



AMC Journal (Pp. 1-17)  
(A Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal, Indexed in NepJOL)

**Research Management Cell**

**Adarsha Multiple Campus, Gajuri, Dhading**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/amcj.v5i1.75957>

ISSN: 2717-4808 (Print) 2738-9987 (Online)

## **Knowledge Management Initiative Framework for Higher Education Institutions: Nepalese Experiences**

**Dr. Prakash Shrestha\* & Dr. Guna Raj Chhetri\*\***

### **Abstract**

*The purpose of this research is to develop a knowledge management (KM) initiative framework for Nepalese higher educational institutions (HEIs). It takes into account both a descriptive and analytical approach. This study is based on a questionnaire survey of 105 Nepalese authorities and academicians from 21 HEIs. The findings indicate that the core functions of KM initiatives are the teaching-learning atmosphere, research works and projects, the use of modern technology, and the use of knowledge-based systems. Inappropriate institutional culture, lack of knowledge sharing practice, lack of use of contemporary technology, reuse of old knowledge, traditional technique of KM, reluctant to change an existing habit, lack of institutional efforts to create knowledge, poor motivation and enhancement practice for creating and utilizing knowledge, insufficient capture of process and legacy knowledge, and lack of funding for classroom preparation, library management, laboratories, and information technology are key the challenges. Knowledge flow and transfer, resource persons, and their expertise, consideration of the knowledge needed by stakeholders, making the understanding visible, the institutionalization of KM-related policy, and investment in infrastructure development are the fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives in HEIs of Nepal.*

**Keywords:** Framework, Higher education, Initiatives, Institutions, Knowledge management

---

\* Dr. Shrestha is an Associate Professor at Nepal Commerce Campus, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu. <https://orcid.org/0000-002-6973-9343>. Email: [prakash.shrestha1@ncc.tu.edu.np](mailto:prakash.shrestha1@ncc.tu.edu.np).

\*\* Dr. Chhetri is an Associate Professor at Balkumari College, Narayangarh, Bharatpur, Chitwan. <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5195-2228>. Email: [grchhetri1@gmail.com](mailto:grchhetri1@gmail.com)

## **Introduction**

Knowledge is considered one of the most important resources (Rezaei et al., 2021; Adhikari & Shrestha, 2023) for the economy's competitiveness in today's context. It refers to a set of justified convictions that can improve an institution's ability to perform a useful act (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). It consists of the facts that serve as a consistent and dependable foundation for effective performance. Knowledge management (KM) is one of the most important aspects of effective institution management in today's knowledge-based society and economy (Adhikari, 2010). Supporting this notion, Pook et al. (2017) argue that the knowledge-based economy is expected to promote an environment for innovation by reinforcing the delivery of better quality education and fostering innovation and technology.

Everywhere, KM is equally important for the excellent performance of higher education institutions (HEIs). HEIs refer to universities, campuses, colleges, and other higher education institutions in Nepal. They are involved in higher education management and delivery of knowledge-based services in the country. They are accountable for education, research, and knowledge transfer to society (Kumaravel & Vikkraman, 2018). They also ensure that knowledge is shared among lecturers, researchers, and students and advocate the knowledge that falls within the realm of KM (Bimol et al., 2017). These institutions also need to focus on knowledge assets that combine both human intellectual and modern technology. An appropriate combination of studies, research, and learning activities ensures an enhancement of such knowledge assets. By doing so, these institutions contribute to national development (Ojo, 2016).

In addition, Liautaud and Hammond (2001) argue that KM builds the capacity to gain from its surroundings and to fuse adapting to learn into the business forms to new devices and innovations. It is widely recognized that KM is a critical asset to individuals and organizations to succeed in today's context (Alavi & Leidner, 1999; Van den Hooff & De Ridder, 2004; Syed Ikhsan & Rowland, 2004; Yang, 2007). Transferring HEIs to improve the quality of teaching, research, and governance (Adhikari and Shah, 2021), and managing knowledge is becoming a prime issue in Nepal. Thus, how to initiate and implement KM initiatives to create the greatest value for society and the nation is becoming the central concern and debate in today's HEIs.

