



TAPFLARE / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Social Media Template Approval Checklist: Buyer Tests

Tapflare is a flat-rate monthly subscription for graphic design and website development. A dedicated project manager assigns each request to senior designers and developers, so companies get steady creative and web output without hiring.

Published by Tapflare · 2026-10-27 · social media template approval checklist · social media template acceptance criteria · social media template quality assurance · social media design sign-off · editable templates · canva · template handoff · design procurement

Original article: <https://tapflare.com/articles/social-media-template-acceptance-tests>



In this article

1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction and Background
 3. Key Changes
 4. Define Acceptance Criteria Before Delivery
 5. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
 6. Buyer Acceptance Test Worksheet
 7. Classify Defects and Record Sign-Off
 8. Data Analysis and Evidence
 9. Worked Product-Promotion Review (Hypothetical Example)
 10. Implications and Future Directions
 11. Conclusion
-

Executive Summary

A **social media template approval checklist** should establish whether the intended buyer can reuse the delivered source files in the agreed account. Approval should follow an observable sequence: open the correct version, create a working copy, replace realistic content, check protected elements, export, and reopen both the source and the downloaded output. This report proposes that sequence as an acceptance instrument. It adapts the principle that acceptance criteria should be objectively verifiable, with a clear pass or fail outcome. (www.atlassian.com) (trailhead.salesforce.com)

The essential distinction is between **visual approval** and **operational acceptance**. A polished preview demonstrates a particular composition; it does not establish that the recipient can edit, duplicate, or export the underlying file. These capabilities require separate checks: **Figma** documents view and edit permissions alongside controls over copying and exporting, while **Adobe Express** documents separate access requests for brand assets. (help.figma.com) (helpx.adobe.com) For **Canva**, test the exact recipient role and editing route. Its documentation distinguishes partially locked text and images from protected formatting, and distinguishes initial artificial intelligence (AI) generation from subsequent AI editing. (www.canva.com)

The proposed worksheet records the starting file, actor, action, expected result, observed result, evidence link, severity, correction owner, and sign-off. A blank observation means **not tested**. A critical failure prevents acceptance of the affected scope even when other rows pass. Record acceptance, conditional acceptance, or return for correction against a named version. Keep the acceptance record attached to the reviewed file version. Existing preparation guidance already recommends realistic copy, long headlines, editor testing, and export planning; this report adds a buyer-operated evidence and decision structure rather than claiming those practices are new. (madevisualstudio.com)

For accessibility screening, the World Wide Web Consortium (**W3C**) explains contrast minima of **4.5:1** for ordinary text and **3:1** for qualifying large-scale text, subject to the criterion's exceptions. (www.w3.org) These figures support a limited contrast check, not a declaration of Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (**WCAG**)

conformance. Keep image descriptions in the publishing handoff: **X**, for example, documents adding them in its post composer. (help.x.com) No client results, benchmark pass rates, return on investment, or authenticated platform tests are claimed. The worked product-promotion example is explicitly hypothetical.

Introduction and Background

This report addresses a buying decision: should a marketing lead or agency account manager accept a reusable social template pack, request corrections, or agree a narrower deliverable? The proposed method applies to packs commissioned from freelancers, agencies, subscription design teams, or internal designers. Its unit of review is an editable template and its permitted uses. Platform documentation was checked on **27 October 2026**; the worksheet has not been executed in an authenticated recipient account.

Acceptance criteria describe the conditions work must satisfy to be complete. Atlassian recommends objectively verifiable criteria, while Salesforce's guidance emphasizes unambiguous expected outcomes. (www.atlassian.com) (trailhead.salesforce.com) Applied here, "looks on brand" becomes "the intended editor can change the headline while preserving the approved type styling and logo position." That statement identifies an actor, an action, and an observable result.

Existing resources cover parts of this problem. Landingi's design guide contains an in-context link to a **ManyPixels** template resource, illustrating resource discovery rather than proving recipient-account usability. (landingi.com) **MADE VisualStudio** explicitly discusses who edits after handoff, realistic examples, actual-editor testing, and export preparation. (madevisualstudio.com) The worksheet below builds on that coverage. It is a proposed procurement aid, not a validated client case study.

