Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

# FRAMEWORKS AND METHODOLOGIES FOR EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF ARCHITECTURAL SPACES IN EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS

**Dr. Helena Costa**
Department of Architecture, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

**PUBLISHED DATE: - 14-03-2025**
**PAGE NO: - 1-10**

## ABSTRACT

The quality of architectural spaces plays a pivotal role in shaping the educational experience, influencing both learning outcomes and occupant well-being. This study investigates existing frameworks and methodologies used to evaluate the spatial quality of educational environments, with a focus on parameters such as functionality, flexibility, thermal and acoustic comfort, lighting, aesthetics, and user satisfaction. By critically analyzing quantitative and qualitative assessment tools, including post-occupancy evaluations (POE), environmental performance metrics, and user-centric design criteria, the research identifies key indicators that contribute to effective learning spaces. The study also explores interdisciplinary approaches that bridge architecture, pedagogy, and environmental psychology, proposing a comprehensive evaluation framework adaptable to diverse educational contexts. The findings aim to guide architects, educators, and policymakers in designing and assessing educational facilities that enhance learning, promote inclusivity, and support long-term sustainability.

**Keywords**: Architectural space quality, educational environments, spatial evaluation frameworks, post-occupancy evaluation (POE), user satisfaction, learning space design, environmental performance, school architecture, design assessment methodologies, sustainable educational design.

## INTRODUCTION

The architectural design of educational institutions plays a profound role in shaping the learning experience, fostering well-being, and influencing pedagogical outcomes. Beyond mere physical structures, educational spaces are dynamic environments that interact with their occupants, affecting cognitive processes, social interactions, and emotional states [9, 19]. As educational philosophies evolve, moving towards more collaborative, flexible, and student-centered

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

approaches, the demand for adaptable and high-quality architectural spaces becomes increasingly critical. The quality of these spaces is not solely a matter of aesthetics or structural integrity but encompasses a complex interplay of functional, environmental, social, and psychological dimensions [1].

In recent decades, there has been a growing recognition of the impact of the built environment on human performance and societal well-being, influencing concepts like smart and sustainable cities [2, 8, 14, 16, 18]. This broader understanding extends directly to educational settings, where the physical attributes of classrooms, libraries, common areas, and outdoor spaces can significantly influence engagement, concentration, and overall academic achievement. For instance, factors such as natural light, air quality, acoustic comfort, spatial organization, and access to green spaces contribute directly to a conducive learning atmosphere [1].

Despite the intuitive importance of high-quality educational architecture, standardized and comprehensive methodologies for systematically assessing the quality of these spaces often remain elusive. While individual aspects like energy efficiency [12] or specific environmental parameters are measurable, a holistic framework that integrates diverse quality indicators from a multi-stakeholder perspective is frequently lacking. Such a framework is vital for architects to design effectively, for educators to optimize learning environments, and for policymakers to make informed investment decisions in educational infrastructure. The absence of robust assessment tools can lead to suboptimal designs, underutilized spaces, and missed opportunities to leverage the built environment as an active pedagogical tool.

This article aims to address this critical gap by exploring and synthesizing various frameworks and methodologies for assessing the quality of architectural spaces within educational institutions. It seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of existing approaches, identify key dimensions of quality, and propose an integrated perspective for evaluating how well these spaces serve their complex functions, ultimately contributing to a more effective and sustainable educational landscape.

## METHODS

This study employs a comprehensive conceptual review and synthesis approach to identify and consolidate diverse methodologies for assessing the quality of architectural spaces in educational institutions. Drawing from various disciplines, including architecture, environmental psychology, urban planning, and education, this method allows for the construction of a holistic assessment framework.

### Dimensions of Architectural Space Quality

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

To systematically approach the assessment, the quality of educational architectural spaces is conceptualized across multiple dimensions:

1. Functional Quality: Pertains to how well the space supports its intended activities. This includes spatial layout, flexibility, accessibility, capacity, and the provision of appropriate furniture and equipment for diverse learning and teaching styles (e.g., individual study, group work, lectures) [9].

2. Environmental Quality: Relates to the physical comfort and health aspects of the indoor and outdoor environment. Key factors include thermal comfort (temperature, humidity), indoor air quality (ventilation, pollutants), acoustic comfort (noise levels, reverberation), visual comfort (lighting quality, glare control, views), and integration of natural elements (e.g., soft landscape) [1, 12, 16].

3. Aesthetic and Experiential Quality: Focuses on the visual appeal, sensory experience, and psychological impact of the space. This includes design elements, materials, colors, textures, and the overall atmosphere that can inspire creativity, reduce stress, and promote a sense of belonging. This dimension often aligns with concepts of psychogeography, exploring how environments affect individuals' behavior and emotions [4, 7].

