

Guidelines for IPD

IPD Report Form – Poor Example

- Not personal
- Not specific to projects
- Talks about the objective in general rather than how the candidate has satisfied the objective
- Will lead to extensive questioning
- The mentor adds nothing. Reviewers prefer to see positive, informative statements being made by mentors

Candidate Name: M S Engineer				
Membership Number:				
Core Objective: 2.1 – Conceptual Design				
Standard Achieved (please tick)	A	K	E	B
Date of Report: 01/05/10				✓
Report:				
<p>I have gained the ability through experience of conceptual design on various projects, not only to appraise the best solution in terms of structure but to work with the design team to find the best integrated solution to meet the needs of the particular project.</p> <p>This has been done through conceptual design discussions with the design team on subjects such as visual appearance, thermal mass, acoustics, buildability, air tightness, cost and the possibilities of integration of structure and service schemes to provide both energy and/or cost savings.</p> <p>The conceptual design is a key element of every tender when the best value for the project is sought from designers and contractors. An inappropriate design may lead to concerns regarding its viability as a structure or other health and safety issues.</p> <p>Any design should respond to the client's requirements in terms of cost, aesthetics and use.</p>				
Mentor's Comments:				
<i>Agreed</i>				
Candidate Signature:				
Mentor's Signature: Mentor's Name (Print):				
M Entor				

IPD Report Form – Average Example

- Personal
- Whilst some specific details of activities are given the candidate should have provided specific details of what was done on each project
- Give references to help your reviewer find the evidence
- The mentor is positive but lacks detail and could be more personal

Candidate Name: M S Engineer				
Membership Number:				
Core Objective: 2.1 – Conceptual Design				
Standard Achieved (please tick)	A	K	E	B
Date of Report: 01/05/10				✓
Report:				
<p>I have been responsible for the production of conceptual schemes for numerous projects – new builds as well as refurbishments/extensions – in particular structural steel against reinforced concrete and masonry against timber framed structures.</p> <p>I have also prepared options for safely constructing retaining walls by either a bored piled retaining wall or a sequenced traditional reinforced concrete retaining wall. These projects involved both the superstructure and foundation options for tenders/contractor pricing.</p> <p>Refer to the following within my portfolio of work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hancock Bridge strengthening ▪ Burj Al Qatan ▪ Cable-stayed bridge over Dnepr river ▪ Arch dam 				
Mentor's Comments:				
I confirm that Mr Engineer has undertaken the tasks detailed above to a standard of Ability. This can be confirmed within his portfolio of work.				
Candidate Signature:				
Mentor's Signature: Mentor's Name (Print):				
M Entor				

IPD Report Form – Good Example

- Describes candidates approach to the objective
- Gives detailed information for specific projects
- Provides clear references
- Mentor is positive, specific and provides additional insight to the reviewers which may be unavailable
- Mentor gives confidence to the reviewers that they have taken their role seriously

Mentor's Comments:	
<p>Whilst acting as Mr Engineer's mentor for the last four years, I have witnessed a significant improvement in his ability regarding conceptual design. Initially Mr Engineer gained significant ability in designing 'traditional' structures but after only a short period of time was encouraged to undertake the design of more complex and challenging structures. Mr Engineer clearly relishes the challenges posed in designing more complicated structures or where there are underlying problems which must be surmounted for the project to succeed. His innovative approach can be seen in the foundation design (in which he has become something of an office expert) for the honey processing plant and the flexible use ground floor of the exhibition centre.</p> <p>I would not hesitate to assign major and challenging projects to Mr Engineer as I have every confidence that his ability in conceptual design will ensure that the project is a success.</p> <p>Candidate Signature:</p>	
Mentor's Signature:	Mentor's Name (Print): M Entor

Candidate Name:	M S Engineer			
Membership Number:				
Core Objective:	2.1 – Conceptual Design			
Standard Achieved (please tick)	A	K	E	B
Date of Report: 01/05/10				✓
Report:				
<p>During my career I have displayed a strong ability to conceive viable alternate structures as per the client's brief. In so doing I take into account the costs, aesthetics, materials, durability and construction methods of the project. An ability in Conceptual Design has been demonstrated in the following projects; references refer to the portfolio of work where more detailed information can be found including comparisons of different materials, designs etc:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ultrasonicated honey processing plant, Devon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ref: Section 2.1.1 ○ £2.2 m, 2 storey, masonry/fabricated steel structure ○ Complications included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site being on a significant gradient - close proximity of river – required construction of retaining walls - ground investigation showed that ground bearing pressure was not sufficient to use traditional foundations – ground improvement required through use of piled foundations - close proximity of major road – required construction of retaining walls and removal of existing derby retaining wall as client wished the plant to be built 2 m below the road level. Options for removing derby wall were presented to the client and a contiguous retaining wall constructed to support both ▪ (Replacement) Arch Bridge, River Isar, Munich <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ref: Section 2.1.2 ○ £1.5 m, 2 storey (railway and two-lane roadway), steel bridge, three arch 250 m span ○ Replacing a historic bridge which had been rendered unsafe due to an impact by a ferry ○ Improvements to the original design were possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - steel replaced concrete due to quicker construction and lower weight demands - structural system improved by making all arches externally statically detement. This was achieved by tying the arches throughout the bridge deck ▪ Exhibition centre, Liverpool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ref: Section 2.1.3 ○ £125 m, 4 storey (with mezzanine), precast concrete/fabricated steel structure ○ Complications included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - client requested no columns within the main 36 m² exhibition hall – structural steel truss used as economically viable and met the height requirements - numerous staircases and ramps, which were all treated as individual structures within the overall design – a combination of support systems (bearing walls, beams, hanging walls, etc) were used - flexibility of ground floor (main) exhibition hall – utilised a braced steel transfer frame with the floor beams using UC sections; beam deflection analysis was essential to assess the deflection from the dead load of the precast structure of the floors above 				