

- Between Knowledge'." *Ethics and Education* 7 (3): 251–260.
- Hogan, P. 2011. "The Ethical Orientations of Education as a Practice in its Own Right." *Ethics and Education* 6 (1): 27–40.
- Kinsella, A., and A. Pitman. 2012. "Engaging Phronesis in Professional Practice and Education." In *Phronesis as Professional Knowledge: Practical Wisdom in the Profession*, edited by A. Kinsella and A. Pitman, 1–11. Boston: Sense publisher.
- Kristjánsson, K. 2014. "There Is Something about Aristotle: The Pros and Cons of Aristotelianism in Contemporary Moral Education." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 48 (1): 48–68.
- Kvernbekk, T. 2011. "The Concept of Evidence in Evidence-Based Practice." *Educational Theory* 61 (51): 515–532.
- Juujärvi, S., L. Myyry, and K. Pessa. 2010. "Does Care Reasoning Make a Difference? Relations between Care, Justice and Dispositional Empathy." *Journal of Moral Education* 39 (4): 469–489.
- Lawn, M., and S. Grek. 2012. *Europeanizing Education: Governing a New Policy Space*. Southhampton: Symposium Books.
- MacIntyre, A. 2007. *After Virtue*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Matthew, M. 2003. "The Role of Prudence in Education." *Educational Theory* 53 (2): 173–183.
- Orton, R. E., 1998. "How Can Teacher Reasoning Be Practical?" *Educational Theory* 48 (2): 175–192.
- Pring, R. 2004. *Philosophy of Education*. London: Continuum.
- Reid, L. A. 1962. *Philosophy and Education*. New York: Random House.
- Smith, R. 2006. "As If by Machinery: The Leveling of Educational Research." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 40 (2): 157–168.
- Tirri, K., 1999. "Teacher's Perception of Moral Dilemmas at School." *Journal of Moral Education* 28 (1): 31–47.
- Wringe, C. 2015. "Beyond Useful Knowledge: Developing the Subjective Self." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 49 (1): 32–44.

Collaborating to help education students get a foot in the door and “kick it” during interviews

Robyn Huss, Christie Johnson, Judy Butler

University of West Georgia, USA

This manuscript explains the collaborative nature of a hiring simulation for educational leadership and pre-service teacher candidates. In this simulation, faculty members across three academic programs partner to organize an annual hiring simulation. During the course of the mock interviews, teacher education students are introduced to aspiring leaders from surrounding school districts, and these leadership candidates receive an introduction to pre-service teachers enrolled in the university's certification programs. This multidisciplinary collaboration benefits both aspiring teachers and leader candidates in their individual quests within their respective educational fields by leaving them better prepared for real-world job interviews.

Keywords: hiring simulation; teacher education; educational collaboration; simulation methods; interviewing.

Introduction

In academic communities, each spring brings with it anticipation, nervousness, and excitement as soon-to-be graduates begin their quest for employment. In the field of education, it is no different. In an effort to adequately prepare both aspiring teachers and aspiring administrators, the professors of these respective groups turn to each other. The result of the ensuing collaboration is an annual hiring simulation involving the two groups of aspiring educators, during which the leadership candidates interview the pre-service teachers. This multidisciplinary collaboration benefits each in their individual quests within their respective educational fields by leaving them better prepared for real-world job interviews.

Aim

The aim of collaborating to produce the hiring simulation described in this study is twofold: 1) the exercise provides a safe environment in which pre-service teachers are able to practice interviewing for positions before they encounter a real-world interview with consequences, and 2) participation allows aspiring leaders to hone their questioning skills to improve upon their astuteness when choosing new educators to work in their schools.

