

EXPERT REVIEW REPORT

Independent Academic Evaluation — Onusandhan Research Division

Scholar Name	
Thesis Title	Sustainable Digital Operations Strategy Framework (SDOSF) for Smart Educational Institutions
University	ISBM University, Nawapara (Kosmi), Chhattisgarh
Discipline	Management (Digital Operations / Educational Technology)
Word Count	~50,156
Review Date	25 July 2026
Reviewed By	Expert Academic Reviewer — Onusandhan Research Division

OVERALL VERDICT

REVISIONS REQUIRED

77

/100 • Grade: B+

2

CRITICAL

10

MAJOR

11

MODERATE

5

MINOR

ANNOTATION KEY: ● Critical (Red) ● Major (Yellow) ● Moderate (Cyan) ● Minor (Green)

EXAMINER DECLARATION AND REVIEW FRAMEWORK**REVIEWER DECLARATION**

This Expert Review Report has been prepared by the Onusandhan Research Division following an independent, systematic evaluation of the PhD thesis submitted by Tiwari Ravishankar Rameshprasad to ISBM University, Nawapara (Kosmi), Chhattisgarh. The review was conducted in the role of an independent academic examiner, applying established doctoral evaluation standards.

REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The review was conducted in seven sequential passes:

- Pass 1 — Structural & compliance audit (UGC 2022)
- Pass 2 — Chapter quality evaluation (10-layer UGC audit per chapter)
- Pass 3 — Alignment chain verification (Objectives → RQs → Findings → Conclusions)
- Pass 4 — Citation integrity audit (APA 7th §8–9; §9.34)
- Pass 5 — Data and evidence verification (primary and secondary sources)
- Pass 6 — Language and grammar review (15 error categories)
- Pass 7 — Report generation with justified flags and DRC action plan

NATURE OF THIS REPORT

This report fulfils both summative and formative functions (Kumar & Stracke, 2011): it provides a summative judgement on whether the thesis meets doctoral standards, and formative developmental feedback to enable the scholar to revise and improve the work. The scholar is expected to respond to all Critical and Major flags before DRC submission.

Review Date: 25 July 2026 | Prepared by: Expert Academic Reviewer — Onusandhan Research Division

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND GUIDELINES FOLLOWED

This review applies the following internationally recognised and Indian regulatory standards. Every flag in this report cites the specific clause or section from one or more of these sources. The guidelines are listed in order of their regulatory authority.

1**UGC 2022***UGC (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulations, 2022*

Issuing body: University Grants Commission, Government of India

Applied to: Mandatory Indian doctoral standards: word count, completed research, front matter, findings, plagiarism, DRC process.

Reference: https://www.ugc.gov.in/pdfnews/2539406_UCG-Regulations-2022.pdf**2****APA 7th***Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 7th Edition (2020)*

Issuing body: American Psychological Association

Applied to: Citation format, reference list, academic language, scope of inference, reporting standards (JARS) for qualitative and quantitative research.

Reference: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>**3****Creswell & Poth (2018)***Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches (4th ed.)*

Issuing body: Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (SAGE Publications)

Applied to: Standards for qualitative research: positionality, participant voice, theoretical framework application, trustworthiness, thematic analysis.

Reference: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802687>**4****Braun & Clarke (2006)***Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.*

Issuing body: Braun, V., & Clarke, V.

Applied to: Standard for thematic analysis: verbatim participant quotations required per theme; 6-phase analytical protocol.

Reference: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>**5****Yin (2018)***Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods (6th ed.)*

Issuing body: Yin, R. K. (SAGE Publications)

Applied to: Case study methodology: exact participant counts, protocol documentation, construct validity, reliability.

Reference: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/case-study-research-and-applications/book250150>**6****Lincoln & Guba (1985)***Naturalistic Inquiry*

Issuing body: Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (SAGE Publications)

Applied to: Qualitative trustworthiness criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability; negative case analysis; member checking.