The account context matters. The University of North Florida requires approval before its Canva templates can be downloaded, whereas Texas State University's template page says print and digital projects do not require brand review. These are institution-specific policies, not universal Canva behavior. (www.unf.edu) (brand.txst.edu) A buyer therefore needs both a working template and a clear statement of the approval process that applies to its organization.

Use this report alongside a separate, maintained channel-specification sheet and a rights-handoff record. The acceptance worksheet checks whether the agreed behavior works. It should point to those references rather than reproduce an entire platform size guide or attempt license clearance.

Key Changes

Here, "changes" means changes to the proposed buying and review process. It does not imply an industry-wide shift or an announced platform release.

Replace appearance-only review with task completion

Approve a preview for appearance, then test the editable source for reuse. This follows Atlassian's recommendation to make criteria independently testable. (www.atlassian.com) A useful requirement names the recurring task: a product marketer replaces a product photograph, changes the offer, and produces the agreed output without rebuilding the layout.

Evaluate the actual recipient experience. Figma distinguishes viewing from editing, and its owner settings can restrict a viewer's export access. A file that opens successfully therefore has not necessarily passed its export test. (help.figma.com) Keep separate outcomes for opening, editing, copying, and downloading.

Treat protection as a specific editing behavior

For Canva Brand Templates, **Lock position only** can permit text-content changes while protecting formatting. Image or frame partial locks can permit replacement and cropping within the original space. Only admins and brand designers can apply or adjust Brand Template locks. (www.canva.com) Test the promised combination of freedoms and restrictions; do not treat a visible lock icon as sufficient evidence.

Other applications have their own controls. Adobe Express documents restrictions for color, font, and editing options, including choices about unlocking layers. (helpx.adobe.com) A Canva result should not be carried across to an Express or Figma delivery.

Separate manual editing from optional AI behavior

Canva says initial generation can respect different lock levels, while subsequent AI editing currently treats locks alike. (www.canva.com) If AI-assisted copy replacement is part of the brief, create a separate test for that route. A successful manual edit establishes only the manual workflow.

Canva also distinguishes team members who use Brand Templates from the roles that manage them, and its publishing documentation warns that project access does not always permit editing or publishing the Brand Template itself. (www.canva.com) Record the account, role, and route used rather than asserting that an entire subscription tier passes.

The resulting review has explicit boundaries:

- **Appearance:** Compare the agreed visual reference and brand rules.
- **Operation:** Execute the recurring edits under the recipient's role.
- **Protection:** Attempt only the agreed restricted changes on a test copy.
- **Output:** Inspect the downloaded artifact independently.
- **Decision:** Approve the version and scope supported by evidence.

Define Acceptance Criteria Before Delivery

Write the social media template acceptance criteria into the brief before commissioning the pack. Ithaca College's template-request guidance asks for the communication goal, audience, specifications, and intended distribution. (www.ithaca.edu) Those inputs provide a useful starting point, but the buyer should also state exactly what the editor must be able to change.

Use task language. "Price editable" is incomplete if the buyer needs a longer currency label, a promotional qualifier, and a crossed-out previous price. Agree representative content and content limits together. Canva's publishing guidance recommends simple, structured layouts that adapt to different content, while MADE recommends realistic examples rather than placeholder copy. (www.canva.com) (madevisualstudio.com)

Record these requirements:

- **Editor:** Name the operating role and expected level of design skill.
- **Environment:** Specify application, account, team, and approved editing route.
- **Deliverables:** List each template family, variant, and source-file location.
- **Editable fields:** Identify headlines, prices, photographs, dates, and calls to action.
- **Fixed elements:** Identify protected logo placement, typography, colors, and layout rules.
- **Content envelope:** Supply the longest intended headline and representative product shapes.
- **Exports:** State format, dimensions, background behavior, and required page selection.
- **Dependencies:** List fonts, assets, libraries, and account features that must be available.
- **Decision owner:** Name the buyer authorized to accept the pack and any exceptions.

Table 1 is a proposed **deliverable-by-editor permissions matrix**. Replace its role labels with actual recipients. “As agreed” means the requirement must be settled before testing, rather than presumed to be a platform entitlement.

