

# Service Usability

A two-day leadership workshop on redesigning public services around effectiveness, efficiency, and citizen satisfaction.

## Who it is for

Senior managers, heads of service, programme leads, and policy owners responsible for citizen-facing public services. Designed for cohorts of up to 24, or full intact leadership teams.

## What participants leave with

- A shared vocabulary for talking about service quality.
- A diagnostic toolkit for auditing existing services.
- A redesign of one real service from their own portfolio.
- A 90-day plan for embedding usability practice on return to work.

## Pre-work for participants

- Pick two or three candidate services from your portfolio you would be willing to work on during the workshop.
- Bring login access and devices for those services. You will walk through them on Day 1.
- Reflect on the last citizen complaint your team handled. What made it a complaint?

## Room and materials

Round tables of 4 to 6. Flipchart per table, sticky notes (three colours), markers, A4 paper, pencils. Printed copies of the seven templates from this guide (one per participant per template). Wall space for a pattern wall. WiFi and devices for the Service Walk.

## Two-day schedule

Day 1 — Diagnose		
09:00	Module 01 — Welcome and the three pillars	45 min
09:45	Module 02 — Why service usability matters	60 min
10:45	Break	15 min
11:00	Module 03 — The three lenses in depth	75 min
12:15	Module 04 — Citizens as users	60 min
13:15	Lunch	60 min
14:15	Module 05 — The Service Walk	90 min
15:45	Break	15 min
16:00	Module 06 — Failure pattern coding	75 min
17:15	Module 07 — Day one wrap	15 min
Day 2 — Redesign and embed		
09:00	Module 08 — Reflections from Day 1	30 min
09:30	Module 09 — Principles of usable services	75 min
10:45	Break	15 min
11:00	Module 10 — Redesign sprint, part 1	90 min
12:30	Lunch	60 min
13:30	Module 11 — Redesign sprint, part 2	60 min
14:30	Module 12 — Beyond UI: service-level redesign	75 min
15:45	Break	15 min
16:00	Module 13 — Embedding usability practice	60 min
17:00	Module 14 — Commitments and close	30 min

**Facilitator note.** Timings include 5 minutes' buffer per module for transitions. Energy permitting, Modules 11 and 12 can be slightly compressed to give Module 13 more space — embedding is where most workshops underdeliver.

---

## **A** Day one - Diagnose

Day 1 builds shared vocabulary, then turns the room outward onto a real service. By the end of the day each team has walked a service they own, captured its friction, and coded the friction into named failure patterns. The day deliberately does not yet talk about solutions — that is Day 2.

## MODULE 01

# Welcome and the three pillars

Day 1 · 09:00 · 45 min

**Learning outcome.** Participants share a working definition of service usability anchored in three pillars, and surface the services they will work on during the rest of the workshop.

**CONTENT**

Open with the working definition of usability, borrowed wholesale from ISO 9241-11: the extent to which a service can be used by specified citizens to achieve specified goals with effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction in a specified context of use.

Treat each part of that definition as a pillar in its own right, because public services routinely optimise for one and ignore the others.

- **Effectiveness.** Can the citizen complete the task they came to do, and is the outcome correct? Not "did they reach the end of the form" but "did they get the thing they needed."
- **Efficiency.** How much time, effort, and re-work did it cost them? And how much did it cost the agency, including the call centre and assisted-digital teams that exist because of UI failures upstream?
- **Satisfaction.** How did the citizen feel during and after, and would they trust the service next time? In mandatory services, "satisfied" is a strange word — but "felt respected" and "would return without dread" are not.

Walk through one example where the pillars are in tension. Tax filing is reliable: efficient for the agency to extract more information, but lengthens the form and depresses both effectiveness and satisfaction for first-time filers.

**EXERCISE · Introduce yourself by your hardest service**

20 min · plenary · flipchart

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Each participant introduces themselves with name, role, organisation, and the one citizen-facing service in their portfolio that is hardest to get right at the moment.

Facilitator captures the named services on a flipchart visible for the rest of the workshop. This list becomes the candidate pool for the Service Walk in Module 05.

**DEBRIEF**

No formal debrief. The act of listing in public is the work.

