THE MAYFIELD LOOP

ARCHITECT'S RESOURCE

Version 1.1

Purpose:
ARCHITECT'S RESOURCE

This guide supports architects and designers to trial the Mayfield Loop with schools.

The Loop can capture how a space feels right now and build a picture of where a school is heading. It can be used at any stage: early visioning, briefing, design development, or masterplanning.

Each session becomes a small act of discovery. The aim is to:

- Link user experience with design intent.
- Adapt questions to local school contexts and project purposes.
- Support teachers to facilitate reflection with students.
- Feed insights back into both the school's practice and the growing Mayfield dataset.

Let's shift from one-off evaluations into a culture of continuous, collaborative reflection. If another line of questioning emerges, add it, test it, and let us know.

ARCHITECT / DESIGNER'S ROLE

You bring a unique lens to the process, as:

FACILITATOR: create a safe, engaging entry point for reflection.

TRANSLATOR: link sensory/emotional feedback to spatial qualities.

LEARNER: each session is design research.

ADVOCATE: demonstrate that lived experience is design intelligence.

PARTICIPANT: acknowledge how you feel in the space too.

PREPARING WITH THE SCHOOL

Before you begin, ask yourself:

- What do I already know about this school's culture and priorities?
- Which spaces are most valuable to test (e.g. classrooms, shared zones, circulation)?
- Which user groups do I need to involve this time (students, staff, leaders)?
- What level of facilitation is appropriate; should I run the session, or support the school to lead?

Check with the school:

- How can we make participation safe and accessible to meet the needs of the users?
- How should we share results back with your community?
- What resources can the school provide (floor plans, photos, site maps)? Simple visual references help students and staff orient their responses.
- If possible, load these into the **Architect Worksheet** to make it more user-ready.

COLLECTING THE CONTEXTUAL DATA

To make feedback useful beyond a single session, always ensure the following context is captured:

- Architect/Practice
- School
- Space type tested (classroom, library, circulation, outdoor, whole campus)
- Purpose (Masterplanning / Briefing / Post-occupancy / Refurbishment / Minor adjustments / General Touchpoint)
- User groups involved (Students / Teachers / Leaders / Other)
- Number of users in total
- Date of session
- Facilitator (architect vs teacher-led)

Contextual data for users to provide:

- ***Time of day*** → morning / midday / afternoon / evening
- ***Temperature*** → hot / comfortable / cold
- ***Light*** → bright / dim / mixed
- ***Air quality*** → fresh / stuffy / breezy
- ***Noise*** → quiet / moderate / loud

CORE QUESTIONS

These build a shared dataset across all contexts. They are quick, sensory, and comparative.

Pulse Check Questions

- **Emotional Pulse:** Are you content learning in this space today? Y/N. Why?
- **Agency:** Do you feel you can adapt this space to suit your needs? Y/N. Why?

Mapping Questions

- **Positive Learning:** Where do you feel most able to concentrate or learn well?
- **Friction:** Where do you find it hardest to focus or learn? Why?
- **Active:** Where do you feel most energised or playful? Why?
- **Rest:** Where do you feel most calm or at ease? Why?
- **Avoidance:** Is there anything in this space you avoid? (touching, sitting on, looking at, or being near) Why?
- **Change:** If we could change one thing about this space, what would it be?
- **Keep:** What should never change here?

Adapting the Questions

The toolkit provides core questions, but you may need to adjust these depending on the project type and user group.

- **Primary students:** use visual, playful metaphors (stickers, “cactus or velvet” icons).
- **Secondary students:** add more open questions.
- **Teachers:** focus on pedagogy, flexibility, and day-to-day use. Questions about reconfiguration, transitions, supervision.
- **Leaders:** link to long-term priorities, culture, and values.
- **Architects & Designers:** use contradictions as insight; note misalignments between design intent and lived experience.
- **Departments / Systems:** focus on patterns across sites; use questions that surface systemic issues (e.g. repeated design flaws).

Keep questions short and clear. Aim for 8 –10 per session.

