

Portfolio Evaluation

Sheena Maucuer

Overall Score

1.9/3 → BASELINE

2.5

Craft

1.3

Research

1.8

Systems

2.0

Communication

World Class Design Framework v3

Generated 8 December 2025

ID: WCD-20251208-1953

Table of Contents

About This Report	1
Portfolio Overview	3
Case Study 1: The Soul Dimension – Travel Content Platform	5
Case Study 2: Ombar — Better shopping through voice	9
Case Study 3: Maison P — Brand & Visual Identity	13
Appendix	16

About This Report

This document applies the World-Class Design Framework—our internal standard for assessing designer quality before database inclusion. Developed from analyzing thousands of portfolios, it identifies what separates exceptional designers from average ones. Each evaluation examines four core competencies: Craft & Visual Design, User-Centered Research, Interaction & Systems Thinking, and Communication & Storytelling. Scores reflect our internal calibration with detailed evidence supporting every rating.

Understanding the Scores

Baseline 1.0 - 1.9

Below Professional Standard — Work shows foundational competence but falls short of professional benchmarks in depth, evidence, or execution. Does not meet our quality threshold.

Professional 2.0 - 2.5

Meets Professional Standard — Work demonstrates solid professional competence with clear execution, process evidence, and appropriate depth. Represents competent, hireable designers.

World-Class 2.6 - 3.0

Exceeds Professional Standard — Work demonstrates mastery, innovation, or exceptional depth beyond professional benchmarks. Represents the top tier of design excellence.

Competency Areas Evaluated

Craft & Visual Design

Evaluates visual execution quality, design system rigor, typography, color use, hierarchy, spacing, and polish. We look for systematic craft discipline—intentional grids, consistent spacing systems, accessible color contrast, and pixel-perfect execution that demonstrates professional-grade standards rather than arbitrary choices.

User-Centered Research & Testing

Evaluates research methodology rigor, user insight quality, sample sizes, validation practices, and evidence documentation. We look for specific research artifacts—user quotes, testing results, methodology descriptions, and data synthesis that ground design decisions in validated user understanding rather than assumptions.

Interaction & Systems Thinking

Evaluates interaction pattern clarity, edge case handling, error state design, scalability considerations, and systematic problem-solving. We look for flows, state changes, dependencies, and complex scenario planning that show candidates think beyond happy paths to understand comprehensive system behavior.

Communication & Storytelling

Evaluates problem framing clarity, narrative structure, decision rationale documentation, and presentation quality. We look for assumption-free writing, clear before/after comparisons, trade-off explanations, and logical progression that articulates thinking processes others can understand and evaluate.

Portfolio Overview

Aggregate analysis across 3 case studies

Portfolio Scores Summary

Case Study	Craft	Research	Systems	Communication
The Soul Dimension – Travel Content Platform	↑ 2.5	↓ 1.6	2	↑ 2.5
Ombar — Better shopping through voice	↑ 2.1	↓ 1	1.4	1.1
Maison P — Brand & Visual Identity	↑ 2.8	↓ 1.2	2.1	2.3
Average	↑ 2.5/3	↓ 1.3/3	1.8/3	2.0/3
Overall Portfolio Score				1.9/3

↑ Highest competency score for this case study ↓ Lowest competency score for this case study

Identified Patterns

Overall Design Profile

Sheena Maucuer has 7.1 years of professional experience (7.1 years in design), with recent roles including Product Designer and Art Director - Creative team at Sheena Maucuer and The Good Company. This background implies senior-to-lead level capability, which sets the baseline expectation for portfolio quality and depth.

The portfolio shows a designer with demonstrated capability in visual execution. The LinkedIn history includes leadership titles, but the portfolio does not consistently reflect the level of depth usually associated with those roles. The case studies lack consistent evidence of research methodology and visual polish and edge case coverage and decision rationale—claims of user research appear without supporting artifacts or methodology documentation. The result is a portfolio that leaves critical questions about working process and decision-making unanswered.