4. Social Quality: Concerns how the space facilitates social interaction, collaboration, and community building among students, teachers, and staff. This involves the provision of informal gathering areas, collaborative workspaces, and inclusive design that supports diverse user groups.

5. Technological Integration Quality: Assesses the seamless integration of modern educational technologies (e.g., smart boards, connectivity, digital learning tools) into the architectural design, ensuring they enhance, rather than hinder, the learning process. This aligns with broader trends in smart cities and digital talent development [6, 14, 18].

6. Sustainability Quality: Evaluates the environmental performance of the building, including energy efficiency, material choices, water conservation, waste management, and the overall ecological footprint [2, 12, 16, 17].

**Methodologies and Assessment Techniques**

A variety of assessment techniques can be employed, often in combination, to evaluate these quality dimensions:

1. User Surveys and Questionnaires: Directly gather perceptions, satisfaction levels, and needs from students, teachers, and administrative staff regarding various aspects of the space. These

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

can be quantitative (Likert scales) or qualitative (open-ended questions) [10, 19].

2. Expert Evaluations/Audits: Architects, educational psychologists, environmental specialists, and urban planners conduct systematic evaluations against predefined criteria, standards, and best practices. Checklists and rating scales are commonly used.

3. Physical Measurements and Technical Audits: Quantitative data collection on environmental parameters such as temperature, humidity, CO2 levels, light levels (lux), noise levels (dB), and energy consumption. Specialized equipment is used for this purpose [12].

4. Observational Studies: Direct observation of how users interact with and utilize the spaces. This can involve behavioral mapping, time-lapse photography, or ethnographic studies to understand actual usage patterns versus intended design.

5. Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE): A systematic process of evaluating building performance after it has been built and occupied for a period. POE integrates user feedback, expert assessment, and physical measurements to identify strengths and weaknesses [10].

6. Case Study Research: In-depth qualitative investigations of specific educational buildings or spaces, providing rich, context-specific insights into their design, use, and impact [20].

7. Participatory Design and Co-creation Workshops: Engaging end-users (students, teachers) in the design process itself can serve as an indirect assessment method, ensuring that initial designs meet user needs and preferences before construction.

8. Digital Tools and Simulations: Software applications can be used to simulate energy performance, daylighting, acoustics, and even the emotional impact of spaces [13]. Virtual reality (VR) environments can also be used for experiential assessment.

9. Cultural Heritage Assessment: For institutions with historical significance, methodologies for assessing the preservation and adaptive reuse of cultural heritage spaces are relevant [11].

**Integrated Assessment Framework**

The proposed integrated assessment framework emphasizes a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data to provide a comprehensive understanding of space quality. It recommends a cyclical process of initial assessment, intervention (design modifications or operational changes), and re-assessment. The framework stresses the importance of defining clear assessment criteria aligned with educational goals and involving multiple stakeholders throughout the process. The assessment process should also consider the "social practice of urban environment quality assessment" as highlighted in broader urban studies [10].

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

## RESULTS

The synthesis of various methodologies allowed for the development of a multi-dimensional framework for assessing the quality of architectural spaces in educational institutions. This framework highlights the imperative of moving beyond isolated evaluations to a holistic understanding that captures the intricate relationship between the built environment and learning outcomes.

### Core Dimensions and Interdependencies

The assessment framework identifies six key dimensions of quality, as detailed in the Methods section: Functional, Environmental, Aesthetic/Experiential, Social, Technological Integration, and Sustainability. Crucially, the results indicate that these dimensions are highly interdependent. For example:

- Optimal Environmental Quality (e.g., natural light, thermal comfort) directly enhances Functional Quality by improving concentration and reducing discomfort, thereby supporting learning activities [1].
- High Aesthetic and Experiential Quality can positively influence the Social Quality by creating inviting spaces that encourage interaction and a sense of community [4].
- Effective Technological Integration supports Functional Quality by enabling modern pedagogical approaches.
- Strong Sustainability Quality often contributes to better Environmental Quality (e.g., improved indoor air quality from green building practices) and long-term economic viability.

Neglecting one dimension can negatively impact others, demonstrating that a siloed approach to assessment is insufficient.

### Integrated Assessment Process and Tool Types

The synthesized framework proposes a cyclical, multi-stage assessment process that integrates diverse tools to provide comprehensive insights. This process can be broadly categorized into:

1. **Diagnostic Phase:**

- User Perceptions: Employing surveys and focus groups (qualitative) to capture subjective experiences, satisfaction levels, and perceived needs from students, teachers, and staff [10, 19].

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

- Expert Review: Architects and educational specialists conduct initial walkthroughs and apply checklists or rubrics based on design principles and pedagogical best practices [9].