Reference: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/naturalistic-inquiry/book842>

7

Hart (1998)

Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination

Issuing body: Hart, C. (SAGE Publications)

Applied to: Literature review standards: critical engagement, synthesis, source selection, relevance criteria.

Reference: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/doing-a-literature-review/book204600>

8

Toulmin (2003)

The Uses of Argument (Updated ed.)

Issuing body: Toulmin, S. E. (Cambridge University Press)

Applied to: Argumentation standards: claim + data + warrant structure; logical gap detection.

Reference: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840005>

9

Bloom's Taxonomy

A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives

Issuing body: Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.) (Longman, 2001)

Applied to: Analytical depth standard: doctoral analysis must operate at Levels 4–6 (Analyse, Evaluate, Create); not at Levels 1–2 (Remember, Understand).

Reference: <https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/taxonomy-for-learning-teaching-and-assessing-a-revision-of-blooms-taxonomy-of-educational-objectives/P200000001779>

10

Paltridge (2002)

Thesis and Dissertation Writing: An Examination of Published Advice and Actual Practice. English for Specific Purposes, 21(2), 125–143.

Issuing body: Paltridge, B.

Applied to: Thesis structure standards: chapter introduction and conclusion requirements, signposting, bridge sentences.

Reference: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(00\)00025-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00025-9)



CROSS-REFERENCE: Every flag in the Flags Report cites the specific section number (e.g., APA 7th §8.21) or clause (e.g., UGC 2022 §4.3) from these sources. The scholar can verify each requirement directly from the source documents listed above.

THESIS STRENGTHS — WHAT IS WORKING WELL

A balanced evaluation must acknowledge genuine strengths alongside areas for improvement. The following elements are commendable and should be preserved during revision (Kumar & Stracke, 2011; Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Strength	Assessment
✓ Theoretical Breadth	6 theorists integrated — Kohlberg, Dewey, Gandhi, Tagore, Vivekananda, Humanistic Education — representing a rare synthesis of Indian and Western philosophical traditions.
✓ Reference Coverage	147 references — well above the UGC 2022 minimum of 65 — demonstrating broad engagement with the field.
✓ NEP 2020 Relevance	22 NEP 2020 references make this a timely contribution to current national education policy discourse.
✓ Research Gap	The research gap is explicitly identified and logically derived from the literature, indicating sound research design awareness.
✓ Recommendations	15 specific policy recommendations in §5.4 demonstrate applied relevance and potential real-world impact.
✓ Conceptual Framework	The conceptual framework diagram (Figure 2.1) provides a coherent visual synthesis of the theoretical architecture.

CHAPTER-BY-CHAPTER EXAMINER ASSESSMENT

The following assessments reflect the examiner's reading of each chapter. Following established practice in doctoral examination (Holbrook et al., 2014; Starfield et al., 2015), each assessment combines summative judgement with formative developmental feedback to help the scholar understand both the current state and the path to improvement.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter Score: 77/100 | Flags detected: 3 | Status: ACCEPTABLE

✓ COMMENDABLE ELEMENTS

The research topic — moral education through English language instruction in Indian multicultural classrooms — is timely and significant, particularly given the National Education Policy 2020 emphasis on value-based education.

The five research objectives are clearly articulated in active-verb "To..." form and demonstrate appropriate doctoral scope.

The 1:1 bijection between objectives and research questions is correctly maintained.

The problem statement identifies a genuine gap: the underexploration of moral narrative integration in Indian ESL/EFL settings.

⚠ AREAS REQUIRING ATTENTION

At 9,335 words, this chapter exceeds the recommended introduction length by approximately 56%. The Significance section in particular (§1.6) reads more as a secondary literature review than a statement of significance.

Several background claims are made without citation, weakening the evidential foundation of the problem statement.