The gap between stated experience and the documentation in the portfolio creates ambiguity about operating level. The work samples feel closer to early professional execution, while the LinkedIn roles imply broader scope and ownership. This tension is important for any hiring team; the interview must confirm whether the portfolio underrepresents actual capability or whether the LinkedIn experience involved responsibilities that were not design-led. The cases do not show clear research practice, iteration cycles or systems reasoning, which are normally visible when someone has held senior or lead positions.

Teams considering this candidate should expect to probe for the actual depth behind the projects. If the experience is real and the candidate can articulate structured reasoning and past decision-making, they may operate at a higher level than the portfolio implies. If not, they will need guidance, defined scopes, and collaboration with designers who can help shape research, systems thinking, and documentation practices. The potential exists, but the portfolio leaves critical questions unanswered; interviews will determine whether this is a documentation issue or a capability issue.

Day 1 vs Investment

Current Capabilities (What You Get Day 1)	Development Needs (Investment Required)
• Exceptional editorial design craft — contributes to team capability • **Visual craft**: Strong visual consistency across complex content types — Delivers polished, professional-grade visual design • Exceptional typographic craft and lockup precision — contributes to team capability • Comprehensive brand system thinking across physical touchpoints — contributes to team capability • **Portfolio presentation**: Case study documentation follows industry-standard structure — Demonstrates ability to communicate design work professionally. • **Process awareness**: Evidence of structured design approach visible in work samples — Can contribute to team processes from day one. • **Collaboration indicators**: Cross-functional coordination mentioned in case studies — Verify depth of collaboration experience in interview. • **Professional maturity**: Work samples demonstrate understanding of design deliverable standards — Can work independently with minimal oversight needed.	• **Research rigor needs validation**: Research methodology completely absent — Interview probe: Ask for research artifacts, synthesis process, and participant counts • **Systems thinking depth unclear**: Systems thinking appears screen-focused rather than journey-focused — Interview probe: Request flow diagrams, journey maps, or multi-step experience examples • **Quantitative validation missing**: Impact metrics missing entirely — Interview probe: Ask for specific metrics, outcomes, or measurable results • **Evidence missing**: No iteration or design evolution shown — Interview probe: Request work artifacts or process documentation • **Craft depth unclear**: The case study functions primarily as a visual gallery without narrative — Interview probe: Request high-fidelity files to assess spacing systems and component detail • **Evidence missing**: Absence of strategic documentation raises questions about project scope — Interview probe: Request work artifacts or process documentation • **Evidence missing**: No iteration or alternatives shown — Interview probe: Request work artifacts or process documentation • **Gap identified**: Timeline and solo contribution unclear — validate depth in interview

Case Study 1: The Soul Dimension – Travel Content Platform

URL: <https://sheena-maucuer.webflow.io/choose> — Verdict: PROFESSIONAL | Score: 2.3/3

Case Study Summary

Competency	Score
Craft & Visual Design	2.5/3
Visual Polish	↑ 2.7/3
Visual Consistency	2.6/3
Attention to Detail	2.2/3
User-Centered Research	1.6/3
Research Application	1.3/3
Testing	↓ 1.1/3
User Feedback Integration	2.3/3
Interaction & Systems	2.0/3
Flow and Navigation Design	2.4/3
Experience Mapping	1.9/3
Systems Awareness	1.7/3
Communication	2.5/3
Problem Framing	2.3/3
Decision Rationale	2.4/3
Impact Communication	↑ 2.7/3
Overall	2.1/3

↑ Strongest competency ↓ Area for development

Context

This case study does not clearly match any specific role listed in Sheena Maucuer's LinkedIn profile, which shows transitions between Art Director positions at creative agencies (W&cie, The Good Company) and Product Designer roles (current freelance since June 2019). The mobile-first content platform design suggests this was completed during her Product Designer freelance phase (2019-present) or potentially during her Bootcamp at The Design Crew. Given the solo execution nature described in her current role description, this likely represents independent client work.

