\*\*5.- Is the story credible?\*\*

\*\*5 – Totally agree\*\*

The setting, characters, and conflicts depict a highly believable scenario within academia. The deterioration of university infrastructure and administrative neglect are realistic, especially in older institutions, as are the emotional and professional responses of long-serving faculty.

\*\*6.- Does the text require your participation or cooperation to complete its form and meaning?\*\*

\*\*4 – Agree\*\*

The story invites reflective participation, particularly through its metaphoric treatment of decay, resistance, and legacy. Readers are expected to read beyond the literal to grasp its commentary on institutional values and generational transitions.

\*\*7.- Does it propose a new perspective on reality?\*\*

\*\*4 – Agree\*\*

By paralleling physical decay with neglected intellectual traditions, the story offers a subtle but powerful critique of modern academia's shift away from the humanities. It calls for renewed valuation of enduring ideals amid superficial progress.

\*\*8.- Does it propose a new vision of the genre it uses?\*\*

\*\*3 – Neutral\*\*

The story fits comfortably within literary realism and campus fiction. While it doesn’t reinvent the genre, it uplifts it with emotional richness and philosophical depth, offering a thoughtful embodiment of the aging academic archetype.

\*\*9.- Does it give an original way of using the language?\*\*

\*\*3 – Neutral\*\*

The prose is well-crafted and fluent, with thoughtful metaphoric layering, but it doesn’t push stylistic boundaries. Its strength lies in clarity and emotional weight rather than linguistic innovation.