Design Maturity Scorecard

Created by Emily Sin

References:
- Invision Design Maturity Model
- Pistoia Alliance UXLS Maturity Model

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	"Design makes it look good"	"Design is a standardized, scalable process"	"Design is a standardized, scalable process"	"Design is a hypothesis and an experiment"	"Design is a business strategy"
	Level 1 companies are focused only on the most visible aspects of design — the pixels on the screen. At this level, organizations make early attempts to create efficiency and consistent story through visual identity guidelines but neglect processes, collaboration, and advanced tools. Key Activities: • Wireframes • Interactive prototypes Key Benefits: • Feature usability Collaborating across teams (e.g. through workshops and online tools) and building out a user research program will give Level 1 companies what they need to get beyond the pixel and help their colleagues see that design is more than just a pretty picture.	Design teams at Level 2 organizations have developed more collaborative processes, incorporating joint working sessions with non-design peers. User research, user stories, usability testing, and personas are also more prevalent. There's more talk of design in the air—from executives who promote its importance to employees who express more interest and empathy for customers. Key Activities: • Team alignment • Rapid sketching • Stakeholder input • Integrations between designer and developer tools Key Benefits: • Product usability • Customer satisfaction • All previous from Level 1 Digging in on design systems, hiring semi-dedicated or dedicated people (e.g. designers, engineers, and product managers) who focus exclusively on creating systems for design at scale will give Level 2 companies what they need to scale.	Level 3 businesses have formalized design as a scalable function. They have shared ownership, role clarity, joint accountability, and more documentation of their now more substantial design practices. This enables design to support more complex product ecosystems while integrating itself into equally complex internal operating structures (e.g. cross-functional teams) Key Activities: • Planning and prioritization • Design briefs • Written documentation Key Benefits: • Product and experience consistency • Usability is not a barrier to renewal • All previous from Level 2 Level 3 companies look very mature on paper, as they are doing a lot of design, with operational efficiency to scale it broadly throughout the company. But often, they do not know if the work is effective. To level up, Level 3 companies need to strengthen their experimentation practices, building in mechanisms and routines around developing hypotheses, running tests, and measuring results.	Organizations at this level are masters of behavioral analytics and experimentation design. They have sophisticated practices for analytics, experimentation, recruiting for user research, and monitoring and measuring the success of specific efforts. They have the beginnings of a design strategy practice, engaging in market research and vision development. The design team is empowered to pursue opportunities it deems important. Key Activities: • Concept testing • Comprehensive behavioral analytics • Project-specfic metrics • Funnel and conversion metrics Key Benefits: • Product maturity • Accessibility and localization • Design is a competitive differentiator • Effectively connect design to company goals • All previous from Level 3 For Level 4 companies to level-up, they have to make design core to their business strategy. They have the design team, the infrastructure and operations, and the testing and learning capabilities to make this happen. Design thinking needs to be brought into the boardroom and employing design exploration to discover the next business opportunity.	Level 5 companies are robust in all dimensions of maturity, but what really separates them from others is design's involvement in strategy. Design brings a unique lens to strategy through exploratory user research techniques, trends and foresight research that assess product market fit, and the delivery of unified cross-platform strategies. As a result, Level 5 companies report that design has impact on the widest range of benefits, from employee productivity to growth in market share to the development of new intellectual property. Key Activities: • Research into trends • Market-level research • Product market fit tests • Vision artifacts • Cross-platform strategies Key Benefits: • Organization believes in the value of design • Identify personas and opportunites in new markets • Entry into new markets • All previous from Level 4
Product Quality Product quality should be a baseline expectation in any product organization, and should be the easiest to directly affect with design. UX metrics defined for product usability and customer satisfaction are key measurable indicators of product quality, and in the most mature orgs, these metrics should feed into organization-wide goals.					