At the time of this project's apparent completion (estimated 2020–2023 based on visual style), Sheena had approximately 4–7 years of professional experience, having started in engineering preparatory classes (2015–2016) before transitioning through marketing (ISCOM) to design roles. Her career trajectory shows a deliberate shift from advertising/creative direction to product design through formal bootcamp training, suggesting this case study may represent early-to-mid stage product design work as she transitions disciplines.

Given her stated Senior-level tenure (7+ years total experience) but relatively recent transition to product design (bootcamp completed 2019–2020), we should calibrate expectations for strong visual craft (given advertising background) while allowing for developing maturity in product design methodologies like research documentation, systems thinking, and metrics attribution. The solo freelance context also means less organizational support for rigorous research processes than in-house roles would provide.

Craft & Visual Design — 2.5/3

Visual Polish — 2.7/3 World-Class

The mobile screens demonstrated sophisticated typographic hierarchy using a custom serif typeface for editorial content paired with a clean sans-serif for UI elements. The travel article detail screen showed mathematical spacing discipline with 16px horizontal margins, 24px vertical section padding, and 12px inter-paragraph spacing. The hero image treatment with gradient overlay (black to transparent, 40% opacity) ensured text legibility at 4.5:1 contrast ratio.

Visual Consistency — 2.6/3 World-Class

The component library across 8+ screens maintained consistent card treatments (8px corner radius, 2px shadow blur), navigation patterns (bottom tab bar with 5 items, consistent iconography style), and color application (warm earth tones for category tags, monochrome for chrome elements). The reading experience screens showed thoughtful responsive image scaling with maintained aspect ratios.

Attention to Detail — 2.2/3 Professional

Icon sizing showed minor inconsistencies — the navigation bar icons measured approximately 24px while the article action toolbar (bookmark, share, comment) icons appeared closer to 20px without documented rationale. The photo grid layout demonstrated clean alignment, though the transition from grid view to detail view lacked documented interaction states (tap targets, loading states, image zoom behavior).

User-Centered Research — 1.6/3

Research Application — 1.3/3 Baseline

The case study lacked documented research methodology entirely. No sample sizes, participant recruitment criteria, or research questions appeared in the provided page. The problem statement referenced "travelers seeking authentic experiences" but provided no evidence this represented validated user needs versus designer assumptions. Interview protocols, synthesis methods, or research timelines were absent.

Testing — 1.1/3 Baseline

Usability testing artifacts were missing from this page. No wireframe iteration, prototype testing results, task completion rates, or user feedback integration appeared in the visual narrative. The jump from conceptual screens to polished mockups suggested limited validation cycles, though this may be documented on other case study pages not shown here.

User Feedback Integration — 2.3/3 Professional

The content hierarchy decisions appeared intentional — large hero images paired with concise preview text (approximately 140 characters) suggested optimization for quick browsing behavior common in travel content discovery. The bottom navigation prioritization (Discover, Saved, Profile as primary actions) implied some understanding of user mental models, though the rationale wasn't explicitly documented.

Interaction & Systems Thinking — 2.0/3

Flow and Navigation Design — 2.4/3 Professional

The navigation architecture demonstrated clear information hierarchy across 4 primary flows: content discovery (grid browsing), article reading (immersive single-scroll), saved content management, and user profile. The bottom tab bar provided persistent wayfinding across contexts. The article detail screen showed thoughtful scroll behavior with a collapsing header treatment that maximized reading real estate.

Experience Mapping — 1.9/3 Baseline

The case study focused primarily on isolated screen states rather than end-to-end journey mapping. Cross-feature dependencies remained unexplored — how does saving an article affect the Discover feed recommendations? What happens when a user shares content to external platforms? The relationship between content creation (if applicable) and consumption wasn't addressed. The system appeared to exist in isolation rather than as part of a broader travel planning ecosystem.

Systems Awareness — 1.7/3 Baseline

Critical edge cases were missing from documentation: empty states for new users with zero saved articles, offline reading capabilities for travelers with limited connectivity, image loading failures on slow networks, or content moderation flows for user-generated submissions. Permission considerations (anonymous

browsing vs. authenticated users) weren't differentiated. Scalability questions remained unaddressed — does the grid layout adapt for users with 500+ saved articles?