Theoretical framework

The need for high-quality hiring practices

Research broadly supports that school or district hiring practices directly affect positive or negative outcomes for organizational advancement in critical areas, including student achievement, school climate, and teacher retention (Clement 2013; Hughes 2014; Peterson 2002). National attention to the cultivation of best hiring practices, however, suffered a heavy setback during the recent years of economic decline in the U.S. and the ensuing reductions of classroom teachers that resulted from long-term funding losses (Hughes 2014). In addition to economic drivers, other teacher attrition factors have also contributed

to improvisatory hiring practices. These include increased state and federal mandates (Hughes 2014), a greying “Baby Boomer” population that includes more than half of all teachers (Carroll 2009), and professional dissatisfaction among novice teachers (Ingersoll, Merrill, and May 2012).

As the national economy strengthens, so does the need for qualified teachers prepared to enter U.S. classrooms, with a projected need of over two million within the next decade (Hughes 2014; Lee 2005). Numerous studies explore the data surrounding current teacher forecasts. Lee, for example, suggests the pool of qualified, classroom-ready teachers will not keep pace with forecasted need, though according to Aaronson and Meckel (2009), student birth rates over the next decade are projected to fall within historical norms. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (2003) states that high teacher turnover is driving national teacher shortages. These are among the reasons a growing number of educational leaders are showing renewed interest in hiring practices and human capital management as key to attracting and retaining quality teachers for improving their schools (Donaldson 2013). Scholarly attention to national hiring practices, according to Hughes (2014), is also on the rise as the need for more teachers increases with the rebounding national economy.

An essential hiring practice that often challenges both school administrators and teacher applicants alike is the job interview (Peterson 2002; Clement 2013). The job interview, despite its flaws and complexities, is a critical component of the personnel selection process for school administrators seeking the best teacher applicants (Peterson 2002). While an applicant’s ability to create a favorable impression during an interview does not guarantee the candidate will be an effective teacher, Clement (2013) and Hughes (2014) suggest that hiring interviews are helpful in revealing important candidate attributes. Among these are response to a pressured environment, communication skills, content knowledge, and community awareness (Peterson 2002).

The benefits of hiring simulations

Preparing for and participating in interviews can challenge even the most well-prepared job candidates. Hiring simulations are one method of experiential simulation designed to help alleviate interview jitters experienced by many of those who are new to the job market (Newberry and Collins 2012). According to Newberry and Collins, the fail-safe laboratory environment is one of the most important benefits of participating in a hiring simulation. In studying their own students, for example, Schaff and Randles (1972) found them frustrated and nervous prior to participation in hiring interviews, regardless of rigorous study and preparation. Even extensive practice and discussion of good interviewing tactics did not alleviate the fear they felt when the real hiring interview presented itself (Schaff and Randles 1972). Schaff and Randles responded to their students’ needs by creating a simulated interview program that offered both student interns and administrative interns an opportunity to role-play in a hiring interview.

A sound research base exists supporting the use of hiring simulations or role-playing exercises as a means of preparing participants for success in real-world interview opportunities in both the educational arena and greater business community (Brooks 2010; Cairns 1995; Kolb 1983; Schaff and Randles 1972; Wells 1982). Kolb, for example, suggests that role-playing simulations can provide a conceptual bridge for transitioning from an academic environment to career roles. Researchers from other fields, including business, education, and healthcare, report similar findings with the use of experiential simulations such as those used for hiring practices (Newberry and Collins 2012; Oh and Solomon 2014).

A body of research found primarily in the areas of business and social science holds a range of suggestions concerning how to prepare for and act during a mock interview (Brooks 2010; Hansen et al. 2009; Oh and Solomon 2014). In an overview of career transitions, Brooks discusses the simulated job interview and suggests ways to handle a role-play. These include thinking ahead about situations that may occur in the desired position: What are the responsibilities of the position? Are there products, such as reports, that must be produced, and what might they look like? Will you have to manage a group? Topics such as these are often adapted and used by interviewers in preparing questions and scenarios and are typical of those used to encourage an interviewee's planned response strategy. Brooks reminds participants to put on their "best self," suggesting that interviewees seek to balance talking with careful listening to gain knowledge of the culture of the organization. Similar advice regarding strategic response includes the importance of nonverbal cues, active listening, structured responses, and post-interview follow-up (Hansen et al. 2009; Newberry and Collins 2012; Oh and Solomon 2014). Post-interview debriefing and feedback are particularly important in improving interview skills or technique (Newberry and Collins 2012; Oh and Solomon 2014).

