

WHAT MAKES A PLACE GOOD TO LIVE?

One idea must land: liveability is real — but it depends on who is looking. Perception is the descriptor's beating heart.

WE ARE LEARNING

What makes places liveable, why different people see the same place differently — and how to inspect our own suburb with honest eyes.

CURRICULUM · VERBATIM

“The factors that influence the decisions people make about where to live and their perceptions of the liveability of places” — Revised WA Curriculum, Y7 Geography (SCSA, implementation 2026).

SPARK THE 60-SECOND STORM

- **Open with the hook:** “Perth keeps landing near the top of world liveability lists. Who decided that? Did anyone ask you?” Let it hang two seconds. Then: “Today the experts get overruled.”
- **Run the storm:** 60 seconds, solo, pens moving the whole time — words not sentences. Then partner merge: steal the best two ideas. Then **harvest to the board:** go around the room, one idea per voice, build the master list. If devices are out, a live word-cloud poll makes the harvest electric — the big words grow as they type.
- **Group the list as you go** into the factor families the image shows: housing · getting around · health · safety · parks and nature · things to do. Don't name the families first — let their words build them.

CORE THREE PEOPLE, ONE SUBURB

- **Say:** “Same streets. Same parks. So why would a nurse on night shifts and an 80-year-old rate it differently?” Partners talk 90 seconds per person, then harvest a few answers aloud.
- **Land the word:** perception — how a place looks depends on who is looking. Students write their own version in the box. This is the descriptor, in their voice.

WORKSHOP THE INSPECTION

- **Set the norm before pens move:** “An inspector who gives everything 10 out of 10 gets fired. A 4 with a sharp reason beats a fake 10.” Honesty is the skill being marked.
- **Do:** each student picks their three factors from the master list, marks an X on each score line, writes the reason. Then the sketch: best corner, worst corner — labels beat art.
- **Circulate for reasons, not scores.** “Why a 6 and not an 8?” is the question that does the teaching.

LAND IT TOP FIVE + THE MISSION

- The top-five ranking, then **hand out the mission slips** (printable) and read the two tasks aloud: interview two adults — their real words — and find one checkable online fact with its source. Set the return day clearly.
- Exit question 2 plants Lesson 2: a mine, 3 km from home — which factor gets touched first? Most will circle parks/nature or safety. That circle is next lesson's doorway.

■ WHAT THE MISSION DATA FEEDS — SO YOU CAN PROMISE IT HONESTLY

The interviews and facts return next lesson. Use them two ways: Lesson 2 opens with a two-minute share (“whose adult mentioned nature, quiet, or space? Hands up” — it seeds environmental quality perfectly), and Lesson 3 uses the whole data pool when teams build their evaluation criteria. Nothing they collect is wasted — tell them that; it changes how seriously they collect.

■ ANTICIPATED STORM ANSWERS — AND THE TRANSLATION TRICK

Expect: the beach, a footy oval, Maccas nearby, good wifi, mates' houses close, a quiet street, dogs allowed, no bullies, a big backyard. **Honour every answer by translating it, never dismissing it:** “Maccas nearby” is access to services. “Mates close” is community. “No bullies” is safety — and it's the most serious answer in the room. When their word becomes a geography word in front of them, they own the concept.

■ RUNNING THE HARVEST

Write their words on the board **verbatim** — kid language, not yours. When the board is full, draw loops around the natural clusters and ask the class to NAME each loop. The factor families should feel discovered, not delivered. Digital option: a live word-cloud poll makes the big ideas literally grow on screen as they type — then loop the cloud the same way.

■ PROBING QUESTIONS WHILE YOU CIRCULATE

- “Why a 6 and not an 8? What would your suburb need to do to earn the 8?”
- “Whose top five would be most different from yours — someone older, younger, or with a different job?”
- “Is there a factor money can't fix?”
- “Would your number 1 survive if you moved 400 km inland?” (Quiet seed for the whole unit.)

■ DIFFERENTIATION

Support: the storm can be spoken before written — pair a talker with a scribe; offer sentence starters for score reasons (“I gave a __ because my suburb has/lacks...”). **Extend:** the rank-flip — rebuild your top five as the 80-year-old. Which factors swap in? What does that prove about perception?

■ RUNNING SHORT — THE CUT LINE

Cut the sketch, keep everything else. Protect the storm-and-harvest, the perception box, at least two honest score strips, and the mission slips going home.

■ MISCONCEPTIONS TO WATCH

“Liveable means rich or fancy” (a safe park beats a marble foyer) · “everyone wants the same things” (the nurse and the 80-year-old just disproved it) · “my suburb is boring, so there's nothing to write” (boring IS data — what's missing, exactly?).

Perth's strong showing on world liveability lists is well established — stated without a specific rank or year, it will survive any fact-check. Everything students add from the mission carries its own source; that's the program's brand.