User Research	No one dedicated to research. If there is research being done, it's done by the designer doing the research, and is focused solely on usability testing. The design team relies heavily on intuition and feedback from 'experts' in the company in driving design forward, rather than having their own functions dedicated to research. No understanding of scientists' motivations and workflow. Documentation is inconsistent and sporadic.	Small staff of fulltime researchers focused on discovery and validation of designs already on the roadmap. Possible reliance on convenient particiants or participants as service (e.g. usertesting.com). Research is primarily communicated to the immediate design/ product team. Moderate understanding of scientists' motivations and workflow and creation of ad-hoc foundational artifacts like journey maps or personas. Basic repository for evidence, but older research feels inaccessible and hard to find.	There is a formalized and repeatable research function for efficiently validating design usability for getting good participants and feeding many teams. The researchers know our scientists better than anyone else (motivations, touchpoints with the product, lifecycle of drug development, and the where, what, why and how of the artifacts scientists create). Good processes are in place for collecting, classifying, and sharing evidence across the organization. Research findings are easily accessible and external teams can navigate the documentation. Researchers begin communicating findings up and out of their teams.	The research team facilitates experimentation and concept testing. Usability testing and documentation is a well-oiled machine. Research supports the beginnings of vision development. Research findings help shape product strategy and roadmap planning.	The research team employs exploratory user research techniques, researching trends, assessing product market fit and informing the delivery of unified cross-platform strategies. New features and product lines do not move forward unless supported by research.
UI Design	Design principles are not defined. Product is usable and functional, but is not desirable nor unique from the competition.	Design principles are defined but not applied consistently. Applications are mostly similar in experience but some inconsistencies remain. Product is functional and usable, desirable, or unique from the competition.	Design principles are defined and adhered to. Anyone on the design team can point to the design principles and how they are reflected in BenchSci's products. Product experience is consistent across applications. Product is highly functional, usable and desirable. Product could use further differentation to make it unique from the competition.	Product stands out as having one of the best experiences among its competitiors in the biomedial space. It highly functional, usable, desirable and unique from the competition. Design principles are so ingrained in the product and process that applying them becomes second nature.	Product is the leader in its space in terms of functionality, usability, desirability and uniqeness. Other companies use the product interface as an example to learn from and strive for (e.g. BenchSci is the leader in the biomedical space like how Google is the leader in the search engine space.)
Accessibility and Localization	No stance on accessibility and internationalization defined and any compliance is coincidental.	Starting to define accessibility stance and there is some compliance. Plans for localization and internationalization defined.	Stance on accessibility mostly defined and some compliance is present in the applications. Product is being internationalized. Text tokens being used to ensure consistency	Stance on accessibility is well-defined and reflected completely in the applications. New features are built with internalization in mind and product is being localized in countries where the product is in use.	Product is a leader in accessibility in the biomedical space. Product is internationlized and localized in all countries currently using the product.
Content and UX Writing	Product has no established voice and tone. UX writing in the applications varies and is not consistent. No dedicated UX writer and those doing writing are not specifically trained in writing for the screen.	No dedicated UX writer - using a borrowed resource (e.g. product marketing). Jargon is being removed and the team is starting to discover what the voice to scientists need to be. Application has consistency. Guidelines are starting to be outlined.	There is a dedicated UX writer and professional writing is attached to major projects. Guidelines for writing are fully outlined and reflected in all parts of the application (e.g. scientists understand actions and know what's expected, they know what risk means.)	In addition to the qualities of a Level 3 company, product has a polished and established voice and tone, combining scientific language with usability and desirability to create a voice unique to BenchSci.	Same as Level 4. At Level 3, the company has already achieved peak craft - the rest is refinement and doesn't heavily affect design's influence on business strategy.
Product Usability and Customer Satisfaction Metrics and Analytics	No analytics or metrics.	Basic analytics tool in place to automatically capture clicks, but no intention behind what metrics to collect and why. Metrics not used to inform decision-making.	Measurement and collection system in place for usability (e.g. SUS) and customer satisfaction. Metrics are used to improve features.	UX metrics are formalized and are assessed on a regular basis as a measurement of ongoing business value (e.g. Establishing a Google HEART framework where metrics are tracked and shared with key stakeholders). Metrics are defined for each feature (e.g. funnel and conversion metrics to asses the success of a feature).	Organizational expectation that everything has UX metrics and a formalized framework. UX metrics feed into an organization wide-framework for senior leaders. e.g. Strategic objectives are defined in terms of UX metrics.
