SAMPLE REPORT · EXCERPT 1 OF 4

Northwind Analytics

Research Operations Assessment

Six dimensions, 48 criteria, one uneven profile

PREPARED BY
Keri Mitoff
Best Designer LLC

ENGAGEMENT
Enterprise UX Research Toolkit

DATE
January 2026

CLASSIFICATION
Client confidential

HEADLINE FIGURE

52 / 100

BAND
Emerging

6 dimensions · 48 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

Northwind has eleven researchers and no research operation. Studies are well designed and well run by the individuals who run them; almost nothing about how they are run survives that individual leaving. The assessment scored six dimensions against forty-eight criteria and found a spread of 2.4 points between the strongest and weakest - the widest in any assessment we have run at this size.

Knowledge management is genuinely strong at 3.6. There is a repository, a taxonomy, a weekly insight share and a decision log. Participant operations is the constraint at 1.2: there is no panel, no consent register, and recruitment runs through three researchers' personal networks with no documented sourcing or bias record.

Data governance scored 1.8, which is the finding with the shortest deadline. Session recordings sit in three unapproved cloud accounts, retention is undefined, and consent language does not cover secondary use. Under GDPR that is not a maturity gap, it is exposure.

> **What this report asks you to decide.** Tooling is over-provisioned and under-integrated: fourteen paid tools for five methods, with three overlapping usability platforms and no single source for session recordings. The redundancy costs roughly the salary of the junior researcher the team says it cannot afford.

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
Strategy & planning	16%	2.0	50	Gap
Participant operations	17%	1.2	30	Constraint
Tools & infrastructure	15%	1.8	45	Gap
Data governance & security	18%	1.8	45	Gap
Knowledge management	17%	3.6	90	Strength
Quality & enablement	17%	2.1	52	Gap
HEADLINE FIGURE	**100%**	—	**52**	**Emerging**

Reading the shape. The spread between the strongest and weakest dimension is 2.4 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	**Session recordings held in three unapproved cloud accounts**	Critical	Storage audit, 14 tools	GDPR exposure; no retention schedule; consent excludes secondary use
02	**No participant panel or consent register**	Critical	Panel audit, 0 of 8 criteria met	Recruitment depends on 3 personal networks; bias undocumented
03	**Fourteen tools for five methods, three overlapping**	High	Licence audit, 41k annual	Redundant spend exceeds the cost of the requested hire
04	**Study practice undocumented; 9 of 11 researchers solo**	High	Protocol review, 48 criteria	A single departure removes a method from the organisation
05	**Repository is strong but not linked to decisions**	Medium	Repository query, 210 entries	Insight exists; the decision log references it in 22% of cases

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.