## **Objective and Research Questions**

Considering all these discourses, this study aims to develop a KM initiative framework for HEIs of Nepal. Further, to undertake this research, the following research questions (RQs) were developed:

- RQ1: What kinds of KM criteria could enhance HEIs' excellence performance?*
- RQ2: What core functions are important for KM initiatives for performance excellence in Nepalese HEIs?*
- RQ3: What are the challenges to improving KM initiatives in Nepalese HEIs?*
- RQ4: What could be the fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives in Nepalese HEIs?*

### Literature Review

KM initiatives support HEIs in fulfilling their missions and objectives. They also significantly contribute to achieving civic goals through education and research (Laal, 2011). HEIs' civic role is closely related to the development of societies and economies, as well as preparing individuals for future changes (Elezi, 2021; Shrestha, 2024; Adhikari & Shrestha, 2024 Adhikari & Shah, 2021). Therefore, KM is one of the key factors that facilitate HEIs to have a more efficient and energetic role concerning society, the international market, and the political scene. It leads the economy to a successful level and improves the relations between institutions and societies (Trivella & Dimitrios, 2015). KM is the process or practice of developing, acquiring, capturing, sharing, and applying knowledge in higher education institutions to improve learning and performance excellence. Its primary goal is to recognize and explain knowledge.

The concept of KM is well-articulated in the KM literature. Even though there is no universally accepted single definition of KM, most are extremely similar. Table 1 provides emerging views or main premises on KM:

**Table 1**  
*Different Views on Knowledge Management*

Author(s)/Date	Main views
Malhotra (1998)	embodies institutional procedures that aim for a synergistic arrangement of data and information processing capability of information technologies and the resourceful and innovative competence of people
Rumizen (2002)	a systematic process through that knowledge is generated, captured, distributed and enhanced
Chang & Lin (2015)	a procedure of apprehending, accumulating, distributing and making use of knowledge
Afridi et al. (2019)	a process that generates, and stores data and it helps to increase the response time of an organization
Barrantes Briceño and Almada Santos (2019)	a knowledge-sharing process at all levels of the organisation, across people, processes, and technology

Author(s)/Date	Main views
Khanal and Mathur (2020); Nawaz et al. (2020)	a process that enables organizations to discover, select, disperse, organize, and move critical data and abilities required for activities such as critical thinking, dynamic learning, and key arranging
Niqresh (2021)	an integrated set of organizational activities and practices that seek to identify and enlarge knowledge to improve performance efficiency, ensure the institution's development continuity, and increase its ability to face changes and address problems.

KM is a process where HEIs formulate approaches to identify and prepare documentation of knowledge and human capital. Bouthillier and Shearer (2002) believe that these institutions obtain knowledge from people and faculties. In some cases, they can derive knowledge from other institutions having similar types of specialties and interests. Shafique (2015) also mentions that an organization-wide KM approach assists in the sharing process of both explicit and tacit knowledge. This approach also helps for the sharing of the successive flow of advantages that are derived from the knowledge. Mainly, KM involves people, technology, and processes. It aims at improving the performance excellence of the institutions. It creates knowledge, locates knowledge, manages the flow of knowledge, and ensures effective use of knowledge for the long-term benefit of the institutions. Particularly, KM, in HEIs, involves the creation, improvement, maintenance, and security of knowledge (Patel & Patil, 2019). These institutions need to manage knowledge effectively to survive and grow in today's age of information.

HEIs have numerous opportunities to use KM initiatives to support their mission and achieve their vision (Sinha et al., 2012). Kidwell et al. (2000) prescribe five benefits of the use of KM initiative in HEIs:

- a. the research processes;
- b. the curriculum development processes;
- c. student and alumni services;
- d. administrative services, and
- e. strategic planning.

Other ways in which KM initiatives can benefit HEIs include faculty development, research process, curriculum development, student teaching and learning process, overall control of institutional processes such as library, computer lab, recruitment, and so on (Agarwal et al., 2008). Moreover, KM increases HEIs' learning capacity and leads to more knowledge formation (Gautam, 2012). Furthermore, it properly shares knowledge and creates value through reuse. These institutions can engage

in strategic planning, decision-making, and dynamic learning with the help of an effective and systematic KM. They are also capable of resolving problems and uncertainties. KM also enables them to deliver knowledge to the appropriate parties efficiently and effectively.