Operational Efficiency There is a process in place for doing best practice UX design and user research. Methods give us efficiency and good processes ensure we can accurately predict and improve time to market. Employee productivity is a combination of efficient resourcing and having the right tools in place.					
Process	None. Without a process, design and research hinders the time it takes to get features to market.	Inconsistent process and ad-hoc collaboration with external parties (PMs, developers, SMEs) occurring at different times for different projects. Dependencies are not well-understood, and this results in timelines being unpredictable and sometimes hinders time to market.	Defined, repeatable design and research process where collaboration and touchpoints with other parties is well-defined and followed. Process is well-defined for execution of features already on the roadmap, with basic usability testing requirements. Timelines are predictable and do not hinder time to market.	Design process for roadmap features with basic usability testing and validation is a well-oiled machine. Experimentation and concept testing are now built into the design process and are expected as part of new projects.	Design process for roadmap features with basic usability testing and validation is a well-oiled machine. Experimentation and concept testing are built into the design process and timelines for this are predictable. There is an established process for design and research to conduct exploratory research across the platform, and for this to feed into roadmap planning.
Design System	No design system in place.	Design system has basic components and patterns defined. Components often need to be added with new projects. 50% of components in the applications are design system components.	Design system has components and patterns designed for 95% of the use cases. New components and patterns are introduced only in very specific cases. 100% of components in the applications are design system components.	Design system is recognized for its quality amongst other companies in the biomedical space.	Design system is the leader in quality among other companies in the biomedical space.
Tools	Have some tools. Not widely used. Not standardized and no training.	Have some tools for both prototyping and user research, but not all. Some people use them, some are standardized, but missing others. Training is sporadic.	Tools for prototyping and user research are in place. They are standardized, and everyone is trained.	Prototyping and research tools automate the process of getting ideas in front of users as much as possible. Everyone is trained. Someone has role of reviewing tools and their use, trains new staff, and makes recommendations for new or different tools.	Same as Level 4
Resourcing	Not enough designers and researchers to handle all feature/roadmap projects.	Enough designers and researchers to cover projects, but no time for non-feature/roadmap projects. No resources focused on design and research operations.	Enough designers and researchers to cover projects, but rarely have time to dedicate to improving design and research practice within the team. There are resources dedicated to design and research operations.	Designers and resources can dedicate 20% of their time to improving design and research practice within the design team, and evangelizing design thinking outside the team.	Designers and resources can dedicate 30% of their time to improving design and research practice within the design team, and evangelizing design thinking outside the team. There are resources dedicated to exploratory research and cross-platform design strategy.
Impact Design has an impact on strategic-level decisions and whole product lines. Others understand the benefits and contributions of design and advocate for it.					
Reach and Intention	Not enough designers and researchers to handle all feature/roadmap projects.	Reactive UX. Enhancing or tinkering with existing systems rather than being involved with new developments. e.g. Improving the usability of an existing search results interface because users are complaining about it.	Improvement by Design. UX is involved and integrated into new development or off-the-shelf software from the beginning. e.g. Deployment and design of a new off-the-shelf LMS system.	New concept and proactive UX. A project is starting with UX being a primary driver or UX specialists are able to initiate value-propositions for the business. e.g. User research has identified insights and opportunities that will drive a new value proposition.	Strategic design leadership means that UX is a primary driver behind projects, and UX specialists are involved in vetting and initiating any value propositions for the business. e.g. A truly patient-centric product line, or entering into new markets based on exploratory research
Teaching and Visibility	Other teams don't know what design does.	Some sharing and teaching of what design does is occurring, but it is not regular and not customized to each group.	Sharing and teaching occuring among other functional and cross-functional teams according to a plan. It is regular and customized for each group.	Sharing of work feeds up to leadership in addition to functional and cross-functional teams according to a plan. It is regular and customized for each group.	Leadership is actively engaged in design and other functional and cross-functional teams can articulate the importance of design. Teaching and sharing is a regular routine.