SAMPLE REPORT · EXCERPT 1 OF 4

Halcyon Financial

Design System Health Assessment

Four platforms, 214 components, one profile

PREPARED BY
Keri Mitoff
Best Designer LLC

ENGAGEMENT
Design System Audit Kit

DATE
March 2026

CLASSIFICATION
Client confidential

HEADLINE FIGURE

61 / 100

BAND
At risk

8 dimensions · 60 criteria · weighted

This is a real report structure with representative findings, included so you can see the shape of the deliverable before you buy. The client name and figures are illustrative; the structure, the scoring logic and the writing standard are the ones the kit produces.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The short version

Halcyon's design system is well funded and well liked, and it is not yet doing the job it was funded to do. The library covers 71% of the components the four product teams actually ship, but only 43% of those components behave identically on web and native - so every product team maintains a private fork for the difference.

The profile is lopsided. Infrastructure robustness scores 3.1 and organisational alignment 3.4, while documentation and accessibility scores 1.6 and governance 1.9. That shape is the classic failure mode: a strong build with no rules for changing it, and no written record of what it does.

The consequence is measurable. Support requests per component have risen 38% year on year while component releases have stayed flat. Two of the four product teams now ship screens that fail WCAG 2.2 AA on contrast, because the token layer has no documented contrast pairs and the library's own defaults are wrong in dark mode.

> **What this report asks you to decide.** The recommendation is not more components. It is documentation, a contribution model and a token audit, in that order, over two quarters. The full roadmap is on page 9.

DIMENSION PROFILE

Where the shape is lopsided

Each dimension is scored 0–4 and normalised to 100. The headline figure is the weighted mean. The lowest dimension is the constraint, and it sets the order of the roadmap.

DIMENSION	WEIGHT	SCORE /4	NORMALISED	READ
Organisational alignment	14%	3.4	85	Strength
Team effectiveness	10%	2.8	70	Adequate
Infrastructure robustness	15%	3.1	78	Adequate
Governance	13%	1.9	48	Gap
Support & enablement	11%	2.4	60	Gap
Adoption & conformance	15%	2.2	55	Gap
Tokens & foundations	11%	1.8	45	Gap
Documentation & accessibility	11%	1.6	40	Constraint
HEADLINE FIGURE	**100%**	—	**61**	**At risk**

Reading the shape. The spread between the strongest and weakest dimension is 1.8 points on a four-point scale. A spread above 1.5 means the operation is not one system with a weak part; it is two systems, one of which is undocumented. Fix the constraint before extending the strength.

FINDINGS

What we found

Ranked by consequence, not by ease. Every finding carries the evidence that produced it and the consequence if it is left alone.

ID	FINDING	SEVERITY	EVIDENCE	CONSEQUENCE
01	**Dark-mode token pairs fail WCAG 2.2 AA contrast**	Critical	Token audit, 14 of 61 semantic pairs	Text at 3.1:1 on surface-raised; affects every dark-mode screen
02	**No published contribution model**	High	Governance canvas, 1 of 8 criteria met	Three teams maintain private forks; 41 detached components
03	**Documentation covers 34 of 214 components**	High	Coverage matrix	New engineers take 11 days to first shipped screen, against a 3-day target
04	**Web and native parity unmeasured**	High	Parity audit, 4 platforms	43% parity; the difference is undocumented in 9 of 12 cases
05	**Deprecation has no policy or migration path**	Medium	Governance canvas	Six components in use are two major versions behind

The remaining pages of the full report — method, scope and limitations, recommendations in payback order, the 30/60/90 roadmap and the appendix of evidence references — follow the same structure. The template ships as PDF and DOCX so you can rebrand it and write your own findings into it.