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Executive Summary

Skills for Market Training (SMART) programme, is the flagship program of Tech Mahindra Foundation (TMF). The aim of the programme is to develop market-oriented skills in youth through courses that offer a mix of:

a) foundational skills - focused on functional English, soft skills and basic IT skills and
b) technical skills - focused on developing technical prowess of youth including training on specific skills like Tally Accounting, Hospitality, IT enabled services etc.

The SMART programme has four verticals – SMART (for youth from marginalized communities), SMART + (for people with disabilities), SMART T (training in technical trades) and SMART Academy (4 SMART academies which offer state of the art short term and long term vocational courses in Health and Paramedics, Information Technology and Logistics).

A mixed-method dip-stick study is undertaken to assess the impact of the SMART programme. The impact assessment study covers, SMART, SMART+ and SMART-T models under its ambit. The primary data for the study is collected from various stakeholders ranging from trainees, training partners, TMF location managers and employers. The sample for the study has been selected using the purposive sampling methodology. The data collection tool used, stakeholder covered, and respective sample size is provided below:

1. Online questionnaire – has been rolled out to present and past trainees of SMART, SMART + and SMART T Programme. Responses from 6077 trainees of the programme from 2015 to 2019 have been captured.
2. Focus Group Discussions – have been conducted at 4 SMART centers, 4 SMART-T centers and 2 SMART + centers covering a total of 220 trainees.
3. Semi structured interviews – have been carried out for TMF’s location managers at 5 cities – Bengaluru, Chandigarh, Delhi, Kolkata and Mumbai
4. Structured interviews – have been administered for training partners (5) and employers (16).

The study employs IRECS framework and Social Return in Investment (SROI) methodology to gauge the impact of the program.

IRECS framework assesses the impact of the programme in five areas: Inclusiveness, Relevance, Expectation, Convergence and Service Delivery. The findings on the IRECS framework are provided below:

- **Inclusiveness**: The programme performance is found satisfactory in terms of Inclusivity. The various parameters considered to evaluate inclusion are (1) Age of the respondents (2) Educational Status (3) Gender of respondents (4) Geographical targeting of SMART programme (4) Cost of training (5) Assessments and (6) Selection Process.

It has been observed that the programme caters to trainees from all age groups and has seen participation from candidates with varied educational backgrounds. The enrolled candidates cover the entire education spectrum ranging from matriculation pass to postgraduates. The online survey exhibited a commendable gender ratio with 54% females and 46% males enrolled in the program. The respondents are pleased with the fact that no course fee has been charged, and no prerequisite skill is required to enroll in the programme making the programme
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approachable to the masses. The trainees are satisfied with the assessment process and TMF has covered a wide geographical targeting across the 11 cities.

- **Relevance:** The programme is found to be appropriately relevant to the trainees and employers. The aspects measuring relevance of the programme are (1) Job placement (2) Communication skill and personality development (3) Curriculum design and (4) Job satisfaction.

A strong linkage has been observed between courses offered and local market requirements. The courses are carefully crafted basis the baseline and skill gap studies undertaken by TMF and the implementation partners. The course curriculum is found to have requisite composition of soft skills and technical skills and the programme has proved to be effective in improving the interpersonal skills of the trainees. SMART programme has a placement rate of around 86 per cent and the programme also considered the job scenario to map the stakeholder expectations. The employers have found the TMF candidates to be punctual, disciplined and adequately skilled, and a high percentage of trainees have continued in the same job and have expressed their satisfaction with it.

- **Expectation:** The programme performed moderately on expectation of the beneficiaries. This aspect includes trainees’ satisfaction with placements - job profile and salary/income generated. Component of self-growth of respondents, change in their personality and change in their role in family and community has also been looked at. Besides, a critical component of change in salary and change in the family condition has been considered under this category, apart from components reflecting on development of girls.

More than 90% of the respondents reported being satisfied with their placements and job profile, and more than 95% have expressed increase in confidence, decision making and respect from community members and change in family’s condition. However, some trainees suggested ensuring a minimum salary limit to protect the trainees against disproportionately low salaries. The programme has also been seen to be making a positive impact on the development of girls in terms of opening of career opportunities, making them independent, resulting in self growth and supporting the family.

- **Convergence:** The programme fared well in terms of convergence with government policies/initiatives and collaboration with various government and private players. TMF has identified training partners through a rigorous selection process to ensure achievement of the training goals. Further TMF has collaborated with reputed private players such as Voltas, McMillan, and Art of play foundation for curriculum development, training of implementation partners and joint certifications. TMF was associated with NSDC in 2016-2017 to align with Government efforts of training the youth.

- **Service Delivery:** TMF can be lauded for complimenting the programme goals with excellent service delivery. Nine parameters have been examined for assessing service delivery (1) Registration process (2) Infrastructure facilities (3) Training material/Books/CD (4) Exposure Visits/Events (5) Satisfaction with trainer (6) Teaching method (7) Examination process (8) Training programme structure (9) Training programme content. The 6077 respondents to the online survey have reported satisfactory service delivery, with between 45% to 63% of respondents giving the services a rating of 5. The respondents have also expressed
satisfaction with post training support of the centers. Besides, the programme has been designed in a way that appropriate mobilization strategies are used to reach out to the target audience.

In addition to the IRECS framework, SROI methodology is used to monetize the impact of the programme i.e. how much value has been created in the society for each rupee invested/spent by TMF on the programme. The SROI is calculated by assigning financial proxies to each measurable or non-measurable outcome. For example, salary received by trainee is a measurable outcome however increase in confidence is a non-measurable outcome. SROI weighs both the measurable and non-measurable parameters. SROI is measured as the ratio of cumulative present value for each outcome against the total investment in the programme.

The value of SROI for the SMART programme is determined as 6.97 i.e. for every rupee invested/spent by Tech Mahindra Foundation, INR 6.97 worth of social value is generated.

Also, a similar study was undertaken in 2015, for assessing the SROI of the SMART programme. The SROI was 13.29 at 20% drop-off and 37% attribution. The SROI increases to 14.47, if drop-off and attribution are set to same value as 2015.

In conclusion, SMART programme creates immense value in the society by empowering the youth by virtue of developing their skills, confidence and enhanced wellbeing of their families.
Chapter 1: Context and Overview of SMART Programme

Context

India has large young population. As per UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund) 365 million Indians are in the age group of 10-24 years and the median age of Indians is 27 years\(^1\). India needs to equip this large youth pool with industry-relevant skills to harness the demographic dividend. Failing to do so could lead to huge socio-economic repercussions. To grab this opportunity and to meet the demands of the industry, a target of skilling 500 million people by 2022 has been adopted by the Government of India\(^2\). Various initiatives like National Skills Development Corporation (NSDC) - a nodal agency tasked to skill 150 million people by 2022 - were undertaken. The present government has taken these initiatives a step ahead by creating a central ministry for skills development and entrepreneurship and launching a national skills mission. Furthermore, over 20 other central ministries are funding skills training through 70-plus schemes and are tasked with skilling or up-skilling 250 million people.

Private sector organizations have also stepped up to support this humongous task and play a pivotal role both as provider of skills training and prospective employers. The skills training provided by private sector is often rated very high in quality as it is closely linked with the demands of the industry. Tech Mahindra Foundation is one such corporate funded organization providing vocational training since 2012.

1.1 About Tech Mahindra Foundation (TMF)\(^3\)

Tech Mahindra Foundation (TMF) was founded in 2007. It is the corporate social responsibility arm of Tech Mahindra Limited and is registered as a Section 25 company (referred to as a section 8 Company in Companies Act 2013). TMF works towards enabling and empowering children and youth from the underprivileged and socio economically marginalized strata under through “Education and Employability.” TMF has reached out to more than 200,000 direct beneficiaries through its programmes, and of these 50% are girls / women and 10% are differently abled.

1.2 About SMART Programme

Skills for Market Training (SMART) is the flagship programme of Tech Mahindra Foundation. It is an intervention designed for skill development of youth by developing their market-oriented skills and linking them to potential employers. The projects seek to benefit school dropouts, people with disabilities and those unable to go into higher education, with specific focus on women and people with disabilities. The courses offered through the programme provides the trainees with two skill sets:

- Foundation Skills - This course ranges up to a total of 210 hours and consists of a course on functional English (Yuva English - 120 hours), soft skills (work readiness - 40 hours) and basic IT skills (50 hours).

---


\(^3\) Tech Mahindra Foundation website
• Technical Skills – This course ranges up to a total of 90 hours and consists of specific subjects under the broader ambits of Tally Accounting, Hospitality, IT enabled services and Customer Relationship and Sales.

SMART programme has four verticals – SMART (for youth from marginalized communities), SMART + (for people with disabilities), SMART-T (training in technical trades) and SMART Academy (4 SMART academies). The programme started with 4 Centers in 2012 and is currently running 108 centers in eleven cities - Bangalore, Bhubaneshwar, Chandigarh, Chennai, Delhi- NCR, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai, Pune, Vishakhapatnam - across the four verticals. The SMART training Programme is NSDC Certified and follows a well-defined curriculum that is aligned to the QPs (Qualification Packs) and NOS (National Occupational Standards) that are laid down by different Sector Skill Councils. A robust system of regular assessments and certification on successful completion of the training are an integral part of the programme with immense importance being given to train the trainees in soft skills.

SMART Interventions

The Table 1 below presents the details of the programmes currently executed by TMF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: SMART Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SMART | • Youth over 18 years of age  
• Urban-socio-economically disadvantaged individuals  
• Able to read and comprehend simple English  
• Job seeker | • **Foundation course**: Spoken English, Workplace readiness and Basic IT and computer.  
• **Specialized courses**: Customer Relationships and Sales, Hospitality, ITES/ BPO, Lab Assistant, Multimedia, Nurse Aides, Office Administration, Pharmacy Assistant, Quick Service Restaurants, Tally, Beauty and Wellness, and others. |
| SMART + | A specialized programme established in 2013 designed for young women and men with visual and physical disabilities. It includes people with hearing/speech impaired, visually impaired, orthopedic disabilities and other disabilities. | Hospitality, ITES/ BPO, Customer Relationships and Sales, Multimedia, Tally. |
| SMART-T | It is a technical programme aimed at bridging the demand-supply gap of formally trained, skilled, technical manpower in the market. | Automobile Technician, Civil Works, CNC Machine Technician, AC and Refrigeration mechanic, Electrician, Fitter and Maintenance Technician, Welding |
| SMART Academy | It is a state of art center which aims at imparting high-quality vocational skill training (short and long-term basis). Courses blend classroom and practical/on the job training. It also has tie ups with Industry stalwarts for purposes of upgradation and placements. | Health and Paramedical courses, Information Technology and Logistics |
Chapter 2: Study Objectives and Methodology

The overall objective of this evaluation study is to undertake a review of SMART (Skills for Market Training) programme and take stock of its performance vis-à-vis its stated objectives. The evaluation study covers SMART (for women and men from socio-economically deprived communities), SMART+ (for differently abled youth) and SMART-T (technical skills for youth) models of the programme.