Smith and Glover (2002) wrote about their experiences combining simulations with writing assignments. They emphasize that college students have a practical approach to learning; thus, the simulation provides an exciting learning experience for them. Their research focused on both cognitive and affective objectives in addition to the simulation itself; the combination of these objectives paints a richer, more complex experience for students. Students learn the process of hiring, the tools they need to participate successfully, how to read job announcements and descriptions, as well as how to write their résumés and cover letters. Students are also prompted in how to act as a professional; they learn to listen acutely and communicate using professional language as they are introduced to the environment in which interviews occur. These exercises promote the readiness of preservice teachers to present themselves at their best during their real-world hiring applications and interviews.

The need for collaboration

Hiring simulations that are managed well depend upon successful collaboration. The nature of faculty work has been shifting in recent years, and the current trend for interdisciplinary teaching to support student learning promotes collaboration in new and different ways (Eddy 2010). According to Sill (1996), an important strength of interdisciplinary studies is the ability to guide students in developing higher-order thinking skills such as synthesis, creativity, and evaluation. When faculty across disciplines share goals and visions for student outcomes, the collaborations become meaningful not only for the students' achievement, but for the intrinsic motivation of the involved faculty. Effective collaboration provides a strong foundation for the success of the hiring simulation, and productive professional learning community (PLC) groups are a natural outcome.

DuFour (2007), Eston (2012), and others describe PLCs as most effective when they emerge internally, are based on collegial relationships, and share a common vision that centers on creative problem solving. Relationships that support collaboration among higher education faculty, pre-service teachers, and leadership candidate PLCs were key in planning and implementing the hiring simulation lab experience. Though the strategic focus of the three PLCs was unique to the interests of its participants, these characteristics were evident in the collaborative efforts that guided the work of each group to ensure a successful event.

The use of PLCs for strategic problem solving is growing as a means of professional practice among public school personnel, yet institutional barriers result in a more limited use of this collaborative approach among higher education faculty (Addis et al. 2013). Consequently, research on the role of higher education faculty in developing and facilitating PLCs is also an emerging field. Early studies suggest higher education faculty play an important role in supporting the work of school-based PLCs. In their collective case study involving PLC participants working on a range of diverse committee topics that included formative assessments, math, and the effects of poverty, Linder, Post, and Calabrese (2012) found that participation of university faculty can increase PLC productivity. These researchers noted that in-depth study of issues, topical expertise, and facilitating the selection, analysis, and discussion of selected tasks and activities are among the more important contributions of higher education faculty to the work of PLCs (Linder, Post, and Calabrese 2012).

Collaborative hiring simulation preparation and process

Preparation and coordination by faculty

Execution of the particular hiring simulation presented in this study involved a collaborative process among faculty from three university programs. The hiring simulation was initiated with one class of approximately 25 health and physical education teacher candidates during their capstone internship course and a similarly-sized class of leadership candidates in a course related to the recruitment, selection, hiring, and retention of school personnel as a way to meet the needs of both groups: upon completion of their respective programs, they must be prepared for real-world job interviews. As the program for secondary certification at the master's level grew to a similar size, these pre-service teachers were also invited to join the exercise. Open and ongoing communication is critical for establishing the foundation needed for a successful hiring simulation. Fortunately, the three programs involved with the simulation presented in this study are all housed within the Department of Leadership and Instruction within the university's College of Education. In many universities, that is not the case; secondary education programs are typically housed within the academic department of the teaching area of certification. If coordination must take place across multiple departments in several colleges across campus, collaborative planning is even more critical.

