

SHARE THE BRAIN; KEEP IT SHARP

Let the team contribute evidence, then keep shared guidance current and reviewable

A Team Brain is useful only when everyone can tell who may change what. Each adopted change must cite its evidence and human approver, with a route back to the prior version. Raw source records stay untouched. *Anything set as dialogue is an instruction you can give the agent word for word; adapt names and files to the production.*

PREPARED FOR THE AVS SCREENWRITING TEAM · JULY 2026

FADE IN:

DEPOSIT WIDELY; ADOPT DELIBERATELY

A shared folder should accept evidence from the people doing the work without turning every contribution into policy. Contributors deposit drafts, notes, outcomes, and proposals; one accountable curator adopts shared guidance. Adoption does not make a claim true. The curator records what changed, why, who approved it, and how the team can restore the prior state. Paths in this guide begin at AVS-Team-Brain/.

Rule 1: Everyone may contribute evidence; the curator alone adopts guidance.

Rule 2: Raw evidence is append-only. Corrections become new records, never silent rewrites.

Rule 3: Access follows role and production need. A shared location is not permission.

- 1. Choose one approved home with history.** Put the Team Brain in an AVS-approved shared location that records versions. Name one authoritative copy; do not let private mirrors quietly become competing standards. Version history supports restoration, but it does not replace backups, retention policy, or an access review.
- 2. Give each action an owner.** A contributor may deposit evidence and propose a change. The curator reviews, adopts, records, and restores. An approver supplies required human sign-off. A reader may consult current material without changing it. Draft that responsibility map before granting write access:

The Curator
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. Read the approved working agreement at working-agreement.md. Preview the complete contents of GOVERNANCE.md in chat. Define who may deposit evidence, propose derived changes, adopt them, grant production access, and restore an approved snapshot. Preserve AVS policy language and flag unanswered ownership questions. Do not create or edit files.

*You should get: a short responsibility map with unresolved choices visible.
Next: have the accountable lead assign names or roles.*

- 3. Make permission explicit and reviewable.** Record who has access to shared evidence and each production area, why they need it, and who grants or removes that access. Review the list when a person, client, production, or role changes. Tool access never enlarges permission. AVS internal policy, client confidentiality requirements, contract terms, guild or union agreements, and vendor data-handling terms remain authoritative.

- 4. Require a proposal, citations, and a diff.** Name exact sources, contrary examples, the base version, and changed lines. The agent checks; the curator approves:

The Curator
(to the agent)

ASK only. Review proposals/2026-07-10-pacing-line.md against its cited paths, current rubrics/committee.md, named base snapshot, CHANGELOG.md, and GOVERNANCE.md. Check supporting and contrary evidence, the base diff, later entries, and proposer and approver authority. List gaps and conflicts. Do not approve, adopt, or edit files.

You should get: a record and permission check. Next: the curator decides.

- 5. Record adoption as a reversible decision.** Date it; cite exact records; name the approver; record the diff and snapshot. Newer is not truer by default. Keep contrary examples and explain the judgment.

2026-07-10 · rubrics/committee.md · pacing
Sources: evidence/return-visit/draft-2-notes.md #4;
evidence/return-visit/draft-3-notes.md #2, #5
Base team-brain-2026-07-03 · Diff: "Flag setup over two pages." → "Flag only when notes connect length to delayed movement."
Approved: [full name], screenwriting lead · Snapshot: team-brain-2026-07-10-pacing

THE STEWARDSHIP LAYER

AVS-Team-Brain/
└ GOVERNANCE.md authority, access, restoration
└ CHANGELOG.md adopted diffs, sources, approver, snapshot
└ proposals/ cited changes awaiting curator decision
└ archive/ retired derived files, intact
└ workflows/condense.md bounded pruning procedure
└ onboarding/first-week-check.md past-draft calibration

The Curator
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. The curator approved [exact diff] from proposals/2026-07-10-pacing-line.md on [date]; approver: [name, role]. Verify its cited records, then preview one CHANGELOG.md entry with source paths, contrary evidence, base version, exact approved diff, approver, and snapshot. Do not infer details or edit files.

You should get: one reversible record. Next: verify it, append it, and save the snapshot.

- 6. Prove the handoff works.** Someone who did not build the folder can find the current file, name its curator, version, and change authority, and restore the last approved state.

READY WHEN

Two contributors deposit without adopting; the curator reviews, records, and reverses one change.