Project Purpose:

CURATED ADD-ON QUESTIONS

1. Masterplanning / Strategic Planning

- Which spaces best capture who we are as a school? (Identity)
- Which areas of the campus no longer support how the school works or learns? (Change)
- Where are the strongest assets we should carry forward? (Keep)
- What will students and teachers in the future need that isn't here now? (Future)

2. Refurbishment / Renewal

- Which existing spaces still support learning well? (Keep)
- Which spaces most urgently need to change? (Change)
- What character or strengths should we carry forward? (Identity/Keep)
- What should this refurbished space make possible for future students and teachers? (Future)
- Which spaces feel welcoming to everyone? Which don't? (Inclusion)

3. Minor Adjustments to Existing Spaces

- Where do transitions clog or flow? (Change)
- What small workarounds have students/teachers invented? (Identity-as-practice)
- What small adjustment could improve comfort or usability right now? (Future in the immediate sense)
- Which spaces feel welcoming to everyone? Which don't? (Inclusion)

Project Purpose:

CURATED ADD-ON QUESTIONS

4. New Development (Briefing Stage)

- What kinds of activities should a new space support that current spaces don't? (Future)
- What qualities from existing spaces should be carried into new ones? (Keep)
- What should we avoid repeating in a new design? (Change)
- If this new space told our story, what would it say about us? (Identity)

5. Recently Completed Facility (Post-Occupancy)

- Which spaces are being used differently than expected? (Change/Identity)
- If we built this again, what would you keep the same? (Keep)
- If we built this again, what's the one thing you'd change? (Change)
- What possibilities should this building unlock in the future? (Future)
- Does this space feel different at different times of day or year? (Seasonal)

6. Touchpoint / Ongoing Reflection

- Which space feels different this week? (better or worse) (Change)
- What small adjustment has made the biggest impact recently? (Keep/Change)
- Where do you feel most yourself? (Identity)

REMEMBER: If another category or focus emerges, add it. The tool is designed to evolve.

THE FEEDBACK LOOP

Feeding back to the School:

After each session, prepare a 1–2 page **Insight Snapshot**:

- What's working (calm areas, flexible use, valued qualities)
- What's tricky (stress points, sensory discomforts, misalignments)
- Quick wins (small operational or furniture tweaks)
- Design implications (ideas for the next project or brief)
- Visual overlay (heatmap or annotated plan) *show examples in guide*

This closes the loop for participants and demonstrates that their perspectives matter.

Feeding back to Mayfield:

Your role also helps refine the tool itself. Please record:

- Which questions worked well, were confusing or skipped
- Any age-group differences in comprehension
- Contextual data you wished you had
- One change your session directly triggered
- New prompts that emerged

Submit your snapshots to the Mayfield team to support collective learning.

PRINCIPLES TO KEEP IN MIND...

- We are all learning. Differences and contradictions are insights.
- Privacy first. Use plain-language consent, anonymise all data.
- Small scale is fine. A class, a staff group, even 15 minutes of reflection can be valuable.
- Share back insights. Even minor changes build trust and momentum.
- Be iterative. Each session is a test that improves both the tool and your practice.

Good luck and have fun testing the Mayfield Loop!

Architect's Worksheet

PULSE CHECK QUESTIONS

Emotional Pulse: Are you content learning in this space today? Y/N. Why?	Agency: Do you feel you can adapt this space to suit your needs? Y/N. Why?

Architect's Worksheet

MAPPING QUESTIONS

insert plan here

Positive Learning: Where do you feel most able to concentrate or learn well? Why?

Friction: Where do you find it hardest to focus or learn? Why?

Architect's Worksheet

MAPPING QUESTIONS

insert plan here

Active: Where do you feel most energised or playful? Why?

Rest: Where do you feel most calm or at ease? Why?

Architect's Worksheet

MAPPING QUESTIONS

insert plan here

Avoidance: Is there anything in this space you avoid? (touching, sitting on, looking at, or being near) Why?

Architect's Worksheet

MAPPING QUESTIONS

insert plan here

Change: If we could change one thing about this space, what would it be?

Keep: What should never change here?

Appendices 01

PURPOSE AND HOW TO SCALE “THE PULSE CHECK QUESTIONS”

Emotional Pulse - wellbeing snapshor (KPI)

“Are you content learning in this space today? Yes/No Why?”

Why it matters

A fast, comparable wellbeing KPI you can track over time and across schools; the anchor that cross-checks all other signals.

