Notes:

Overall Performance Scores and RSF / Occupant (next page) are equal in Fig. 1.0 and Fig. 1.1.

Fig. 1.0 does not give weight to Workplace Program Performance while Fig. 1.1 includes it.

Definitions of value are shifting from economic and spatial metrics to metrics addressing human well-being and environmental factors.

The direction of the value arrow reflects this change in orientation.

Figure 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKPLACE PROGRAMS</th>
<th>SAFETY</th>
<th>HEALTH</th>
<th>WELLNESS</th>
<th>COMFORT</th>
<th>AMENITIES</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>QUALITY RATING</th>
<th>WORKER SATISFACTION</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>OVERALL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Scores</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.1

Traditional goals of space planning focused on reducing square foot per person, making efficiency the highest value. We now face a new challenge, brought to a critical juncture by Covid-19, in which values other than space and cost efficiency must prevail. The difficulty is in selecting a definition of quality that is both attractive to workers and helpful to the business.

There are many candidates, such as the ten listed above, each with a proprietary brand and set of standards to be followed. Covid is generating its own new set of standards, coming from government, human resources, legal, financial and other sources.

The Value Method enables evaluation of other factors in conjunction with square feet (Safety, Health, Wellness, etc.) These are scored impartially among a company’s locations, and evaluated for improvement needs in each area. They can also be compared impartially with like-minded peers, once performance standards are agreed to and normalized.