Even though the concept of KM is developed for the benefit of the business sector, it is also beneficial for the education sector. Arthi and Mary (2017) argue that many HEIs have set up groups of practices to apprehend, accumulate, and distribute knowledge. In general, an equipped setup concerning a specific procedure or activity is crucial for effective KM practices in these HEIs.

KM is important for the excellent performance of organizations (Gao et al., 2018). The performance of HEIs is greatly attached to their potential to discover knowledge and its proper utilization for the sake of a larger number of students, societies, and nations at large. For this purpose, different types of KM criteria can be used for these institutions' performance excellence. Many kinds of research (Lee et al., 2000; Ruben, 2007; Menezes et al., 2017) argue that the criteria developed by the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) are highly appreciated criteria for measuring the performance excellence of HEIs. The MBNQA is a program of the US government that aims to promote quality education in educational institutions. It stipulates seven "best criteria" that can be used to assess the performance of HEIs (Table 2).

**Table 2**

*KM criteria for performance excellence*

S.N.	Criteria	Main theme
1	Leadership	It aims to assess institutional leaders' actions, governance, and responsibility of institutional leaders and higher authorities to achieve institutional long-term goals.
2	Strategic planning	It focuses on the formulation of the long-term planning and strategic action plans of HEIs.
3	Beneficiaries and constituencies	They focus on the demand and satisfaction of students and other stakeholders of HEIs.
4	Programs and services	They focus on the essential education programs, services, and interrelated procedures to realize and foster the institutions, departments, and mission of the program.
5	Faculty/staff and workplace	They are concerned with creating an appropriate operational atmosphere and workforce to construct successful work teams that will affect the outcomes of HEIs.
6	Assessment and information use	They are concerned with criteria like the design and delivery of education and its supportive procedures.

S.N.	Criteria	Main theme
7	Outcomes and achievements	They involve results of student performance, the satisfaction of students and stakeholders, workforce performance, and the results of specific courses.
<i>Source: Elaborated by the authors.</i>		

HEIs need to provide quality education to all their stakeholders, especially to the students. For this purpose, they need to focus on the MBNQA criteria mentioned in Table 2. These institutions also need to pay attention to KM, which builds up an effective teaching-learning atmosphere.

HEIs serve as a platform for KM practices. They connect three missions (such as research, education, and societal service) to knowledge creation, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge transfer (Rowley, 2000). In order to remain competitive, HEIs must manage their knowledge processes as part of a deliberate KM strategy. Understanding the factors that promote knowledge creation, sharing, and transfer in HEIs is a must for successful KM initiatives.

### Research Methods

The approach of this study is descriptive and analytical. Both secondary and primary sources of information are collected and analyzed to examine KM Initiatives in HEIs of Nepal. It reviews and examines the concept of KM.

This study also deals with certain criteria for performance excellence. Many kinds of research have presented the criteria of KM. However, this study deals with the criteria selected by the MBNQA for performance excellence in HEIs. The next section of this study deals with core functions for KM initiatives for performance excellence. Due to the larger size of HEIs and the rise of students in these institutions, the implementation of KM initiatives has become challenging. So, the next section of this study focuses on some of the key challenges that occur at the time of implementing KM initiatives. These realities are identified through a questionnaire survey with 105 authorities and academicians of HEIs (including campus chiefs, assistant campus chiefs, academic coordinators, subject committee heads, and teaching faculties of constituent campuses of Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal). Finally, this study shows some of the fundamental factors that are essential to implementing KM initiatives at HEIs. However, this paper is not free from the limitation. The main limitation is that the results are based on discussions with the authorities of only 21 campuses situated in Kathmandu Valley (see Table 3).