Capture pattern (micro)

- Contextual data first (quick taps): Time of day; Temperature (hot/ok/cold); Light (bright/dim/mixed); Air (fresh/stuffy/draughty); Noise (quiet/moderate/loud).
- Pulse: Yes/No (+ optional short “why” text/voice/icon).

Scale → dashboards

- Class/School: % Yes by room/zone and by environmental conditions.
- Department/System: sector “Wellbeing Index” (% Yes by typology, term, region) with environment cross-tabs.

Cross-population

- Validates Positive and Rest zones; “No” clusters often co-locate with Friction/ Avoidance; correlates with Agency.

Appendices 01

PURPOSE AND HOW TO SCALE “THE PULSE CHECK QUESTIONS”

Agency - autonomy index

“ Do you feel you can adapt this space to suit your needs? ***Yes/Sometimes/No***

Why? (what you can/can’t change)”

Why it matters

- Turns “flexible learning” from rhetoric into a measurable KPI.

Capture pattern (micro)

- Toggle (Yes/Sometimes/No) + control icons you **can/can’t** use: move furniture / light / sound / airflow / storage.

Scale → dashboards

- School: Agency Index by room type; barrier list (too heavy, locked, out of reach).
- Department/System: benchmarks across schools; ROI on flexibility investments.

Cross-population

- Low agency often co-locates with Avoidance, Friction, and Change and Keep requests.

Appendices 01

PURPOSE AND HOW TO SCALE “THE MAPPING QUESTIONS”

Positive Learning:	Where do you feel most able to concentrate or learn well? Why?
Friction:	Where do you find it hardest to focus or learn? Why?
Active:	Where do you feel most energised or playful? Why?
Rest:	Where do you feel most calm or at ease? Why?
Avoidance:	Is there anything in this space you avoid? (touching, sitting on, looking at, or being near)
Change:	If we could change one thing about this space, what would it be? (OPTION TO SKIP MAPPING IF NOT LOCATION SPECIFIC)
Keep:	What should never change here? (OPTION TO SKIP MAPPING IF NOT LOCATION SPECIFIC)

Appendices 01

PURPOSE AND HOW TO SCALE “THE MAPPING QUESTIONS”

The “Where”

The “where” captures location-based feedback. It asks participants to place a dot or mark on a floorplan to show where they feel positive, calm, challenged, or disengaged. These inputs generate spatial maps and clusters that reveal patterns of use, avoidance, and preference.

The “Why”

The “where” produces maps and clusters, but the “why” is what actually makes the data meaningful and actionable. Without it, we just know that people sit near windows or avoid corners, but we don’t know if it’s for light, sound, comfort, view, social positioning, or something else.

If “why” is too open, it produces unstructured text that’s hard to scale.

If “why” is too closed, it misses nuance.

The challenge then is: how do we structure the “why” so it’s easy to collect, easy to aggregate, and still rich enough to inform design?

The sweet spot is a structured scaffold with optional depth:

- Standardised categories/icons for comparability.
- Optional free text for richness.
- Comparative framing (“why here vs not there”) for deeper insight.

Appendices 01

PURPOSE AND HOW TO SCALE “THE MAPPING QUESTIONS”

Capture pattern (micro)

- First input = where (map dot), “Place a green dot on the plan.”
- Second input = select why (category or icon or open text box for keyword search), “Pick 1–2 icons: 🌞 light / 🔇 quiet / 🌬️ air / 🪑 comfort / 👁️ visibility / 👥 social / ✋ other.”
- Third input = emotional check-in (how it makes you feel → calm, focused, happy, safe). Short note, mood tag, image etc.

Layering ensures you always capture baseline comparable data (category), while leaving space for nuance (emotion/quote).

Shared interface moves (apply across questions)

Scale → dashboards

- Class: heatmaps or floorplans with coloured dots/stickers marking spots; icons/ notes for sensory reasons (light, noise, enclosure)
- School: aggregated positive-zone heatmaps across school
- Department: aggregated charts (bar graphs, percentages) across schools.
- Across Project Types: aggregated charts (bar graphs, percentages) across project types.

