HowHub

FIELD KIT

FOR MARKETERS WHO WANT A SCORE, NOT OPINIONS

# Put 14 AI advisors in one room.

Two rooms grade your homepage on a 100-point rubric, argue across the table, vote, and hand you a verdict you can re-run after every change.

roundtable/verdict.md

```
1  # Same page. Same rubric. Two rooms.
2  MESSAGING   35.5 → 56.0
3  DESIGN      40.0 → 63.0
4  VOTE        open with the problem (6 of 14)
5
```


01 The two rooms

02 The rubric

03 How a run works

04 Build your seats





By **Tyler Howard** · HowHub Consulting · howhubconsulting.com

START HERE

# Most marketing teams have the same fight in two different meetings, and nobody scores it.

The messaging people say the homepage doesn't explain why anyone should pick you. The design people say every line you add to the hero takes attention away from the one button that matters. Both are right, and they rarely argue it out in the same room.

So I built the room. Seven AI advisors on messaging, seven on design, each one simulated from an expert's public work. Every seat owns one question and one slice of a 100-point rubric. They argue in rounds, cross the table, vote, and a chair writes the verdict.

ONE B2B HOMEPAGE, BEFORE AND AFTER A REBUILD

**35.5 → 56**
messaging, out of 100

**40 → 63**
design, out of 100

Same rubric both times, simulated advisors. The first run started after someone outside the company said they couldn't tell what it sells.

WHAT'S INSIDE


01 **The two rooms**
Fourteen roles, the question each one owns, and its share of the score.

02 **The rubric**
Two 100-point scorecards, so the number means the same thing every run.

03 **How a run works**
Evidence, two rounds, a chair, and the rules that stop the room agreeing with you.

04 **Build your seats**
The seat template, and setup in Claude Code or Claude.ai.

# Fourteen seats. One question each.

A seat is a role, not a person. You build each one from the public work of someone you'd learn from (the kit names a reading list for each). The number is that seat's share of its room's 100 points.

## Messaging room — WHAT IT SAYS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Clarity seat**<br>Can a stranger say what you offer, how it helps and how to buy, in five seconds? | 20 |
| **Positioning seat**<br>Against what buyers would do instead, why are we the obvious choice? | 30 |
| **Category seat**<br>What one word or category do we own in the buyer's mind? | 10 |
| **Narrative seat**<br>What change in the world makes this necessary now? | 10 |
| **Awareness seat**<br>How aware is this visitor, and does the page meet them there? | 10 |
| **Onlyness seat**<br>Finish "the only ____ that ____." Is it true, and is the page focused on it? | 10 |
| **Counterweight seat**<br>Is it distinctive, and easy to remember and buy? Argues against clever. | 10 |

## Design room — HOW IT LOOKS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Hierarchy seat**<br>One focal point per screen, a consistent type scale, real restraint? | 15 |
| **Conversion seat**<br>Does the layout help a B2B buyer decide, in the order they decide? | 20 |
| **Usability seat**<br>Can a first-time visitor use it without thinking? | 15 |
| **Art direction seat**<br>Is there an ownable look, or is it stock and template? | 15 |
| **Craft seat**<br>Does it feel current, and does it show the product working? | 15 |
| **Interaction seat**<br>Do motion and interaction details add meaning and feel fast? | 10 |
| **Builder seat**<br>What can we ship, and how much effort is each idea? Built from your own stack. | 10 |

The fight to expect: messaging seats ask for more on the page, design seats answer with what the layout can carry. The conversion seat referees on whether it sells. That argument is the point.

02 · THE RUBRIC

# Two scorecards, 100 points each

Each seat scores only its own dimension, 0 to 10, with a quoted line from the page or a named screenshot. No evidence, no score. Total = score / 10 × points.