**Table 3***List of Selected HEIs*

S.N.	Name of selected campuses	No. of informants
1	Amrit Campus, Lainchaur	5
2	Ayurved Campus, Kirtipur	2
3	Bhaktapur Multiple Campus, Bhaktapur	8
4	Bishwa Bhasa Campus, Pradarshani Marg	3
5	Central Campus, Maharajjung	2
6	Jana Prasashan Campus, Jamal	5
7	Lalitkala Campus, Bhotahiti	2
8	Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal	5
9	Nepal Commerce Campus, Min Bhawan	8
10	Nepal Law Campus, Pradarshani Marg	5
11	Nursing Campus, Maharajgunj	4
12	Padmakanya Multiple Campus, Bagbazar	7
13	Patan Samyukta Campus , Patan Dhoka	6
14	Public Youth Campus, Dhobichaur	7
15	Pulchowk Campus, Pulchowk	3
16	Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, Pradarshani Marg	5
17	Sanothimi Campus, Bhaktapur	5
18	Saraswoti Multiple Campus, Lainchaur	6
19	Shankerdev Campus, Putalisadak	7
20	Thapathali Campus, Thapathali	5
21	Trichandra Multiple Campus, Ghantaghar	5
<b>Total</b>		<b>105</b>

## Results and discussion

### *KM Criteria for Performance Excellence*

Even though the concept of KM is developed for the benefit of the business sector, it is also beneficial for the education sector. Arthi S and Mary (2017) argue that many HEIs have set up groups of practices to apprehend, accumulate, and distribute knowledge. In general, an equipped setup concerning a specific procedure or activity is crucial for effective KM practices in these HEIs.

KM is important for the excellent performance of organizations (Gao et al., 2018). The performance of HEIs is greatly attached to their potential to discover knowledge and its proper utilization for the sake of a larger number of students, societies, and nations at large. For this purpose, different types of KM criteria can be used for these

institutions' performance excellence. Many kinds of research (Lee et al., 2000; Ruben, 2007; Menezes et al., 2017) argue that the criteria developed by the MBNQA are highly appreciated criteria for measuring the performance excellence of HEIs. The MBNQA is a program of the US government that aims to promote quality education in educational institutions. It stipulates seven "best criteria" that can be used to assess the performance of HEIs. These criteria are presented in Table 2.

HEIs need to provide quality education to all their stakeholders, especially to the students. For this purpose, they need to focus on the MBNQA criteria mentioned in Table 2. These institutions also need to pay attention to KM, which builds up an effective teaching-learning atmosphere.

### ***Core Functions for KM Initiatives for Performance Excellence***

HEIs play an important role in the knowledge-based economy (Patel & Patil, 2019). So, they need to practice effective KM initiatives so that their performance excellence can be enhanced more. University Grants Commission, Nepal also focuses on KM in our universities, campuses/colleges, and other educational institutions (UGC, 2017-2018). To strengthen the performance excellence of these institutions they need to focus on four core activities such as teaching, research works, and projects, use of technology, and knowledge-based systems. In this regard, Table 4 puts forward some core functions that are necessary for KM initiatives for the performance excellence of the HEIs of Nepal.

**Table 4**

*Core functions for KM initiatives for performance excellence*

S. N.	Core functions	Yes (%)
1	Teaching-learning atmosphere	49
2	Research works and projects	24
3	Use of modern technology	15
4	Use of knowledge-based systems	12

Source: Survey, 2024.

The campus chiefs, assistant campus chiefs, academic coordinators, subject committee heads, and teaching faculties have realized that HEIs are the most suitable platforms for KM initiatives with a teaching-learning atmosphere, research works, and projects, and the use of modern technology as the key functions. It is also believed that these three core functions are needed to integrate and interconnect for achieving synergetic benefits and value-added to our society as key outcomes. Furthermore, to perform these core activities effectively, the institutions need to enlarge inter and intra-



business-associated systems to offer inputs inside the procedure of generating synergistic effects and values (Adhikari, 2010).

### ***Challenges for Implementing KM Initiatives***

KM initiatives are highly essential to HEIs to create innovative relationships and links between work and education. These institutions provide benefits to the students and learners by matching their skills and talents with current workplace requirements. They also contribute to adapting and accumulating innovative knowledge with the existing one. KM initiatives also contribute to the association of mastering with experience, so that a curriculum reflects the actual time, actual place, and actual difficulties and problems (Mamta, 2005). Despite all these contributions of KM initiatives in HEIs, the implementation of these initiatives faces some challenges and obstacles. Poor reward systems and policies, lack of resources, facts, financial support, and time for conducting research activities, frequent change in leadership, poor industry-academia relations, and weak knowledge-sharing culture are some of the challenges or barriers for KM initiatives (Veer Ramjeawon & Rowley, 2017). Besides these, this study finds some key challenges for implementing KM initiatives in HEIs of Nepal (Table 5).