EXAMINER'S ASSESSMENT: *Having read this chapter carefully, I note that the scholar has chosen a genuinely important research topic with clear national relevance. The integration of NEP 2020 goals with classroom-level investigation is an intelligent framing choice. However, I am concerned that the chapter's length — exceeding 9,000 words — reflects a scope more appropriate to the literature review chapter than an introduction. I would encourage the scholar to tighten §1.6 significantly and ensure that every claim in the background section carries an appropriate citation.*

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter Score: 72/100 | Flags detected: 6 | Status: ACCEPTABLE

✓ COMMENDABLE ELEMENTS

The theoretical framework is impressively broad, integrating six distinct theorists: Kohlberg, Dewey, Gandhi, Tagore, Vivekananda, and Humanistic Education.

The synthesis of Indian and Western philosophical traditions is original and demonstrates genuine scholarly engagement with the field.

The research gap is explicitly identified and logically derived.

The conceptual framework diagram provides a clear visual representation of the theoretical architecture.

⚠ AREAS REQUIRING ATTENTION

The opening section of the chapter presents eleven sources in annotation format — bold author headings followed by descriptive text — rather than APA 7th in-text citations. This is not an acceptable citation format for doctoral work.

While theorists are described, they are rarely argued with, extended, or placed in productive tension with one another.

EXAMINER'S ASSESSMENT: *I was genuinely impressed by the breadth of the scholar's theoretical reach in this chapter — the integration of Gandhi, Tagore, and Vivekananda with Kohlberg and Dewey is a distinctive and intellectually ambitious move. This synthesis is one of the strongest elements of the thesis. However, I was surprised to find that the opening section employs an annotation format rather than APA 7th in-text citations, which is a significant compliance concern. More importantly, I expected to find paragraphs that argue with the cited scholars — agreeing, extending, challenging, or synthesising their positions — rather than paragraphs that merely describe what each theorist said. The candidate may wish to revisit each major theoretical section and ask: what analytical move am I making with this scholar?*

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Chapter Score: 76/100 | Flags detected: 5 | Status: ACCEPTABLE

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Chapter Score: 75/100 | Flags detected: 6 | Status: ACCEPTABLE

Chapter 5: Framework Development, Validation, and Discussion

Chapter Score: 80/100 | Flags detected: 5 | Status: ACCEPTABLE

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Future Scope

Chapter Score: 80/100 | Flags detected: 3 | Status: ACCEPTABLE

QUANTITATIVE REVIEW SUMMARY

 All scores below are computed from the same flag dataset as the Flags Report — they are identical values, not approximations.

Chapter	Score	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	Status	Flags
Ch.1: Introduction	77	70	72	75	75	75	74	75	75	ACCEPTABLE	3
Ch.2: Literature Review	72	72	69	57	72	69	72	69	72	ACCEPTABLE	6
Ch.3: Research Methodology	76	76	76	76	52	76	76	76	76	ACCEPTABLE	5
Ch.4: Data Analysis and Results	75	76	64	76	76	63	76	76	76	ACCEPTABLE	6
Ch.5: Framework Development, Validation, and Discussion	80	78	75	78	70	78	77	78	73	ACCEPTABLE	5
Ch.6: Conclusions and Future Scope	80	73	75	78	78	78	77	78	78	ACCEPTABLE	3

REVIEW MAP

The Review Map shows where every flag sits in the thesis, colour-coded by severity. Use this map to locate issues in the Annotated Thesis and cross-reference with the Flags Report for full justification.

Chapter	Claim No Evidence	Lit Annotation	Framework Not Applied	Method Gaps	Vague Quantifier	Negative Case	Obj-Conc Bijection	Overclaim	Citation Format	Desc w/o Interpret	Structure	Grammar	Data Auth	Compliance	Repetition	Score
Ch.1 : Introduction		—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—	—		—	—	—	77
Ch.2 :				—		—	—	—			—	—	—	—	—	72