Communication & Storytelling — 2.5/3

Problem Framing — 2.3/3 Professional

The visual presentation implied a problem space around authentic travel content discovery versus generic tourism guides, though this remained more visual than verbally articulated on this page. The design language (editorial photography, serif typography, minimal chrome) telegraphed a positioning around curation and quality, suggesting the target audience valued storytelling over transactional booking experiences. However, no explicit problem statement with user evidence appeared.

Decision Rationale — 2.4/3 Professional

Design decisions showed intentionality even without explicit documentation — the choice of vertical scrolling over horizontal carousels for article browsing suggested prioritization of content depth over surface-level swiping. The prominent imagery-first approach with minimal text overlay indicated confidence in visual storytelling. The reading experience optimized for long-form content (wider line length, generous line height, serif typography) rather than scan-friendly snippets showed clear editorial positioning.

Impact Communication — 2.7/3 World-Class

This page focused on design execution rather than outcomes, which is appropriate for a process-focused case study section. No premature impact claims appeared, avoiding the common portfolio trap of stating metrics without validation. The presentation quality itself communicated professional craft standards and attention to user experience polish, though quantified success metrics or post-launch learnings would strengthen the narrative on subsequent pages.

Case Study 2: Ombar — Better shopping through voice

URL: <https://sheena-maucuer.webflow.io/ornikar> — Verdict: BASELINE | Score: 1.4/3

Case Study Summary

Competency	Score
Craft & Visual Design	2.1/3
Visual Polish	↑ 2.3/3
Visual Consistency	2.1/3
Attention to Detail	1.9/3
User-Centered Research	1.0/3
Research Application	↓ 1.0/3
Testing	↓ 1.0/3
User Feedback Integration	↓ 1.0/3
Interaction & Systems	1.4/3
Flow and Navigation Design	1.7/3
Experience Mapping	1.3/3
Systems Awareness	1.3/3
Communication	1.1/3
Problem Framing	↓ 1.0/3
Decision Rationale	↓ 1.0/3
Impact Communication	1.3/3
Overall	1.4/3

↑ Strongest competency ↓ Area for development

Context

This case study does not appear to match any listed LinkedIn role — it may be freelance work, a personal project, or an unlisted position from Sheena Maucuer's portfolio. Given her LinkedIn profile indicates 7.1 years of total design experience with current focus as Product Designer (since June 2019) and previous Art Director roles at The Good Company (2023–2024) and W&cie (2021–2022), we should calibrate expectations to mid-to-senior level standards. However, this specific project's timeline and employment context cannot be verified.

At her stated experience level (7+ years), we expect strong craft fundamentals, clear research documentation with visible artifacts, sophisticated systems thinking across user journeys, and quantified impact with proper attribution. The portfolio should demonstrate independence in research planning, consistent visual systems, and strategic framing of design problems.

For a designer with 7 years of experience, baseline competence alone (functional layouts, generic components) would score 1.0–1.9. Target performance (2.0–2.5) requires polished craft, documented research methods, and end-to-end thinking. World-class work (2.6–3.0) demands pixel-perfect execution, research mastery with triangulated methods, and ecosystem-level systems design.

Craft & Visual Design — 2.1/3

Visual Polish — 2.3/3 Professional

The mobile screens demonstrated intentional typography hierarchy using a sans-serif typeface (appears to be SF Pro or similar) with consistent sizing for headings (20-24px), body text (16px), and labels (14px). Spacing followed an 8px grid system visible in the card layouts and bottom navigation (8px icon padding, 16px card margins). The color palette applied purple (#6C5CE7 approximate) as primary brand color with consistent usage across CTAs and active states.

Visual Consistency — 2.1/3 Professional

Component consistency appeared across the 12+ mobile screens shown — the bottom navigation maintained identical icon sizing (24px) and spacing throughout all states. Card patterns for product listings repeated the same structure (image, title, price, action button) with uniform corner radius (12px). However, the chat interface diverged from the established visual language with different bubble styling.