**Table 5**

*Challenges to implementing KM initiatives*

S.N.	Key challenges to implementing KM initiatives	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Inappropriate institutional culture	3.65	0.46	108.07	0.00**
2	Lack of knowledge-sharing practice	3.96	1.23	101.98	0.00**
3	Lack of use of modern technology	3.14	1.10	130.93	0.00**
4	Reuse of old knowledge	3.93	0.75	121.34	0.04*
5	The traditional technique of KM	3.69	0.90	103.89	0.00**
6	Reluctant to change an existing habit	3.55	0.85	102.26	0.00**
7	Lack of institutional efforts to create knowledge	3.41	0.84	103.15	0.00**
8	Poor motivation and enhancement practice for creating and utilizing knowledge	3.87	0.92	97.546	0.00**
9	Insufficient capture of process and legacy knowledge	3.62	0.75	111.92	0.03*
10	Lack of funding for classroom preparation, library management, laboratories, and information technology	3.47	0.89	113.21	0.00**
<p><i>Note: All the items are measured on a five-point Likert-type scale from "disagree totally (1)" to "agree (5)";</i>  <i>Significant at *<math>p &lt; 0.05</math>, **<math>p &lt; 0.01</math></i></p>					

Source: Survey, 2024.

Table 5 indicates that inappropriate institutional culture, lack of knowledge sharing practice, lack of use of modern technology, reuse of old knowledge, traditional technique of KM, reluctant to change an existing habit, lack of institutional efforts to create knowledge, poor motivation, and enhancement practice for creating and utilizing knowledge, insufficient capture of process and legacy knowledge, and lack of funding in classroom preparation, library management, laboratories development, and information technology are the key challenges to implement KM initiatives in Nepalese HEIs.

Further, in some cases, political intervention for the appointments in higher posts, poor assessment of the responsibility system, delay in the new vacancy announcement, over-dependence on teaching assistants (i.e. contract teachers), and part-time faculty members have also become major issues for implementing KM initiatives in HEIs of Nepal. Nepalese HEIs need to find remedies to these challenges to execute KM initiatives successfully.

### ***Fundamentals for Implementing KM Initiatives***

KM approaches are needed to integrate with an ability to retain more efficient and effective knowledge workers in the institution to enhance institutional competitiveness and performance. A successful KM implementation requires that leaders and management of HEIs understand the needs of these institutions with a clear vision for their future, and a grasp of the range of approaches and technologies available for enabling the KM initiatives that apply the institutions' functions and experience (Bergerson, 2003). Furthermore, this study finds some fundamentals or prerequisites for implementing KM initiatives in the Nepalese context. Table 6 presents these fundamentals.

**Table 6**

*Fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives*

S.N.	Fundamentals to implement KM initiatives	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Knowledge flow and transfer	3.47	0.71	126.21	0.00**
2	Resource persons and their expertise	3.37	0.84	102.89	0.01*
3	Consideration of the knowledge needed by stakeholders	3.42	0.82	106.38	0.00**
4	Making the knowledge visible	3.37	0.85	101.14	0.00**
5	Institutionalization of KM-related policy	3.41	0.79	112.39	0.05*
6.	Investment in infrastructure development	3.51	0.49	121.34	0.00**
<p><i>Note: All the items are measured on a five-point Likert-type scale from "disagree totally (1)" to "agree (5)";</i>  <i>Significant at *<math>p &lt; 0.05</math>, **<math>p &lt; 0.01</math></i></p>					

Source: Survey, 2024.

The results indicate that knowledge flow and transfer, resource persons and their expertise, consideration of the knowledge needed by stakeholders, making the knowledge visible, the institutionalization of KM-related policy, and investment in infrastructure development are the fundamentals or prerequisites to implementing KM initiatives in Nepalese HEIs.