**Facilitator note.** Resist debating ISO 9241 at length. The definition is a vocabulary, not a doctrine. The faster you can shift from frame to introductions, the better the day starts. The "hardest service" answers often surface deep frustration — listen for them; you will return to several by name on Day 2.

## MODULE 02

# Why service usability matters

Day 1 · 09:45 · 60 min

**Learning outcome.** Participants leave with the economic, legitimacy, and fairness arguments for service usability that they can take into their own leadership and board conversations.

## CONTENT

### The economic argument

Channel cost data is widely cited and well-established. Self-service digital transactions cost roughly 50 times less than face-to-face and 15 times less than telephone. The saving only materialises if the digital channel actually works. A poorly-designed online form that pushes 30% of users back to the call centre costs more than no digital channel at all.

### The legitimacy argument

In the commercial world a badly-designed product loses customers to a competitor. In the public sector citizens have no alternative, but their trust in the state erodes one frustrating interaction at a time. Lost trust is expensive to rebuild and shows up in lower compliance, more appeals, more demand on intermediaries, and harder-to-deliver future services.

### The fairness argument

The citizens who depend most on government services are the ones least equipped to navigate badly-designed ones. Service usability is not a comfort feature; it is the operational form of equality of access.

### Brief case studies

- **GOV.UK.** Single domain, strong patterns, embedded research, sustained ministerial backing.
- **Healthcare.gov 2013.** What poor service design costs at launch — political, financial, and reputational.
- **Estonia.** Usability treated as infrastructure rather than interface; secondary effects on civic trust.

## EXERCISE · First-impression scoring

20 min · individual + pairs · Template 1

### INSTRUCTIONS

Facilitator names one well-known national service everyone in the room has used. Each participant scores it on the three pillars, 1 to 5, on the Service Usability Scorecard.

In pairs (5 min), compare scores. Focus on the largest disagreement — it is more interesting than the average.

### DEBRIEF

In plenary, collect two or three disagreements. The interesting answer is usually that participants are scoring as themselves — confident, professional, literate users. The same service scored from the perspective of a first-time, low-literacy, anxious citizen would look very different. This is the move the workshop will keep making: from self-as-user to specified-citizen-as-user.

**Facilitator note.** This is a deliberately easy exercise. Its purpose is to warm the room and introduce the scoring instrument, which will return repeatedly. Don't let the discussion get stuck arguing about whether the chosen service is "actually good". The point isn't the service; it's the scoring lens.

## MODULE 03

## The three lenses in depth

Day 1 · 11:00 · 75 min

**Learning outcome.** Participants leave able to evidence each pillar with specific measures, and able to recognise the trade-offs between them.

## CONTENT

**Effectiveness: measures and traps**

Useful measures include task completion rate broken down by channel and by user segment, error rate, and "right first time" rate. The trap is treating "transactions completed" as a success metric without checking whether the outcome was correct. A form completed incorrectly is not a success.

**Efficiency: from whose perspective?**

Useful measures include time to complete, drop-off rate by step, channel-shift volume (how many digital starts end up in the call centre), and repeat-contact rate. Efficiency must be measured for both citizen and agency — these often pull in opposite directions, and the choice of whose efficiency to optimise is a political one.

**Satisfaction: beyond CSAT**

CSAT and NPS are crude instruments in mandatory contexts. More useful measures include Single Ease Question (SEQ), trust score, perceived fairness, and "would return without dread" — the honest test for services people cannot avoid.

**Trade-offs**

The classic trade-offs: faster forms versus more accurate data, broader eligibility checks versus simpler flows, more help text versus less cognitive load. Service design is the practice of making these trade-offs deliberately rather than accidentally.

## EXERCISE · Three-lens audit with evidence

45 min · pairs · Template 1

**SETUP**

Each pair is assigned a different well-known service. Aim for variety: a transactional service, an informational service, an enforcement or claimant-facing service.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Score the service on each of the three pillars (1 to 5), but this time evidence each score with a specific moment or feature — not a general impression. "Effectiveness 2: the eligibility question on page 3 uses a statutory term rather than the term citizens use, so people self-exclude incorrectly." 30 min in pairs, 15 min plenary readout.

**DEBRIEF**

Which pillar generated the most disagreement within pairs? Which generated the most "I'd never thought of that" moments? Note these for return to in Module 09.