Cross-population baked in

- Green vs Red maps (Focus ↔ Friction).
- Yellow vs Blue maps (Active ↔ Rest)
- Grey ↔ Orange (Avoidance ↔ Change).
- Yellow validates all (Pulse).
- White explains gaps (Agency).
- Purple protects value (Keep).

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 1. EMOTIONAL PULSE

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Quick wellbeing check; recognise patterns (times/activities) that feel better/worse.	Map “happy to learn” zones; identify safe/unsafe areas.	Large-scale mood/engagement data → identify systemic stressors.	Identify typology-specific traits that feel supportive (libraries, classrooms, breakouts).	Identify universal drivers (predictable noise, choice, soft edges, daylight).
Teachers	Spot lesson timing/conditions linked to smooth vs. strained sessions.	Staff /student morale across year levels/rooms.	Cross-school indicators (burnout risk, positive conditions	Which spaces consistently energise vs. drain? Share typology-specific practices that sustain focus (library zoning, classroom seating).	Highlight universal teaching conditions (clear sightlines + micro-retreats). Sector-wide evidence of conditions tied to morale.
School Leaders	Immediate morale signals; target micro-interventions (shade, ventilation, supervision).	Campus mood map; integrate into wellbeing programs.	Evidence for resources; argue wellbeing in capital planning.	Compare outcomes of different typologies (breakouts vs homerooms) → decide which spaces best serve different cohorts. Adjust usage or scheduling based on which spaces energise vs. drain. Specify features that raise “Yes” rates per typology.	Apply system-wide principles → wellbeing benchmarks; ensure equity so no student is left behind. Build school identity around spaces that make people “happy to learn.”
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Compare wellbeing by facility type; fund where morale is low.	Embed wellbeing benchmarks; justify standards (daylight, acoustics).	Spot which facility types give best value for positive learning (e.g., small breakouts vs open commons). Feed into typology-specific design briefs → specify features that promote positive affect.	Build sector-wide benchmarks and equity standards. Formalise standards (positive-learning design as baseline requirement).
Architects/Designers	Note environmental triggers (light, noise, layout) tied to Y/N shifts.	Link affect to spatial features.	Translate affect into design guidance.	Better understand factors of positive learning experiences.	Develop baseline positive learning design factors and principles, build benchmarks for the emotional quality of environments.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Products linked to positive/negative mood.	ROI of wellbeing-focused products.	Track which product features (furniture, finishes, tech) influence affect in specific contexts; test products in different contexts (library vs classroom); identify bundles that consistently support learning.	Validate product features that support learning → market as evidence-based.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Potential case studies showing design ↔ wellbeing.	Wellbeing criteria in policy/ procurement.	Advocacy and procurement reform → evidence that “space matters.” Identify typology-level morale drivers and product preferences → advocate for best practice.	Lead sector-wide advocacy: design = wellbeing.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 2. AGENCY