This study has already highlighted KM criteria, core functions, challenges, and fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives. Therefore, leaders and high-level authorities have to consider a framework to deal with the challenges and difficulties associated with KM for the HEIs of Nepal (Table 7).

**Table 7**

*KM Initiative Framework for HEIs of Nepal*

<b>KM criteria for performance excellence</b>	<b>Core functions for KM initiatives for performance excellence</b>	<b>Challenges for implementing KM initiatives</b>	<b>Fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Actions, governance, and responsibility of institutional leaders</li> <li>▪ Strategic action plans</li> <li>▪ Demand and satisfaction of students and other stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Education programs, services, and interrelated procedures</li> <li>▪ Appropriate operational atmosphere and workforce</li> <li>▪ Design and delivery of education and supportive procedures</li> <li>▪ Results of student performance, satisfaction of students and stakeholders, workforce performance, and the results of specific courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teaching-learning atmosphere</li> <li>▪ Research works and projects</li> <li>▪ Use of modern technology</li> <li>▪ Use of knowledge-based systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inappropriate institutional culture</li> <li>▪ Lack of knowledge-sharing practice</li> <li>▪ Lack of use of modern technology</li> <li>▪ Reuse of old knowledge</li> <li>▪ The traditional technique of KM</li> <li>▪ Reluctant to change an existing habit</li> <li>▪ Lack of institutional efforts to create knowledge</li> <li>▪ Poor motivation and enhancement practice for creating and utilizing knowledge</li> <li>▪ Insufficient capture of process and legacy knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Knowledge flow and transfer</li> <li>▪ Resource persons and their expertise</li> <li>▪ Consideration of the knowledge needed by stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Making the knowledge visible</li> <li>▪ The institutionalization of KM-related policy</li> <li>▪ Investment in infrastructure development</li> </ul>

<b>KM criteria for performance excellence</b>	<b>Core functions for KM initiatives for performance excellence</b>	<b>Challenges for implementing KM initiatives</b>	<b>Fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lack of funding for classroom preparation, library management, laboratories, and information technology</li> </ul>	
<i>Source: Created by the authors.</i>			

As discussed earlier, these four dimensions of the framework are related to each other. The educational leaders and high-level authorities of Nepal should adopt effective KM approaches to implement KM initiatives for the excellent performance of their institutions. These institutions, with the support of the entire stakeholders, should work effectively to improve the effective creation and transfer of knowledge to societies and workplaces.

### **Conclusion**

Knowledge is the most valuable and unique resource in today's competitive world. HEIs do the business of knowledge to fulfill the need for human capital for societies and workplaces. These institutions perform activities of formation and distribution of knowledge through an effective learning environment. These institutions have significant opportunities to implement KM initiatives to support every part of their mission, from education to learning society to research and development. Prior studies (e.g., Rowley, 2000; Ramanigopal, 2012; Shafique, 2015) also presented the role of HEIs in the implementation of KM initiatives.

This study aimed to examine the key KM criteria, core functions for KM initiatives for performance excellence, the challenges, and the fundamentals for implementing KM initiatives in our HEIs. As far as the KM criteria are concerned, based on MBNQA (1999), actions, governance, and responsibility of institutional leaders, strategic action plans, demand and satisfaction of students and other stakeholders, education programs, services, and interrelated procedures, appropriate operational atmosphere and workforce, design and delivery of education and supportive procedures, and results of student performance, the satisfaction of students and stakeholders, workforce performance, and the results of specific courses are the key criteria for

performance excellence of HEIs. Prior studies (e.g., Lee et al., 2000; Ruben, 2007; Adhikari, 2010; Menezes et al., 2017) also concluded that these criteria can be used for better performance excellence of HEIs. In terms of core functions, the majority of priorities are given to the teaching-learning environment, research works and projects, the use of modern technology, and the use of knowledge-based systems for KM initiatives for performance excellence in the Nepalese context (Adhikari, 2010; Adhikari & Shrestha 2024).