Deliverable	Intended non-designer	Designer or administrator	Buyer check
Published master or protected source	Use through the agreed route; alter master only if authorized	Maintain source and agreed controls	Identify authoritative version and master owner
Working duplicate	Replace agreed content and save a reusable copy	Repair structure when required	Confirm duplicate identity and unchanged master
Brand assets or shared library	Access approved assets needed for routine tasks	Manage access and asset location as agreed	Open an asset from the recipient account
Fonts and replacement content	Use the agreed font and supplied replacement media	Resolve unavailable dependencies or agree alternatives	Add new characters and a replacement photograph
Exported media	Download agreed outputs if authorized	Configure or document export route	Reopen the downloaded artifact outside the editor
Decision record	Enter observations and evidence	Respond to defects and submit revisions	Named buyer signs the exact reviewed version

The matrix is an agreement to verify, not a promise that every application supports every permission. For example, Google Drive distinguishes viewing, commenting, and editing, while files inside a shared folder inherit its permissions. (support.google.com) Adobe Express separately documents requests for inaccessible brand or asset locations. (helpx.adobe.com) Test the location containing the dependency as well as the location containing the template.

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Establish a safe, reproducible starting point

The test operator should sign in with the real recipient account and open the delivery link. Record the application, role, file version, and agreed feature dependencies before making changes. Google notes that organizational policy can limit external sharing, so a recipient-side access problem may require an

administrator rather than a layout correction. (support.google.com)

Create a working copy using the documented route. Canva describes **File > Make a copy**, with the duplicate opening in a new tab. (www.canva.com) Adobe Express's published-link workflow can allow remixing while leaving the original untouched, but its documentation says password-protected links do not offer remix. (helpx.adobe.com) The test should therefore name the intended route, not assume every shared link behaves identically.

Use the following setup record:

- **Baseline:** Save the delivery identifier and the visual reference used for comparison.
- **Recipient:** Record the account and role without including credentials.
- **Copy:** Name the working duplicate and retain its link.
- **Inputs:** Assemble agreed headlines, prices, product images, and replacement characters.
- **References:** Link the brand guide, channel-specification sheet, and rights record.
- **Evidence:** Choose a shared location for screenshots, recordings, and downloaded outputs.

No authenticated demonstration was performed for this report. The procedure is reproducible by the buyer, and its results must be collected in that buyer's account.

Test dependencies through editing

A font visible in a preview has not demonstrated future editability. For PowerPoint handoffs, Microsoft warns that embedding only characters already used can limit editing, recommends embedding all characters for others' edits, and notes that some TrueType fonts cannot be embedded. (support.microsoft.com) Test new characters within the agreed copy rather than accepting the original slide alone.

Keep **availability** and **rights clearance** as separate checks. Google Fonts says usage and redistribution conditions are specified in the font license and provides downloadable font files. (fonts.google.com) Record where the approved font comes from and whether the recipient can use it in the required application. Put the license record in the dedicated rights handoff; a working file is not a license opinion.

Likewise, ask the recipient to replace a supplied product photograph with another approved image. Record a missing-library warning, payment request, unavailable asset, or inaccessible folder exactly as observed. Do not diagnose a plan limitation merely from a screenshot: confirm the relevant documented feature and actual account setting.

Keep review ownership explicit

Assign someone to run tests and someone to make the acceptance decision. They may be the same person, but the record should show the role. Asana documents that anyone can complete an approval unless the workflow is configured to restrict that behavior. (help.asana.com) A task marked complete should therefore be checked against the named approver.

Use version-specific comments and attachments. Asana's approval guidance includes assigning the approver with a due date; **Smartsheet** distinguishes comments from a formal review request. (help.asana.com) ([Smartsheet proofing FAQ, question 12](#)) The same discipline can be implemented manually in a spreadsheet.

Buyer Acceptance Test Worksheet

Copy *Table 2* into a spreadsheet and adapt its expected results to the signed brief. It is an original proposed **social media template quality assurance checklist**. Every observation and evidence field is intentionally blank. “Set” means the buyer must assign severity, owner, and decision; it is not an inferred passing result.

