacities have improved and asking for examples; notes from after-action reviews; interviews with staff members.

Frequency of Data Collection:
Semiannually

Purpose:
Building on the results of the KM audit, this indicator (along with indicator 11) gauges the effects of efforts to strengthen internal KM capacity. Indicators 11 and 12 are direct follow-up indicators to indicator 1 (organizational knowledge assets assessed in the last five years), which gives staff members the opportunity to assess the growth of their own KM capacities.

Issues and Challenges:
Once a KM audit has been performed and the organization understands its KM gaps and challenges, leaders can ensure that management puts financial resources and high-level support into improving KM systems overall; that management leads by example, investing their time in doing KM well; and that appropriate KM training is offered when needed. After the changes have taken place and staff members continue KM activities, they can report whether they feel their knowledge, skills, and performance have improved. The accuracy of this indicator depends on trust and clear and open lines of communication between management and the rest of the staff, to ensure that self-reports are honest. These conversations could even be made part of annual performance reviews between supervisors and staff. There are other ways of gauging improvements that may be less subject to bias, for example, changes in how often an internal knowledge sharing system is used or the formation of new internal COPs that meet regularly.
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