

Таким образом, совместные усилия государства и делового сообщества по созданию благоприятных условий для развития малого и среднего бизнеса приведут к стимулированию предпринимательской активности, дальнейшему подъему отечественной экономики и росту благосостояния граждан Казахстана.

Главное условие нашего устойчивого движения вперед – это сплоченность нашего общества в достижении поставленных целей, консолидация всех слоев и групп населения вокруг стратегии, направленной на решение общих задач. Это станет реальным, если в ней мы будем способны правильно учитывать потребности общества и различных групп населения, верно определять приоритеты и обеспечивать их реализацию. Это надо делать в сотрудничестве государства с отдельными группами населения и частным сектором.

Поддержание высоких темпов экономического роста, диверсификация экономики и преодоление бедности являются главными задачами, стоящими не только перед государством, но и перед предпринимательством. По этому поводу в послании Президента народу Казахстана было сказано что, к 2050 году малый и средний бизнес будет производить не менее 50 процентов объема ВВП Казахстана, вместо нынешних 20 процентов. Производительность труда надо увеличить в 5 раз – с нынешних 24,5 тысячи до 126 тысяч долларов./5/

Это будет гарантией стабильности экономики, ее диверсификации, отхода от сырьевой направленности/6/.

Но и субъекты малого и среднего бизнеса не в силах в одиночку справиться с поставленными задачами, в этом случае хорошей помощью предпринимательству будет Комитет поддержки малого и среднего предпринимательства при МЭРТ РК.

Литература

1. Фонд развития предпринимательства «Даму», Экспресс курс предпринимательства. Алматы, 2010.
2. Программа «Дорожная карта бизнеса 2020», 2010.
3. Закон Республики Казахстан «О внесении и изменений и дополнений в некоторые законодательные акты Республики Казахстан по вопросам совершенствования административных процедур», 2007.
4. СТРАТЕГИЯ «Казахстан-2050».
5. Послание Президента Республики Казахстан Н.Назарбаева народу Казахстана. Казахстанский путь – 2050: Единая цель, единые интересы, единое будущее. 17 января 2014
6. Гражданский кодекс Республики Казахстан (особенная часть) (с изменениями и дополнениями по состоянию на 15.07.2010 г.)

УДК 377.1

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Satayeva A. A.

SuleymanDemirel University Almaty/Kazakhstan

Abstract. The Case Study utilizes Stankosky's Knowledge Management (KM) pillars to enterprise learning – leadership, organization, technology and learning - as a lens to investigate and understand Knowledge Management practices and perceptions within Higher Education Institutions, looking at challenges of implementation within this sector. Higher Education Institutions within the Kazakhstan are very complex institutions, with diverse backgrounds, history, culture, resources and missions. The University presents itself in today's knowledge economy with a dichotomy of priorities, one which aims to provide quality teaching and research activity, and the other, to ensure effective and efficient management and administration within an increasingly competitive market. Being a service, non-profit organization ensures that the values of scholarship remain a very important aspect of its mission; yet, the

external environment within which HEIs conduct their business today is rapidly changing, forcing HEIs to reflect on how they do 'business' given the external pressures they face.

Keywords: knowledge management, grounded theory, higher education

Nowadays it is affirmed that knowledge lies at the heart of the modern economy, where knowledge assets are the principal factors of production and where nations and organizations have to organize their knowledge assets to their best advantage. Ideas of knowledge management (KM) began to emerge in business in the 1990s, and were heavily influenced by the massive expansion of access to information and analytical power created by new computing methods, increasing expectations regarding quality and quality assurance, and new emerging ideas about human factors and human capital. There is no clear, accepted definition of KM, but Andrea M. Serban (2002, 6) offers two ideas that help in understanding the concept:

1. Knowledge management is about connecting people to people and people to information to create competitive advantage.
2. Knowledge management is the systematic process of identifying, capturing and transferring information and knowledge people can use to create, compete and improve.

Michael Stankowsky's (2005) four pillars of knowledge management: leadership, organization, technology and learning.

The creation and transmission of knowledge is central to the *raison d'être* of higher education institutions. Using knowledge management techniques and technologies in higher education is as vital as it is in the corporate sector. If done effectively, it can lead to better decision-making capabilities, reduced "product" development cycle time (for example, curriculum development and research), improved academic and administrative services, and reduced costs.

Higher education is moving from the old culture that considers 'what's in it for me' to a new culture that says 'what's in it for the customer?' And it is developing a culture that is ready to embrace knowledge management. In order to explore the application of KM, findings may be divided into the following eight categories and summarized as follows:

Definitions. Despite higher education institutions being in the business of creating, developing and transferring knowledge through teaching and research, it was evident that there was no clear, widely accepted definition of knowledge. This undermined attempts to use information more effectively. It was revealed some uncertainty about the benefits of KM, even among those leaders and managers charged with implementation. This was often crucial in shaping the relative success or failure of the project.