## Messaging

| | DIMENSION | THE TEST | PTS |
|---|---|---|---|
| M1 | **Clarity** | Above the fold: what you offer, how it helps, what to do next. After Miller's StoryBrand grunt test. | **20** |
| M2 | **Offer legibility** | What a buyer gets, who delivers it, how long, rough cost. After Dunford. | **15** |
| M3 | **Differentiation** | Names the real alternative, including doing nothing, and shows why this beats it. | **15** |
| M4 | **Category** | One word or frame a buyer remembers. After Ries and Trout. | **10** |
| M5 | **Narrative** | The story starts from a change in the world, not the product. After Raskin. | **10** |
| M6 | **Awareness match** | Meets the visitor at their level of awareness. After Schwartz. | **10** |
| M7 | **Onlyness** | "The only ____ that ____" is on the page and true. After Neumeier. | **10** |
| M8 | **Distinctiveness** | Repeated, distinctive assets tied to real buying situations. After Sharp. | **10** |

## Design

| | DIMENSION | THE TEST | PTS |
|---|---|---|---|
| V1 | **Hierarchy** | One focal point, consistent scale and spacing. After Refactoring UI. | **15** |
| V2 | **Message-to-layout fit** | Carries the messaging room's answer in the order a buyer decides. | **20** |
| V3 | **Usability** | Where am I, what's clickable, what next, on desktop and phone. After Krug. | **15** |
| V4 | **Art direction** | Graphics, color and type form an ownable look. | **15** |
| V5 | **Craft** | Feels current and shows the product working. | **15** |
| V6 | **Motion** | Interaction details add meaning and feel fast. | **10** |
| V7 | **Build health** | Mobile render, page speed, reusable modules. Tags every idea S/M/L/XL. | **10** |

**85+**
Clear, owned, and it looks the part

**70–84**
Clear but forgettable

**50–69**
You can explain it on a call. The page can't.

**<50**
A stranger can't say what you sell

# Evidence, two rounds, one verdict

**STEP 1**

### Gather evidence, not vibes.

The page as text, screenshots at desktop width, what someone said that made you run it, and two or three concrete options to vote on (three hero lines, say).

**STEP 2**

### Round 1: every seat scores alone.

One AI agent per seat, in parallel. Each scores its dimension with quotes from the page, names its top three problems, votes on the options, and says the one change it would make first.

**STEP 3**

### Round 2: cross the table.

Every seat reads every round-1 file and argues with at least one seat from the other room. It concedes only what new evidence moved, then casts a final vote.

**STEP 4**

### The chair writes the verdict.

Both scores, the vote, the winning option with the edits the dissent forced in, then two lists: fix now, and decisions the page is waiting on.

**STEP 5**

### Change the page. Re-run.

Same pages, same screenshots, same rubric. Expect a few points of drift run to run. Report the real number.

### The chair's rules, or the room agrees with you

1. **Blind the seats.** Pass an objection as a claim to test, never as "the client thinks."
2. **Flips need evidence.** A seat that changes its mind cites what moved it, or the chair marks it "folded."
3. **Seat a red team every round.** One seat argues against the room's leaning, even if it agrees.
4. **Say when the room can't know.** If it depends on how buyers react, the verdict names a test instead of taking a vote.

04 · BUILD YOUR SEATS

# A seat is a file, built from sources

Copy the template once per seat and fill it from 6 to 12 primary sources you can read: their books, talks and interviews. Never from memory. Every seat is labeled simulated, and its lines are never presented as something a real person said.

**Lens**
What it looks at first, and what makes it wince.

**Frameworks**
How each one works, with its source attached.

**Positions**
The opinions that start arguments with other seats.

**Scoring guide**
What a 2, 5, 8 and 10 look like on its dimension.

**Voice**
How it argues, in three to five lines.

**Sources + gaps**
What it read, and what it should say "I don't know" about.

### Set it up in Claude Code

1. Copy the `roundtable` folder into `~/.claude/skills/`.
2. Build three seats per room to start: clarity, positioning and the counterweight; hierarchy, conversion and usability.
3. Ask: `Run the roundtable on example.com. Options: A) ... B) ... C) ...`

No Claude Code? Upload the folder to a Claude.ai Project and run the seats one at a time. Slower, same rubric.

The seat-per-expert idea comes from Nate Herk's roast room. This version adds the rubric so the score can be re-run.


## Want it run on your site?

I'll set up the room on your homepage, run both councils, and walk you through the verdict and the fixes.

Book a call →