Test and starting file	Actor / role	Action	Expected result	Observed result	Evidence link	Severity if failed	Owner	Sign-off
Access: delivered master link	Intended editor	Open from the recipient account	Correct version opens with agreed access; required dependencies available	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Copy: delivered master	Intended editor	Create working duplicate; change its title	Separate identifiable copy exists; master remains unchanged	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Copy replacement: working duplicate	Intended editor	Replace placeholder with normal campaign headline	Editable text updates while agreed styling remains intact	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Text expansion: working duplicate	Intended editor	Enter “Meet the modular workspace built for growing teams across every time zone”	Entire agreed headline fits approved content limits without overlap or hidden text	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Price change: working duplicate	Intended editor	Replace “USD 29” with “USD 1,299 per bundle”	Agreed price envelope fits; currency and qualifier remain legible	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Photograph swap: working duplicate	Intended editor	Replace wide product shot with tall packaging photo; adjust crop	Product stays identifiable inside agreed frame; headline and logo remain clear	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Brand controls: test duplicate	Intended editor	Attempt prohibited logo movement and permitted content edit	Fixed brand elements behave as agreed; permitted content remains editable	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Font dependency: working duplicate	Intended editor	Add agreed new characters; reopen where required	Approved font remains available; no unexpected substitution changes layout	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Asset dependency: working duplicate	Intended editor	Open referenced library; insert approved replacement asset	Recipient can access required asset through agreed entitlement	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Export: edited duplicate	Intended editor	Download agreed pages, format, and background option	Export completes with agreed settings and page selection	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending

Test and starting file	Actor / role	Action	Expected result	Observed result	Evidence link	Severity if failed	Owner	Sign-off
Output inspection: downloaded file	Buyer reviewer	Open in independent viewer; check dimensions, crop, text, and background	File matches specification and edited source; visible content is intact	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Source persistence: saved duplicate	Intended editor	Close; reopen saved source; make another agreed edit	Prior content persists and subsequent editing remains possible	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Publishing handoff: export and copy record	Publisher	Preview on intended channel; attach description text where supported	Agreed channel variant and required publishing information are ready	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending
Optional AI route: separate duplicate	Authorized intended editor	Perform specifically agreed AI-assisted replacement	That route meets its own brief without altering protected content	Not tested	Add link	Set	Set	Pending

The long headline, price strings, and product shapes are **proposed test inputs**, not universal capacity requirements. Replace them with buyer-approved examples. MADE already recommends realistic content tests; the added discipline here is recording who ran each test, its result, and retrievable evidence. (madevisualstudio.com) Preserve separate evidence for source behavior and downloaded output.

Inspect the export independently

Figma documents editable **.fig** files separately from image exports. Its format guidance describes PNG transparency and warns that JPG compression can affect text readability. (help.figma.com) The buyer should therefore distinguish source delivery from final media delivery and use the format agreed for each purpose.

For Canva, its transparent-background instructions specify PNG and eligible plans. Verify the recipient's entitlement before making transparency an acceptance requirement. (www.canva.com) Avoid assuming that a successful download in the designer's account establishes the same outcome for the recipient.

Check the intended channel preview as a separate step. Buffer generates channel previews, CoSchedule describes its preview as an estimate, and Hootsuite notes that some elements are finalized by the network at publication. (support.buffer.com) (coschedule.com) (help.hootsuite.com) Record a preview as preview evidence. Arrange any live publication check separately if it is actually within scope.

Include a limited accessibility handoff

Check text legibility and contrast after the agreed image replacement. W3C warns that point sizes inside image editors can be unreliable for determining rendered size. (www.w3.org) Avoid calling a small line “large text” solely because the source file reports a particular size.

Prepare description text with the export. W3C's tutorial says alternatives for images of text must contain the same text, while its decision tree recommends conveying the meaning of meaningful photographs or graphics. (www.w3.org) X documents adding descriptions in the composer and separately describing images in a

multiple-image post. ([help.x.com](#)) These checks support the publishing handoff; they do not establish WCAG conformance for a social account or platform.

Classify Defects and Record Sign-Off

Use the approved brief to distinguish **broken agreed behavior**, **a changed requirement**, and **an account or platform restriction**. These categories are proposed decision rules, not legal determinations about a supplier's obligations. Acceptance criteria should remain objectively verifiable and understandable to the reviewer. ([www.atlassian.com](#)) ([trailhead.salesforce.com](#))

Table 3 maps those categories to practical remedies. The acceptance owner should confirm severity based on the effect on the agreed use, rather than applying a universal score.