Initial planning for the event began approximately six months prior to the hiring simulation. Because the simulation involved student participants from three programs and thus three courses, the date had to be established early enough to appear in the course bulletin; students needed to be advised of the date and their required attendance when they registered for the courses, and they were reminded of the date when they received their course syllabi at the beginning of the semester. Pre-event planning included selecting an appropriate venue, creating interview teams, scheduling participants and interview sessions, and developing feedback surveys.

Logistics, particularly those involving locating and securing a physical meeting space, was one of the key pieces in planning the hiring simulation. Selecting a venue that would adequately accommodate both large and small groups in lecture and job interview formats on campus involved early and continuous collaboration with numerous departments and staff across campus. The university coliseum (a new facility housing state-of-the-art technology, a computer lab, lecture hall, classrooms, and comfort facilities) was identified as the best fit for the hiring simulation needs. Confirming the venue well ahead of the hiring

simulation, a Saturday event, also proved wise due to high demand for use of the coliseum during weekends.

Interview teams were composed of two to three school and district administrators. Participants were matched as closely as possible to their real-world grade levels or district positions. Because pre-service teacher “applicants” were interviewing for school-based grade level positions, district-level administrators were assigned to interview teams with elementary, middle, or high school administrators. Once the teams were formed, the roster of pre-service teacher “applicants” was surveyed to tally the types of positions that would need to be offered in a mock job posting. Grade levels and subject areas of expertise were taken into account during this planning phase. After the interview teams were formed and the positions were created, pre-service teachers were matched to an appropriate interview panel.

Preparation of leadership candidates and preservice teachers

Participants began their hiring activities approximately six weeks in advance. Each team of school administrators worked collaboratively to identify a school and select an existing or projected employment vacancy within the school for use in building an interview scenario. In most instances, the teaching vacancies were invented; however, some administrative teams elected to post genuine job searches. The interview teams then crafted and posted a job description with detailed instructions for the application process. Job advertisements were “posted” through course resources available online exclusively to pre-service teachers. School administrators developed questions and evaluation rubrics for scoring teacher candidates’ responses during the interview; a sample teacher candidate interview evaluation rubric can be found in Appendix 1. Preparations for the pre-service teachers were done as components of their capstone seminar course. Course assignments included writing a résumé and letter of application, which were a natural fit for the simulation requirements; the students were able to write these and receive feedback from their course instructor prior to making their revisions in anticipation of the hiring simulation.

Process of the hiring simulation

A series of three one-hour sessions was scheduled for each administrative team. Time allotted during the one-hour interview sessions included a 30-minute interview, a ten-minute panel debriefing, ten minutes of post-interview feedback, and ten minutes for room transitions. Teacher candidates entered each one-hour session in assigned groups of three, with one teacher candidate scheduled to be interviewed while the remaining two teacher candidates recorded observations. At the end of the interview session, peer observers provided written feedback to the interviewing candidate and the administrative panel. Strategic scheduling ensured that teacher candidates serving as observers were not assigned to provide feedback for their own interview team. This precaution served to ensure the integrity of the hiring simulation interview experience for all participants.

Following completion of the teacher interview, the administrative team excused the teacher candidate from the room for a ten-minute panel debriefing. During this time, each administrative team member was allotted five to seven minutes to independently rate the preservice teacher candidate on two levels: the preceding application letter and résumé and the interview itself. Refer to Appendix 1 for a sample evaluation chart that was used by members of the administrative interview panel to rate each pre-service teacher candidate. The evaluation instrument was designed using proficiency standards from a Likert-based rubric with intervals ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Administrators

used the remaining portion of the ten-minute debrief to collectively prepare warm and cool feedback for the teacher candidate.