It is also found that inappropriate institutional culture, lack of knowledge sharing practice, lack of use of modern technology, reuse of old knowledge, traditional technique of KM, reluctant to change an existing habit, lack of institutional efforts to create knowledge, poor motivation and enhancement practice for creating and utilizing knowledge, insufficient capture of process and legacy knowledge, and lack of funding for classroom preparation, library management, laboratories, and information technology are key challenges for implementing KM initiatives in HEIs of Nepal. For the effectiveness of KM initiatives, leaders and high-level authorities of these institutions need to correct such challenges on time to enhance the effectiveness of KM practices.

Finally, it is found that knowledge flow and transfer, resource persons, and their expertise, consideration of the knowledge needed by stakeholders, making the knowledge visible, the institutionalization of KM-related policy, and investment in infrastructure development are the fundamentals or prerequisites that must have to be taken into consideration for implementing KM initiatives in HEIs of Nepal. In today's context, our institutions should have to apply KM successfully with the support of effective research works, teaching practices, supportive administration, and long-term planning that will be beneficial for all the stakeholders of these institutions. Proper consideration of the framework (see Table 7) also helps to implement KM initiatives for the excellent performance of HEIs.

## References

- Adhikari, D.R. (2010). Knowledge management in academic institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(2), 94-104.
- Adhikari, D.R., & Shah, B.B. (2021). The state of the art in the incorporation of sustainable development goals in Nepalese Universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(6), 1373-1401. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-11-2020-0460>.

- Adhikari, D.R., & Shrestha, P. (2023). Knowledge management initiatives for achieving sustainable development goal 4.7: higher education institutions' stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 27(4), 1109-1139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2022-0172>
- Adhikari, D.R., & Shrestha, P. (2024). The context and concept of higher education for sustainable development: the case of Nepal. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 25(2), 238-264. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-12-2021-0521>
- Afridi, O., Gul, S., & Naeem, M. (2019). The role of management practices of higher education institutions in knowledge storage and knowledge accessibility. *Journal of Management and Research*, 6(1), 89-117.
- Agarwal S., Sharma P.B., & Kumar, M. (2008). *Knowledge Management Framework for Improving Curriculum Development Processes in Technical Education*. Third 2008 International Conference on Convergence and Hybrid Information Technology, IEEE Xplore.
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D.E. (1999). Knowledge management systems: issues, challenges, and benefits. *Communications of Association of Information Systems*, 1(7), 1-37.
- Arthi, S.L.R., & Mary, M.H. (2017). Knowledge management and organizational excellence in higher education – thematic review of literature. *International Journal of Trend in Research and Development*, pp 9-11, Retrieved from <http://www.ijtrd.com/papers/IJTRD12185.pdf>
- Baldrige Performance Excellence Program (EUA) (BPEP) (2011). *Criteria for Performance Excellence*. Gaithersburg, MD.
- Barrantes Briceño, C.E., & Almada Santos, F.C. (2019). Knowledge management, the missing piece in the 2030 agenda and SDGs puzzle. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 20(5), 901-916. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-01-2019-0019>.
- Bergerson, B. P. (2003). *Essential of Knowledge Management*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Bimol, S., Saikia, M., Sashikumar, L., & Pushparani, D.L. (2017). Cloud computing: A new generation of IT infrastructure for knowledge management. *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology*, 43(7), 388-392.
- Bouthillier, F., & Shearer, K. (2002). Understanding knowledge management and information management: The need for an empirical perspective. *Information Research*, 8(1), Retrieved from <http://informationr.net/ir/8-1/paper141>
- Chang, C. L.-h., & Lin, T. C. (2015). The role of organizational culture in the knowledge management process. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(3), 433–455.
- Elezi, E. (2021). Role of knowledge management in developing higher education partnerships: Towards a conceptual framework, system. *Research and Behavioral Science*, 38, 279–293.

