

Advice to failed candidates

Associate-Membership examination 2010

It is not possible for the examiners, in the short time available, to give specific and detailed advice on every script, nor are they employed to do so.

What the Institution hopes to do at this stage is to indicate, through 17 points, any obvious areas of weakness in each script so that the candidates can act in a professional way, with the help of their supervising engineers and colleagues, to improve their ability and their examination technique to a satisfactory standard.

Notice that these are not 'failure points' but advice and guidance, with the exception that if the solution proposed is unsafe, or if the candidate so alters the question by ignoring important limitations in the client's brief that the question is effectively altered, the candidate must fail.

Candidates below the pass mark often show inadequacy in several parts of their answer and it is then difficult to point to specific areas for improvement. This should be remembered when reading any examiner's comments.

However, some parts of their answer may be especially weak and these are indicated:

1. The structure you proposed for your solution in section 1(a) was unsafe and would have failed in whole or in part and this must result in instant failure.
2. Your proposed solution in section 1(a) did not fully take into account limitations set out in the client's brief thus changing the set question and this must result in instant failure.
3. The marks you obtained were very low in both sections of the paper. The examiners consider that you should consult your supervising engineer and your sponsors in depth and reconsider how your experience and your preparation for the examination can be improved before taking the examination again.

An Institution preparation course for the Associate-Membership examination would help you to improve your time management and examination technique and further supervised experience would be very useful.

4. Your section 1 answers were insufficient in total to gain a pass mark. The examiners consider that you need to allow more time for this section during the examination and in your preparation beforehand.

An Institution preparation course would be useful as would additional supervised experience.

5. Overall your section 2 answers were not sufficient to gain a pass mark. The examiners consider that more time must be given to answering this part of the question during the examination and in your preparation beforehand.

An Institution preparation course combined with your revision would help.

6. Although much of what you presented was of reasonable standard and gained enough marks to put you fairly close to the pass borderline, you need to produce more in the examination and of a better standard of presentation
7. Your section 1(a) was unsatisfactory because the functional framing, load transfer and stability aspects of your scheme was not clearly indicated.
8. Your proposal in section 1 (b) did not show how you could produce what was requested but instead limited the client to the existing structure.

9. Your proposal in section 1 (b) was unsatisfactory. It did not outline clearly and fully how the client's request might be achieved.
10. Your proposal in section 1(b) evaded the problem to be addressed and did not show how you would produce a scheme to satisfy the client's requirements.
11. You did not include in section 2(c) enough calculations of the size of structural members to demonstrate your ability to establish the form and size of all principal structural elements.
12. The calculations you submitted in section 2 (c) were insufficient to establish the size, strength, performance or buildability of the principal structural elements in your proposed scheme.
13. Your general arrangement drawings in section 2(d) were insufficient to show the layout and disposition of the structural members for estimating purposes.
14. Your sketches of the detailed connections required by section 2(d) were of a poor quality and did not show clearly detail of the requested elements.
15. Your drawings and sketches failed to show sufficient detail and information.
16. Your method statement for the safe erection of the structure requested in section 2(e) lacked essential information.
17. Your method statement for the safe erection of the structure requested in section 2(e) was inadequate and not specific enough to the structures and the site.