Finding	Classification	Recommended next action	Decision evidence
Agreed headline fits in reference but clips in recipient copy	Broken agreed behavior	Designer repairs layout or documented editing route, then buyer retests	Original criterion, screenshot, corrected version, retest
Agreed editable offer cannot be changed by intended editor	Broken behavior or access configuration, diagnose first	Designer and administrator identify cause and correction owner	Recipient role, exact action, restriction message
Buyer requests a new channel or content shape outside brief	Changed requirement	Agree revised scope, constraints, and acceptance test before adding work	Change request and approved revised criterion
Required feature is unavailable under documented recipient setup	Account or platform restriction	Administrator verifies setup; parties choose feasible alternative or narrowed scope	Official feature reference and observed account result
Minor visual discrepancy does not affect agreed reuse	Cosmetic issue if buyer agrees	Record correction commitment or explicit exception	Affected version, screenshot, named decision
Required task cannot be tested because an asset is missing	Blocked test	Assign dependency owner; keep outcome untested until retest	Missing asset record and next action

Interpret the table through the brief. An absent feature is not automatically a design defect, and an unexpected subscription requirement is not automatically a change request. Ask what was agreed about the recipient's environment and who was responsible for making it usable. Adobe Express documents plan-dependent template controls and separate asset access, illustrating why these dependencies should be visible before delivery. ([helpx.adobe.com](#))

Use this severity scheme only after adapting it to the purchase:

- **Critical:** An essential agreed task is impossible, or the correct deliverable cannot be identified.
- **Major:** A recurring agreed task requires rebuilding, unauthorized access, or an unaccepted workaround.
- **Minor:** A localized issue has an agreed temporary workaround and a correction owner.
- **Cosmetic:** A visual discrepancy does not affect agreed content or reuse.

- **Blocked:** Evidence cannot be collected; this is an execution state, not a passing severity.

Record the final outcome:

- **Accepted:** Required tests pass for the named version and scope.
- **Conditionally accepted:** Buyer explicitly accepts listed exceptions, their effects, and the follow-up owner.
- **Returned for correction:** Unresolved agreed behavior prevents acceptance of the affected delivery.
- **Scope narrowed:** Buyer and supplier explicitly remove an unsupported use and revise the acceptance baseline.

Attach the decision to the source version, export examples, unresolved findings, reviewer, and decision timestamp. Asana recommends comments explaining approval decisions. (help.asana.com) Preserve the buyer's version history alongside its observations. A message saying “looks good” should be converted into a record identifying exactly what was accepted.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The quantitative evidence relevant to this worksheet concerns **specified thresholds and observed test records**, rather than market demand or creative performance. No search volume, conversion uplift, backlink-quality total, review-time benchmark, or return on investment is established by the sources used here.

Use published numbers within their actual scope

W3C's explanation of WCAG Contrast (Minimum) specifies **4.5:1** for text and images of text, with **3:1** for qualifying large-scale text and stated exceptions. (www.w3.org) It also says computed values should not be rounded. (www.w3.org) A buyer can record the measured foreground/background pair and check it against the appropriate criterion. For a changing photographic background, record which area was checked and whether the replacement photo changes the result.

These values do not certify a reusable template. The rendered size matters, and W3C specifically cautions against relying on point sizes reported inside image-editing applications. (www.w3.org) Treat contrast as a scoped check of the delivered example and agreed replacements. Keep broader accessibility evaluation separate.

Process timing is similarly local. North Florida's Canva guidance asks users to allow **up to 3 business days** for approval. (www.unf.edu) That is its institutional instruction, not a benchmark for freelancer turnaround, subscription design delivery, or buyer review. Texas State's template page describes a different review policy. (brand.txst.edu) The lesson is to record the buyer's actual approval requirement rather than import another organization's timetable.

Measure the review without manufacturing a benchmark

The buyer may add execution minutes to each test record and sum them:

Total initial review time = sum of minutes spent on the initial test executions.

Record **retest time separately** so that a revised delivery does not obscure the original review effort. Also keep blocked waiting time separate from hands-on execution if those distinctions matter to the buyer. These are proposed buyer-entered measurements; this report supplies no expected duration.

If a pass percentage is useful, define it explicitly:

Executed-test pass percentage = passed required tests / executed required tests × 100.

Report blocked and not-tested rows alongside the percentage. Exclude optional tests only if the selection rule is recorded. This calculation is descriptive, not an acceptance algorithm. A critical failure remains visible regardless of the arithmetic.

