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

Rating: 5 (Totally agree)

The story's credibility stems from its painfully accurate depiction of institutional dysfunction, contractor incompetence, and academic precarity. Every detail rings true—from bureaucratic gaslighting to the paralysis of untenured faculty.

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

Rating: 4 (Agree)

Readers must recognize the satirical tone and connect the renovation disaster to broader systemic failures in academia. Understanding academic hierarchies and employment precarity is essential to fully appreciate the critique.

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

Rating: 4 (Agree)

It brilliantly reframes academic exploitation through the metaphor of literal structural damage, making visible the usually abstract power dynamics that trap educated professionals in untenable situations.

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

Rating: 3

(Neither agree nor disagree) While excellently executed, this follows established traditions of academic satire and institutional critique. It doesn't revolutionize the genre but represents a strong example of contemporary satirical fiction.

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

Rating: 4 (Agree)

The prose achieves dark comedy through bureaucratic deadpan mixed with absurdist observations ("afraid it might actually be a person, like his department chair"). Technical language ("flashing") juxtaposed with human desperation creates distinctive ironic effect.