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Identify whether they feel able to rearrange, personalise, or move in the space.	See which spaces afford choice and agency across age groups.	Aggregated data on perceived agency → system-level sense of empowerment.	How different typologies (labs, classrooms, libraries) support or restrict agency.	Universal patterns of when and where students feel empowered.
Teachers	Gauge ease of reconfiguring furniture/technology; note obstacles to autonomy.	Compare degrees of control across rooms (some highly adaptable, others rigid).	Evidence whether "flexible learning environments" deliver promised autonomy.	Compare adaptability of different teaching spaces.	Sector-wide insights into adaptability and its effect on practice.
School Leaders	Observe whether students and teachers actually use the space flexibly as intended; Identify immediate barriers (furniture too heavy, storage inaccessible); Decide if local budget adjustments (lighter chairs, movable partitions) are needed.	Map which rooms afford more or less agency across campus; Decide which spaces need targeted investment or reallocation to support autonomy; Use data in conversations with staff about pedagogy and space use.	Use evidence of low agency to advocate upward for systemic change; Demonstrate impacts on student voice, engagement, and learning outcomes.	See how agency differs by typology (science labs vs. classrooms vs. libraries); Adjust local use strategies (more staff support in rigid labs, more freedom in breakouts).	Contribute to broader advocacy for student/teacher autonomy in space; Position agency as part of the school's identity and values.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	Class-level feedback reveals whether "flexible learning" policies translate into practice; Helps identify systemic flaws in procurement (e.g. non-movable "flexible" furniture).	Compare how different schools report on flexibility and adaptability; Detect patterns: which types of spaces consistently empower or limit users; Feed into regional procurement frameworks (e.g. require stackable chairs, adjustable desks).	Evaluate whether system investments in "flexible learning environments" deliver as promised; Justify changes in policy or funding to prioritise adaptability.	Aggregate typology-specific findings across schools; Refine design briefs to match real adaptability needs in each project type.	Build system-wide benchmarks for "usable flexibility." Move from rhetoric to evidence-based standards for adaptability. Align future investment with user empowerment and equity goals.
Architects/Designers	Observe whether students and teachers actually use the space flexibly as intended; See if design features (furniture, partitions, controls) genuinely enable flexibility.	Identify systemic barriers (e.g. furniture too heavy to move, lighting controls out of reach).	Validation or critique of flexibility policies.	Typology lessons → e.g. open-plan zones with movable furniture vs. fixed labs.	Build benchmarks for "usable flexibility" in briefs.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	School-level demand for flexible, durable, and intuitive products.	Procurement data to scale adaptable products.	Test adaptability in typologies (science labs vs. classrooms); Opportunities for products tailored to typology-specific needs.	Push design of universally adaptable products.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Evidence of how flexibility affects learning culture and wellbeing.	Case for design guidelines and procurement standards on flexibility.		Cross-sector demand for adaptable design solutions.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 3. POSITIVE LEARNING

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Identify preferred spots; note sensory reasons (light, sound, enclosure). Build capacity to reflect on personal learning experiences, feel heard, and understand peers' preferences.	Map preferred spaces across classrooms and shared areas; highlight where they feel most supported to learn.	Aggregate evidence of environments that reliably support learning and focus across multiple schools.	Identify typology-specific traits that feel supportive (libraries, classrooms, breakouts).	Identify universal drivers (predictable noise, choice, soft edges, daylight).
Teachers	Seat/zone planning; routines that protect focus; micro-layout tweaks to improve conditions.	Share practices that consistently create focus and calm (arrival routines, noise norms, furniture setups).	Show how conditions that reduce behavioural load can increase teaching/learning time.	Share typology-specific practices that sustain focus (library zoning, classroom seating).	Highlight universal teaching conditions (clear sightlines + micro-retreats).
School Leaders	Observe local classroom conditions → link to behaviour and attendance; provide coaching or small resourcing supports.	Identify school-wide patterns → adjust timetables, zoning, supervision; recognise whole-of-school assets that support focus and replicate in future refurbishments.	Share insights into leveraging positive spaces in leadership training; advocate for investment cases (e.g., daylight, acoustic standards).	Compare outcomes of different typologies (breakouts vs homerooms) → decide which spaces best serve different cohorts.	Apply system-wide principles → wellbeing benchmarks; ensure equity so no student is left behind.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Spot school-wide trends to inform funding bids or improvement programs.	Develop strategic insights for funding → prioritise features that consistently support learning.	Spot which facility types give best value for positive learning (e.g., small breakouts vs open commons).	Formalise standards (positive-learning design as baseline requirement); apply system-wide principles → wellbeing benchmarks; ensure equity so no school is left behind.
Architects/Designers	Note design features that support positive learning (orientation, materials, acoustics, retreat corners).	Identify repeatable spatial qualities (daylight, adjacencies, materiality) that can be replicated elsewhere.	Use data to inform policy guidance on minimum positive-learning features.	Refine typologies (alcoves, nooks, retreat zones).	Develop baseline "positive learning kit" for briefs and audits.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Gain campus-level demand signals for effective product types (acoustic panels, adjustable furniture).	Define sector-level specs for products that support learning; identify procurement opportunities for high-performing products.	Test products in different contexts (library vs classroom); identify bundles that consistently support learning.	Validate product features that support learning → market as evidence-based.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Build evidence of design success → use in sector advocacy and exemplar case studies.	Support funding and policy cases for embedding design standards (acoustics, daylight) into frameworks.	Publish benchmarks of which typologies consistently deliver positive learning.	Build cross-sector evidence to promote minimum design standards globally.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 4. FRICTION