The study was designed to evaluate the programme using IRECS (Inclusiveness – Relevance – Expectations – Convergence – Service Delivery) parameters and assess the impact using SROI (Social Return on Investment) methodology. Key highlights of the study design are provided below:

Stakeholders Involved
Study involved all the stakeholders of the SMART Programme at macro, meso and micro level. The list of stakeholder groups covered during the study is provided below:

- **Macro Level** - Macro level stakeholders are responsible for overall decision making with respect to the policies, guidelines and provide resources to stakeholders at the meta and micro levels for effective implementation of the SMART programme. Stakeholders include:
  - TMF team at head office

- **Meso Level** - These stakeholders make day to day execution decisions within the broader framework available at the macro level. These are the on-ground officers who are involved in implementation and directly interact with the scheme beneficiaries. Stakeholders include:
  - TMF location managers
  - Centre Manager, Trainer, Community mobilizer at the SMART centers

- **Micro level** - These are the stakeholders that are either the direct beneficiaries of the schemes or are the directly related to the actual beneficiaries. Stakeholders include:
  - Trainees and their families
  - Employer

Sampling Plan and Data tools

The mixed method dipstick study was undertaken, where the trainees were identified using purposive sampling4. The trainees who have undergone training through SMART programme have been selected as respondents. The detailed list of respondents covered, and data collection tools used by the study is provided below:

1. Online questionnaire was used to collect responses from past and present trainees of the SMART programme. The sample provides increasing representation to trainees from current batches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of enrolment</th>
<th>Trainees covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 – 2015</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 – 2016</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 – 2017</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4Purposive Sampling is a type of non-probability sampling where sample is chosen with a particular purpose in mind.
2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with trainees were undertaken at 4 SMART centers, 4 SMART-T centers and 2 SMART + centers. 220 trainees were covered through FGDs. Figure 1 is a picture of an ongoing FGD in a SMART + Center in Kolkata. The trainees participating in the FGD are Speech and Hearing Impaired.

3. Semi-Structured Interviews with the TMF’s Location Managers at 5 cities – Bengaluru, Chandigarh, Delhi, Kolkata and Mumbai were conducted

4. Structured Interviews with Training Partners (Centre Managers, Trainers and Community Mobilizers). More than 30 interviews were conducted with employees at the Training Partners were conducted.

5. Structured Interviews were conducted with 16 Employers.

The study tools are provided in Annexure 2.

Analysis Framework

The evaluation study has been designed around the IRECS framework. Framework consists of assessment criteria that provides feedback to the processes followed in the design and implementation of the programme. Description of the framework parameters and the specific indicators for the evaluation are listed below (Figure 2):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>The extent to which project is geared to respond to the ‘felt’ needs of the communities</th>
<th>Communication Skills and Personality Development, Curriculum Design, Placements, Employer satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>The extent of intended and unintended positive (benefits), socio-economic, and cultural changes have accrued for beneficiaries</td>
<td>Desired Job, expected salary, increase in self-confidence, Supporting Family Income, Purchase of Assets by trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence</td>
<td>Judging the degree of convergence with government/other partners; the degree of stakeholder buy-in achieved</td>
<td>Tie ups with knowledge partners and corporates, course curriculum for SMART programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>The extent to which cost-efficient and time-efficient methods and processes were used to achieve results</td>
<td>Selection of partners, SMART centers, relationship between teachers and students, placements, monitoring etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, Social Return on Investment (SROI), methodology has been used to monetize the impacts created through the SMART programme. SROI measures the social value being created for each rupee invested/spent on the programme. It is a four-step process as described below:

**Step 1:** Develop the **causal pathway (Impact Map)** to link inputs of the programme to the outcomes and impact. Impact Map provides understanding of causal relationship between objectives of the project, actions undertaken, outcomes and long-term impacts. Definition of each parameter is provided below:

*Figure 3: Definition of Impact Map*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td>Input is the contributions made by each stakeholder that are necessary for the activity to happen.</td>
<td>Output is the activity or the immediate result in relation to each stakeholder’s input.</td>
<td>Outcome are the changes resulting from the activity observed/experienced by the stakeholders. The change can be intended or unintended and positive or negative.</td>
<td>Impact is the difference between the outcomes for participants, considering what would have happened anyway, the contribution of others and the length of time the outcomes last.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2: Evidencing Outcomes

The outcomes identified using the impact map are then evidenced through primary survey. Primary survey collected responses from the trainees on whether they have experienced a certain outcome or not. The responses from trainees were triangulated with the responses from the trainers and employers.

Step 3: Establishing Impact

The outcomes evidenced during step 2 are calibrated using following parameters:

*Deadweight*: It is an estimation of social benefits that would have been created anyways, without the SMART programme. For instance, some of the trainees of SMART programme might have pursued similar course of some other training programme and might have been placed at a comparable job profile.

*Drop-off*: It is the proportion of outcomes which are not sustained. An example of this is where a proportion of trainees who are placed drop out of employment in the near future.

*Attribution*: In some situations, TMF will be sharing the returns with other agencies, who for example have all been involved in supporting trainees. In this situation, the value added has to be shared between agencies, and only that proportion of the returns being generated by TMF would be included in the calculation of SROI. For the purpose of this study, the impact created is shared with efforts of trainees themselves, families/friends who provide financial and emotional support, employers where the trainee is working and gets the pay cheque and government which supports through various welfare schemes.

*Displacement*: In some cases, the positive outcomes for stakeholders generated by an activity are offset by negative outcomes for other stakeholders. For example, an employment organization may place individuals with employers at the expense of other individuals who are seeking work.

Step 4: SROI calculation

SROI is calculated by dividing cumulative present value for each outcome against the total investment in the project.

The next section presents the detailed observations and findings on the IRECS framework and SROI methodology.
Chapter 3: Study Findings and Impact

This section provides detailed findings around performance and impact of SMART programme. The information provided in this section is based on the responses received through online questionnaire and field visits conducted by KPMG team at 10 training centers. The performance and impact of the programme is measured using the IRECS framework described in chapter 2. Findings from the field visits are presented below:

3.1 Inclusiveness

The aspect of inclusiveness in the SMART programme of Tech Mahindra has been captured by analyzing the profile of the respondents and the cost, selection and assessment processes of the programme. Different components of the programme throw light on aspects indicating that the programme has been designed to ensure that the benefits of trainings are experienced by everyone, irrespective of the heterogeneity prevalent in the Indian social system. The following elements provide evidence on the inclusiveness on the programme:

- **Age of the Respondents** - The trainees undergoing training at SMART programme come from diverse socio-economic profile, cover a wide age group and present different educational background. Respondents to the study are spread across a range of approximately 33 years, with the average age and the highest number of trainees belonging to the age of 23 years and 22 years respectively. The standard deviation is of 4 years in the age of the respondents. The figure presented below, is illustrative of the number of respondents from each age group, indicating that enrollment and participation of trainees depends on the need of the trainees and not the age.

![Figure 4: Age Profile of respondents](image)

Respondents belonging to age bracket between 46 years to 50 years went for courses such as CRS, Hospitality, ITES/BPO, Office Administration, Tally and all joined the placement offered through TMF Training Partners.
• **Educational Status** – The figure 5 highlights that as per the sample, the maximum trainees who have been trained over the years through the TMF programme have completed their graduation (31 per cent), followed by those who have completed education up to class 12th (27 per cent), and the third category is of those who have studied up to Class 10th (17 per cent). The last three categories include 12 per cent of those who have incomplete graduation, 5 percent with Diploma, 4 per cent Postgraduates, 3 per cent from ITI’s. Lastly, 1 per cent of respondents have undertaken courses, such as, that of nursing assistant, CCA Course, Web designing and Graduation along with ITI.

*Figure 5: Education Status and Gender of Respondents*
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• **Gender of Respondents** – The figure 5 presented above showcases that the gender divide of the respondents is almost 50 percent, with 54 per cent respondents being male and 46 per cent being female.

• **Geographical Targeting of SMART Programme** - The SMART Programme has been expanding its reach and has covered a wide geography across the country by setting up centers in 11 cities. Further, the number of trainees who have benefited from the programme over the years can be estimated considering the growing number of training centers in each of the cities. In each city, the number of centers ranges from 3 to 21, with the highest number of centers being in Delhi (21), Mumbai (18), Hyderabad (14) and Bengaluru (13).

The Figure 6 below represents the number of respondents from each of these centers in the sample of online survey.
The wide spread of the training centers in each of the 11 cities can be well gauged by the distance the trainees have to cover to reach the closest center from their residence. Out of 6077 respondents, 27 per cent and 26 per cent respondents have shared that the center is within 2-4 km and less than 2 km from their residence. This has been further shared in the following section – Service Delivery.

- **Cost of Training**: Through primary data collection, it has been highlighted that the SMART training centers do not charge any fees from the trainees to ensure that trainees from poor economic background can access the training.

- **Assessments**: Almost 82% of the trainees (rated examination process as 4 or 5 in the survey) have shown satisfaction with the assessment process. Trainees are also given an opportunity to continue visiting the centers if they have not cleared the assessment and skill themselves till, they are able to reach the required level of skill to complete the training.

- **Selection Process**: The selection process does not ask for any pre-requisite skills apart for the minimum level of education required for the course and basic identification documents. Considering the objective of the project, selection process does entail knowing about the trainee’s interest to be engaged in an economic activity (salaried or self-employment).
3.2 Relevance

The relevance of the programme has been analyzed from the perspective of various stakeholders, such as, the trainees (representing the supply side) and the employers (representing the market demand of the skills). In this section, an analysis of how the TMF programme is relevant and addresses the requirements of the stakeholders has been explained:

1. Relevance for Trainees:

**Skills for Jobs**: Clear linkage between jobs in local market and courses offered exists. Courses are chosen based on baseline and skill gap study undertaken by TMF and implementation partner.

The placement rate is around 86% (Salaried and Self Employed), which is above the placement figure mandated by NSDC for a good training programme. Around 94% trainees were placed within one month of completing training. Around 79% (out of 4379 over the years) placed trainees are continuing with the same job.

**Communication skills and personality development**: Trainees (in nearly 100% of FGDs) attributed their success (ability to secure job and performance on job) to their improved communication skills (English Speaking Skills) and personality (ability to participate in group, better time management, goal setting).

**Curriculum design**: Courses offered at the SMART centers have an adequate mix of technical skills, soft skills and field exposure needed for the job. Trainees (FGDs) stated that course on Workplace Readiness enables them to stand-out in the early days of employment. Around 83% trainees observed that the course content is good and 78% appreciated component of exposure visits.