**Facilitator note.** If a pair finishes early, ask them to score the same service from the perspective of a different segment — a first-time user, an assisted-digital user, a non-native speaker. The difference is always larger than they expect.

## MODULE 04

## Citizens as users

Day 1 · 12:15 · 60 min

**Learning outcome.** Participants stop talking about "citizens" in the abstract and start working with specified user groups, including the ones their service does not currently serve.

## CONTENT

**The bullseye user**

Public services typically serve a primary audience (the bullseye), an adjacent audience served well enough (ring 1), and a wider audience served imperfectly (ring 2). Outside the rings sit citizens the service does not serve at all — often the people who need it most.

**Four hard-to-reach groups**

Most government services have to work for four overlapping populations that standard recruitment misses: older citizens, people with low digital literacy, people whose first language is not the dominant one, and people in active claimant relationships with the state. Each has different barriers and risks.

**Assisted-digital is a design constraint, not an afterthought**

Many citizens complete services with help — from family, from library staff, from advocacy workers, from call centre agents. Design the screen so both the citizen and the helper can make sense of it. "Assisted-digital" is the second user, not a fallback channel.

**EXERCISE · Bullseye user map for one of your services**

40 min · individual then table · Template 2

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Each participant takes one service from their own portfolio and fills in the Bullseye User Map: who is the primary user, who is in ring 1, who is in ring 2, and who is excluded entirely. For excluded groups, write why.

25 minutes individual. Then 15 minutes at the table: each person shares their map. Tablemates challenge the bullseye and the exclusions.

**DEBRIEF**

Common pattern: the bullseye described is the user the team finds easiest to research, not the user the policy intent targets. Surfacing this gap is the work.

**Facilitator note.** Some participants will resist naming excluded groups, framing it as defeatist or as out-of-scope. Push back: a service that excludes a group does so whether or not the team has named the exclusion. Naming it is the only thing that lets you decide what to do about it.

## MODULE 05

## The Service Walk

Day 1 · 14:15 · 90 min

**Learning outcome.** Each team has walked a real service from their portfolio end to end, captured every step, and identified the moments of friction that will drive the rest of the workshop.

## CONTENT

**What a Service Walk is**

A Service Walk is a structured observation of a live service, carried out by the team responsible for it, from the perspective of a citizen attempting the task for the first time. The discipline is observation, not analysis. You record what happens; you do not yet ask why.

**Capture protocol**

- Pick one path through the service. Pick a real, plausible one — not the simplest.
- Screenshot or photograph every step. Number the screenshots.
- At every step, note: what did you have to know? What did you have to do? What were you unsure of? Where did you wait?
- Flag every moment of friction — every confusion, every re-read, every doubt about the right answer, every dead end. Do not yet judge whether it is fixable.

**EXERCISE · Walk the service you brought**

75 min · teams of 3 to 4 · Template 3

**SETUP**

Form teams of 3 to 4. Each team picks one service from the candidate pool captured in Module 01. Where multiple people on a team own the service, one person plays the citizen; the others observe and record.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Walk the service end to end on the actual live channel (website, app, or in person if logistically possible). Use the Service Walk Field Notes template. Capture every step, every observation, every friction point.

The person playing the citizen is forbidden from using internal knowledge. If they would not know something as a first-time user, they do not know it now.

60 min walking and recording. 15 min in plenary: each team reads out the worst single moment they found.

**DEBRIEF**

Do not yet attempt fixes. The Day 2 work depends on Day 1 ending with a clear record of what is wrong, uncluttered by premature solutions.

**Facilitator note.** If a team's service is internal-facing or has authentication barriers that prevent a cold walk, two adjustments: have a tablemate from another agency play citizen (they bring genuine naivety), or walk a citizen-facing comms artefact instead (the decision letter, the follow-up email, the IVR script).

## MODULE 06

# Failure pattern coding

Day 1 · 16:00 · 75 min

**Learning outcome.** Friction observed on the Service Walk has been categorised into named failure patterns. Teams have a shared diagnostic vocabulary they can use back at work.