CUT TO:

PRUNE DERIVED CONTEXT; PRESERVE SOURCE RECORDS

Raw drafts and notes are source records; preserve them unchanged. Briefs, rubrics, standards, and workflows are derived context, so keep only what helps people make decisions. Shorten derived files through review, retire them reversibly, and never treat tidiness as evidence.

FILE CLASSES: evidence (append only) · derived context (propose, review, adopt) · archive (retired files, intact)

Condense inside a hard boundary. The workflow may merge repeated guidance, shorten wording without changing meaning, clarify a conflict, or propose retirement of superseded files in `team-brief.md`, `rubrics/`, `standards/`, and `workflows/`. It may never rewrite, summarize in place, or delete `evidence/`. Every proposal needs exact source citations and a rollback path.

The Curator
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. Preview complete `workflows/condense.md` in chat. Include goal, named inputs, allowed actions, protected `evidence/`, numbered proposals with source citations and exact diffs, archive targets, rollback paths, curator approval, a separate APPLY step, and stops for missing citations, source conflict, or an existing archive target. Do not create, edit, move, or archive files.

You should get: a one-page procedure with a hard evidence boundary. *Next:* test and approve it.

The Curator
(to the agent)

PROPOSE only. Run `workflows/condense.md` on `team-brief.md`, `rubrics/`, `standards/`, and `workflows/`. Number proposals. Cite support and contrary records; show each exact diff, archive target, and rollback path. Do not create, edit, move, or archive files; leave `evidence/` untouched.

You should get: numbered, cited diffs with rollback paths. *Next:* approve item by item, archive intact, and record each adoption.

Onboard with an exact reviewed pair. A new writer should understand how the system reached a judgment, not memorize prompt language. Use the approved draft and returned-notes paths below as a calibration exercise before granting write access:

The Curator
(to the agent)

ASK only. Read `team-brief.md` and `rubrics/committee.md`. Run `workflows/self-coverage.md` on `exemplars/return-visit/approved-draft-2.pdf`; compare `evidence/return-visit/draft-2-notes.md`. Stop if `onboarding/first-week-check.md` exists. Return a cited comparison, uncertainty, and discussion questions in chat. Do not create or edit files.

You should get: a cited past-draft exercise in chat and no file changes. *Next:* discuss it with a human, then use a separate PROPOSE instruction to preview `onboarding/first-week-check.md`. APPLY only the approved file before granting write access.

Watch for quiet failure in a mature system.

- **Overfitting:** ideas start resembling the rubric. Keep one unconstrained option; judge it afterward.
- **Sycophancy:** the agent agrees with the person typing. Ask it to identify weak reasoning, cite contrary evidence, and say “nothing material” when it finds nothing worth flagging.
- **Staleness:** new notes and the rubric diverge. Before updating it, check whether the difference comes from the production, reviewer mix, evidence, or tool behavior.
- **Craft atrophy:** pages speed up while the writer practices less. The writer makes the first canonical pass.

Diagnose drift before editing the rule. Causes may overlap. Inspect the records first:

The Curator
(to the agent)

ASK only. Compare the last three rounds in `evidence/return-visit/` with `rubrics/committee.md` and `onboarding/first-week-check.md`. Check whether the apparent drift tracks changes in reviewer behavior, production, evidence, or tool behavior. Causes may overlap; cite each claim and mark unresolved causes. Do not update the rubric or edit files.

You should get: supported, overlapping causes and uncertainty. *Next:* investigate; the curator decides.

Keep shared guidance usable.

- Schedule stewardship when evidence or contradiction warrants it, not by calendar.
- Keep `team-brief.md` short enough to read.
- Review access whenever people, roles, clients, or productions change.
- Rotate the curator with an approved snapshot and handoff.
- Preserve dissent, contrary cases, and first-pass experimentation.
- Audit writer judgment, not throughput alone.

WHEN STEWARDSHIP FAILS

If an unauthorized change lands, raw evidence changes, or condensing drops citations or a rollback path, suspend write access. Preserve the incident and identify the failed governance or workflow check. Restore only the unauthorized change from the last approved snapshot; preserve later approved work. The accountable lead resumes writes after the check is repaired and tested.

Final guardrail. The Team Brain is shared reference, not shared authorship. It supports the people accountable for the work. AVS policy and human approval govern access and release; craft, voice, credit, and responsibility remain with the writer. Nothing leaves the building without human approval.

READY WHEN

Contributors deposit without adopting; the curator records and restores; condensing leaves evidence intact; a new writer completes the exercise before write access.

FADE OUT.