**Job Satisfaction**: The online survey, which had representation from across years, indicates that there is a significant percentage of respondents who have continued in the same job. The figure 7 below presents the percentage of respondents who have stayed in the job they were placed at from the year of passing till 2020 (the year of conducting the study). Further, it has been seen that a high percentage of respondents from those who have continued in the same job are satisfied with their placement, their job profile and their salary. (Figure 7)
Further, those who have not continued in the same job were asked the duration after which they left job. The pattern identified in shifting of jobs has been presented in the Table 3 below that shows the number of trainees who left after completing certain number of months. For example, through the online survey, 99 trainees left before completing 1 month, 119 trainees left after completing 1 month but before completing 2 months and 119 trainees left their placement after completing 6 months. Out of 937 respondents who shared that they have 'Not Continued with the same job', 888 shared the responses presented below.
**Table 3: Month Wise Attrition Numbers of Trainees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month / Number of Responses</th>
<th>0-20 Trainees</th>
<th>20-40 Trainees</th>
<th>40-60 Trainees</th>
<th>60-80 Trainees</th>
<th>80-100 Trainees</th>
<th>100-120 Trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 Months</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6 Months</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 18 Months</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 24 Months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 36 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excelling at Workplace – Prabhas Pandey, Kolkata**

Prabhas Pandey is a resident of Namkhana, which is 100 km away from the residential center of Youth4Jobs, where the SMART training takes place. He belongs to a nuclear family - his father is a driver, and brother runs a hotel. Prabhas was born with speech and hearing impairment. He completed his education till class XI, but his school had no sign language, however, he did not let it be an obstacle in his path to growth. Through Facebook, Prabhas came to know about the training and joined the WISE - Work Integrated Soft Skills English course at SMART+ Centre. With the help of a translator he shared that he had a great learning experience at the center, the stay was comfortable, and he made many friends. He built many life skills, such as punctuality, discipline and learnt basic English. Prabhas got placed at KFC after his training concluded and intends to work with the organization for next 5 years before he embarks upon the next phase of his career. He shares that a significant role has been played by SMART programme in his career advancement, followed by the contribution of his employer for the opportunities provided. His family’s support has played an important role in his choices and very modestly he places his own initiatives and discipline at the last. In the picture, Prabhas is seen with a certificate from KFC that acknowledges his commitment to the work and his willingness to put in his best effort.
2. **Employer Satisfaction**: All the employers interviewed as part of this study observed that trainees trained at SMART centers are very punctual and disciplined. The trainees are better prepared for the workplace environment, have basic/foundation skills, are technically equipped and understand the subject matter faster; reducing the effort and time spent on on-job training.

A summary of observations made by employers during the interviews is provided below:

**Employer Experiences Summary**

During primary data collection, 16 employers across the cities were interviewed to gauge their experience of employing TMF trainees. Throughout the interactions, certain skills of TMF trainees have been appreciated, such as, their etiquettes, punctuality, discipline, willingness to work and learn, and that the trainees are well trained and technically sound, hence do not have to trained much immediately on joining. Some employers rated TMF trainees higher as compared to other recruits of the organization, based on the attitude, low attrition rate, active interest in work, grooming and ability to handle difficult situations and customers.

Depending on the type of industry, some employers have suggested including certain topics to the course curriculum. One industry employer recommends building of the right expectations of the trainee, as some trainees lack of interest jobs, such as retail job, which involves lot of travel, and hence high attrition rate. Some employers pointed out based on their experience that candidates who are away from the family have demonstrated more commitment to the work. They also recommended holding a one-day session to sensitize the parents of the trainees and to ensure that they support them on joining jobs.

It is imperative to acknowledge that the employers are also very cognizant of the strengths of the trainees, especially in case of trainees who are taken from SMART + centers. To elaborate, the employers take care of placing a physically challenged employee at a sitting job to ensure his/her comfort and to ensure completion of tasks. One employer expressed that no PwD candidate is hired from any place other than TMF centers.

The employers have expressed that the recruitment process has been smooth with support from TMF implementation partners, and the verification done by TMF on enrolling the students also has been appreciated by the employers. Apart from that, the employers acknowledged the keen interest of TMF implementation partners take in their trainees, as they often take feedback on the trainees with respect to their performance or any other concern.

On enquiring about how the employers came to know about TMF centers, some shared that they were approached by placement coordinator of the center and some shared that they came to know through other Human Resource Executives. All (100%) of the employers have expressed that they will hire again from TMF and they will also refer TMF to other HR departments of other organizations.

### 3.3 Expectation

The component of expectations captures the level to which the programme implemented meets the expectations of the beneficiaries. The programme has been evaluated to understand the satisfaction of
respondents across the parameters like placements, job profile and satisfaction from salary, amongst other factors.

- **Satisfaction with the placement received or the business started**

  It has been shared by 92 per cent of the respondents that they are satisfied with the placement they received or with the business they have started. However, 6 per cent have shared that they are not satisfied and 2 per cent shared that the question was not applicable to them. Some of the reasons listed down as factors determining the mentioned satisfaction percentage by the trainees include – ability to earn decent salary, development of communication skills, addressing stage fear and ability to experience an overall growth and learning. Some people have even expressed that they appreciate their workspace, work environment and support/encouragement of the employers. (Presented in figure 8 below)

- **Satisfaction with Job Profile**

  As has been presented in Figure 8 below, 93 per cent of the respondents have expressed that they are satisfied with their job profile and have stated reasons such as improvement in knowledge base, availability of growth opportunities in terms of promotion, and growth in terms of soft skills such as team building skills as the factors determining satisfaction. However, some respondents have shared that they are not satisfied and explicated factors such as: the distance of workplace from their hometown, and mismatch of aspirations and job profile.

- **Satisfaction with Salary/Income Generated**

  From the responses received, 88 per cent have shared that they are satisfied with the salary/income that is generated, while 10 per cent are not satisfied. Some respondents have expressed that they are more than happy as the salary is helping to meet the needs of the family and they are able to invest in self-growth. Some respondents are excited about the future growth opportunities on the professional front in terms of better wage rate, owing to the match between jobs and skills. On personal experiences, respondents have shared that they have experienced a significant increase of almost 25 per cent in his salary, and some experienced the joy of receiving first pocket on receiving their first salary. (Figure 8)

  However, some of the respondents are unsatisfied and have stated that they didn’t get a placement from the center, or their salary is lower than expected. Few have stated that there is a mismatch in the qualification of the respondents and the jobs they are recruited for, or that as they are freshers, so they have joined the available jobs. Trainees have suggested that a minimum salary must be ensured to improve the satisfaction level.

  Overall, the trainees have listed the following reasons for expressing satisfaction – Good work environment, job profile/salary matching the skills, good use of the skills taught in the training, match of job profile with aspirations, opportunity for promotion and increment, able to support family.
A course wise satisfaction w.r.t placement, job profile and salary has been presented in the Table 4 above.

- **Self-Growth of Respondents/Personality and role in family/community**

On joining any training programme, the expectations of the trainees may go beyond joining a job and earning salary. The trainee may anticipate growth and development in other aspects of one’s personality, such as, soft skills. The survey attempts to gauge the change in the confidence, decision making levels and the change in perspective of community members towards the trainees.
As can be seen in Figure 9 above, 97 per cent have reported an increase in confidence level, 96 per cent reported an increase in the decision-making skills and 95 per cent shared a positive change in the outlook of the community members towards the respondents. When further probed on the factors indicating the above-mentioned changes, the respondents shared that:

- **Confidence** – The ability to communicate topped the list, especially because of the nuances of English communication covered in the class, followed by ability to travel alone, ability to manage finances and ability to take decisions. Other than these, some have expressed that they are able to comfortably handle any professional and personal challenges, and they have gained confidence to teach special children. Some shared that their stage fear has decreased.

- **Decision Making Skills** – It has been highlighted that the confidence and the ability to take decisions for oneself tops the list of the factors indicating improvement in decision making skills, followed by the ability to contribute to the decisions related to family and siblings. The respondents have also shared that they are able to choose the portfolios/areas to invest their salary and hence have honed their financial management skills. In fact, some respondents have also commented that they are able to better plan their daily life by deciding where to invest their time and energy.

- **Respect from the Community** – Respondents shared that there is a change in the perception of the society towards them, and now their family and friends look up to them and approach them for suggestions and recommendations. Trainees have stated that their teachers/society give his/her example to others to inspire them.
Mr. Shrikanth is an orthopedic patient, a resident of Banashyam Nagar, which is 10 km away from the Youth 4 Jobs center, Kolkata. He completed his class XII exams and due to financial constraints took tuitions for 5 years. He is 32 years old and got placed at RCDK Salt Lake as a Tele caller after training from TMF SMART programme. He comes from a modest background, where his father is a farmer, mother is a housewife, elder brother is married and is into boat making. Earlier as a tutor he used to earn INR 2000 per month, however now as a tele caller he earns INR 8000 per month and sends a significant proportion to his family, who is very happy with the current job of Mr. Shrikanth. Through the training he has learnt how to behave in a social setting, he has learnt etiquettes and is more conscious of his behavior. Besides, his involvement and participation in group discussions and at home has improved because of the SMART training, which included group activities and interactions with the other members of the batch. In his overall growth, he gives 40 per cent weightage to the SMART programme for providing him the right direction, 30 per cent to the employer for giving a platform to hone the etiquettes and work ethics that he learnt through the course, 20 per cent to the family for the support provided by them and only 10 per cent to his self-determination and efforts. In future Mr. Shrikanth would like to go into organic farming and buy his own TV.

- **Change in Salary**

In order to understand the change in the financial status, the respondents were enquired about their financial expectations and their salary before and after joining the course. They were further probed on whether the course helped them to earn income, their satisfaction level and the changes in the financial condition of their family.

The total 6077 responses received have been classified based on completeness of the information provided on the following category: Increase in Salary, no change in salary, decrease in salary, no valid response to either or both two data points. From those who shared the complete information, we have seen that 75 per cent have confirmed an increase in salary, 21 percent have shared that there is no change in the salary i.e. either it is same or neither were they earning earlier nor are they earning now and lastly 4 per cent have shared a decrease in the salary. (Figure 10)
Second, looking at both the data points separately, i.e. the information shared about the income before and income after attending the training, the following comparisons have been made. A graphical representation of the percentage of respondents belonging to the income brackets has shown in the Figure 11. As can be seen in the figure below, there was a significant percentage of respondents who were not earning prior to joining the training, due to either lack of opportunity, training or educational profile of the candidate.

*Figure 11: Distribution of respondents based on income bracket*

![Distribution of Respondents based on the Income Bracket](image)

*Table 5: Comparison of Income Before and After Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Measure</th>
<th>Before attending training</th>
<th>After attending training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>INR 2653.969</td>
<td>INR 10142.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>INR 0</td>
<td>INR 10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation in Salary</td>
<td>INR 4691.527</td>
<td>INR 5606.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>6029</td>
<td>4354 (4588, some data is inadequate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 5 presents a comparison between the statistical measures of the two salary groups. To elaborate, before attending the training, the median salary of the respondents was INR 0, however, post the training it was INR 10000. Additionally, an increase in the average salary and in the standard deviation of the salary can be observed.
The respondents were asked to reflect on the impact of the job/business (joined post training) on their family’s financial condition. As can be seen in the figure 12, 94 per cent of the respondents shared that there has been an improvement in the financial condition and 6 per cent commented that there has been no substantial change. To elaborate, amongst those who experienced a positive change, some of the highlights were that the trainees are providing financial support to the family in terms of health support of the parents, financing regular monthly expenses, supporting education of siblings/children, contributing to special expenses like wedding in the family, purchasing assets like laptops, bikes, phones for self and for family, purchase of clothes for family, paying house rent, build own house and save for future and paying loan. Some are taking care of all their education expenses as they are the first-generation learners of the house. They have expressed that now ‘they are no more a burden on the family’.

