**Group workload profile**

The purpose of the group workload profile is to guarantee the fairness of the grade individualisation process, starting from the grade awarded to each group project submission. Members of each group must record their effort, by openly and fairly agreeing to what the quantitative and qualitative contribution of each group member has been during the project.

A group member may not agree with one or more contribution values agreed by other members in the profile. In this case, they should:

1. Avoid signing the profile (which implies unconditional acceptance of ALL that is written in it concerning each group member).
2. By the project submission deadline, email the course coordinator, explaining the motivation for refusing to sign the profile.

Students must ensure that ALL team members have signed this form, and all agree with the declaration, before it is submitted with the coursework. Group members may complete the profile, by using the following to indicate their relative effort:

* 0% - I contributed the same as my team members
* +X% I contributed more than my team members by a specific amount X% (see below)
* -X% I contributed less than my team members by a specific amount X% (see below)

X% = 10%, 25%, 50%, 100%

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group number |  | | | |
| Group supervisor: |  | | | |
| Student name | Student ID number | Contribution | Signature | Date |
| CHEN, ZHENGLAN | 50087565 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| CHEN, BOCHAO | 50087566 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| DAI, JUN | 50087513 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| TIAN, SHUO | 50087538 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| JI, YUAN | 50087535 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| ZHAO, WENHUI | 50087514 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| WENG, ZIXUAN | 50087520 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| LIN, QINGXI | 50087537 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| FENG, JUNNANG | 50087516 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |
| LUO, JIAYANG | 50087573 |  |  | 15/12/2023 |

The interpretation of such percentages is as follows:

0%: The team member will get the mark assigned to the project (whatever this turns out to be). This means that, according to the person providing this rating, the amount of work done by the rated team member and the quality of her/his work reflect the overall project quantity and quality. That team member neither delivered more nor less than the other members.

+ 10%: The team member mark will be 110% of the mark assigned to the project (whatever this turns out to be). This means that, according to the person providing this rating, the amount of work done by the rated team member and the quality of her/his work is marginally higher than the project average. That team member delivered more (but not much more in quality and quantity) than the other members. Roughly speaking, we could say that the team member delivered around 10% more than the average. This higher contribution w.r.t. the average must be motivated and measurable (no perception-based motivations are allowed).

- 10%: The team member mark will be 90% of the mark assigned to the project (whatever this turns out to be). This means that, according to the person providing this rating, the amount of work done by the rated team member and the quality of her/his work is marginally lower than the project average. That team member delivered less (but not much less in quality and quantity) than the other members. Roughly speaking, we could say that the team member delivered around 10% less than the average. This lower contribution w.r.t. the average must be motivated and measurable (no perception-based motivations are allowed).

- 25%: The team member mark will be 75% of the mark assigned to the project (whatever this turns out to be). This means that, according to the person providing this rating, the amount of work done by the rated team member and the quality of her/his work is appreciably lower than the project average. That team member delivered definitively less in quality and quantity than the other members. Roughly speaking, we could say that the team member delivered around 25% less than the average. This lower contribution w.r.t. the average must be motivated and measurable (no perception-based motivations are allowed).

- 50%: The team member mark will be 50% of the mark assigned to the project (whatever this turns out to be). This means that, according to the person providing this rating, the amount of work done by the rated team member and the quality of her/his work is exceedingly lower than the project average. That team member delivered definitively much less in quality and quantity than the other members. Roughly speaking, we could say that the team member delivered around 50% less than the average. This lower contribution w.r.t. the average must be motivated and measurable (no perception-based motivations are allowed).

This marks covers several cases that inevitably trigger a complete failure in the course, the obligation to do the group project again the following year, and negative consequences both in the grade spectrum and in the CV. Some of the most common scenarios are as follows. A group member, after having contributed for a while, disappears for a long time (several weeks) during a critical project stage, leaving the others in trouble. A group member only starts contributing halfway during the project, having previously done akin to nothing. A group member, despite her/his attendance at meetings, only delivers around 50% of what s/he has been assigned to do. A group member, despite being involved in groupwork, consistently delivers poor quality results that are mostly useless for the project.

- 100%: The team member mark will be CGS G3. This means that, according to the person providing this rating, the rated team member has not contributed to the project. That team member did not do most of what s/he was expected to do, and the quality of those elements which were actually delivered was poor. Roughly speaking, we could say that the team member delivered akin to nothing useful. This lower contribution w.r.t. the average must be motivated and measurable (no perception-based motivations are allowed).

This marks covers a case that inevitably triggers a complete failure in the course, the obligation to do the group project again the following year, and negative consequences both in the grade spectrum and in the CV.