## CONTENT

### Why naming patterns matters

Friction the team can name is friction the team can act on. Generic complaints ("the form is confusing") rarely produce change. Named patterns ("this is an eligibility cliff at question 4") direct attention precisely.

### A working catalogue of failure patterns

- **Eligibility cliff.** A question whose wrong answer silently disqualifies the user, with no path forward.
- **Synonym trap.** The service uses statutory language; the citizen uses everyday language; the mismatch causes errors or self-exclusion.
- **Silent wait.** No acknowledgement after submission (no email, no SMS, no status page). The citizen does not know whether they are in the queue.
- **Hidden mandatory.** Required fields revealed only on submission error, forcing the user to scroll back and guess what they missed.
- **Repeat yourself.** The same information requested twice across pages, departments, or channels.
- **Triangulator.** The user is referred to another office to confirm something the originating office could have confirmed itself.
- **Status black box.** No visibility into where the application is, what is happening, or when a response is due.
- **Shame error.** An error message that blames the user ("You have entered invalid data") rather than describing what is needed.
- **Dead end.** No clear path when the answer is "you are not eligible" — leaving the citizen with no signpost to where they can go instead.

**EXERCISE - Code your Service Walk into named patterns**

60 min · teams · sticky notes + wall space

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Each team takes their Service Walk friction list and codes each issue with a failure pattern from the catalogue. Where the existing patterns do not fit, the team names a new one and writes a one-sentence definition.

Each pattern goes on a sticky note. Patterns aggregate on a shared pattern wall in the room, with the supporting observations posted underneath.

45 min coding. 15 min standing at the wall: which patterns showed up in everyone's service? Those are systemic.

**DEBRIEF**

The patterns that appear across multiple unrelated services are the ones worth investing in. A solution to "status black box" written once can be applied across a portfolio.

**Facilitator note.** *Keep the pattern wall up for Day 2. It is the bridge between diagnosis and redesign. If your venue does not allow wall stickers, use flipchart sheets pinned together.*

**MODULE 07****Day one wrap**

Day 1 · 17:15 · 15 min

**Learning outcome.** The room closes Day 1 with a brief individual reflection and a clear orientation to Day 2.

**CONTENT**

Round the room: each participant says one thing they noticed today they will think about overnight. Facilitator captures the surfaces but does not respond — the noticing is the point.

Brief preview of Day 2: principles, redesign sprint, service-level mapping, embedding.

Logistics for the next morning. Close.

**Facilitator note.** Discourage workshop alcohol or networking activities that would compete with the overnight reflection. The Day 2 opening depends on participants having sat with Day 1's discomfort.

---

## **B** Day two - Redesign and embed

Day 2 turns from diagnosis to action. By the end of the day each team has a paper redesign of the worst part of their service, tested informally with a fresh pair of eyes, mapped across the full service iceberg, and converted into a 90-day plan the participant will commit to in front of the room.

## MODULE 08

# Reflections from Day 1

Day 2 · 09:00 · 30 min

**Learning outcome.** The room re-enters the workshop having articulated what they carried overnight, and is oriented toward action.

**CONTENT**

Open with the overnight-reflection round. Each participant has 30 to 45 seconds. No commentary from the facilitator during the round; comments shape the room more than the facilitator realises.

After the round, the facilitator names two or three themes that recurred. These themes become the through-line for the day. Common ones: "we are the wrong people to test our own service"; "the friction is in places we never measure"; "the citizen has less information than we assumed".

**Facilitator note.** *If the room is quieter than Day 1, do not chase energy with enthusiasm — that often signals the workshop is working. The right Day 2 opening is contemplative, not performative.*

## MODULE 09

## Principles of usable services

Day 2 · 09:30 · 75 min

**Learning outcome.** Participants have a working set of ten design principles for public services, with examples drawn from their own portfolio and the patterns surfaced on Day 1.

## CONTENT

Ten principles, each with brief rationale. Treat as a starting set, not a doctrine. Each can be inverted to describe a common failure pattern from Day 1.