The proposed evidence package should preserve the underlying observations: starting version, actual role, input, result, screenshot or recording, and correction history. Salesforce's pass/fail framing and Atlassian's independently testable criteria support separating outcomes instead of compressing every issue into an impressionistic quality score. (trailhead.salesforce.com) (www.atlassian.com)

Worked Product-Promotion Review (Hypothetical Example)

Every company detail, product, file identifier, input, observation, severity, and decision in this section is **illustrative and invented**. This is not a customer case study or a demonstration executed in Canva, Figma, or Adobe Express.

Assume a fictional e-commerce buyer commissions a product-promotion template for a modular desk organizer. The fictional brief permits headline, offer, and product-photo replacement, while keeping logo position and typography fixed. The intended editor is a marketing coordinator using the buyer's own account. The source identifier is “organizer-promo-vA”; the working duplicate is “organizer-review-copy.”

The fictional buyer runs selected worksheet rows and records:

- **Copy, illustrative pass:** The coordinator creates a distinct working copy, changes its title, and confirms that the master still contains its original content. Evidence placeholder: “copy-check recording.”
- **Headline, illustrative fail:** The agreed long headline overlaps the offer strip in the duplicate. The buyer records a major defect, assigns the layout correction to the designer, and leaves sign-off pending. Evidence placeholder: “headline-overlap screenshot.”
- **Price, illustrative pass:** The proposed replacement “USD 1,299 per bundle” fits the agreed offer area without manual resizing. Evidence placeholder: “price-replacement screenshot.”
- **Photo, illustrative fail:** The tall replacement photograph cuts off the product's identifying label in the agreed frame. The designer owns the crop or frame correction. Evidence placeholder: “replacement-photo screenshot.”
- **Export, illustrative pass:** The coordinator downloads the agreed file and opens it in an independent viewer. The output matches the tested copy. Evidence placeholder: “downloaded artifact.”
- **Reopen, illustrative blocked:** The coordinator has not yet reopened the saved editable copy. No result is inferred from the export. Evidence placeholder: “pending execution.”

These fictional outcomes illustrate why an attractive export and successful price change do not establish acceptance of the whole pack. The long-headline behavior was inside the agreed content envelope, so it returns for correction. A subsequent request for a completely different channel layout would be evaluated as a change request rather than silently added to that repair.

The fictional buyer returns the affected template for correction, retaining the passing evidence and the untested reopen row. After a revised source arrives, the buyer reruns failed tests and any other tests whose behavior could have changed. The retest keeps each acceptance criterion observable on its own. The final decision still requires actual observations and a named buyer; none of the placeholders above is an evidence link.

Implications and Future Directions

Reusable templates should be bought with an explicit definition of the editing work they must support. A supplier can prepare sensible defaults, but the buyer must validate the account, content, and approval conditions under which reuse will happen. The institutional examples show that even documented Canva workflows can carry different local review requirements. (www.unf.edu) (brand.txst.edu)

For recurring production, preserve a baseline for each template family and rerun affected tests when dependencies change. A changed font, asset location, permission, protected field, or export requirement should trigger review of the relevant acceptance criteria. Google Drive's inherited permissions and Microsoft's font-embedding cautions provide concrete reasons to check the dependency rather than only the visible canvas. (support.google.com) (support.microsoft.com)

The protocol can also separate routine operation from an optional AI route. Canva's documented distinction between generation and later AI editing makes that separation useful, but it does not establish the behavior of other products. (www.canva.com) Keep platform-specific instructions linked to their own official documentation.

For resourcing decisions, apply the same worksheet to a freelancer, an agency, an internal team, or a recurring design subscription. Tapflare is the publishing design-and-development provider; this instrument is intended for evaluating commissioned creative across those arrangements. Its tables compare files, permissions, tests, and remedies for commissioned design.

Keep the handoff responsibilities explicit:

- **Designer:** Repair agreed layout and template behavior.
- **Administrator:** Confirm recipient access and relevant account restrictions.
- **Buyer:** Supply representative content and make the acceptance decision.
- **Publisher:** Check the intended channel and add required description text.
- **Account lead:** Preserve versions, exceptions, owners, and follow-up dates.

Channel previews remain useful review aids. Buffer supports channel-specific customization, while CoSchedule advises checking each selected profile. (support.buffer.com) (coschedule.com) Their role here is additional output evidence, alongside the source-file tests and the agreed publication boundary.