- Initial Physical Measurements: Basic measurements of light levels, temperature, and noise in representative areas to identify obvious deficiencies.

**2. Detailed Analysis Phase:**

- Objective Environmental Metrics: Conducting comprehensive measurements of indoor air quality (CO2, VOCs), advanced lighting analyses (luminance, glare), and detailed acoustic surveys (reverberation time) [12].

- Behavioral Mapping and Observation: Systematic observation of how spaces are actually used, identifying patterns of movement, interaction, and areas of high/low utilization.

- Spatial Analysis: Using architectural analysis tools to evaluate layout efficiency, accessibility, and flexibility, potentially through simulation software [13].

- Sustainability Audits: Assessing energy consumption, water usage, waste generation, and material lifecycles against green building standards [2, 12, 16].

**3. Synthesis and Recommendation Phase:**

- Triangulation of Data: Combining insights from all data sources (subjective user feedback, objective measurements, expert opinions) to form a holistic understanding of space quality. For instance, user complaints about stuffiness (survey) validated by high CO2 readings (physical measurement).

- Gap Analysis: Identifying discrepancies between current performance and desired quality standards, or between design intent and actual usage.

- Prioritization of Interventions: Developing actionable recommendations for design modifications, operational changes, or maintenance improvements, prioritized by impact and feasibility.

The output of such an integrated assessment is not merely a score but a detailed report that outlines the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement across all quality dimensions. For instance, a "result" could be the identification of specific classrooms with inadequate natural light (affecting functional and environmental quality) leading to lower student engagement (affecting learning outcomes), or common areas that are aesthetically pleasing but acoustically poor, hindering social interaction.

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

### Illustrative Applications and Best Practices

Examples from the literature demonstrate how these methods contribute to assessing different facets:

- Assessment of outdoor spaces (soft landscape) using user feedback and expert observation to enhance comfort [1].
- Evaluation of "smart" features and their contribution to sustainability in educational settings [2, 13, 14].
- Case studies highlighting successful transformations of school spaces based on pedagogical needs [9, 19].
- Assessment of cultural heritage sites within educational contexts, balancing preservation with modern functionality [11].

The results indicate that no single method is sufficient; a blend of quantitative data for objective metrics and qualitative data for subjective experiences is essential for a comprehensive and actionable assessment of architectural space quality in educational institutions.

## DISCUSSION

The systematic review and synthesis presented in this article clearly demonstrate that assessing the quality of architectural spaces in educational institutions demands a multi-dimensional and integrated approach. Relying solely on aesthetic appeal or basic functionality is insufficient; a holistic understanding must encompass environmental, social, technological, and sustainability aspects. The interdependencies between these dimensions highlight that optimizing one often requires considering its impact on others, reinforcing the need for a comprehensive framework.

The proposed integrated assessment framework, which combines quantitative measurements with qualitative user perceptions and expert evaluations, provides a robust methodology for evaluating educational environments. This mixed-methods approach is crucial for capturing both the objective performance of a space (e.g., light levels, air quality) and its subjective impact on occupants (e.g., comfort, inspiration, sense of belonging) [10, 19]. For instance, while a classroom might meet basic lighting standards, user surveys could reveal issues with glare or lack of connection to the outdoors, which impact the learning experience [1]. Such nuanced insights are vital for truly effective design interventions.

The importance of aligning assessment criteria with specific educational goals cannot be overstated. A space designed for collaborative learning will have different quality indicators than

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

one optimized for quiet individual study. Therefore, the assessment framework must be flexible enough to adapt to the diverse pedagogical approaches and specific needs of various educational levels and institutions [9, 15]. The increasing adoption of agile learning environments and digital pedagogies further emphasizes the need for architectural spaces that are adaptable and technologically well-integrated [6, 13].

**Implications for Stakeholders:**

- Architects and Designers: The framework provides a structured approach for Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE) and continuous improvement, allowing designers to validate their assumptions, learn from built projects, and inform future designs [10]. It encourages a user-centric design process, potentially incorporating participatory elements from the outset.

- Educational Administrators and Planners: The assessment results can serve as a powerful tool for strategic planning, resource allocation, and prioritizing investments in educational infrastructure. It enables data-driven decisions on renovations, new constructions, and the adoption of smart building technologies [14, 18].

- Policymakers: Insights from such assessments can inform the development of national and local guidelines for educational building design, promoting high standards for learning environments that support sustainability and well-being [2, 12, 16].

**Limitations and Future Research:**

While this study offers a comprehensive synthesis, it acknowledges certain limitations. Being a conceptual review, it does not present new empirical data from a specific case study, relying instead on insights from diverse existing literature. The generalizability of findings across vastly different cultural or socio-economic contexts may require local adaptation. Furthermore, the dynamic nature of educational needs and technological advancements means that any assessment framework must remain adaptable and evolve over time.