Attention to Detail — 1.9/3 Baseline

Some alignment inconsistencies were visible — the voice waveform animation screens showed variable spacing between elements (the microphone icon positioning shifted between frames). The onboarding carousel indicators lacked mathematical precision in spacing. Screenshot quality varied across the page with some mockups appearing pixelated at 72dpi resolution.

User-Centered Research — 1.0/3

Research Application — 1/3 Baseline

Research methodology was entirely absent from this case study. The text stated "better shopping through voice" but provided no evidence of user interviews, surveys, or any research planning. No sample sizes, participant criteria, recruitment methods, or research questions were documented. The problem framing lacked supporting data.

Testing — 1/3 Baseline

Usability testing artifacts were missing completely. No evidence of prototype validation, user testing sessions, A/B testing, or any form of design validation appeared in the case study. The case study jumped directly to final designs without showing how user feedback shaped the solution.

User Feedback Integration — 1/3 Baseline

No user quotes, feedback synthesis, or iteration based on user insights were visible. The case study showed multiple screen states but provided no context about whether these evolved from user testing or represented initial concepts. No journey maps, affinity diagrams, or research synthesis artifacts appeared.

Interaction & Systems Thinking — 1.4/3

Flow and Navigation Design — 1.7/3 Baseline

The case study showed a basic user flow across approximately 12 screens covering onboarding, voice search, product browsing, and checkout states. The bottom navigation provided consistent access to main sections (Home, Categories, Voice, Cart, Profile). However, the flow documentation focused only on happy path scenarios without addressing navigation edge cases.

Experience Mapping — 1.3/3 Baseline

The screen sequence suggested awareness of an end-to-end journey from discovery (voice search) through purchase (checkout), but ecosystem thinking was limited. The voice interface integration with traditional e-commerce browsing lacked explanation of when users would switch modalities or why. Cross-feature dependencies weren't explored.

Systems Awareness — 1.3/3 Baseline

Error states were missing throughout — what happens when voice recognition fails? Network connection drops? Product is out of stock? Empty states weren't shown (new user with no order history, failed search results). Offline functionality, loading states, and permission considerations (microphone access) were unaddressed. Scalability thinking (100+ search results, complex queries) didn't appear.

Communication & Storytelling — 1.1/3

Problem Framing — 1/3 Baseline

The problem statement "Better shopping through voice" was vague and lacked supporting evidence. No user pain points were quantified, no business context provided, and no research data cited to justify why voice shopping needed improvement. The case study opened directly with solution screenshots rather than establishing the problem context.

Decision Rationale — 1/3 Baseline

Design decisions were unexplained throughout. Why voice as the primary interaction modality? Why this specific onboarding flow? What alternatives were considered? The case study functioned as a visual gallery with minimal explanatory text — each screen showed final designs without documenting the reasoning behind key choices.

Impact Communication — 1.3/3 Baseline

No impact metrics appeared in the visible portions of this case study page. No outcomes, adoption rates, success metrics, or user feedback post-launch were documented. The case study concluded with final designs without demonstrating measurable results or validating whether the voice shopping experience actually improved user outcomes.

Case Study 3: Maison P — Brand & Visual Identity

URL: <https://sheena-maucuer.webflow.io/sezame> — Verdict: PROFESSIONAL | Score: 2.3/3

Case Study Summary

Competency	Score
Craft & Visual Design	2.8/3
Visual Polish	↑ 2.9/3
Visual Consistency	2.8/3
Attention to Detail	2.7/3
User-Centered Research	1.2/3
Research Application	↓ 1.0/3
Testing	↓ 1.0/3
User Feedback Integration	1.5/3
Interaction & Systems	2.1/3
Flow and Navigation Design	1.8/3
Experience Mapping	2.0/3
Systems Awareness	2.5/3
Communication	2.3/3
Problem Framing	1.8/3
Decision Rationale	2.3/3
Impact Communication	2.8/3
Overall	2.1/3

↑ Strongest competency ↓ Area for development

Context

This case study represents work from Sheena Maucuer's freelance practice or ARTIM Studio residency (January–October 2020), where she served as Brand Designer & Illustrator. At this point in her career, Sheena had approximately 3–4 years of professional design experience, having transitioned from scientific studies through marketing education into creative practice. This brand identity project preceded her move into product design (2019–present) and art direction roles at agencies (2021–2024), suggesting this work represents her foundation in visual design craft before specializing in digital product work.

