ASSESSMENT GUIDE

ICT707
Knowledge Management - Semester 1, 2025

Assessment Overview

Assessment tasks				Learning Outcome Mapping	
Assessment ID	Assessment Item	When due	Weighting	ULO#	CLO# for MITS
1	KM Strategy Report (Individual) (2000 Words)	Session 6	30%	1	1, 2, 3
2	KM Tasks Design Report (Individual) (2000 Words)	Session 9	30%	2, 3	2, 3
3*	KM Solution Design Report and Demonstration (Group) (2500-3000 Words)	Session 13	40%	2, 4	3, 4, 5

Note: * denotes 'Hurdle Assessment Item' that students must achieve at least 40% in this item to pass the unit.

Referencing guides

You must reference all the sources of information you have used in your assessments. Please use the IEEE referencing style when referencing your assessments in this unit. Refer to the library's reference guides for more information.

- https://elearning.vit.edu.au/pluginfile.php/473840/block_html/content/VIT%20Library%20Referencing%20-%20IEEE%20-%2007042020.pdf

Academic misconduct

VIT ensures that the integrity of its students' academic studies follows an acceptable level of excellence. VIT will adhere to its **VIT Policies, Procedures and Forms** where it explains the importance of staff and student honesty in relation to academic work. It outlines the kinds of behaviors that are "academic misconduct", including plagiarism.

Late submissions

In cases where there are no accepted mitigating circumstances as determined through **VIT Policies, Procedures and Forms**, late submission of assessments will lead automatically to the imposition of a penalty. Penalties will be applied as soon as the deadline is reached.

Short extensions and special consideration

Special Consideration is a request for:

- Extensions of the due date for an assessment, other than an examination (e.g. assignment extension).
- Special Consideration (Special Consideration in relation to a Completed assessment, including an end-of-unit Examination).

Students wishing to request Special Consideration in relation to an assessment the due date of which has not yet passed must engage in written emails to the teaching team to Request for Special Consideration as early as possible and prior to start time of the assessment due date, along with any accompanying documents, such as medical certificates.

For more information, visit **VIT Policies, Procedures and Forms**.

Inclusive and equitable assessment

Reasonable adjustment in assessment methods will be made to accommodate students with a documented disability or impairment. Contact the unit teaching team for more information.

Contract Cheating

Contract cheating usually involves the purchase of an assignment or piece of research from another party. This may be facilitated by a fellow student, friend or purchased on a website. Other forms of contract cheating include paying another person to sit an exam in the student's place.

Contract cheating warning:

- By paying someone else to complete your academic work, you don't learn as much as you could have if you did the work yourself.
- You are not prepared for the demands of your future employment.
- You could be found guilty of academic misconduct.
- Many of for pay contract cheating companies recycle assignments despite guarantees of "original, plagiarism-free work" so similarity is easily detected by TurnitIn.
- Penalties for academic misconduct include suspension and exclusion.
- Students in some disciplines are required to disclose any findings of guilt for academic misconduct before being accepted into certain professions (e.g., law).
- You might disclose your personal and financial information in an unsafe way, leaving yourself open to many risks including possible identity theft.
- You also leave yourself open to blackmail - if you pay someone else to do an assignment for you, they know you have engaged in fraudulent behaviour and can always blackmail you.

Grades

We determine your grades to the following Grading Scheme:

Grade	Percentage
A	80% – 100%
B	70% – 79%
C	60% – 69%
D	50% – 59%
F	0% – 49%

Assessment Details for Assessment Item 1:

Overview

Assessment tasks				Learning Outcome Mapping	
Assessment ID	Assessment Item	When due	Weighting	ULO#	CLO# for BITS
1	KM Strategy Report (Individual) (2000 Words)	Session 6	30%	1	1, 2, 3

Case Study: Revolutionizing Knowledge Management at TechInnovate Corporation

Introduction:

TechInnovate Corporation, a prominent technology company, is facing significant challenges in knowledge management, hindering innovation and growth. This case study explores the current state of knowledge management at TechInnovate and proposes strategies to overcome these challenges.

