SCORECARD · SIMPLIFIED PREVIEW

The Design System Health Scorecard

Eight dimensions, sixty criteria, one defensible profile.

This is the simplified printable version of the instrument inside the kit. The full workbook computes every figure live from your evidence: dimension scores, the weighted profile and the headline figure. Use this page to see how the method thinks before you buy.

DIMENSION	WEIGHT	CRITERIA	SCORE 0–4	WEIGHTED
Organisational alignment	14%	8	—	—
Team effectiveness	10%	7	—	—
Infrastructure robustness	15%	8	—	—
Governance	13%	8	—	—
Support & enablement	11%	7	—	—
Adoption & conformance	15%	8	—	—
Tokens & foundations	11%	7	—	—
Documentation & accessibility	11%	7	—	—
HEADLINE FIGURE	**100%**	**60**		**— / 100**

SCORE	BAND	WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE ENGAGEMENT
85-100	Exemplary	Protect the pattern. The audit becomes a benchmark, not a repair list.
70-84	Strong	Targeted fixes. A short roadmap, mostly quick wins and documentation debt.
55-69	At risk	Structural work. Two or three dimensions need redesign, not patching.
40-54	Weak	Programme, not project. Budget for sequencing across quarters.
0-39	Critical	The system is not doing its job. Re-fund and re-scope before adding components.

The normalisation. Dimension score = (sum of criterion scores / (4 x criteria scored)) x 100. System health = weighted mean of the eight dimension scores. **The balance rule:** the report always names the lowest-scoring dimension, because a system is only as strong as its weakest layer - a high average with one collapsed dimension is a failing system with good marketing.

CRITERIA 1–60 OF 60

The 60 criteria

Score each 0–4. Write the evidence reference beside it.

ID	CRITERION	0	1	2	3	4	EVIDENCE REF
OA1	Leadership sponsorship is named, visible and funded beyond a single quarter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA2	The system has a stated strategic position - platform, product or brand layer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA3	Funding is stable enough to plan two quarters ahead	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA4	Cross-functional buy-in exists at director level in design, engineering and product	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA5	Success measures are agreed with the sponsor, not invented by the system team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA6	The system appears in product roadmaps as a dependency, not a side project	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA7	Decision rights between the system team and product teams are documented	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
OA8	Reorganisations do not reset the system's mandate or its funding	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE1	Core team capacity is sized against contribution volume, not headcount alone	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE2	The team holds the disciplines it needs - design, front-end, content, accessibility	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE3	Working agreements exist for review, pairing and hand-off	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE4	Time is protected for maintenance, not only for net-new components	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE5	Contribution load is distributed and visible, not carried by one person	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE6	Team wellbeing is monitored - burnout is a delivery risk, not a personal one	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TE7	A succession path exists for the team's critical roles	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR1	Component coverage is measured against a real product inventory, not a wish list	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR2	The same component behaves consistently across every supported platform	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR3	Component APIs are stable and versioned	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR4	Foundations - colour, type, space, radius, elevation, motion - are defined once	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR5	Documentation covers usage, anatomy, states and do/don't	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR6	Tooling supports the workflow end to end, from design file to shipped code	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR7	Content standards are encoded in the system, not left to each product team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
IR8	Accessibility behaviour is baked into components, not bolted on per screen	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

ID	CRITERION	0	1	2	3	4	EVIDENCE REF
GV1	A contribution model is published and actually used	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV2	Deviation from the system is tracked, with a route back	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV3	Decision-making authority is clear for new components and breaking changes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV4	A flexibility philosophy is stated - where teams may diverge, and why	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV5	Versioning and release strategy is documented and followed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV6	Deprecation has a policy, a timeline and a migration path	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV7	Prioritisation uses a stated framework with published criteria	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
GV8	Exceptions are reviewed on a cadence, not granted by favour	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE1	Onboarding exists for new designers and engineers, and its effect is measured	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE2	Help channels are staffed with a stated response expectation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE3	Office hours or clinics run on a predictable schedule	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE4	Changelogs, release notes and a roadmap are published where teams actually look	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE5	Champions or advocates exist in product teams with a defined role	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE6	Feedback loops turn repeated usage questions into documentation fixes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
SE7	Training material is current with the latest release	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC1	Component usage is instrumented, not estimated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC2	Conformance is measured per product, per release	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC3	Detached or forked components are counted and triaged	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC4	Adoption is reported to the sponsor in the same language as product metrics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC5	Teams trust the system enough to ship on it without workarounds	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC6	Time-to-first-shipped-screen for a new team is known	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC7	Support ticket volume per component is tracked as a quality signal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
AC8	Adoption targets exist and are reviewed quarterly	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF1	Tokens are the single source of truth, not a parallel style sheet	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF2	Token naming follows a documented, predictable convention	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF3	Token tiers are separated - primitive, semantic, component	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF4	Tokens are exported to every consuming platform automatically	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF5	Theme and mode support is token-driven, not hardcoded	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF6	Token changes are versioned and communicated before release	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
TF7	Token format follows the W3C Design Tokens Community Group draft	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
DA1	Every published component has a documentation page that is current	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
DA2	Documentation states the accessibility requirements per component	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
DA3	Colour pairs are documented with measured contrast ratios	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
DA4	Keyboard and screen-reader behaviour is specified, not implied	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

ID	CRITERION	0	1	2	3	4	EVIDENCE REF
DA5	Focus management is defined for overlays, menus and dialogs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
DA6	Documentation is searchable and reachable from inside the design tool	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
DA7	Documentation is tested with real users of the system, not only written	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Score 0 = absent. 1 = emerging - ad hoc, person-dependent. 2 = functional - it works, but only just. 3 = strong - documented, followed, measured. 4 = exceptional - self-correcting, benchmarked externally. Every rating carries a reference - a file path, a ticket ID, a screenshot - or it is marked provisional and excluded from the headline figure.

METHOD & SOURCES

Every dimension and criterion in this instrument is derived from a published framework, standard or study. The kit documents the mapping so a reviewer can trace any score back to its source.

Nielsen Norman Group	Design-System Maturity: A 6-Dimension Framework (Huei-Hsin Wang) - organisational alignment, team effectiveness, infrastructure robustness, governance, support, adoption; the 1-5 scale and the multi-evaluator assessment method	nngroup.com
U.S. Web Design System	Maturity model - three levels: integrate design principles, follow UX guidance, use USWDS code	designsystem.digital.gov
W3C	Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2, W3C Recommendation, 5 October 2023	w3.org/TR/WCAG22
W3C Design Tokens Community Group	Design Tokens Format Module - the token format referenced in Dimension 7	tr.designtokens.org
Amy Hupe & Geri Reid	Design system governance, contribution models and maturity writing	amyhupe.co.uk