- **One thing per page.** Each step asks one question. The user knows where they are; you know which step has the problem.
- **Use citizen language.** Test every label against what a first-time user would type into a search box, not what the statute says.
- **Show eligibility before you ask for personal details.** Do not make people enter their date of birth to find out they are not eligible.
- **Save and resume by default.** People will be interrupted. Assume it.
- **Make status visible after submission.** "We received your application on Tuesday and will respond within 14 days." Then keep them updated.
- **Design for the assisted-digital case.** Someone is helping someone. Both should be able to make sense of the screen.
- **Explain what you will do with their information.** In the citizen's own words. Generic GDPR boilerplate does not count.
- **Confirm what was submitted, in plain English.** Not just a reference number.
- **Design the error message before you write the validation.** What does the user do next? Say that.
- **Test the unhappy path.** What if they fail eligibility? What if the page times out? What if they make a mistake on page 9? These are not edge cases; for some citizens they are the path.

## EXERCISE · Audit your Service Walk against the principles

30 min · teams · Template 5

## INSTRUCTIONS

Each team takes the Service Walk findings from Day 1 and marks each principle as observed, partially observed, or violated. For each violation, point to a specific moment.

The output is not a score but a list: "these three principles are violated, in these specific places, and those will be the focus of the redesign in the next module."

## DEBRIEF

Which principle was most commonly violated across teams? That principle deserves portfolio-wide attention back at work.

**Facilitator note.** *Encourage teams to disagree with the principles. A team that says "we cannot save-and-resume because of legacy IT" is more honest — and more interesting — than one that ticks every box.*

## MODULE 10

## Redesign sprint, part 1

Day 2 · 11:00 · 90 min

**Learning outcome.** Each team has a paper redesign of the worst part of their service, applying at least three of the ten principles deliberately.

## CONTENT

## The brief

- Take the worst single moment from your Service Walk — the one that drew the strongest reaction from the team on Day 1.
- Redesign that moment on paper. Not a wireframe, not a screen layout — a paper sketch with words and arrows.
- Apply at least three of the ten principles deliberately. Annotate which principle each design decision corresponds to.
- It must work for the bullseye user from your Module 04 map AND at least one ring-1 audience.
- Time limit on the sketching: 60 minutes. The constraint is the point. Paper redesigns that take longer than an hour are over-engineered.

## EXERCISE · Paper redesign of the worst moment

75 min · teams · paper, markers, sticky notes

## INSTRUCTIONS

60 min sketching. Facilitator(s) rotate between teams and ask three questions: which principles are you applying? Who is this for? What would break if you removed each element?

15 min: pin all redesigns to the wall in a gallery. No presentations yet — just walk.

## DEBRIEF

Hold the debrief for Module 11, after testing. Premature praise here makes teams defensive when they get feedback.

**Facilitator note.** *Insist on paper. Whiteboards, laptops, and Figma all change the behaviour of the team — paper keeps the redesign at the right level of fidelity and prevents premature investment in any one version. If a team produces something that looks too polished, they have left the level of abstraction they need to be at.*

**MODULE 11****Redesign sprint, part 2 - test**

Day 2 · 13:30 · 60 min

**Learning outcome.** Each redesign has been tested with at least one fresh pair of eyes, and iterated based on the friction surfaced in the test.

**CONTENT**

Pair each team with another. Each pair will swap redesigns. Each team plays citizen for the other's redesign, using the Service Usability Scorecard to record their experience.

The citizen team is forbidden from being charitable. If something is unclear, they say so. If they would not know what to do next, they stop. This is not workshop politeness — it is a research discipline.

**EXERCISE · Swap, test, iterate**

50 min · paired teams · Template 1

**INSTRUCTIONS**

20 min: Team A plays citizen for Team B's redesign. Team B observes silently and records every friction moment. Team A scores on the scorecard.

20 min: roles reverse. Team B plays citizen for Team A.

10 min: each team has 5 min to revise their own redesign based on what they observed.

**DEBRIEF**

Plenary: which redesigns changed the most under test? What did testing surface that the team had missed? What did the team "know" but only realise once a fresh user hit it?

**Facilitator note.** *The single most common Day 2 insight is that the team's redesign was perfectly clear to the team and confusing to anyone else. When this lands, do not soften it; it is the lesson that earns the workshop's existence.*

## MODULE 12

# Beyond UI - service-level redesign

Day 2 · 14:30 · 75 min

**Learning outcome.** Participants understand that a UI redesign cannot work unless the policy, operations, comms, and capability layers beneath it move with it. Each team has mapped what must change in each layer for their redesign to land.