Case Background:

TechInnovate Corporation is grappling with the following knowledge management challenges:

- **Silos of Information:**
  Teams and departments are working in isolation, limiting the flow of knowledge across the organization.
- **Lack of Codification Standards:**
  Knowledge documentation lacks uniformity, making it challenging to retrieve and apply information efficiently.
- **Limited Knowledge Sharing Culture:**

Employees are not actively participating in knowledge-sharing practices, impacting collaboration and innovation.

- **Technological Barriers:**

  Outdated technology hampers effective knowledge sharing and collaboration within the organization.

Questions:

1. **Silos of Information:**

   Question: How can TechInnovate identify existing silos of information within the organization and encourage cross-functional knowledge sharing?

2. **Lack of Codification Standards:**

   Question: What steps can TechInnovate take to establish standardized codification practices for knowledge documentation, ensuring uniform adoption across the organization?

3. **Limited Knowledge Sharing Culture:**

   Question: What initiatives can be implemented to foster a culture of knowledge sharing among employees at TechInnovate?

4. **Technological Barriers:**

   Question: Conduct an assessment of TechInnovate's current technology infrastructure. What upgrades or new tools are recommended to enhance knowledge sharing?

Submission Instructions

All submissions are to be submitted through Turnitin. Drop-boxes linked to Turnitin will be set up in Moodle. Assessments not submitted through these drop-boxes will not be considered. Submissions must be made by the end of the session.

The Turnitin similarity score will be used to determine any plagiarism of your submitted assessment. Turnitin will check conference websites, Journal articles, online resources, and your peer's submissions for plagiarism. You can see your Turnitin similarity score when you submit your assessments to the appropriate drop-box. If your similarity score is of concern, you can change your assessment and resubmit. However, re-submission is only allowed before the submission due date and time. You cannot make re-submissions after the due date and time have elapsed.

Note: All work is due by the due date and time. Late submissions will be penalized at 20% of the assessment final grade per day, including weekends.

Marking Criteria/Rubric

You will be assessed on the following marking criteria/Rubric:

Assessment criteria	Exceptional >=80%	Admirable 70% – 79%	Creditable 60% - 69%	Acceptable 50% - 59%	Unsatisfactory <=49
Introduction & Context	Exceptional clarity in introducing the case study and setting the context. Demonstrates a profound understanding of the challenges faced by TechInnovate.	Provides a clear introduction and context for the case study. Demonstrates a good understanding of TechInnovate's challenges.	Adequately introduces the case study but lacks depth in presenting the context. Demonstrates a basic understanding of TechInnovate's challenges.	The Introduction is unclear or missing, and there is a lack of context for the case study. Shows a poor understanding of TechInnovate's challenges.	No Submission
Identification of Challenges	Thoroughly identifies and articulates all challenges faced by TechInnovate. Demonstrates insightful analysis and exploration of each challenge.	Identifies and articulates most challenges faced by TechInnovate. Provides a good analysis and exploration of the majority of challenges.	Identifies challenges faced by TechInnovate but lacks depth in analysis and exploration.	Fails to identify or poorly articulate the challenges faced by TechInnovate. Lacks critical analysis and exploration.	No Submission
Strategies to Overcome Challenges	Develops highly effective and innovative strategies to overcome challenges. Strategies are well-reasoned,	Develops effective strategies to overcome challenges. Strategies are well-reasoned and aligned with best practices.	Develops strategies to overcome challenges but lacks depth in reasoning or alignment with	Strategies to overcome challenges are ineffective, poorly reasoned, or not aligned with best practices.	No Submission