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Pinpoint stressors (glare, echo, drafts, crowding).	Recurring no-go areas (corridors, entries, canteen lines).	Systemic discomforts (noise, heat, smell) across contexts.	Typology-specific friction (e.g., open studios too loud).	Universal friction patterns to design against.
Teachers	Disruption hotspots; supervision blind spots.	Patterns of friction in transitions and shared spaces.	Workload impacts of poor environments (voice strain, behaviour).	Where particular layouts consistently hinder pedagogy.	Cross-context practices that mitigate friction.
School Leaders	Notice where classroom layout or furniture causes disruption (blind spots, bottlenecks, noisy equipment). May prompt small budget reallocations or staff adjustments.	Identify high-friction spaces across campus (noisy corridors, crowded entries, echoey halls). Enables operational fixes (supervision, timetabling) and prioritising maintenance/retrofit (acoustics, shading, storage).	Feed friction evidence upward → argue for support or capital works, capital vs minor-works prioritisation from evidence.	Recognise that certain typologies consistently create problems (e.g. science labs with poor acoustics, gyms that double as assemblies). Guides local scheduling or facility planning, choose room types that minimise friction for cohorts.	Highlight universal friction issues (climate control, storage) that undermine user experience, and communicate upwards for systemic change.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Compare across multiple schools → highlight recurring weak spots (underperforming open-plan zones, poor circulation design). Data helps decide funding priorities.	System-level patterns reveal where policy/standards fail (e.g. ventilation across builds). Evidence justifies adjustments to design guidelines, procurement, or building codes.	Aggregate cross-school evidence for typology redesign → update briefing templates or building standards to fix common flaws.	Build a broad evidence base to set system-wide priorities (acoustics, thermal comfort, circulation flow) and direct major capital works or policy updates; system policies (max occupancy, acoustic thresholds).
Architects/Designers	Misfit details vs intent; near-term layout trials.	Campus-scale adjacency problems to redesign.	Common failure modes to avoid in standards.	Iterate typology guidance (partitioning, baffles).	A “do-not-repeat” library of pitfalls.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Feedback on underperforming products (unstable desks, noisy HVAC).	Flags for product redesign or de-listing, data to refine supply contracts → reduce recurring complaints.	Match products to context to reduce friction. Understand which product lines repeatedly fail in specific settings.	Sector-wide specs that eliminate common pain points, push innovation where friction is widespread → market opportunity.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Build evidence of design failures → sector advocacy for change	Demonstrate systemic costs of poor acoustic/thermal performance.	Compare failure modes across typologies (open-plan vs closed).	Aggregate friction → system-wide case for revised guidelines.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 5. ACTIVE

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Identify energising spots (collaboration tables, open zones); reflect on sensory drivers (light, buzz, peers).	Map playful/active zones across campus; highlight where they feel energised.	Aggregate data → environments that spark joy/engagement across schools.	Compare energising features across typologies (gyms, commons, studios).	Universal energisers (movement, colour, natural light, peers).
Teachers	Map where engagement peaks; adjust group work layouts.	Compare which spaces support collaborative or active learning.	Evidence linking active spaces to collaboration outcomes.	Spot which facility types consistently drive active learning.	Evidence of conditions that always energise or overwhelm.
School Leaders	Observe links between active zones and participation; support staff in harnessing energy productively.	Identify school-wide energising assets (commons, outdoor areas); align with pedagogy and culture.	Share evidence of positive engagement to advocate upward.	Typology comparisons → which spaces energise different cohorts best.	Position active learning as a school identity marker.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Spot whole-school patterns → which schools use activity-rich spaces well.	Prioritise funding for spaces that foster playful/active learning.	Aggregate activity-linked data → refine typology briefs.	Develop standards balancing calm and active space provision.
Architects/Designers	Note design elements supporting activity (open layouts, movable furniture, visibility).	Document repeatable features that foster engagement.	Feed into guidelines for active-learning environments.	Refine typologies to support engagement (flexible commons, outdoor classrooms).	Universal design kit for energising spaces.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Demand signals for active-learning products (modular furniture, sports/arts spaces).	Specs for active-learning products; procurement intelligence.	Product insights for typologies (gym flooring vs modular seating).	Market intelligence → products that reliably drive engagement.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Case studies showing design's role in engagement.	Advocacy for designing spaces that balance calm and active modes.	Promote typologies proven to enhance active learning.	Advocate playful, active learning as a sector benchmark.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 6. REST