Institutional Context. It is important to explain fully the potential benefits of KM. Some universities had undergone major changes in recent years due to references made to "change fatigue". The decision to implement a KM strategy was made internally, motivated by a desire to enhance operational efficiency by the more effective use of knowledge. Universities that wanted change reflected their ambitions and priorities (i.e., a positive view of change).

Working Environment. There is need for leadership to create an environment within which staff had a positive attitude towards the institution as a whole. This does not always come easily. Most academic staff first identify with their disciplines and departments or with their research area rather than with their institutions (Becher and Trowler 2001). Senior managers believed that such attitudes could have a negative effect on implementation of institution-wide KM initiatives.

Leadership. The importance of strong, visionary central leadership is emphasized. Cultural change is required in order to support the implementation of KM. It was recognized that KM "would not just happen" unless leadership was committed to ensuring the necessary working environment and resources. In some universities leadership was seen as the single most important factor influencing the success or failure of KM. It was suggested that leaders have very different backgrounds, experiences and skills they bring to their institutions, which set the tone in creating a collaborative working environment and in promoting open communications.

Strategy. Senior managers in university were concerned that KM needs to be recognized within the

overall institutional strategy in that “there cannot be any conflict in this respect.” It was also suggested that a distinct operational KM plan was needed in order to clarify understandings of the terminology and ensure that the KM process was fully coordinated.

Resources. It was clear from the case studies that in the past universities were not known to prioritize and invest huge sums of money on administrative systems. However, leaders and managers now believe that they must tackle questions of student experience; new ways of working are necessary to streamline processes and increase efficiency. KM might improve the quality of services and, potentially, could lead to long-term improvements in efficiency and to savings, but, in the short term, such initiatives could cost money. A KM agenda requires the investment of money, but also requires the investment of time. Given the increasing pressure on university staff to do more with less and to incorporate market-like behaviors into their work, a KM project might be seen as an un-welcome distraction. However, for a KM project to succeed, such challenges would need to be faced.

Staff Development. An important issue highlighted by universities was the need to support a KM project with an effective staff development program. This helped to secure understanding of the benefits of KM and acceptance of change, as well as widening the appropriate skill base in the institution.

Organizational Structure. Universities implemented highly devolved structures, but these were not necessarily seen as helpful for the implementation of KM. Structures were seen to have a direct effect on KM, especially as KM assumed a high level of sharing.

Conclusion: This research is fascinating in the area of KM is increasing in popularity and institutions offer it as an academic program or course, yet few, have embarked on research of the application or implementation of KM within conclusion, this research has enabled some rich themes and findings to emerge with regards to the this context. Further research is required to provide an evidence base of the benefits of KM as a management tool to enhance the competitive advantage of universities within the KZ; however, this case study research has shown that, as Ponzi (2002) postulates, KM is in the process of establishing itself as a new aspect of management and slowly but surely it is capturing the attention of the HEIs.

References

1. Becher, A. (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories*, Open University Press: Buckingham.
1. Birgeneau, R. (2005) *The Role of the University and Basic Research in the New Economy*, in Jones, G., Mccarney, P.
2. Systems: Clarification for Better KMS Development, in Coakes E (Ed.) *Knowledge Management: Current Issues and Challenges*. United Kingdom, IRM Press.
- Cole, G. (2004) *Management Theory and Practice*, Thomson Learning.
- Cranfield, D. and Taylor, J. (2007) "Knowledge Management Practices within Higher Education Institutions in the UK".
3. *KMPro*, Vol.4, No.2, pp.6-15.
- Crotty, M. (1998) *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspectives in the Research Process*, Allen and
4. Unwin. Davenport, T. and Prusak, L. (2000) *The Pragmatics of Knowledge Management. Working Knowledge : How Organisations Manage What They Know.*, Harvard Business School Press.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989) "Building Theories from Case Study Research". *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14,
5. http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2006/06_13/. Levy, D. (2003) "Qualitative Methodology and Grounded Theory in Property Research". "Qualitative Research in Information Systems". *MIS Quarterly*, 21, 2.
- National Committee of Inquiry (1997) *Report of the National Committee of Inquiry; The Dearing Report*. Available at
6. <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/ncihe/>.
- Ponzi, L. and Koenig, M. (2002) "Knowledge Management: Another Management Fad?". *Information Research.*, 8, 1.
- Rowley, J. (2000) "Is Higher Education Ready for Knowledge Management?". *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14, 7, 325-333.
- Shattock, M. (2003) *Managing Successful Universities*, Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Stankosky, M. (2005) *Advances in Knowledge Management: University Research Toward an Academic discipline*, in