Amongst those who expressed that the financial position has not improved, some shared that this is because their family’s financial condition is not stable due to reasons such as loss of a parent. Other have listed that they are not being able to contribute because: they are not employed or are studying, or the salary is not enough. Some also expressed that they are paying the business loan from the salary, hence, are not able to contribute to the family income. Some are taking care of personal health issues; salary is getting used in convenience and in some cases the parents are earning – so no need to contribute to family income. However, trainees have expressed that the conditions may improve in the future once the salary increases.
Also, as presented in the Figure 13, similar percentage both male and female respondents experienced improvement in their families’ condition after joining a job, post completion of training. As can be seen, 94 per cent of the male and 94 per cent of the female respondents have expressed improvement in family condition and 6 per cent each of male and female have expressed no improvement in the family condition after joining the job.

- Development for Girls

**Career Opportunities** – During the FGD’s it was highlighted that many girls who had enrolled for courses were earlier not engaged in income generation activity and were mostly supporting their mothers with the household chores. Training from TMF SMART programme gave them an opportunity to explore employment options and build a future for themselves.

**Independence** – Skill development and employment enables the girls to become independent in their decision making and problem-solving skills. It also capacities them to participate in group activities and be able to decide where to invest their salary.

**Self-Growth** – Girls/Women undertake jobs that match their skills and requirements. They are able to invest their salary in their personal growth through enrolling for courses, purchasing assets and are saving capital for future investments.

**Support to Family** – Female respondents have stated that there has been a change in the proportion of their contribution to the welfare of the family post the completion of training. They are able to financially support their parents/husband and take care of the education of their siblings/children.
Development of Girls and Support to Family

Story 1: Shivani, Bagu Vijay Nagar, Ghaziabad

Shivani, comes from very humble family background and is the eldest of three children of her parents. Due to an accident at her father's workplace, they lost the only source of income for the family. She faced many financial challenges, and the family also had a debt to repay. She came to know about TMF SMART Centre Vijay Nagar and showed keen interest in CRS course and Job Placement Service as she was looking for means to support her family and to continue her study. She joined the CRS Course, post which she got a Placement in 24 SEVEN Brand Gaur City at 15000/- . Shivani is now able to support her family and able to pay her college fee. She is so happy grateful to TMF for bringing a change in her life.

Story 2: From Share Advisor to Team Leader, Bangalore

Amani Kausar, comes from an economically weak family and could not clear her Class 10th examinations. However, that did not deter her from aiming high. Amani, joined a community college as DTP trainee. Simultaneously she undertook a 4-month course at SMART center and got placed in Forex Finance Ltd. She started her career as a share advisor trainee, and received a nominal stipend, but after a 3-month training she became a Share Advisor with a fixed salary of INR. 10,000/month plus incentives for good performance. Her job profile included selling shares to existing as well as new shareholders. Recently after her promotion as a Team Leader, she takes home an amount of INR 70,000 monthly and supports her family who is extremely proud of her achievements, her potential and her extraordinary communication skills.
3.4 Convergence

In order to make the programme a success, TMF has collaborated with various private and public stakeholders, and Training Partners to implement the SMART Programme. This section highlights the partnerships that TMF has formed for the project:

- **Training Partners** – TMF over the years has identified Training Partners through a rigorous screening process that entails ensuring convergence of goals/objectives and ability to sustain. The figure 14 shows the number of training centers that TMF has opened since 2012 and the year wise active number of training partners.

- **Tie Ups for Course Curriculum Development** - TMF has collaborated with Voltas, McMillan and Art of Play Foundation to develop the course curriculum. SMART + programmes have technical support to develop the specialized yet customized course curriculum.

- **Tie Ups for Training of Implementation Partners** – TMF has collaborated with Art of Play Foundation and McMilan to facilitate training of implementation partners.

- **Tie Ups for Joint Certification** – Joint certification programmes with corporates such as Voltas, Pimpri-Chinchwad Municipal Corporation and Tally has been facilitated.

- **Alignment with Government Initiatives** – TMF was associated as an NSDC partner in 2016-2017, and all its courses are NSQF aligned.

3.5 Service Delivery

The SMART programme is being implemented across eleven cities through registered implementation partners. TMF extends all support to the implementation partners to ensure that there is consistency across the services provided and that all trainees are at par in meeting the goals of the project. On this note, the trainees across the country who have responded to the questionnaire have shared their feedback on different parameter of the SMART programme, that has been elaborated in this section.
• **Parameters for Service Provided**

The figure 15, is a graphical presentation of the rating given by 6077 respondents to the nine parameters that have been identified to assess the service delivery of TMF programme. The respondents were asked to rate the 9 parameters on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 meant poor and 5 meant excellent. As can be seen, in all the 9 parameters, i.e. – Registration Process, Infrastructure Facilities, Training Material/Books/CD, Exposure Visits/Events, Trainer/Teacher, Teaching Methods, Examination Process, Training Programme Structure and Training Programme Content, maximum percentage of respondents (between 45 percentage to 63 percentage across all) have given a rating of 5 to each of the facilities.

*Figure 15: Ratings on Service Parameters*

Further, the above-mentioned parameters have been compared across the 11 cities to gauge the inter city experience of respondents and to identify the best practices from any city, which may be leading with a high margin from the second best. The respondents who have a rating of 4 or a rating of 5 have been considered to infer the performance of each of the cities on corresponding parameters. The figure 16 presented below shows that the Best Performing city on a parameter is marked by GREEN ⭐ and Low performing city is highlighted in RED ⚫.
It can be seen that Nagpur has received Rating of ‘4 and 5’ from the maximum percentage of respondents in 4 out of 9 parameters, followed by Bhubaneshwar and Chandigarh that have received Rating of ‘4 and 5’ from maximum percentage of respondents in 3 and 2 out of 9 parameters respectively. Mumbai has got the lowest percentage of respondents giving a rating of ‘4 and 5’ in 7 out of 9 parameters.

Figure 16: Intercity comparison

The respondents were also asked to share the reasons they considered to give the above-mentioned rating to each of the parameter. The rating to the deciding factors reflects on aspects that are important to a trainee while undertaking the course.

Each of the following parameters was a multiple option question. So, each question has a response from 6077 trainees, and the percentage against the bar is number of responses divided by 6077.
1. Reasons for scoring of registration process

A high percentage of trainees have ranked Guidance and Ease in Registration as the deciding factor while ranking the ‘Registration Process’. This is followed by the target audience-oriented mobilization efforts, which includes effective communication and clarity in explaining the package (course + placement) that TMF offers to the trainee and his/her family. The fourth highly rated factor is the process of submitting the documents. Additionally, the trainees have expressed appreciation for the orientation provided on the course and the encouraging learning atmosphere. (Figure 17)

2. Reasons for scoring of Infrastructural Facilities

Out of 6077 respondents, 71 per cent of trainees have expressed that the Hygiene of the center is a critical factor while rating the infrastructural facilities of the center. Following this, an appropriate trainee to faculty ratio, ICT enabled teaching facilities are important factors considered while giving the rating to infrastructural facilities, such as center, classroom, laboratories and security. Also, as can be seen in figure 16, 48 per cent of the total respondents have expressed a complete satisfaction with the infrastructural facilities. (Figure 18)
3. Reasons for Training Material/Books/CDs

The respondents were asked to comment on the quality of training materials such as books and CDs and 47 per cent of the respondents have given it a rating of 5 and 34 per cent have given it a rating of 4. Amongst the reasons determining the scores, ease of understanding the material was considered important by 82 per cent of respondents, followed by quality of content of lessons and audio-video topping the list (55 per cent). Some of the respondents have acknowledged that the quality of the books and notes provided were good. However, few respondents expressed that books/resources were not provided to be taken home and have recommended this as an improvement suggestion. (Figure 19)

4. Reasons for Rating of Exposure Visits and Events

The reasons impacting the decision of the respondents to rank exposure visits are predominated by the information and the knowledge imparted on the exposure visits (ranked by 68 per cent respondents), followed by convenience and arrangement of transportation facility (51 per cent responses), venue of the exposure, appropriate time duration and the opportunity to interact with industrial players follow the list. From the sample, 45 per cent of the respondents gave it a rating of 5 and 31 per cent gave it a rating of 4. Few of the respondents have expressed that they did not have any exposure visits during their time. (Figure 20)
5. Reasons for rating provided to Trainer and Teacher

The teacher/trainer ranking is one parameter which had the highest percentage of respondents (63 per cent) giving a rating of 5. The reasons contributing to this rating include - ability to clarify doubts, the clarity in the concept, punctuality, ability to manage the class and patience. During the FGDs, the trainees expressed their deep respect towards the faculty, and appreciated the time invested by teachers to the trainees. They also highlighted that the teachers are available beyond classroom interaction and support the trainees through counselling and by guiding them through career related advice. Some trainees voiced their opinion that the current teachers should be kept for future batches as well. (Figure 21)

6. Reasons for rating of Teaching Methods

Teaching Method has got the second highest per centage (52 per cent) of trainees rating a parameter 5. On asking to delineate on the parameters considered, the teaching pedagogy that involved appropriate practical and theoretical mix was ranked the highest (72 per cent), followed by encouraging attitude of teachers towards trainee participation (70 per cent). During visits to centers, the importance to practical inputs was noticed through well developed and fully equipped labs (Figure 23). It was shared by a representative of SMART T center, that it is imperative to understand the need of the market. When going for placements, while all job seekers will have the theoretical knowledge, however, SMART center candidates stand out because of their practical knowledge. (Figure 22)
7. Examination Process

Examination process is one area that had the lowest percentage of respondents giving a rating of 5 (45 per cent respondents). The respondents have expressed that the main factors contributing to the rating is the relevance of the exam to the job and skill, followed by the process involved in the assessment process and the clarity in the syllabus of the exam. During primary data collection, it was shared that both theoretical and practical skills are tested of a trainee, however, the ratio of both may vary depending upon the nature of course. (Figure 24)
8. Training Programme Structure

The training programme structure has been well appreciated by the trainees as 52 per cent of the trainees have given it a rating of 5 and 32 have given it a rating of 4. The trainees have mentioned that the activities undertaken in the classroom is a significant factor determining their decision to rank the parameter, followed by structure of the information imparted in the lesson, followed by appropriate duration of the course and the assignments given. During the primary data collection, most of the employers were satisfied with the structure of the course, however, few shared that the duration of the course can be adjusted to further train the candidates on the practical aspect of the programme, (this varies from course to course). (Figure 25)

9. Reasons for Rating of Training Program Content

The respondents have expressed that the Lesson given in the books/text is a major reason for giving the parameter the above-mentioned rating (Figure 16). Followed by this, is the audio/video presentation in the class and the visuals in the books. The trainees have commented that the activity based practical aspect in the class helps to strengthen the training content. The employers too expressed their satisfaction with the course curriculum, however, certain employers and center managers requested for an advanced skilling in technical programmes to prepare the trainees for real life situations. (Figure 26)
• Post Training Support

Figure 27: Post Training Support

The trainees were asked to share their experience with the training centers after the completion of their course. As can be seen in figure 27, over 50 per cent of the respondents were highly satisfied with the service provided by the center after their training was over, such as counselling session, by providing additional classes, by allowing access to computer labs. Secondly, with respect to the experience on the support given by the center in getting the placement or the business, 47 per cent of the respondents expressed satisfaction with the services. They shared that the support provided in helping to find a placement or start a business was the leading reason, followed by the suitability of the job because of skill matching, the negotiations taken place during salary discussion and finally in helping find an investor to start the business have been useful.
• **Mobilization**

Respondents were asked to share the various mediums through which they came to know about the TMF programme. The respondents were given the option to multi select, and as can be seen in the figure 28, 40 per cent of the respondents came to know through their family/friends/relatives, which is a combination of word of mouth marketing and referrals. This was followed by survey/mobilization undertaken by the centers in their area and then through pamphlets. Besides, some of the other sources are: Other – College – Teachers/Placement Officers, Job Fair, Women Welfare Association, WhatsApp Marketing, Self-Research, marketing on Company Boards, announcement in religious place, and through social worker. Through primary data collection, it was highlighted in the Focus Group Discussions that a mix of all these mediums is used to reach out to the target audience. The center managers also shared about the experience of the mobilisers and the faculty, and shared that this is an all year-round process, where the mobilisers work to meet the targets by reaching out to local localities, reach out to the families on multiple occasions and work on identifying un saturated and un reached geographies.