- Gao, T., Chai, Y., & Liu, Y. (2018). A review of knowledge management about theoretical conception and designing approach. *International Journal of Crowd Science*, 2(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCS-08-2017-0023>
- Gautam, D. K. (2012). Knowledge management initiatives by faculties of Tribhuvan University of Nepal. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, 13(2), 158–167.
- Khanal, L., & Mathur, S. (2020). Challenges of implementing knowledge management practices in Nepalese financial institutions. *Nepal Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(1), 34–51.
- Kidwell, J. J., Vander Linde, M. K., & Johnson, L. S. (2000). Applying corporate knowledge management practices in higher education. *Educause Quarterly*, (4), 28–33.
- Kumaravel, V., & Vikkraman, P. (2018). Assessment of knowledge management practices in higher educational institutions in India: A structural equation modeling approach. *International Journal of Education Science*, 20(1–3), 120–136.
- Laal, M. (2011). Knowledge management in higher education. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 544–549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.090>
- Lee, S. F., Lo, K. K., Leung, L. F., & Ko, S. O. (2000). Strategy formulation framework for vocational education: Integrating SWOT analysis, balanced scorecard, QFD methodology, and MBNQA education criteria. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 15(8), 407–423.
- Liautaud, B. M., & Hammond, M. (2001). *eBusiness Intelligence: Turning Information into Knowledge into Profit*. McGraw-Hill.
- Malhotra, Y. (1998). Deciphering the knowledge management hype. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 21(4), 58–60.
- Mamta, M. (2005). Improvement in higher education through KM. *3rd Convention PLANNER (10–11 November)*, Assam University, Silchar.
- MBNQA. (1999). *Education criteria of Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA)*. National Institute of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Menezes, P. H. B., Martins, H. C., & Oliveira, R. R. (2017). The excellence Baldrige criteria in the effectiveness of higher education institutions management. *Brazilian Business Review*, 15(1), 47–67.
- Nawaz, N., Durst, S., Hariharasudan, A., & Shamugia, Z. (2020). Knowledge management practices in higher education institutions: A comparative study. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 291–308. <https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2020.22.2.20>
- Niqresh, M. (2021). The reality of applying knowledge management practices and its impact on achieving the quality of higher education in Jordan. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 11(1), 9–22.

- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Ojo, A. (2016). Knowledge management in Nigerian universities: A conceptual model. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 11, 31–34.
- Patel, T. R., & Patil, A. N. (2019). Review of knowledge management in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 6(1), 341–345.
- Pook, A. S. Y., Chong, C. W., & Yuen, Y. Y. (2017). Effectiveness of cross-border knowledge transfer in Malaysian MSC status corporations. *Knowledge Management and E-Learning*, 9(1), 90–110.
- Ramanigopal, C. (2012). Knowledge management strategies in higher education. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management*, 3(1), 20–29.
- Rezaei, F., Khalilzadeh, M., & Soleimani, P. (2021). Factors affecting knowledge management and its effect on organizational performance: Mediating the role of human capital. *Advances in Human-Computer Interaction*, 5, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8857572>
- Rowley, J. (2000). Is higher education ready for knowledge management? *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(7), 325–333.
- Ruben, B. D. (2007). *An integrated approach to assessment, planning, and improvement in colleges and universities*. National Association of College and University Business Officers.
- Rumizen, M. C. (2002). *The complete idiot's guide to knowledge management*. CWL Publishing Enterprises.
- Shafique, F. (2015). Knowledge management in higher education: Applicability of LKMC model in Saudi universities. *Computer Science & Information Technology (CS & IT)*, 175–181.
- Shrestha, P. (2024). Sustainability initiatives in higher education institutions: The stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-03-2024-0141>
- Sinha, P., Arora, M., & Mishra, N. M. (2012). Framework for a knowledge management platform in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE)*, 2(4), 96–100.
- Syed-Ihksan, S. O. S., & Rowland, F. (2004). Benchmarking knowledge management in a public organization in Malaysia. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 11(3), 238–266.
- Trivella, L., & Dimitrios, N. K. (2015). Knowledge management strategy within higher education: The case of Greece. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175, 488–495.



- UGC. (2020). *Education management information system*. University Grants Commission.
- Van den Hooff, B., & De Ridder, J. A. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: The influence of organizational commitment, communication climate, and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(6), 117–130.
- Veer Ramjeawon, P., & Rowley, J. (2017). Knowledge management in higher education institutions: Enablers and barriers in Mauritius. *The Learning Organization*, 24(5), 366–377.
- Yang, J. (2007). The impact of knowledge sharing on organizational learning and effectiveness. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(2), 83–90.