**Future research could delve into several promising avenues:**

- Development of Standardized Assessment Tools: Creating practical, validated, and user-friendly tools (e.g., software applications, detailed checklists) based on this integrated framework that can be widely applied by educational institutions [13].

- Longitudinal Studies: Conducting long-term studies to track the impact of architectural space quality on student performance, teacher satisfaction, and organizational outcomes over time.

- Cost-Benefit Analysis: Quantifying the economic benefits (e.g., energy savings, reduced

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

maintenance, improved student retention) of investing in high-quality architectural spaces in educational institutions.

- Impact of Specific Design Features: Deeper empirical investigation into the precise impact of specific architectural features (e.g., daylighting design, biophilic elements, flexible furniture systems) on learning and well-being.
- Role of Smart Technologies in Assessment: Exploring how advancements in IoT sensors, AI, and big data analytics can revolutionize the collection and analysis of environmental and usage data for continuous, real-time assessment of educational spaces.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, investing in and systematically assessing the quality of architectural spaces in educational institutions is no longer a luxury but a fundamental necessity. By adopting a multi-dimensional and integrated approach to evaluation, stakeholders can ensure that these environments are not just buildings, but active and nurturing partners in the educational journey, contributing significantly to human development and a sustainable future.

## REFERENCES

1. Ale, T. A., & Ayeni, D. A. (2024). Enhancement of work place comfort through the use of soft landscape. City Territ Archit, 11, 5–6.
2. Balova, S. L., de Velazco, J. J. H. G., Polozhentseva, I. V., Chernavsky, M. Y., & Shubtsov, L. V. (2021). The formation of the concept of smart sustainable city with the purpose of environmental protection. J. Environ. Managem., 12, 1269–1275.
3. Barrese, J. (1983). Efficiency and equity considerations in the operation of transfer of development right plans. Land Economics, 59, 238–245.
4. Debord, G. (2017). Psychogeography. Ad Marginem Press.
5. Dessouky, N. (2016). Procedia Environmental Sciences. Procedia Environmental Sciences, 34, 401–410. doi:10.1016/j.proenv.2016.04.035
6. Digital Talent. (2017). Road to 2020 and beyond: A national strategy to develop Canada's talent in a Global Digital Economy. Information and communications technology council.
7. Fairclough, G., Sarlov, I., & Swanwick, C. (2018). Routledge handbook of Landscape Character Assessment. Current approaches to characterization and assessment. Routledge.

Available online at www.jomaar.com

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ARCHITECTURE RESEARCH
E ISSN: 2689 3541; P ISSN 2689 355X
Volume:07; Issue:03 (2025)

**8.** Hallsmith, G. (2003). The key to sustainable cities: Meeting human needs. Transforming community systems. New Society.

**9.** Ivanova, E. V. (2014). Foreign experience of architectural planning of the subject-spatial environment of modern schools. Bulletin of the Moscow State Pedagogical University. Series: Pedagogy and Psychology.

**10.** Ivashova, V. A. (2020). Social practice of urban environment quality assessment. IOP Conference Series. Materials Science and Engineering, 775, 3–5.

**11.** Jagodzińska, K. (2015). Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe. Full Report.

**12.** Kornienko, S. (2017). Energy efficiency, environmental safety, economic efficiency – priority tasks of «green» construction. Bulletin of the Volgograd State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering. Series: Construction and Architecture, 49, 167–177.

**13.** Kuripta, O., Popova, E., & Osipova, S. (2021). Conceptual aspects of designing a software application for calculating the sustainability class of the habitat for real estate objects. Technology and technology: ways of innovative development, 125–132.

**14.** Lagutenkov, A. (2018). Smart city: from concept to implementation. Sci. and Life, 8, 102–106.

**15.** Maruna, M., Rodic, D., & Colic, R. (2018). Remodelling urban planning education for sustainable development: the case of Serbia. Int. J. Sustain. High. Educ., 19, 658–680.

**16.** Naguib, D. (2014). Towards sustainability in Eco-cities, Faculty of Engineering. Cairo University.

**17.** Pryadko, I., & Ivanova, Z. (2017). Biosphere and social processes in the aspect of the design of the urban environment. Industrial and civil construction, 10, 12–17.

**18.** Smart Cities. (2011). Smart Technologies and Infrastructure for Energy, Water, Transportation, Buildings, and Government. Business Drivers. City and Supplier Profiles Market Analysis, and Forecasts Research Report. Executive Summary Boulder (CO, USA: Navigant Consulting, Inc).

**19.** Vinogradova, I. (2016). Modern school space: the main aspects of transformation. A new look, International Scientific Bulletin, 14, 131–132.

**20.** Yin, R. (2013). Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.