**CONTENT****The Service Iceberg**

The UI is the visible tip. Beneath it sit five layers any UI change depends on:

- **Policy.** What rules and decisions the UI is expressing. Some redesigns require policy clarification, or reveal that the policy itself is ambiguous.
- **Operations.** What case-handlers and back-office staff do with the information the UI collects. A faster form is useless if the operational queue stays the same.
- **Comms.** Letters, emails, IVR scripts, status pages. Every UI redesign creates a downstream comms problem unless the comms are redesigned with it.
- **Training and capability.** What staff need to know to support the new service. New screens often require new answers to questions citizens will ask.
- **Performance and governance.** What the leadership measures. A UI optimised for citizen completion conflicts with operational targets focused on call deflection — until governance changes, the UI change will not survive.

**The honest discomfort**

Most UI redesigns fail not because the UI was wrong but because one of the layers below was never updated. Naming this in the room is uncomfortable but necessary.

**EXERCISE · Map your redesign across the iceberg**

50 min · teams · Template 6

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Take your tested redesign. For each of the five layers below the UI, write what would need to change for the redesign to work in reality.

Be honest about scope. "Policy must be reinterpreted" is a legitimate entry. "Comms must be redesigned for five different segments" is a legitimate entry.

**DEBRIEF**

Compare maps across teams. The pattern is usually stark: the UI work is a small fraction of the total service work, and the layer that most often blocks improvement is governance, not technology.

**Facilitator note.** Resist the urge to make this section reassuring. The discomfort of confronting how much sits below the UI is the workshop's main contribution to participants' authority back at work.

## MODULE 13

# Embedding usability practice

Day 2 · 16:00 · 60 min

**Learning outcome.** Each participant has a 90-day plan with concrete changes to governance, metrics, and capability that they will own personally back at work.

**CONTENT****How usability dies in organisations**

One champion, no infrastructure. The champion is promoted or leaves. The practice evaporates. Workshops alone do not survive this. Governance, metrics, and capability do.

**Governance**

Who must sign off on a service before launch, and what evidence do they require? A workable rule: no service goes live without evidence of testing with hard-to-reach users, and without sign-off from someone whose job it is to represent the citizen.

**Metrics**

What is on the leadership dashboard? Suggested set, replacing or supplementing existing KPIs: completion rate by channel and by segment; drop-off by step; time-to-complete by segment; satisfaction by segment; channel-shift volume; repeat-contact rate; assisted-digital share.

**Capability**

Who in the organisation needs which skills? At a minimum: research (someone who can talk to citizens), content design (someone who can write at reading age 9 and mean it), service design (someone who holds the iceberg in their head), and accessibility (someone who audits, not just designs).

**EXERCISE · 90-day plan**

40 min · individual · Template 7

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Each participant writes their own 90-day plan covering four areas:

- One governance change you will introduce or propose.
- One metric you will start tracking, with who owns it.
- One capability you will grow on your team, with how.
- One service you will redesign next, with first step.

30 min individual writing. 10 min in pairs: each person reads their plan aloud; the partner asks one hard question.

**DEBRIEF**

Plans that change after the hard question are better plans. Encourage revision.

**Facilitator note.** Be visibly sceptical of grand 90-day plans. The best ones are small and specific: "on day 8 I will book a meeting with the head of operations to discuss the channel-shift metric."

**MODULE 14****Commitments and close**

Day 2 · 17:00 · 30 min

**Learning outcome.** Each participant has made one public commitment in front of the room, and the facilitator has captured these for follow-up.

**CONTENT**

Round the room. Each participant says one thing they will do in the next 30 days. The facilitator captures these verbatim. Within seven days the facilitator emails the list back to each participant as a reminder.

Resources for after the workshop: the templates from this guide; the named failure pattern catalogue; the ten principles. Each is designed for reuse without the facilitator present.

Close. Thank participants for the work — it is real work, and naming it as such matters.

**Facilitator note.** *The follow-up email at seven days is not optional. The commitment ritual without the follow-up is theatre. With it, the workshop converts measurably more often into change at work.*

---

## C Templates

The seven templates that follow are designed to be printed and reused. Each is referenced by its number from the relevant exercise. Print enough copies of Template 1 for each participant to use multiple times — it returns in Modules 02, 03, and 11.

