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

\*\*Rating: 4\*\*

The story presents a believable scenario of academic infrastructure neglect that resonates with real institutional experiences. The details about leaking ceilings, bureaucratic indifference, and faculty frustration feel authentic. The characterizations and their responses are grounded in reality, though some timeline inconsistencies (protest planning then suddenly occurring) slightly diminish credibility.

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

\*\*Rating: 2\*\*

The narrative is largely explicit and self-contained, leaving little interpretive space for readers. The symbolism between the decaying building and humanities' decline is directly stated rather than suggested. The story explains rather than invites discovery, reducing reader participation in meaning-making.

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

\*\*Rating: 2\*\*

While competently executed, the story presents familiar themes about academic decline and institutional neglect without offering fresh insights. The parallel between crumbling infrastructure and humanities' marginalization is well-worn territory in academic fiction, lacking innovative perspective or unexpected revelations.

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

\*\*Rating: 1\*\*

This follows conventional literary realism without challenging or expanding genre boundaries. The structure, narrative approach, and thematic treatment align with standard academic fiction conventions, offering no formal innovation or genre reimagining.

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

\*\*Rating: 2\*\*

The prose is competent but conventional, employing standard academic fiction vocabulary and syntax. While clear and readable, it lacks distinctive voice, stylistic innovation, or memorable linguistic flourishes that would distinguish it from similar narratives.