Lite ratu re Rev iew																
Ch.3 : Res earc h Met hod olog	—	—	—	● ⁺ 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	76
Ch.4 : Dat a Ana lysi s and R	—	—	—	—	●	●	●	—	—	●	—	—	● ⁺ 1	—	—	75
Ch.5 : Fra me wor k Dev elop me	—	—	—	● +1	—	—	—	—	—	—	●	●	●	—	—	80
Ch.6 : Con clus ions and Fut	●	—	—	—	—	—	—	●	—	—	—	●	—	—	—	80
TOT AL FLA GS	3	1	1	7	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	—	—	28

REVIEW MAP — Flag Category Legend

[A] Claim Without Evidence — finding stated with no quote or N=	[B] Literature Annotation — source cited with no analytical move	[C] Theoretical Framework — Ch.2 framework not applied in Ch.4	[D] Methodology Documentation — ethics, instrument, positionality gaps
[E] Vague Quantifier — "many/most" without N= or %	[F] Negative Case Absence — no disconfirming findings reported	[G] Objective-Conclusion Bijection — objective not explicitly answered	[H] Overclaim / Scope Violation — universal claim beyond sample
[I] Citation Format Error — non-APA, missing DOI, wrong et al.	[J] Description Without Interpretation — no "this suggests..." statement	[K] Structure / Signposting — missing intro, conclusion, bridge sentences	[L] Grammar and Language — tense, agreement, informal vocabulary
[M] Data Authenticity — statistic stated without verifiable source	[N] Structural Compliance — word count, front matter, UGC format	[O] Chapter Repetition — content restated without new synthesis	

CHAPTER SCORECARDS

Each dimension score is computed from the flags detected in that chapter. Deductions: Critical –8 | Major –5 | Moderate –3 | Minor –1.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Evaluation Dimension	Score /20	Weight	Weighted Score	Flags
D1 Argument Clarity	70	15%	10.5	1
D2 Evidence Quality	72	20%	14.4	1
D3 Literature Engagement	75	15%	11.2	0
D4 Methodological Rigour	75	15%	11.2	0
D5 Analytical Depth	75	20%	15.0	0
D6 Language Quality	74	10%	7.4	1
D7 Citation Integrity	75	5%	3.8	0
D8 Structure and Flow	75	5%	3.8	0
CHAPTER TOTAL			77/100	ACCEPTABLE

3 flags in this chapter — see Flags Report for full detail.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Evaluation Dimension	Score /20	Weight	Weighted Score	Flags
D1 Argument Clarity	72	15%	10.8	0
D2 Evidence Quality	69	20%	13.8	1
D3 Literature Engagement	57	15%	8.6	3
D4 Methodological Rigour	72	15%	10.8	0
D5 Analytical Depth	69	20%	13.8	1
D6 Language Quality	72	10%	7.2	0
D7 Citation Integrity	69	5%	3.5	1
D8 Structure and Flow	72	5%	3.6	0
CHAPTER TOTAL			72/100	ACCEPTABLE

6 flags in this chapter — see Flags Report for full detail.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

Evaluation	Score /20	Weight	Weighted Score	Flags
------------	-----------	--------	----------------	-------

Dimension				
D1 Argument Clarity	76	15%	11.4	0
D2 Evidence Quality	76	20%	15.2	0
D3 Literature Engagement	76	15%	11.4	0
D4 Methodological Rigour	52	15%	7.8	5
D5 Analytical Depth	76	20%	15.2	0
D6 Language Quality	76	10%	7.6	0
D7 Citation Integrity	76	5%	3.8	0
D8 Structure and Flow	76	5%	3.8	0
CHAPTER TOTAL			76/100	ACCEPTABLE

5 flags in this chapter — see Flags Report for full detail.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Evaluation Dimension	Score /20	Weight	Weighted Score	Flags
D1 Argument Clarity	76	15%	11.4	0
D2 Evidence Quality	64	20%	12.8	3
D3 Literature Engagement	76	15%	11.4	0
D4 Methodological Rigour	76	15%	11.4	0
D5 Analytical Depth	63	20%	12.6	3
D6 Language Quality	76	10%	7.6	0
D7 Citation Integrity	76	5%	3.8	0
D8 Structure and Flow	76	5%	3.8	0
CHAPTER TOTAL			75/100	ACCEPTABLE

6 flags in this chapter — see Flags Report for full detail.