**TEMPLATE 1**

# Service Usability Scorecard

Used in Modules 02, 03, and 11.

**Service** \_\_\_\_\_

**Scorer** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**EFFECTIVENESS**

*Can the citizen complete the task and is the outcome correct?*

Score (circle one): 1 2 3 4 5

**EVIDENCE**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**WHAT WOULD MAKE IT +1**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**EFFICIENCY**

*How much time, effort, and re-work did it cost?*

Score (circle one): 1 2 3 4 5

**EVIDENCE**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**WHAT WOULD MAKE IT +1**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**SATISFACTION**

*How did the citizen feel? Would they trust the service next time?*

Score (circle one): 1 2 3 4 5

**EVIDENCE**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**WHAT WOULD MAKE IT +1**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Facilitator note.** *Score from the perspective of a first-time, non-expert citizen — not your own perspective as a professional. When in doubt, score lower.*

**TEMPLATE 2**

# Bullseye User Map

Used in Module 04.

**Service** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>BULLSEYE · primary user</b>	<b>RING 1 · adjacent users</b>	<b>RING 2 · less-frequent users</b>	<b>OUTSIDE · excluded users</b>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

**FOR EACH RING, NOTE: WHO ARE THEY? WHAT DO THEY NEED? WHAT MAKES THIS SERVICE HARD FOR THEM?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**WHY ARE THE EXCLUDED USERS EXCLUDED?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



**TEMPLATE 4****Failure Pattern Catalogue**

Reference card. Used in Module 06.

<b>Eligibility cliff</b>	A question whose wrong answer silently disqualifies the user, with no path forward.
<b>Synonym trap</b>	The service uses statutory language; the citizen uses everyday language; the mismatch causes errors or self-exclusion.
<b>Silent wait</b>	No acknowledgement after submission. The citizen does not know whether they are in the queue.
<b>Hidden mandatory</b>	Required fields revealed only on submission error, forcing the user to scroll back and guess what they missed.
<b>Repeat yourself</b>	The same information requested twice across pages, departments, or channels.
<b>Triangulator</b>	The user is referred to another office to confirm something the originating office could have confirmed itself.
<b>Status black box</b>	No visibility into where the application is, what is happening, or when a response is due.
<b>Shame error</b>	An error message that blames the user rather than describing what is needed.
<b>Dead end</b>	No clear path when the answer is "you are not eligible" — leaving the citizen with no signpost to where they can go instead.

**NEW PATTERNS YOUR TEAM IDENTIFIED**


---



---



---



---

**TEMPLATE 5****Ten Principles Audit**

Used in Module 09.

**Service**

PRINCIPLE	STATUS	WHERE IS IT VIOLATED?
One thing per page	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Use citizen language	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Show eligibility before personal details	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Save and resume by default	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Make status visible after submission	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Design for the assisted-digital case	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Explain what you will do with their information	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Confirm submission in plain English	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Design the error message before the validation	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	
Test the unhappy path	<input type="checkbox"/> OK <input type="checkbox"/> Partial <input type="checkbox"/> Violated	

**TEMPLATE 6**

# Service Iceberg Map

Used in Module 12.

**Redesign**

---

<p><b>UI - visible</b> What the citizen sees on the screen.</p>	
<p><b>Policy</b> What rules and decisions does this UI express?</p>	
<p><b>Operations</b> What do case-handlers and back-office staff do?</p>	
<p><b>Comms</b> Letters, emails, IVR, status updates.</p>	
<p><b>Training and capability</b> What do staff need to know to support this?</p>	
<p><b>Performance and governance</b> What is measured? Who signs off?</p>	

**TEMPLATE 7**  
**90-Day Plan**

Used in Module 13.

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Service or area** \_\_\_\_\_

HORIZON	COMMITMENT	FIRST STEP
---------	------------	------------

**Day 30**  
One governance change

**Day 30**  
One metric to start tracking

**Day 60**  
One capability to grow

**Day 90**  
One service to redesign next

**PUBLIC COMMITMENT** · one sentence you will read aloud at the close

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_