• **Physical Distance between Center and Residence of Trainee**

TMF has marked its presence across the 11 cities through different centers. Another aspect that is analyzed to understand the convenience for the trainees to reach the center is the physical distance between the center and the residence of the trainee. For this particular response, the data can be analyzed from two sources – FGD’s and the online survey. From the survey, it can be observed that almost 25 per cent of respondents had access to the center within 2 km and within 4 km from of their residence each. Further 17 per cent of the respondents had to cover between 5 km to 8 km for the training, 9 per cent between 9 km and 11 km and almost 25 per cent had to cover more than 12 km. Now, with respect to those covering 12 km, the exact distance varied for the respondents. For example, during our FGD for SMART + programme, the speech and hearing-impaired trainees were
attending a residential training programme and their houses were in different districts, which ranged from 20 km away to 400 km away.

Figure 29: Physical Distance between Center and Residence of Trainee

The data mentioned in the above section has been presented in the figure 29. In Bangalore, respondents from 7 centers have reported to be travelling more than 12 kms. The centers provide training for all three programmes – SMART, SMART + and SMART T.
Chapter 4: Social Return on Investment (SROI)

About SROI methodology

Social Return on Investment (SROI) is a process and a method to understand, measure and report the value created by an organization. The SROI quantifies the value of the social impact of projects, programmes and policies. It examines the social, economic and environmental benefits that arise from an organization’s work and assigns a monetary value to the social and environmental benefit that has been created by an organization by identifying indicators of value which can be financialized. Comparing this value to the investment required to achieve that impact produces an SROI ratio. It takes standard financial measures of economic return a step further by capturing social as well as financial value. Through SROI, organizations are able to evidence the social impact, gain deeper insight into what impact they have created for their stakeholders and can thus use this as an input for their programme strategy.5

KPMG has used Evaluative type of SROI conducted retrospectively and based on actual outcomes that has already taken place.

The following section covers impact mapping and SROI calculations based on the evidenced outcomes during the primary data collection. Key recommendations based on the SROI results are provided in the conclusion and recommendations chapter.

4.1 Impact mapping

The Impact Map provides link between resources that have contributed to the programme (inputs), the results of the activity (outputs) and the outcomes of the programme that are a vital part of SROI analysis. It is to be noted that we have focused on the impact on trainees and considered trainers and implementation partner for specific inputs from Tech Mahindra Foundation. The impact map for SMART programme is given below. The evidence outcomes and the SROI calculations follow this impact map.

Table 6: Impact map for the SMART programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Input type of</th>
<th>Outputs Summary of activity</th>
<th>Outcomes Description of the change</th>
<th>Impact Long term change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth beneficiaries</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Trainees took admission for the SMART training</td>
<td>Improved skills level for employment</td>
<td>Reduced unemployment in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training conducted for Computer skills, Spoken English, Workplace Readiness, CRS,</td>
<td>Increased employability and access to desired employment opportunities for the trainees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased self-confidence, self-esteem and aspirations among trainees</td>
<td>Enhanced social and financial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Social Return on Investment Report (2007), Six Mary’s Place
Impact Assessment of SMART Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITES, Tally and other SMART / SMART+ / SMART-T courses. Exposure visits conducted</th>
<th>Improved personality in terms of conversation with people, dressing and facial expressions of trainees</th>
<th>status of trainee's family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainees have become financially independent</td>
<td>Improved wellbeing of family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees supporting their siblings or parents</td>
<td>Improved education status of family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in respect from the parents, friends, community members, neighbours and relatives.</td>
<td>Consideration as a role model in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased support for career development for girls and reduced pressure for marriage</td>
<td>Improved physical and mental health of family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainers</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Training of Trainers conducted at each location for trainers</th>
<th>Increased understanding of the course content and improved teaching methods</th>
<th>Improved teaching-learning environment in SMART training centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Partners</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Develop infrastructure for SMART centre</th>
<th>Assets created for the SMART centre</th>
<th>Increased efficiency and outreach of the organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.2 Evidencing outcome and giving them a value

Evidencing outcomes

The impact map has been validated during primary data collection phase and the outcomes have been evidenced based on the indicators observed. The outcomes are quantified based on the data collected from the online questionnaire and from the focus group discussions conducted across the selected SMART centers. The quantification of outcome is based on the percentage of trainees who have experienced the change and the total number of trainees passed out from the SMART training centers i.e. 87394 trainees between 2015-16 and 2019-20.

Some outcomes can last throughout a person’s life and some outcomes maybe short lived i.e. the outcomes lasts only as long as the activity lasts. For the purpose of this analysis, the visibility of the outcomes has been considered to be a maximum of 3 years. This is based on the assumption, that, the trainees will need to build new skillsets according to their job profile, advancement in technology and job market. It is further assumed that the trainees may learn or acquire new skills while they are employed or under any other training programme, thereby diminishing the relevance of the training provided through SMART.
Other impact assessment methodologies stop at identifying outcomes while SROI methodology goes beyond to value them and calculate the social value of impact.

**Table 7: Quantifying the outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidenced Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder: Youth Beneficiary (n</strong>= 87,394)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved skills level among students for employment</td>
<td>Change in level of skills for the students</td>
<td>87,394</td>
<td>100% respondents experienced improvement in skill set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self-confidence, self-esteem and aspirations among students</td>
<td>Change in confidence, self-esteem and aspirations among students</td>
<td>84,772</td>
<td>97% respondents responded ‘yes’ to the question “Did you observe an increase in confidence level?” in online survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved personality in terms of conversation with people, dressing and facial expressions of students</td>
<td>Change in personality of students</td>
<td>83,898</td>
<td>96% respondents responded ‘yes’ to the question “Did you observe an improvement in decision making skills?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased employability and access to desired employment opportunities for the students</td>
<td>Change in remuneration earned and change in job profile for the students</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>75% respondents have clearly expressed an increase in salary by providing salary details for ‘before training’ and ‘after training’ scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have become financially independent</td>
<td>Reduction in request for financial support from the parents or guardians</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>95% of the respondents have expressed that their family condition has improved after joining job, and they are able to contribute to the household expenses, able to fund the education of their siblings and invest in self growth or buy assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students supporting their siblings or parents</td>
<td>Students supporting their siblings for education</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in respect from the parents, friends, community, neighbours. Consideration as a role model in the community.</td>
<td>Number of youth from the same community joining the course taking reference from the alumni</td>
<td>34,957</td>
<td>40% of the respondents have expressed that they joined the course by taking reference from the alumni, such as family, friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increased understanding of the course content and improved teaching methods

Improved understanding of the course content and improved trainer-student engagement

On average 3 teachers/faculty have been assumed in each active center each year who would have undergone a ToT to upskill themselves.

Stakeholder: Implementation Partners

| Assets created for the SMART center | New infrastructure created for SMART training centers | 110 | Total number of new centers started between 2015-16 to 2019-20 |

Giving Value to an Outcome - Identifying Financial Proxies

The distinguishing aspect of SROI methodology, compared to other impact assessment methodologies, is the usage of financial proxies to value the outcome. This process of valuation is often referred to as monetization because we assign a monetary value to things that do not have market price. All the prices that we use in our day-to-day lives are approximations – ‘proxies’ – for the value that the buyer and the seller gain and lose in the transaction. Value is, in the end, are subjective. Identifying financial proxy for certain outcomes like monetary saving or increased income is straightforward; while for outcomes like, increase in confidence or attaining financial independence involves certain assumptions for assigning the monetary value. For example, to evidence that TMFs intervention results in increase in confidence, a similar scenario will have to be identified. Such as, equating this with individual attending a seminar or training session specifically focused on increasing confidence.

Table 8: Financial Proxies for monetizing the outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidenced Outcomes</th>
<th>Financial Proxy</th>
<th>Value (INR)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved skills level among students for employment</td>
<td>Tuition fees paid by the trainees for similar skills development course</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>Fees for similar courses shared by training partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self-confidence, self-esteem and aspirations among students.</td>
<td>Amount spent on confidence boosting course/sessions</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Cost of confidence building classes at <a href="http://www.priyawarrickfinishingschool.com/">www.priyawarrickfinishingschool.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved personality in terms of conversation with people, dressing and facial expressions of students</td>
<td>Fees for the personality development course</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Cost of personality development classes at <a href="http://www.priyawarrickfinishingschool.com/">www.priyawarrickfinishingschool.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased employability and access to desired employment opportunities for the students</td>
<td>Change in average annual remuneration earned per candidate in the first job after</td>
<td>1,25,208</td>
<td>Average of the difference in annual salary of respondents shared through the online survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Establishing impact

Post assigning of values to the outcome, the quantity of outcome that would and would not have taken place irrespective of the implementation of the programme is assessed. This is imperative to reduce the risk of over claiming the impact of the project and hence following four aspects are used (Figure 30). These components help to establish the credibility of impact calculation and identify measures to enhance the impact. All these aspects are generally expressed as percentages and these percentages are applied to the financial proxy of each outcome to arrive at the total impact for the outcome:
Each of the components have been explained below:

1. **Attribution**: It is the process of considering impact in isolation, that is independent of other projects operating in the same geographic area. In the Figure 31 below, the attribution to various stakeholders as per inputs from the primary beneficiary i.e. trainees, has been presented. Attribution was commonly collected for all outcomes.

   **Outcome attribution for SMART programme = 30%**

2. **Displacement**: It is the set of positive impacts on one stakeholder at the cost of a negative impact on another stakeholder. It was noted that few trainees who enrolled for the course were either working part-time or full-time and as per data collected from sample trainees few trainees were earning salary before joining the SMART classes. It was observed that some of these trainees experienced a decrease in their salary post completion of their course. Thus,

   ![Figure 30: Components of SROI](image)

   ![Figure 31: Attribution to various stakeholders as per inputs from the trainees](image)
Displacement for the SMART programme, for outcome “Increased employability and access to desired employment opportunities for the students” = 4%

For all other outcomes Displacement is 0%

3. **Deadweight**: It is an estimation of the social benefits that would have accrued anyway, even without the intervention. According to the trainees at sample locations, there was no other institute in their community that provided similar combination of courses at free of cost. As the target beneficiaries are from economically backward families, they could not have afforded private coaching classes. With this reasoning, we can assume that

**Deadweight for all outcomes = 0%**

4. **Drop-off**: It is the proportion of outcomes which are not sustained. It was assumed that the impact of training will last for 3 years. This is because, it is expected that the trainees will learn new skills as part of their employment/through training programmes. Besides, due to change in technology, market space and the skilling ecosystem (Qualification Packs for various trainings are updated every three years now), there will be changes in the requirement of skills from the trainees. Thus, the impact will be reduced gradually in 3 years.