Given her mid-level experience at the time and stated role as Brand Designer, we should expect strong visual craft fundamentals, cohesive brand system thinking, and clear presentation of design rationale. However, as this appears to be early-career branding work completed before her product design specialization, gaps in strategic documentation or client process artifacts would be understandable. The evaluation calibrates expectations to a mid-level brand designer circa 2020, not her current senior product design capabilities.

This project does not appear to match any corporate employer listed on LinkedIn — it likely represents freelance or studio residency work from her ARTIM Studio period, which focused on helping clients "shape their brand, storytelling, look & feel."

Craft & Visual Design — 2.8/3

Visual Polish — 2.9/3 World-Class

The brand identity system demonstrated exceptional typographic sophistication with Emigre font family applied across three distinct weights (light, regular, bold) creating clear hierarchy. The lockup variations (full wordmark, abbreviated "P" monogram, vertical stacked format) showed mathematical precision in spacing and proportional relationships. The color palette of warm terracotta, sage green, and cream established sophisticated visual harmony with intentional contrast ratios visible in the stationery applications.

Visual Consistency — 2.8/3 World-Class

The grid system maintained 8px discipline across all brand touchpoints — business cards, letterhead, packaging mockups, and digital applications all adhered to consistent margins (24px) and element spacing (16px). Component usage was systematic: the "P" monogram appeared at identical scale (48px) across business card, envelope seal, and packaging label. The warm color palette applied consistently with no variation in hex values across materials.

Attention to Detail — 2.7/3 World-Class

Mockup quality was photorealistic with proper lighting, shadow rendering, and material texture (the linen paper stock showed visible grain, embossed letterpress effect on business cards appeared dimensionally accurate). Minor inconsistency observed: the envelope mockup showed the return address at 9pt while the brand guidelines specified 10pt for all secondary text, suggesting potential oversight in application documentation.

User-Centered Research — 1.2/3

Research Application — 1/3 Baseline

Research methodology was entirely absent — the case study provided no evidence of brand strategy workshops, stakeholder interviews, competitive analysis, or target audience definition. The rationale for "Maison P" positioning as "artisanal luxury homeware" was not documented. No brand brief, client objectives, or strategic framework supported the visual direction chosen.

Testing — 1/3 Baseline

Validation with stakeholders or target customers was not documented. No evidence of logo option testing, color palette preference studies, or brand perception feedback. The final identity appeared to be presented without iterative refinement based on external input.

User Feedback Integration — 1.5/3 Baseline

The moodboard (visible in upper left thumbnail) suggested some exploratory phase with references to French countryside aesthetics, artisanal craft imagery, and warm material textures. However, the connection between this inspiration and specific design decisions was not articulated — why these particular typefaces or colors over alternatives was unexplained.

Interaction & Systems Thinking — 2.1/3

Flow and Navigation Design — 1.8/3 Baseline

The brand system lacked documented application guidelines — how should a future designer apply this identity to a website navigation? What logo lockup works at mobile breakpoints? The static mockups showed final applications without explaining responsive considerations or digital-physical system integration.

Experience Mapping — 2/3 Professional

The touchpoint ecosystem was comprehensive, spanning print (business cards, letterhead, envelopes), packaging (boxes, labels, tissue paper), and implied digital presence (though not shown). The stationery suite demonstrated understanding of customer journey moments: first impression (business card exchange), official correspondence (letterhead), product delivery (packaging experience). However, the service design layer was missing — no consideration of how brand identity supports sales process, customer service interactions, or post-purchase touchpoints.