	practical, and aligned with best practices.		best practices.		
Overall Cohesiveness & Structure	Demonstrates exceptional organization and structure. Transitions between sections are seamless, enhancing overall coherence.	Exhibits have good organization and structure. Transitions between sections are smooth, contributing to overall coherence.	Demonstrates basic organization and structure. Transitions between sections may lack smoothness, affecting overall coherence.	Lacks organization and structure. Transitions between sections are abrupt or missing, hindering overall coherence.	No Submission
References & Citations	Exceptional use of diverse and relevant references. Citations are accurate and follow prescribed citation style consistently.	Good use of relevant references. Citations are mostly accurate and follow the prescribed citation style.	Adequate use of references. Citations may contain inaccuracies or inconsistencies in following the prescribed citation style.	Poor use of references. Citations are inaccurate, inconsistent, or absent.	No Submission
Overall Quality & Depth of Analysis	Exceptional depth of analysis, providing nuanced insights into challenges and strategies. Demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the subject matter.	Provides a good depth of analysis, offering insightful perspectives on challenges and strategies. Demonstrates a solid understanding of the subject matter.	Offers a basic depth of analysis, presenting surface-level insights into challenges and strategies.	Lacks depth of analysis, presenting shallow or inaccurate insights into challenges and strategies.	No Submission

Assessment Details for Assessment Item 2:

Overview

Assessment tasks				Learning Outcome Mapping	
Assessment ID	**Assessment Item**	**When due**	**Weighting**	**ULO#**	**CLO# for BITS**
2	KM Tasks Design Report (Individual) (2000 Words)	Session 9	30%	2, 3	2, 3

Assignment Title: Designing a Knowledge Management Solution: A Practice-Based Case Study

Objective

The objective of this assignment is to evaluate and design an effective Knowledge Management (KM) solution for an organization through a practice-based case study. The assignment will focus on the evaluation of tools and techniques for knowledge capture, codification, and sharing, as well as the design of a comprehensive KM solution using five distinct stages.

Tasks

Introduction (Approx. 300 words):

- Briefly introduce the concept of Knowledge Management (KM) and its significance in organizational success.

- Provide an overview of the case study organization without revealing its identity.

Evaluation of Tools and Techniques (Approx. 500 words):

- Identify and evaluate at least three tools or techniques for knowledge capture, codification, and sharing in an organizational context.

- Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each tool/technique.

- Justify the suitability of each tool/technique for the case study organization.

Case Study Overview (Approx. 200 words):

- Provide a concise overview of the case study organization, its industry, and any specific challenges or opportunities related to knowledge management.

Designing the KM Solution - Five Distinct Stages (Approx. 700 words):

Stage 1: Knowledge Identification and Capture:

- Describe how the organization will identify and capture tacit and explicit knowledge.
- Propose specific activities or processes for knowledge identification.

Stage 2: Knowledge Codification:

- Outline the methods for codifying knowledge within the organization.
- Discuss the importance of categorization and structure in knowledge codification.

Stage 3: Knowledge Storage and Retrieval:

- Design a system for storing and retrieving knowledge efficiently.
- Explore technological solutions that support knowledge storage and retrieval.

Stage 4: Knowledge Sharing and Collaboration:

- Develop strategies for promoting knowledge sharing and collaboration among employees.
- Consider both formal and informal channels for knowledge dissemination.

Stage 5: Knowledge Maintenance and Continuous Improvement:

- Propose mechanisms for maintaining the relevance and accuracy of stored knowledge.
- Suggest ways in which the KM solution can adapt to changing organizational needs.

Conclusion (Approx. 300 words):

- Summarize the key findings and recommendations.
- Emphasize the potential impact of the proposed KM solution on the organization's overall performance.

Submission Instructions

All submissions are to be submitted through Turnitin. Drop-boxes linked to Turnitin will be set up in Moodle. Assessments not submitted through these drop-boxes will not be considered. Submissions must be made by the end of the session.

The Turnitin similarity score will be used to determine any plagiarism of your submitted assessment. Turnitin will check conference websites, Journal articles, online resources, and your peer's submissions for plagiarism. You can see your Turnitin similarity score when you submit your assessments to the appropriate drop-box. If your similarity score is of concern, you can change your assessment and resubmit. However, re-submission is only allowed before the submission due date and time. You cannot make re-submissions after the due date and time have elapsed.

Note: All work is due by the due date and time. Late submissions will be penalized at 20% of the assessment final grade per day, including weekends.