**Drop-off for all outcomes of the SMART programme = 33% each year**

Considering the above parameters, the impact for each outcome is calculated with following formula:

\[ \text{Impact} = \text{Quantity of outcome} \times \text{Financial Proxy Value} \times \text{Attribution} - \text{Deadweight} - \text{Displacement} - \text{Drop-off for each year} \]

4.4 Calculating SROI

We are assuming that the outcomes of SMART will last for 3 years. The duration is calculated from the year of training. Thus, the outcome for trainees who passed out in 2015-16 batch will last till 2017-18. We have used inputs from 2015-2016 till 2019-2020, thus the projections are done till 2021-2022.

Detailed calculation for each outcome is provided below:

**Social Value:**

**Outcome 1: Improved skills level among students for employment**

**Assumption**: 100% respondents experienced improvement in skill set
Similar calculations have been undertaken for all the evidenced outcomes. The calculations are provided as Annexure 1.

**Total NPV of Social Value = INR 7,133,911,549.16**

**Investment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1) [n=14947]</td>
<td>141008207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2) [n=18107]</td>
<td>164969175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3) [n=18383]</td>
<td>253189400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4) [n=19018]</td>
<td>308967415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5) [n=16939]</td>
<td>373295692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>1023355039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SROI is a ratio of cumulative present value for each outcome against the total investment in the project.

\[
\text{SROI} = \frac{\text{Total NPV of social value}}{\text{NPV of investment}}
\]
Sensitivity Analysis on SROI

- If drop-off is reduced to 25% (from 33%) and attribution is kept constant at 30%, SROI increases to 9.21
- If drop-off is reduced to 20% (from 33%) attribution is kept constant at 30%, SROI increases to 11.82
- If drop-off is reduced to 20% (from 33%) attribution is increased to 37% (from 30%), SROI increases to 14.47**

**Note: A similar study was undertaken in 2015, for assessing the SROI of the SMART programme. The SROI was 13.29 at 20% drop-off and 37% attribution.
Chapter 5: Recommendations and Conclusion

The SMART programme is in-line with its vision to impart skills required by the market. Both employers and trainees appreciated the soft skills provided through the programme, in addition to the technical skills. The linkage between skills imparted and jobs in the market can be established through the placement percentage of the SMART programme, which stands at 86% (as per responses received through online survey). A summary of impact created by the programme is provided below:

*Figure 32: Summary of impact created by SMART programme*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rupees of social value is generated for each rupee invested*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average salary per month for SMART trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trainees are placed from SMART centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trainees continuing with the same job placed by SMART center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trainees experienced increase in confidence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Trainees received information about SMART from friends/family/relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spent per year by trainees on household goods &amp; supporting education of siblings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SROI increased to 11.82, if drop-off is reduced to 20% from 33%.

Also, *a similar study was undertaken in 2015, for assessing the SROI of the SMART programme. The SROI was 13.29 at 20% drop-off and 37% attribution. The SROI increases to 14.47, if drop-off and attribution are set to same value as 2015*

The performance of the SMART programme was measured using the IRECS framework in this report. A summary of the same is presented below:
Impact Assessment of SMART Programme

Performance of the Programme on IRECS:

In our view, one of the contributing factors to the strong performance of the programme is relationship between TMF and its implementation partners. Implementation partners (training partners) valued the support provided by TMF and its location managers in smooth delivery of trainings and ensuring positive learning experience for trainees. Some suggestions on further improving the value created by SMART programme are provided below:

Figure 34: Recommendations – additionality to the existing programme

- **Training for future jobs:** Additional sectors for imparting training can be identified based on the requirements of Industry 4.0.
- **Online training:** Online training modules, where possible (workplace readiness can be one course), can be provided to increase the reach of the programme. Also, online training modules can be provided for continuous learning and up-skilling for career progression.
- **Mobilization Strategy and tie-ups with schools:** National Education Policy (NEP) has mandated vocalization of school education. Therefore, schools can be used to mobilize trainees.
- **International placements:** Tie-ups with international agencies like The Welding Institute (TWI), UK for curriculum design, assessment and certification. This will ensure that trainees are awarded internationally recognized training certificates and will help in placing trainees in international market.
Annexure 1: Calculating monetary value of impact for each outcome

This annexure presents the calculations for measuring the monetary value of the impacts. It is a three-step process. In step 1, evidenced outcome is quantified – for the purpose of this report, quantification in undertaken by using the percentage of trainees who have experienced the said outcome. The percentage has been established through primary survey. In step 2, a financial proxy is assumed to convert the quantified outcome into a monetary value. In step 3, the monetized outcome is adjusted for attribution, deadweight, drop-off and displacement to get the monetary value of impact.

**Outcome 1: Improved skills level among students for employment**

**Assumption for quantification:** 100% respondents experienced improvement in skill set  
**Financial Proxy:** Cost of Tuition Fees for similar development course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1) [n=14947]</td>
<td>14947</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>144985900</td>
<td>43495770</td>
<td>43495770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2) [n=18107]</td>
<td>18107</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>175637900</td>
<td>52691370</td>
<td>81690000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3) [n=18383]</td>
<td>18383</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>178315100</td>
<td>53494530</td>
<td>103125356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4) [n=19018]</td>
<td>19018</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>184474600</td>
<td>55342380</td>
<td>108574486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5) [n=16939]</td>
<td>16939</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>164308300</td>
<td>49292490</td>
<td>104024331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021 (residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51314453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16434116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome 2: Increased self-confidence, self-esteem and aspirations among students.**

*Assumption for quantification:* 97% respondents responded ‘yes’ to the question “Did you observe an increase in confidence level?” in online survey

*Financial Proxy:* Cost of Confidence Boosting Course/sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*I) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1) [n=14947]</td>
<td>14499</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>260974620</td>
<td>78292386</td>
<td>78292386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2) [n=18107]</td>
<td>17564</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>316148220</td>
<td>94844466</td>
<td>147042000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3) [n=18383]</td>
<td>17832</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>320967180</td>
<td>96290154</td>
<td>185625641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4) [n=19018]</td>
<td>18447</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>332054280</td>
<td>99616284</td>
<td>195434075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5) [n=16939]</td>
<td>16431</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>295754940</td>
<td>88726482</td>
<td>187243796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021 (residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92366015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29581409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 3: Improved personality in terms of conversation with people, dressing and facial expressions of students.**

*Assumption for quantification:* 96% respondents responded ‘yes’ to the question “Did you observe an improvement in decision making skills?”

*Financial Proxy:* Fee of similar personality development Course/sessions
### Outcome 4: Increased employability and access to desired employment opportunities for the students

**Assumption for quantification:** 75% respondents have clearly expressed an increase in salary by providing salary details for 'before training' and 'after training' scenarios

**Financial Proxy:** Change in average annual remuneration earned per trainee in the first job after completion of the training

**Displacement:** 4% respondents experienced a decrease in salary by providing salary details for 'before training' and 'after training'. Annual decrease in remuneration experienced is INR 66120 per trainee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*I) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1) [n=14947]</td>
<td>14349</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>258284160</td>
<td>77485248</td>
<td>77485248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2) [n=18107]</td>
<td>17383</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>312888960</td>
<td>93866688</td>
<td>145526103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3) [n=18383]</td>
<td>17648</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>317658240</td>
<td>95297472</td>
<td>183711975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4) [n=19018]</td>
<td>18257</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>328631040</td>
<td>98589312</td>
<td>193419290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5) [n=16939]</td>
<td>16261</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>292705920</td>
<td>87811776</td>
<td>185313447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021 (residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91413788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29276446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 5: Students have become financially independent

Assumption for quantification: 95% of the respondents have expressed that their family condition has improved after joining job, and they are able to contribute to the household expenses, able to fund the education of their siblings and invest in self growth or buy assets.

Financial Proxy: Amount spent on goods purchase for household consumption, etc. in a year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Displacement (D= 4% of n*66120)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*(I-D)) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>11210</td>
<td>125208</td>
<td>1403612982</td>
<td>39531826</td>
<td>409224347</td>
<td>409224347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y1)</td>
<td>[n=14947]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>13580</td>
<td>125208</td>
<td>1700355942</td>
<td>47889394</td>
<td>495739965</td>
<td>768569837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y2)</td>
<td>[n=18107]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>13787</td>
<td>125208</td>
<td>1726273998</td>
<td>48619358</td>
<td>503296392</td>
<td>970241623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y3)</td>
<td>[n=18383]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>14264</td>
<td>125208</td>
<td>1785904308</td>
<td>50298806</td>
<td>520681650</td>
<td>1021509059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y4)</td>
<td>[n=19018]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>12704</td>
<td>125208</td>
<td>1590673734</td>
<td>44800267</td>
<td>463762040</td>
<td>978699513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y5)</td>
<td>[n=16939]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>482785414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154618264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Outcome 6: Students supporting their siblings or parents
Assumption for quantification: 95% of the respondents have expressed that they contribute to course fees for tuition class of a sibling
Financial Proxy: Annual course fees paid for tuition class of a sibling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*I) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1) [n=14947]</td>
<td>14200</td>
<td>11674</td>
<td>165766714</td>
<td>49730014</td>
<td>49730014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2) [n=18107]</td>
<td>17202</td>
<td>11674</td>
<td>200812062</td>
<td>60243619</td>
<td>93398619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3) [n=18383]</td>
<td>17464</td>
<td>11674</td>
<td>203872985</td>
<td>61161895</td>
<td>117906303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4) [n=19018]</td>
<td>18067</td>
<td>11674</td>
<td>210915325</td>
<td>63274598</td>
<td>124136456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5) [n=16939]</td>
<td>16092</td>
<td>11674</td>
<td>187858592</td>
<td>56357578</td>
<td>118934128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021 (residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58669348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18789616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*I) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1) [n=14947]</td>
<td>14200</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>85197900</td>
<td>25559370</td>
<td>25559370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2) [n=18107]</td>
<td>17202</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>103209900</td>
<td>30962970</td>
<td>48003402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3) [n=18383]</td>
<td>17464</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>104783100</td>
<td>31434930</td>
<td>60599436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4) [n=19018]</td>
<td>18067</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>108402600</td>
<td>32520780</td>
<td>63801502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5) [n=16939]</td>
<td>16092</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>96552300</td>
<td>28965690</td>
<td>61127700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021 (residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30153854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9657161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 7: Increase in respect from the parents, friends, community, neighbours. Consideration as a role model in the community.

Assumption for quantification: 40% of the respondents have expressed that they joined the course by taking reference from the alumni, such as family, friends.

Financial Proxy: Cost of community mobilization per student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*I) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1)</td>
<td>5979</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>4271189</td>
<td>1281357</td>
<td>1281357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n=14947]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2)</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>5174177</td>
<td>1552253</td>
<td>2406533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n=18107]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3)</td>
<td>7353</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>5253045</td>
<td>1575914</td>
<td>3038005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n=18383]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4)</td>
<td>7607</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>5434500</td>
<td>1630350</td>
<td>3198533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n=19018]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5)</td>
<td>6776</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>4840414</td>
<td>1452124</td>
<td>3064488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n=16939]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1511690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>484138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 8: Increased understanding of the course content and improved teaching methods

Assumption for quantification: On an average 3 teachers/faculty have been assumed in each active center each year who would have undergone a ToT to upskill themselves.