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Identify calm spots (corners, window seats); reflect on sensory triggers (quiet, soft light, enclosure). Builds self-awareness and peer empathy.	Map calm zones across classrooms and shared areas; highlight where they feel safe or regulated.	Aggregate calm zones across schools; show how environments support regulation.	Identify calm traits in typologies (libraries, gardens, classrooms).	Universal calm drivers (quiet, soft edges, choice, predictable routines).
Teachers	Map zones where behaviour de-escalates; adjust seating and micro-layouts to sustain calm.	Share practices and spaces that consistently create calm (arrival routines, quiet rooms, sensory gardens).	Evidence that reduces behavioural load; link to increased learning time.	Share strategies in different facilities (quiet rooms vs open commons).	Universal conditions (clear sightlines, micro-retreats, low noise).
School Leaders	Observe how calm zones link to behaviour and attendance; provide targeted coaching or resources.	Identify whole-school calm assets; replicate in refurbishments; align with wellbeing programs.	Share best practice restful environments in leadership training.	Compare which typologies best deliver for cohorts.	Develop rest benchmarks to support equity and wellbeing.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Spot school-wide calm trends; support funding for wellbeing-linked spaces.	Prioritise funding for features that consistently support calm (daylight, acoustics).	Spot typologies that consistently provide rest → refine standards.	Formalise calm-supporting design as baseline requirement.
Architects/Designers	Document design features that support calm (acoustics, retreat corners, soft finishes).	Identify replicable calm-supporting spatial qualities (adjacencies, light, materials).	Feed into design guidance for rest-supporting environments.	Refine typology designs (e.g. breakout nooks).	Establish rest-supportive design kit for briefs.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Identify products (acoustic panels, soft furnishings, calming colour palettes) that contribute to calm.	Define specs for rest-supportive products; procurement opportunities.	Test calming/restful products in different contexts.	Validate product features at scale.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Use evidence to promote design standards for wellbeing.	Advocate for restful baselines in wellbeing-focused design standards.	Benchmark typologies that deliver calm across schools.	Promote rest-supportive design as part of wellbeing policy.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 7. AVOIDANCE

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Reveal hidden sensory discomforts (glare, echo, smells, crowding). Builds awareness that others experience the same triggers.	Map consistent avoidance across shared spaces (corridors, canteens, yards).	Aggregate sensory avoidance → noise, glare, smell patterns across schools.	Compare what's avoided in libraries vs classrooms vs gyms.	Universal dataset of "what kids avoid" → sensory barriers (noise, glare, smells).
Teachers	Spot underused corners, desks, or tools → links avoidance to disengagement.	Highlight design features that consistently block teaching (unused AV setups, unmanageable seating).	Consistent rejection of layouts/ tools (open-plan zones, ICT labs).	Spot repeated underuse of typologies (open-plan consistently avoided by older students).	Broad patterns of disuse → evidence to inform training or advocacy.
School Leaders	Recognise small but persistent barriers (no one uses mezzanine seats, certain desks always empty). Enables minor works to remove triggers.	Spot patterns of waste (investment not being used) → redirect resources or repurpose spaces.	Provide context for why elements are avoided and how this impacts engagement/attendance.	Recognise facility types consistently underused → adjust local scheduling or modify spaces.	Contribute to sector-wide knowledge of wasted design; protect against repeating mistakes in refurbishments.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Compare school-to-school → detect systemic problems (slippery flooring, disliked furniture lines).	Build systemic datasets on underused/wasted features; Modify procurement lists (de-list poor performers); Adjust design standards to prevent repeating mistakes.	Aggregate avoidance by typology → revise briefing templates, standards.	Build evidence base → direct funding/policy away from consistently avoided features.
Architects/Designers	Immediate evidence of misfit between design intent and lived use.	Campus diagrams show which spaces don't function as intended.	Reveal system-wide hidden spots in design assumptions.	Refine typology design playbooks ("avoid mezzanines in junior areas").	Create "do-not-repeat" checklists across all briefs.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	School-level signals on product rejection → redesign triggers.	Cross-school signals = case for redesign or product retirement.	Product-specific fixes for typologies (different seating lines in labs vs libraries).	Market intelligence → retire avoided features, innovate replacements.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Identify categories of wasted investment across multiple schools.	Evidence to influence procurement and policy → reduce waste.	Comparative insights across typologies → policy lever ("ICT labs underused statewide").	Advocacy infographics → "Top 10 most avoided features in schools."