Chapter 5: Framework Development, Validation, and Discussion

Evaluation Dimension	Score /20	Weight	Weighted Score	Flags
D1 Argument Clarity	78	15%	11.7	0
D2 Evidence Quality	75	20%	15.0	1
D3 Literature Engagement	78	15%	11.7	0
D4 Methodological Rigour	70	15%	10.5	2
D5 Analytical Depth	78	20%	15.6	0

D6 Language Quality	77	10%	7.7	1
D7 Citation Integrity	78	5%	3.9	0
D8 Structure and Flow	73	5%	3.6	1
CHAPTER TOTAL			80/100	ACCEPTABLE

5 flags in this chapter — see Flags Report for full detail.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Future Scope

Evaluation Dimension	Score /20	Weight	Weighted Score	Flags
D1 Argument Clarity	73	15%	10.9	1
D2 Evidence Quality	75	20%	15.0	1
D3 Literature Engagement	78	15%	11.7	0
D4 Methodological Rigour	78	15%	11.7	0
D5 Analytical Depth	78	20%	15.6	0
D6 Language Quality	77	10%	7.7	1
D7 Citation Integrity	78	5%	3.9	0
D8 Structure and Flow	78	5%	3.9	0
CHAPTER TOTAL			80/100	ACCEPTABLE

3 flags in this chapter — see Flags Report for full detail.

SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTION AND CLOSING REMARKS

Original Contribution to Knowledge

The present investigation addresses a genuine gap in Indian educational research: the systematic integration of moral narratives into ESL/EFL classroom instruction within multicultural school settings. The synthesis of Indian philosophical traditions (Gandhi, Tagore, Vivekananda) with Western developmental theories (Kohlberg, Dewey) constitutes an original theoretical contribution that has not, to this examiner's knowledge, been attempted in this particular disciplinary intersection. The alignment of the research with NEP 2020 goals further positions the study as a timely policy-relevant investigation.

However, this contribution is currently undermined by methodological incompleteness. Until the fieldwork is demonstrably completed, the sample sizes are definitive, and the findings are supported by verbatim participant evidence, the contribution cannot be claimed with confidence. The original knowledge this thesis aspires to contribute is within reach — but it requires the revisions identified in this report to be realised.

Developmental Closing Statement

I wish to conclude this report on an encouraging note. The thesis under review demonstrates intellectual ambition, topical relevance, and a genuine passion for the subject of moral education in Indian classrooms. These qualities are not easily taught and should not be underestimated. The theoretical architecture — particularly the integration of Indian and Western philosophical traditions — is genuinely impressive and represents the kind of original synthesis that doctoral scholarship requires.

The challenges identified in this report — principally the methodology chapter's tense, the absence of participant voice in Chapter 4, and the structural issues in Chapter 5 — are significant but correctable. They reflect gaps in execution rather than gaps in conceptual understanding. With the revisions recommended in this report, I am confident that this thesis has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to the literature on moral education in Indian multilingual school contexts and to meet the standards required for the award of the PhD degree under UGC 2022 Regulations.

I would encourage Tiwari Ravishankar Rameshprasad to approach the revisions systematically, beginning with the Critical flags which affect the fundamental validity of the study, before addressing the Major and Moderate concerns. The estimated revision time of approximately 8 hours is achievable within a structured three-week revision plan.

Note on Examination Process

This report reflects the independent assessment of one academic reviewer. Under UGC 2022 guidelines, PhD theses are typically evaluated by at least two examiners (one Indian, one external), and the scholar may receive additional feedback from those evaluations. The present report is intended as a preparatory evaluation to assist the scholar in strengthening the thesis before formal university submission. It does not constitute the official university examination report.