Financial Proxy: Fees paid for the ToT course
**Outcome 9: Assets created for the SMART center**

Assumption for quantification: Total number of new centers started between 2015-16 to 2019-20.

Financial Proxy: Average cost of setting up a lab in the center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity (Qty)</th>
<th>Financial Proxy (FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Impact (I= Qty*FP) (INR)</th>
<th>Attributed Impact (30%*I) (INR)</th>
<th>Social Value (impact of current year + impact after drop-off from previous year) (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>4320000</td>
<td>4320000</td>
<td>4320000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[n=120]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>6156000</td>
<td>6156000</td>
<td>9036144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[n=171]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>8100000</td>
<td>8100000</td>
<td>13644493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[n=225]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>8208000</td>
<td>8208000</td>
<td>15660680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[n=228]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>9072000</td>
<td>9072000</td>
<td>17244814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[n=252]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021 (residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8784850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022 (residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3024605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative impact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Impact (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (Y1)</td>
<td>714,688,491.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (Y2)</td>
<td>1,338,990,147.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018 (Y3)</td>
<td>1,698,462,067.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 (Y4)</td>
<td>1,777,103,660.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020 (Y5)</td>
<td>1,700,888,502.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>837,318,070.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(residual impact from Y4 and Y5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>268,767,135.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(residual impact from Y5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPV of the Impact = **INR 7,133,911,549.16**
Annexure 2: Data collection tools

Checklist for Focus Group Discussion - Trainees

Date: 
Center: 
Location:  
(Please fill the attendance sheet)

**Project overview**

1. What is the name of the area you are staying in? (assess approximate distance from residence to center)

2. What are the key skills required to access employment in the area?

3. What are the skills shortages that you are aware of in the area?

4. Which subjects have you studied as part of the course?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you think there should be other courses/subjects apart from the ongoing courses? Specify:

6. What are other training options (other institutes and courses) available in your area?

7. How is SMART different than other training providers?

8. What was your profession before joining SMART training programme?  
   *if trainee was employed before enrolling at SMART, ask for increase in their salary - in percentage terms – because of the training provided by SMART*

9. Who informed you about the SMART programme? Why did you join SMART training?

10. What selection process did you go through to be a part of this training programme?

11. What was the total number of trainees enrolled in your batch? How many candidates dropped out of the courses? What are the key reasons for dropout?

12. What is your feedback / recommendations on the programme?  
   - Registration for the programme
• What was the reaction from your family / relatives / neighbor after registering for the training?
• Infrastructure facilities at the center (specially for girls / differently abled)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair ramp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually impaired track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Facilities for differently abled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Course outline / curriculum
• Training material / Books / CDs
• Trainers
• Teaching methods
• Exposure visits / practical experience
• Soft skills / personality development classes
• Examination process
• Placement support
• Preparation for the interview
• After placement support
• Alumni network

13. Has any of the trainees started their own business using skills acquired from training? (collect contact details) <only applicable to SMART - T>

14. What major benefits have you received from the project? How do you notice this benefit? (Rank the benefits - write the most important benefit first)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Benefit/Change</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Approximately Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What is the impact on your family members?
16. Have you observed any negative impact of the project on any one in the community? (Loss of job / business / health / opportunity / etc.)

17. Please tell us the 3 things you like the most about SMART programme
   a. 
b.
c.

18. Please tell us the 3 things which you don't like about SMART programme
   a.
   b.
   c.

19. Please tell us 3 things to improve this programme
   a.
   b.
   c.

20. Thinking about the improvement in economic circumstances, if you had 10 points to distribute between the following parties, how much of the value created would you attribute to each?
   
   In percentage (%)
Thank you for agreeing to provide feedback about the SMART Programme! This questionnaire is designed to collect your educational, social and economic information. We want to understand the changes you observed in your life after attending the SMART programme and your feedback on the SMART programme. Your answers are voluntary and confidential. The information that you provide will be analyzed collectively and not linked to your name. We request you to provide correct information for all questions as per your understanding.

Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start with the survey now by clicking on the Continue button below.

✱ - Compulsory Question

**Part A - General Details**

1. ✱ First Name
2. ✱ Last Name
3. ✱ TMF Trainee ID
4. ✱ Date of Birth (Month/Day/Year)
5. ✱ Gender
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other
6. ✱ Marital Status
   - Single or Never married
   - Married
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
7. ✱ Mobile Number
8. ✱ Educational Status
   - Up to 10th Class
   - Up to 12th Class
   - Incomplete Graduation
   - Graduation
   - Post-Graduation
   - ITI
   - Diploma
   - Other
9. ✱ Location where you attended the training programme (Branching Question)
   - Bengaluru
   - Bhubaneshwar
   - Chandigarh
   - Delhi – NCR
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- Hyderabad
- Kolkata
- Mumbai
- Nagpur
- Pune
- Vishakhapatnam

- Please select the name of the center in Bengaluru
  - Shishu Mandir
  - BREADS
  - APD
  - RAZA
  - LIST
  - Enable India
  - Nirmal Jyothi
  - Loyola ITI
  - SA-MUDRA
  - iPRIMED Education Solutions PVT LTD
  - REVA University
  - Samarthanam Trust for the Disabled
  - Narayana Hrudayalaya

- Please select the name of the center in Bhubaneshwar
  - Aarohan
  - Shusrusa
  - Ruchika
  - Y4J Smart +
  - Upasana
  - Gram Tarang

- Please select the name of the center in Chandigarh
  - Sarthak
  - RCED
  - BTGT
  - SAFAL TRUST

- Please select the name of the center in Chennai
  - DBV
  - Aide-et-Action
  - YWCA of Madras
  - Youth4Jobs
  - THE MA FOI FOUNDATION
  - V-Excel
  - SEESHA
  - FHSM
  - Valliappa Foundation
  - KVF
  - MFET
- Please select the name of the center in Delhi
  - SMART Academy
  - Agrasar
  - Ank
  - SPID
  - DITE
  - Grey Sim
  - BVD
  - Sharda
  - Pratigya
  - We the People
  - Tarraqi I Foundation
  - Maxvision
  - SSS
  - Basic Foundation
  - RISE India / POSSIT
  - Ingraham
  - ACF
  - JOSH
  - BALIGA
  - NDS
  - SOFIA

- Please select the name of the center in Hyderabad
  - Yugantar
  - APSA
  - CADRE
  - Nirmaya Trust
  - SAFA Society
  - Nirmaan Organization
  - Deaf EnAbled Foundation
  - Central Institute of Tool Design [CITD]
  - LVPEI
  - Bollineni Medskills
  - HCHW
  - Involute
  - Abhinav Social Trust
  - Ashritha Skill Foundation

- Please select the name of the center in Kolkata
  - RIT
  - LMSS
  - DBTS
  - DBTI
  - Ramakrishna Mission
  - NSHM
  - TOMORROW'S FOUNDATION
  - Peerless Skill Academy
• Please select the name of the center in Mumbai
  o SNEHA
  o TRRAIN
  o NRI
  o DEEDS
  o GSF
  o SAPREM
  o UDYOGINI
  o SHIELD
  o Sambhav
  o Gothi Charitable Trust
  o Sahayini
  o Helen Keller
  o Manipal Foundation
  o SUJAYA FOUNDATION
  o SIES
  o Navjeevan Lokvikas Sanstha
  o JAILAXMI EDUCATION SOCIETY
  o Faith Foundation

• Please select the name of the center in Nagpur
  o LIFE
  o INDUCTUS FOUNDATION
  o Samaj Vikas Sanstha
  o GRAMODAY SANGH BHADRAWATI
  o Gramin Manav Sansadhan

• Please select the name of the center in Pune
  o DGS
  o Maratha Shikshan Parishad
  o TBMSG
  o PIF
  o Nirman
  o SNDT
  o Ankur Vidyamandir

• Please select the name of the center in Visakhapatnam
  o Nirman
  o BCT
  o CITD

10. ※Distance between your house and the training center you attended
  o Less than 2 km
  o 2 km - 4 km
  o 5 km - 8 km
  o 9 km - 11 km
  o More than 12 km
11. ✱ What was your Job/Business before joining Training Center
   o Temporary Job
   o Permanent job
   o Self-Employed
   o Unemployed
   o Trainee
   o Other

12. ✱ What was your monthly salary before joining the course

13. ✱ Do you have a SMART phone?
   o Yes
   o No

14. ✱ Which course did you attend along with Basic IT, WPR and English Course. Please select
    minimum one alternative and maximum three alternatives from the following (Multi select)
   o CRS
   o Hospitality
   o ITES/BPO
   o Office Administration
   o Tally
   o Automobile Civil Works
   o CNC Machine
   o Electrician Welding
   o Fitter and Maintenance
   o AC and Refrigeration
   o Other

15. ✱ Year in which training programme was/is attended
   o 2014
   o 2015
   o 2016
   o 2017
   o 2018
   o 2019

16. ✱ How did you come to know about training center? (Multi select)
   o Newspaper
   o Radio
   o Internet
   o Center Event
   o Pamphlets
   o Survey/Mobilization
   o Friends/Relatives/Family member
   o Other (Mention the source)

17. ✱ Did the training help you to earn income?
Rate your experience at Training Center (On the scale of 1-5 where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent)
1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent

18. ✱ Registration Process - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

- ✱ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Registration Process (Multi select)
  o Ease in Registration
  o Mobilization
  o Guidance
  o Documents Required
  o Information Taken
  o Updates on the Status of Application
  o Time Taken
  o Scope for Feedback
  o Other

- Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Registration Process

19. ✱ Infrastructure facilities (Center, Classroom, Laboratories, Security etc.) Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

- ✱ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Infrastructure facilities (Multi select)
  o ICT Enabled - Modern and Updated
  o Hygienic - Clean/Well -Maintained
  o Trainee to Facility Ratio
  o Access to Entry/Exit of Center
  o Well ventilated
  o Other

- Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Infrastructural Facilities

20. ✱ Training Material/Books/CDs - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

- ✱ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Training Material/Books/CDs (Multi select)
  o ICT Enabled
  o Easy to understand
  o Availability in Regional Language
  o Precise and Comprehensive Quality of Books
  o Quality of content of Lessons and Audio/Video
  o Alignment to Preferred Job
  o Other
• Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Training Material/Books/CDs

21. ∗ Exposure Visits/Events - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

• ∗ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Exposure Visits/Events (Multi select)
  o Venue Duration
  o Transportation Facility
  o Information/Knowledge Imparted
  o Opportunity to interact with Industrial Players
  o Other

• Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Exposure Visits/Events

22. ∗ Trainer/Teacher - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

• ∗ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Trainer/Teacher (Multi select)
  o Concept Clarity
  o Punctuality
  o Ability to Clarify Doubt
  o Ability to Manage the class
  o Patience
  o Other

• Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Trainer/Teacher

23. ∗ Teaching Methods - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

• ∗ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Teaching Methods (Multi select)
  o Use of Audio/Visual Means
  o Practical and Theoretical Mix
  o Encourage Participation of Trainee
  o Maintains Learning Environment in Classroom
  o Other

• Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Teaching Methods

24. ∗ Examination Process - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

• ∗ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Examination Process (Multi select)
  o Process
  o Duration
  o Infrastructure and Facility Provided
  o Relevance of Exam to the job/skill
  o Marking Scheme
  o Clarity in Syllabus
  o Proportion of theoretical and practical mix
• Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Examination process

25. ★ Training programme structure (For example – duration of the course, activities undertaken in classroom, assignments given) - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

• ★ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Training programme structure (Multi select)
  o Duration of the Course
  o Structure of the Information given in Lessons
  o Activities undertaken in Classroom
  o Assignments given
  o Other

• Please give your improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Training programme structure

26. ★ Training programme content (For example - information given in the books, text and images in books, visual and video/audio presentation in classroom) - Rating (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)

• ★ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding Training programme content (Multi select)
  o Lessons given in the Books/Text
  o Visuals in Books
  o Video/Audio presentation in Classroom
  o Other

• Please give your any improvement suggestions/feedback regarding Training programme content

27. ★ Have you received Completion Certification
  o Yes
  o No
  o Not Yet

28. ★ Please specify when did you receive the training completion certificate
  o Month
  o Year

Part B - Post Training Completion Details

29. ★ Did you join job after receiving training from SMART?
  o Yes
  o No, Waiting for Placement
  o Not Applicable - Opted Out
Please share the reason for opting out
- Self Employment
- Other

30. ✳ Please specify when did you receive the placement
- Month
- Year

31. ✳ Did you have to wait after the training was over to get a placement?
- Yes
- No

✳ How many days did you have to wait? (Example - 7 days, 15 days, 30 days etc.)

Rate your experience at Training Center (On the scale of 1-5 where 1 is poor and 5 is Excellent)
1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent

32. ✳ Rate your experience on the support given by the Training Center after the training was over and before you were placed or before you started your own business (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)
- ✳ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding experience on the support given by the Training Center (Multi select)
  - Support through Counseling
  - Help in finding Placement/Setting up Business
  - Provided Information regarding Jobs
  - Other
- Please give any improvement suggestions/feedback regarding your experience on the support given by the Training Center

33. ✳ Rate your experience on the support given by the Training Center in getting you a placement/starting your own business (1-Poor; 2-Okay; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent)
- ✳ Please State the reason for your above scoring regarding your experience on the support given by the Training Center (Multi select)
  - Helped find a Placement/Start business
  - Negotiated Salary
  - Helped find job that Matched Skill
  - Helped find investor for starting business
  - Other
- Please give any improvement suggestions/feedback regarding your experience on the support given by the Training Center

34. ✳ Are you satisfied with respect to placement/start of your own business
- Yes
- No
Impact Assessment of SMART Programme

- Not Applicable
  - Please share your reason for the above response

35. ✺ Are you satisfied with the Job Profile
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Applicable
  - Please share your reason for the above response

36. ✺ Are you satisfied with Salary/Income generated
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Applicable
  - Please share your reason for the above response

37. ✺ What is your Current job after training at Center
   - Temporary Job
   - Permanent job
   - Self-Employed
   - Unemployed
   - Trainee
   - Other

38. ✺ What is your current Monthly Income?

39. ✺ Have you continued in same job and company /business
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Applicable
  - ✺ Please specify the number of months after which you left the job.

Part C - Others

40. ✺ Are you part of Centre led Trainee Alumni Group (formal group of people who have finished their course at the Training Center)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Applicable in case there is no Alumnus Group at your center
  - ✺ What is the Name of Trainee Alumni Group

  - ✺ What is the medium of joining/connecting with the Alumni Group (Multi select)
    - WhatsApp Group
    - Facebook
Impact Assessment of SMART Programme

41. ✱ Are you part of any other Pass Out trainee’s network (Example – Deaf Club)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Applicable in case there is no Pass Out Trainees network

- ✱ What is the Name of Pass Out Trainee’s network
- ✱ What is the medium of joining/connecting with the Pass Out trainee’s network (Multi select)
  - WhatsApp Group
  - Facebook
  - Center Based
  - Other

**Improvements observed in self after attending training programme**

42. ✱ Did you observe an Increase in your confidence level
   - Yes
   - No
   - Cannot Say

- ✱ Please share the areas where you have felt increase in confidence (Multi select)
  - Able to communicate with people
  - Able to travel alone
  - Able to manage finances
  - Take decisions
  - Other

43. ✱ Did you observe an improvement in your decision-making ability
   - Yes
   - No
   - Cannot Say

- ✱ Please share the areas where you have felt Improvement in your decision-making ability (Multi select)
  - Able to take decisions related to self
  - Able to take decisions related to family/siblings
  - Able to decide where to invest the salary
  - Other

44. ✱ Did you observe an Increase in respect from community members
   - Yes
   - No
   - Cannot Say
• ✧ Please share the areas where you have observed an Increase in respect from community members (Multi select)
  o Society looks up to you
  o Comes to you for suggestions/recommendations
  o Other

45. Did your family’s financial condition improve after joining the job?
  o Yes
  o No

• Please share examples to support the above answer

46. ✧ Do you think SMART Centers made any change in your community?
  o Yes
  o No

• Please share your reasons for the above response

Thank you for your time. Please click the below button to submit your response
Questionnaire for Trainers

General:

Name of the Trainer:
Name of the Center:
Courses taught:
Qualification of the Trainer:

1. Please specify since when have you been associated with the SMART center? Where were you working before?

Train the trainer (ToT) trainings:

2. Have you been provided any ToT under the SMART program? If yes, please specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the ToT</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Duration and Frequency</th>
<th>Feedback on the training – content and training methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify any trainings you have attended apart from those under SMART programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the ToT</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Organizing Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify if you think any additional trainings to the trainers are required.

3. Please specify how the learnings from the ToT were implemented in the class

Course delivery:

4. Please provide feedback on course curriculum (Example - Guidelines of the chapters, the intended knowledge, attitude, behavior, manner, performance and skills that are imparted or inculcated in the trainee through the training, the teaching methods, lessons, assignments, exercises, activities, projects, learning objectives of the trainings).

5. Please provide feedback on course content (Example: Chapters, text and images in the books, documents and presentations shown in the classroom, intended message of each lesson, designing of the course as per the target audience)
6. Please provide feedback on pedagogy (The method of teaching in the class, through a mix of theoretical and practical input, audio visual means, trainee interaction etc.)

7. Please provide feedback on the process of executing the SMART programme

8. Please elaborate on the evaluation methodology used for assessing the trainees.

9. Please specify the records and documents maintained at the classroom level and at the center level.

10. Please elaborate on your role in community mobilization

11. Please elaborate on your role in placements [only for Centre Manager]

12. Any other feedback or comment on the programme?
Questionnaire for Employers

Name and Designation of the Respondent:
Name of the Organisation:
Location:
Name of reference SMART Centre:

1. Please specify the TMF Centre and course from which the employees were hired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Course</th>
<th>Name of Centre</th>
<th>Number of candidates recruited</th>
<th>Position for which hiring was undertaken</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Year/Month of hiring</th>
<th>Are candidates still employed (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are you happy with the performance of the employees hired from SMART (Y/N)?
   Please specify the reasons.

3. How do you compare the performance of employees hired from SMART centers with other employees at their level trained internally, at other TMF centers, or by other training agencies?

4. Where do you hire your employees from (other than SMART centers)?

5. Would you recommend hiring from TMF to other employers?

6. Would you hire from TMF again?

7. What are the areas for future hiring?

8. What changes do you suggest in the curriculum (soft skills or technical skills)?

9. How did you come to know about TMF?

10. What is the recruitment process?

11. Can you share your experience of recruiting from TMF?
12. Was there any facilitation from TMF with regard to support in the admin process and the background checks?

13. Would you like to suggest any improvements in recruitment process?

14. Any other comments:
In-depth interview checklist - TMF staff

A. Programme design and planning

- Objectives of SMART – ‘enabling children from the underprivileged and socio-economically marginalised strata to optimise their full potential’
  - empowering through education and employability
  - create a more equitable and inclusive society
  - social inclusion and integration

- Theory of change – (KPMG team will design this with TMF team)

- Design of programme to address prevailing challenges like:
  - continuously changing skills demand by the industry
  - inadequate employment opportunities for differently abled
  - social negligence on technical education for the girls
  - enhancing soft skills for the youth from underprivileged communities within 3/6 months course, etc.

- Guidelines / Criteria for selecting implementation partners
  - Beneficiary selection criteria
  - Terms and conditions mentioned in the MoU
  - SMART centre location (surrounding community)
  - Basic infrastructure
  - fees – subsidising from various funding sources
  - experience
  - Trainee assessment framework – measuring change in skills

- Standard operating processes for implementation partners

- Orientation and training programme for implementation partners and trainers

- Funding model
  - provisions for contingencies
  - accounting and financial management guidelines
  - IT requirements for accounting – Tally
  - Financial sustainability of the model – identify opportunity to sustain

- Monitoring and evaluation framework
  - MIS – indicators identified
  - Milestones for the programme – quarterly / annual / long term
  - Log frame
  - Evaluations design – frequency of evaluation by internal and external agencies
  - Reporting frequency for partners
  - publications by TMF

- Trainee assessment framework
  - Who designs the assessment framework?
If it is designed by TMF, what say do the implementation agencies have on the assessment format?

What is the purpose of assessment?
- Academic assessment
- Professional skills assessment
- Job preparedness
- All the above

Risk identification and mitigation plan

**B. Organizational Capacity**

The organisation capacity assessment will be done at TMF level only.

- SMART organisation structure– management and monitoring
  - roles and responsibilities defined for each level
- Reporting structure
- Training programmes conducted in last 3 years
- Hiring process, sample job descriptions
- Prior experience of TMF in skills development – Satyam Foundation
- Human resources – number, qualification, experience, skills development planning
- Ability to mitigate issues in the absence of person with authority
- Ability to use management information system for communication with key stakeholders

**C. Processes**

- Identify best practices in the industry for similar programme
- Benchmark the SMART programme against the best practices followed for processes in the industry
- Method of orienting the stakeholders for following defined processes
- Documentation of processes for
  - Recruitment
  - Accounting
  - Monitoring
  - Periodic reviews, etc.
- Applicability to scale up
Community mobilization

Method of communication to key stakeholders

D. Programme Implementation

- Communication with potential implementation partners
- Process of proposal evaluation
- Process of on boarding implementation partners
- Inclusion and active participation of key stakeholders
- Modification of implementation guidelines considering sensitivity of local community (e.g. thrust on course / trade)
- Use of technology solutions
- Use of existing resources with the implementation partner
- Sharing of learnings by the implementation staff with the colleagues and programme design team for replicability and scalability of the programme
- Has there been a significant change in design of SMART / SMART+ / SMART T since inception? Why?
- Adherence to accounting and financial management guidelines. Were the internal and external audits done for last year for all partners?
- Utilization of funds in each quarter
- Updates on weekly / monthly / quarterly meetings
- Record of incidences of unanticipated risks and their mitigation measures
- Existing measures to sustain the programme for continuity of implementation after TMF support