Conclusion

A **social media design sign-off checklist** should lead to a defensible acceptance decision about a particular editable delivery. The buyer needs to know who tested it, which file and account were used, what changed, what was expected, and what evidence supports the result. A general approval message cannot provide those details by itself.

Use the proposed worksheet as the operating record. Agree the editor, permitted changes, protected elements, representative content, dependencies, and exports before delivery. Run the tests from a duplicate under the intended role. Inspect the exported media independently, then reopen the saved editable source. Keep untested and blocked outcomes visible.

When something fails, compare the observed behavior with the brief. Return broken agreed behavior for correction, evaluate new requirements as scope changes, and assign account restrictions to the person able to resolve them. Conditional acceptance should name the exception and owner; narrowing scope should change the acceptance baseline explicitly.

The worksheet is a proposed reference asset. Its illustrative product-promotion review supplies a model for recording both passing and failing rows, not evidence of client performance. No pass percentage should conceal a critical defect, and no preview should stand in for the unperformed editing tasks.

The practical acceptance standard is straightforward: the intended non-designer can complete the agreed recurring work in the intended environment, and the decision record identifies the version, evidence, exceptions, and approver supporting that conclusion.

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. <https://www.atlassian.com/work-management/project-management/acceptance-criteria>
2. <https://trailhead.salesforce.com/content/learn/modules/user-story-creation/construct-a-user-story>
3. <https://help.figma.com/hc/en-us/articles/360040531773-Share-files-and-prototypes>
4. <https://helpx.adobe.com/express/web/brands-libraries-projects/create-manage-brands/edit-shared-template.html>
5. <https://www.canva.com/help/brand-template-locks>
6. <https://madevisualstudio.com/how-to-prepare-social-media>
7. <https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG22/Understanding/contrast-minimum.html>
8. <https://help.x.com/en/using-x/add-image-descriptions>
9. <https://landingi.com/digital-marketing/design-types>
10. <https://www.unf.edu/brand/templates.html>
11. <https://brand.txst.edu/resources/templates/canva.html>
12. <https://helpx.adobe.com/express/web/brands-libraries-projects/create-manage-brands/template-control.html>
13. https://www.canva.com/en_in/help/create-on-brand-designs
14. <https://www.ithaca.edu/marketing-communications/canva/canva-templates>
15. https://www.canva.com/en_gb/help/publish-team-template

16. <https://support.google.com/drive/answer/7166529?hl=en>
17. <https://www.canva.com/help/duplicate-designs>
18. <https://helpx.adobe.com/express/web/invite-collaborate/share-view-only-links.html>
19. <https://support.microsoft.com/en-gb/office/fonts/benefits-of-embedding-custom-fonts>
20. <https://fonts.google.com/faq>
21. <https://help.asana.com/s/article/approvals>
22. https://www.smartsheet.com/sites/default/files/2020-10/23INT_Seamless%20Content%20Collaboration%20Made%20Easy_%20Top%2020%20Q_A%20.pdf
23. <https://help.figma.com/hc/en-us/articles/360040028114-Export-static-designs-from-Figma>
24. <https://www.canva.com/help/transparent-background>
25. <https://support.buffer.com/articles/scheduling-posts-4Qdld7giAZ>
26. <https://coschedule.com/support/social-publishing/create-and-schedule/preview-a-social-message>
27. <https://help.hootsuite.com/s/article/preview>
28. <https://www.w3.org/WAI/tutorials/images/textual>

THE PUBLISHER

About Tapflare

Tapflare gives companies an on-demand design and web team for a flat monthly fee.

How it works

Each subscriber has a dedicated project manager who learns the brand, assigns every request to a senior specialist in that kind of work, and reviews the result before it is delivered. Requests are submitted and discussed in the Tapflare portal, each plan includes a daily allotment of design or development time, and the client keeps full ownership of the export and source files.

What it covers

Graphic design, custom illustration, presentation design, logos and brand guides, video editing and motion graphics, website and mobile-app mockups, and website development, from design mockups to HTML, to drag-and-drop builders or custom code.

What it is not

Tapflare is not a marketing agency, a media-buying, SEO or copywriting service, a software product or a freelance marketplace. Where a reader needs one of those, the honest answer is to say so.

Visit

See [Tapflare](#) and its [pricing](#).

Articles published here explain general practice and cite their sources. Prices and plan contents, including Tapflare's own, change; check the provider's current pricing page before deciding.

Website: <https://tapflare.com>

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.