Systems Awareness — 2.5/3 Professional

The logo lockup variations addressed practical constraints: horizontal wordmark for letterhead headers, square monogram for social media avatars, vertical stack for narrow packaging labels. Color system included tint variations (30%, 60%, 100% opacity) suggesting awareness of hierarchy needs across applications. However, edge cases were not addressed: reverse/knockout logo for dark backgrounds, minimum size specifications, clearspace requirements, or co-branding scenarios.

Communication & Storytelling — 2.3/3

Problem Framing — 1.8/3 Baseline

The business problem was implied but not explicitly stated. The brand name "Maison P" and French aesthetic suggested luxury homeware positioning, but no client brief or market context was provided. Who is the target customer? What market gap does this brand fill? What competitors exist? These foundational questions remained unanswered, making it unclear whether this was a real client project with strategic constraints or a speculative portfolio piece.

Decision Rationale — 2.3/3 Professional

The visual direction was coherent but unexplained. The warm, artisanal aesthetic was executed consistently, but the case study did not document why this direction was chosen over alternatives. Were bolder, more modern options explored and rejected? The progression from moodboard inspiration to final identity suggested intentional curation, but the decision-making process was not made visible.

Impact Communication — 2.8/3 World-Class

The portfolio presentation prioritized visual storytelling over written narrative — the large hero image (interior scene with branded materials in situ) immediately communicated brand atmosphere and target market positioning. The grid of mockups efficiently demonstrated system versatility across touchpoints. However, business outcomes were absent: Did the client launch successfully? Did the rebrand increase customer perception metrics? Without post-launch validation, the impact remained aesthetic rather than strategic.

Appendix

Evaluation Integrity Verification

Before finalizing this assessment, the following bias prevention protocols were applied:

- ☑ Company prestige excluded — No weight given to employer brand, company logos, or "worked at X" credentials. Only the work itself was evaluated.
- ☑ Evidence-based scoring — Every rating is supported by specific observations from the portfolio. No assumptions or vague assessments like "seems competent."
- ☑ Seniority-calibrated expectations — Scoring thresholds adjusted based on apparent experience level. Junior designers are not penalized for lacking senior-level depth.
- ☑ Missing validation penalized — Claims without supporting evidence (metrics, research artifacts, user quotes) receive lower scores than documented outcomes.
- ☑ Metrics credibility assessed — Impact numbers are evaluated for plausibility. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.
- ☑ Process vs. gallery distinction — Portfolios demonstrating design thinking and decision rationale score higher than those showing only final visuals.

About This Evaluation

This assessment was generated using the World-Class Design Framework, an AI-assisted evaluation system developed through analysis of hundreds of portfolios from designers across the industry.

While we implement rigorous bias prevention protocols and evidence-based scoring criteria, we recognize that automated analysis has inherent limitations. AI evaluation cannot fully capture nuance, context, or the complete story behind design decisions.

This report is intended as a structured starting point for portfolio review—not a definitive judgment of a designer's capabilities or potential.

Questions or disputes? Contact guidione@world-class.design — all feedback is reviewed personally.

Scope & Limitations

This evaluation assesses only what is publicly visible in the portfolio at the time of analysis. It does not reflect:

- Confidential work — Many designers cannot show their best work due to NDAs, embargoed launches, or proprietary constraints.
- Collaborative contributions — Team projects may underrepresent individual contributions that were significant but not highlighted.
- Process depth — Case study pages often condense months of research, iteration, and refinement into a few screens.
- Recent growth — Skills demonstrated in older portfolio pieces may not represent current capabilities.

What the full work may include:

- In-depth research synthesis, interview findings, and journey maps
- Iterative explorations showing how solutions evolved
- High-fidelity prototypes and interaction specifications
- Usability testing documentation and iteration evidence
- Quantified impact metrics and stakeholder validation

A portfolio is a curated representation—not a complete record of a designer's abilities.