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 8. CHANGE

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Immediate irritants (noise, glare, clutter, lack of storage).	Highlight repeated irritants (e.g. overcrowded corridors).	Aggregated voice of priorities for change.	Compare what kids consistently want to change in similar rooms.	Universal dislikes (noise, heat, lack of choice).
Teachers	Barriers to teaching flow (AV placement, visibility, storage).	Consistent requests for improvement (storage, acoustics).	Evidence of systemic weaknesses (e.g. underperforming open-plan).	Typology-level tweaks (e.g. science labs need more sinks).	System-wide irritants (storage, acoustics, AV placement).
School Leaders	Distinguish quick fixes (storage, acoustics, lighting); use insights to direct minor works budgets.	Identify themes across classrooms and shared spaces; prioritise which changes to pursue.	Advocate upward for targeted capital works; provide evidence of what changes matter most.	Spot typology-specific issues (e.g. gyms double as assemblies); inform scheduling or facility planning.	Feed school perspectives into sector-wide evidence.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Compare “change” trends across schools; use patterns to direct funding (e.g. shading, acoustics).	Aggregate “must change” findings system-wide; distinguish operational fixes from long-term priorities.	Aggregate “change” across typologies; revise briefing templates.	Build datasets of recurring problems; inform system-wide policy and procurement.
Architects/Designers	Micro adjustments that highlight misalignments.	Identify features that consistently need redesign at campus scale.	Validate or refine core design principles.	Refine typology-specific design standards.	“Do-not-repeat” library of design lessons.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Feedback on failing products at school scale.	Procurement signals → which products need redesign.	Consistent product “replace” signals by typology.	Market intelligence on consistently failing products.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Recognise systemic product/design weaknesses.	Identify recurring design/product issues across the sector.	Direct typology-level product innovation.	Cross-sector signals for reform and innovation.

Appendices 02

INTERFACE MAPPING - 9. KEEP

	INSIGHTS ACROSS SCALES				
USERS	**Space**	**School**	**Department/organisation**	**Other similar project types**	**All project types**
Students	Favourite spots and beloved features (nooks, windows, furniture).	Loved communal spaces (library, yard, hall).	System-level anchors (quiet, daylight, sense of safety).	Consistently loved features across libraries, labs, classrooms.	Universal favourites (quiet corners, daylight, choice).
Teachers	Reliable layouts, flexible zones, effective tools.	Valued features (quiet areas, functional staff spaces).	Assets that consistently support practice.	Typology-specific anchors (e.g. libraries = quiet, science labs = benches).	Universal features that always help teaching (clear sightlines, functional storage).
School Leaders	Protect core strengths; ensure budgets don't erase valued features.	Prioritise qualities to preserve long-term; strengthen trust by protecting them	Advocate upward for preserving what matters to culture and identity.	Recognise typology-specific anchors worth preserving.	Contribute to a broader culture of valuing lived experience.
Departments/ Organisations/ Institutions	N/A	Identify "must keep" features across schools; avoid wasted resources.	Aggregate "must keep" signals into design briefs and funding priorities.	Use data to refine typology-specific standards.	Sector-wide dataset of what works best; embed into policy and procurement.
Architects/Designers	Highlight repeatable, high-performing design elements.	Distil campus-wide anchors that should inform new designs.	Data-driven validation of repeatable design strengths.	Typology "must-repeat" elements.	System-wide "do-repeat" library.
Suppliers/ manufacturers	N/A	Product-level "keep" signals.	Strengthen procurement of high-performing product lines.	Products consistently kept across typologies.	Market intelligence → product ranges to continue/scale.
Industry Leaders	N/A	Identify facilities/products with proven longevity.	Promote "what works" through policy exemplars.	Promote typology-based successes.	Sector-wide advocacy for enduring features.