Marking Criteria/Rubric

You will be assessed on the following marking criteria/Rubric:

Criteria	Exceptional (>=80%)	Admirable (70% – 79%)	Creditable (60% - 69%)	Acceptable (50% - 59%)	Unsatisfactory (<=49%)
Introduction (Approx. 300 words)	Comprehensive intro to KM, emphasizing significance.	Clear intro to KM with good emphasis on significance.	Basic intro to KM, may lack depth in emphasizing significance.	Limited intro to KM without clear emphasis.	Fails to introduce KM effectively.
Tools and Techniques Evaluation (Approx. 500 words)	Identify and thoroughly evaluate at least three tools/techniques.	Identify and evaluate with good analysis.	Identify and evaluate but may lack depth or overlook some aspects.	Identify with basic evaluation and limited analysis.	Fail to identify and evaluate effectively.
Case Study Overview (Approx. 200 words)	Concise overview of the organization, its industry, and KM challenges/opportunities.	Clear overview with relevant details.	Basic overview, may lack depth or key details.	Limited overview with minimal relevant details.	Fails to provide an effective overview.
Designing the KM	Comprehensive plan	Solid plan with some	Basic plan with	Limited plan with	No comprehensive

Solution (Approx. 700 words)	for five stages integrating identification, codification, storage/retrieval, sharing/collaboration, maintenance/improvement.	gaps or lack of specificity in activities.	significant gaps or lacks practicality.	minimal practicality.	plan for knowledge identification.
Conclusion (Approx. 300 words)	Comprehensive summary of key findings and recommendations, emphasizing potential impact.	Summarizes key findings and recommendations effectively, highlighting potential impact.	Basic summary with some key findings and recommendations.	Limited summary with minimal emphasis on key findings.	Fails to summarize effectively.
Citations & References	All references and citations are correctly written and present.	One reference or citations missing or incorrectly written.	Two references or citations missing or incorrectly written.	Three references or citations missing or incorrectly written.	Fails to provide the references and citation

Assessment Details for Assessment Item 3:

Designing a Knowledge Management (KM) Solution Introduction Overview

Assessment tasks				Learning Outcome Mapping	
Assessment ID	Assessment Item	When due	Weighting	ULO#	CLO# for BITS
3*	KM Solution Design Report and Demonstration (Group) (2500-3000 Words)	Session 13	40%	2, 4	3, 4, 5

Note: * denotes 'Hurdle Assessment Item' that students must achieve at least 40% in this item to pass the unit.

This group assessment centers on crafting a Knowledge Management (KM) solution for a real-world case study. With a focus on ethical, legal, and management aspects, the assignment challenges groups to collaboratively design an effective KM solution. As organizations grapple with information overload, this task not only sharpens practical KM skills but also emphasizes the crucial dimensions of ethics, legality, and effective management.

Introduction (Approx. 300 words)

- Briefly introduce the concept of Knowledge Management (KM) and its significance.

- Provide an overview of the selected practice-based case study without revealing its identity.

- Clearly state the purpose of the report, emphasizing the focus on designing an effective KM solution with ethical, legal, and management

considerations.

Literature Review (Approx. 600 words)

- Review relevant literature on KM tools, techniques, and ethical considerations in KM.

- Explore legal aspects related to knowledge sharing, data privacy, and intellectual property in an organizational context.

- Investigate management issues related to implementing KM solutions, such as resistance to change, organizational culture, and leadership.

Evaluation of Tools and Techniques (Approx. 600 words)

- Identify and evaluate at least three tools or techniques for knowledge capture, codification, and sharing.

- Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each tool/technique.

- Justify the suitability of each tool/technique for the selected case study organization.

Designing the KM Solution - Five Distinct Stages (Approx. 1200 words)

Stage 1: Knowledge Identification and Capture

- Describe how the organization will identify and capture tacit and explicit knowledge.

- Propose specific activities or processes for knowledge identification.

Stage 2: Knowledge Codification

- Outline methods for codifying knowledge within the organization.

- Discuss the importance of categorization and structure in knowledge codification.

Stage 3: Knowledge Storage and Retrieval

- Design a system for storing and retrieving knowledge efficiently.

- Explore technological solutions that support knowledge storage and retrieval.

Stage 4: Knowledge Sharing and Collaboration

- Develop strategies for promoting knowledge sharing and collaboration among employees.
- Consider both formal and informal channels for knowledge dissemination.

