Collaborative Aptitude for the Project (AC):
The team's ability to work together effectively, including communication and teamwork among developers.

AC (Collaboration Fit)	
Value	Description
VL	**POOR FIT** **Characteristics**: Severe Communication Issues: Team members rarely communicate, preferring to work in isolation. There's little to no discussion on tasks or shared understanding. Lack of Trust and Support: There is no sense of trust among team members, and they avoid seeking or offering help. Collaboration is perceived as an afterthought. Frequent Conflicts: Unresolved conflicts are common, and team members blame each other for issues without productive resolution. Disengagement: Team members show little interest in team goals. Individuals focus on their own tasks without considering the team's overall progress. Institutional: The team is dispersed in terms of what the project represents, people follow different convictions and values from the institution. **Example**: A team working on a machine learning project where data scientists, engineers, and analysts work in silos. When problems arise, each department blames the other for delays or errors. Meetings are unproductive, and team members refuse to collaborate or offer help, resulting in missed deadlines and a fractured team dynamic.
L	**BELOW AVERAGE FIT** **Characteristics**: Inconsistent Communication: While some collaboration happens, it is irregular and usually occurs only when problems arise. Team members often solve issues in isolation rather than collaboratively. Unequal Contribution: A few team members shoulder the burden of teamwork, while others contribute minimally, leading to uneven collaboration. Limited Feedback: Team members rarely seek feedback from each other, resulting in overlooked issues and lost opportunities for improvement. Some Trust, but Hesitant: There is some trust within the team, but it's fragile. Team members may be reluctant to share openly or ask for help. Institutional: The team has some awareness of institutional values and goals but often deviates from them in practice. Members are inconsistent in following company processes, which leads to misalignment and occasional friction with institutional standards. The team may struggle to integrate its work within the broader organizational framework. **Example**: In a mobile app project, a couple of developers frequently collaborate, but the rest of the team works mostly on their own. There is a sense of disconnect, and while daily scrums occur, they are superficial. Feedback is often ignored, and progress is slow due to lack of deep collaboration.

M	**AVERAGE FIT** **Characteristics**: Functional but Limited Collaboration: Team members collaborate well during formal meetings (such as Daily Standups), but ad-hoc collaboration throughout the day is minimal. Clear but Task-Oriented Communication: Communication is focused on task completion rather than problem-solving or innovation. Team members communicate adequately but don't go beyond basic requirements. Moderate Trust: There is a reasonable level of trust in the team, and most members feel comfortable asking for help, although some might still hesitate. Occasional Knowledge Sharing: Knowledge sharing happens, but typically only when necessary. The team could improve by proactively sharing lessons learned or best practices. Institutional: The team generally understands and follows institutional values and processes but inconsistently applies them. While team members largely align with company goals, there are occasional deviations that can cause minor inefficiencies or disconnects between the team's actions and the institution's expectations. However, the team is capable of adjusting and realigning when needed. **Example**: A team developing a web-based SaaS application communicates during formal Agile ceremonies but rarely collaborates outside of them. Developers focus on their individual tasks and only interact when absolutely necessary. They achieve their goals, but collaboration could be improved for greater efficiency and innovation.
H	**ABOVE AVERAGE FIT** **Characteristics**: Strong Communication: Team members communicate frequently and openly, sharing their progress, ideas, and challenges. They seek each other's input regularly. Trust and Support: High levels of trust within the team. Members are comfortable asking for help, and peer assistance is a norm. Feedback Culture: The team has established a strong feedback culture, with regular peer reviews, feedback sessions, and retrospectives that lead to tangible improvements. Shared Ownership: There is a sense of shared responsibility for team outcomes. Team members help one another regardless of whose tasks are affected, working towards the overall success of the project. Institutional: The team is highly aligned with institutional values and processes, following them proactively. There is a strong sense of shared purpose, and the team's work is fully integrated with the company's goals. They ensure their actions reflect institutional standards, rarely deviating from the expected framework. **Example**: A team developing an e-commerce platform uses daily standups effectively, but collaboration doesn't stop there. Throughout the day, team members pair program, share insights, and offer to help each other resolve blockers. They regularly meet to discuss challenges and implement feedback from reviews, ensuring smooth progress.

	PERFECT FIT **Characteristics**: Seamless Communication: The team communicates continuously and naturally. Discussions flow freely, and team members anticipate each other's needs without prompting. High Trust and Psychological Safety: The team has a deep level of trust and psychological safety, enabling them to challenge each other constructively and innovate without fear of judgment. Constant Feedback Loop: Feedback is continuous and highly valued. Team members constantly give and receive feedback, improving processes, quality, and personal growth. Proactive Collaboration: The team collaborates proactively without waiting for formal ceremonies. They solve complex problems together and generate innovative ideas through frequent brainstorming and knowledge sharing. High Adaptability and Cohesion: Team members are highly cohesive and can adapt to changes in scope, requirements, or team structure with ease. They consistently take ownership of both successes and failures. Institutional: The team is exemplary in embodying the institution's values and processes. Every team member is deeply committed to following and promoting company standards, with their work seamlessly integrated into the broader institutional structure. They set the benchmark for others and often lead initiatives to strengthen institutional alignment across the organization. **Example**: A team working on a real-time analytics platform collaborates seamlessly, with no bottlenecks. They use pair programming daily, hold spontaneous problem-solving sessions, and share new insights immediately. The team trusts each other completely, and feedback is continuous, resulting in high productivity and low technical debt.
VH	