Stage 5: Knowledge Maintenance and Continuous Improvement

- Propose mechanisms for maintaining the relevance and accuracy of stored knowledge.
- Suggest ways in which the KM solution can adapt to changing organizational needs.

Ethical, Legal, and Management Considerations (Approx. 500 words)

- Analyze ethical considerations related to knowledge sharing and the impact on stakeholders.
- Examine legal implications and compliance requirements for the proposed KM solution.
- Discuss potential management challenges and strategies for overcoming them.

Conclusion (Approx. 300 words)

- Summarize key findings from the literature review and the proposed KM solution.
- Emphasize the significance of ethical, legal, and management considerations in the design of the KM solution.
- Provide a seamless transition to the individual assessment components.

Individual Assessment Components (Approx. 300 words each)

Peer Review Report:

- Evaluate the contributions of each group member.
- Assess the effectiveness of collaboration and communication within the group.
- Provide constructive feedback on areas of improvement for each member.

Self-Reflective Report:

- Reflect on your individual contributions to the group project.

- Discuss the challenges faced and lessons learned during the collaborative process.

- Outline personal growth in understanding KM, ethical considerations, legal aspects, and management challenges.

References (As needed)

Submission Instructions

All submissions are to be submitted through Turnitin. Drop-boxes linked to Turnitin will be set up in Moodle. Assessments not submitted through these drop-boxes will not be considered. Submissions must be made by the end of the session.

The Turnitin similarity score will be used to determine any plagiarism of your submitted assessment. Turnitin will check conference websites, Journal articles, online resources, and your peer's submissions for plagiarism. You can see your Turnitin similarity score when you submit your assessments to the appropriate drop-box. If your similarity score is of concern, you can change your assessment and resubmit. However, re-submission is only allowed before the submission due date and time. You cannot make re-submissions after the due date and time have elapsed.

Note: All work is due by the due date and time. Late submissions will be penalized at 20% of the assessment final grade per day, including weekends.

Marking Criteria/Rubric

You will be assessed on the following marking criteria/Rubric:

Assessment criteria	Exceptional >=80%	Admirable 70% – 79%	Creditable 60% - 69%	Acceptable 50% - 59%	Unsatisfactory <=49
KM Solution Design	Comprehensive KM solution with seamless integration of ethical, legal, and management considerations.	Sound KM solution with effective integration of ethical, legal, and management aspects.	Basic KM solution with consideration of ethical, legal, and management dimensions.	Incomplete or inadequate KM solution lacking key considerations.	Fails to address critical elements of a KM solution.
Individual	Peer Review:	Peer Review:	Peer Review:	Peer Review:	Peer Review and

Reports	Thoughtful evaluation with constructive feedback. Self-Reflective: Insightful reflection on personal growth and collaborative challenges.	Adequate evaluation with some constructive feedback. Self-Reflective: Reasonable reflection on personal growth and collaborative challenges.	Limited evaluation with minimal feedback. Self-Reflective: Superficial reflection on personal growth and collaborative challenges.	Incomplete or inadequate evaluation. Self-Reflective: Lack of meaningful reflection.	Self-Reflective components are insufficient or missing. No meaningful evaluation or reflection provided.
Presentation and Clarity	Clear and organized presentation of KM solution and individual reports.	Generally clear presentation with minor organizational issues.	Presentation lacks clarity, affecting overall understanding.	Poorly organized, hindering comprehension.	Presentation is confusing and lacks structure.
Team Collaboration	Seamless collaboration evident in the KM solution.	Effective collaboration, but with minor issues.	Some challenges in collaboration affecting the quality of the KM solution.	Poor collaboration, impacting the overall quality of work.	Little to no evidence of effective collaboration
References & Citations	Exceptional use of diverse and relevant references. Citations are accurate and follow prescribed citation style	Good use of relevant references. Citations are mostly accurate and follow the prescribed	Adequate use of references. Citations may contain inaccuracies or inconsistencies in following the prescribed	Poor use of references. Citations are inaccurate, inconsistent, or absent.	Not Attempted

	consistently	citation style.	citation style.		