While the interview panel discussed and evaluated each teacher candidate, the teacher candidates also reflected on the interview process during the ten minutes immediately following the interview. Part of their reflection took the form of a written summary, as Smith and Glover (2002) suggested. Candidates were instructed to spend approximately five minutes jotting notes regarding their experiences while they were still fresh in their memories. These first impressions would serve for lengthier response papers to be turned in later as part of their seminar coursework. Suggested writing prompts included what the learning opportunities were, what they might do differently next time, and how the simulation experience would help during preparation for an actual interview. The candidates were also given a survey to rank their interview panel during the remainder of this time. Refer to Appendix 2 for a sample evaluation chart that was used by each pre-service teacher candidate to rate the members of the administrative interview panel.

Following the ten-minute debriefing session, the teacher candidate returned to the interview room to meet with the panel of administrators. Returning to the interview room in a more relaxed atmosphere was beneficial for the participants as they exchanged ideas about what went well and what could be strengthened. Focus areas included feedback from the administrators regarding the teacher candidate's first impression, body language, responses to questions, and suggestions to strengthen weak responses, as well as critiques of the résumé and letter of application. Feedback was also given by the teacher candidate so the panel could learn ways to put the interviewees more at ease, how to follow responses with probing questions to elicit greater depth or examples, and questions the candidate was expecting to be asked but were missed opportunities by the administrative teams.

After all three rounds of interviews were completed, the whole group reconvened in the lecture hall. During this meeting, each administrative team congratulated the best teacher candidate that they had interviewed, and each job winner was awarded a certificate as an "employment offer." At the conclusion of the hiring simulation, all participants were provided with an opportunity to give feedback to the organizing faculty regarding their overall impressions of the simulation. The survey questions that were given to the teacher candidates and leadership candidates can be found in Appendices 3 and 4, respectively. The surveys that are collected following each hiring simulation are used to make improvements during successive years.

Implications for teacher education

Benefits for collaborating faculty

The hiring simulation provided collaborating faculty a unique opportunity to work within a PLC model across university departments and program areas, a rare approach among higher education faculty (Addis et al. 2013). In addition to sharing the heavy workload inherent to planning and implementing a major event, numerous other benefits resulted from collaboration among higher education faculty. Among these were stronger professional relationships, distribution of responsibilities aligned with faculty expertise, and greater efficiency in managing time and resources. The higher education faculty that engaged in planning and implementing the hiring simulation noted these positive outcomes during a collegial debriefing and review of the reflective analyses received from participants. Positive outcomes for the authors and other higher education faculty involved in the hiring

simulation PLC suggest that additional research may better inform the work of similar groups participating in future PLC collaborative models.

Benefits for participating student groups

The interdisciplinary study provides students the opportunity to engage in higher-order thinking skills. Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of educational objectives is the standard by which educators measure their students' academic engagement through the use of active verbs; the highest four of the six levels of Bloom's revised taxonomy are focal points of the hiring simulation. Participants *create* the documents that will be used during the interviews and *apply* their knowledge of education and educational practice to asking and answering questions during the interview; both teacher and leader candidates have opportunities to *analyze* the interview process and *evaluate* themselves, their counterparts, and their peers.

The hiring simulation offers participants a safe environment in which to experience the positive and negative factors often present during the employment process. While some of the administrative teams, for example, quickly reached a post-interview selection, others were challenged in determining a single "job winner." Administrative teams experiencing the greatest success during the post-interview decision making process, similar to the functions of real-world PLCs, remained conscious of their goal, centered discussion on relevant circumstances, and contributed positively to problem-solving efforts (DuFour 2007). Though the employment opportunities from administrative teams were based on artificial criteria, post-interview discussion and decision-making were driven by authentic responses from the teacher applicants. Introduction of the human element created an even greater sense of responsibility for administrators in making the "right" decision while protecting the integrity of all pre-service teachers involved in the interview process. Kolb (1983) describes this transformation as a bridge that transitions participant thinking from a simulated environment to real-world application.

The final 10 minutes of each interview round consisted of warm and cool feedback from the interview team to the teacher applicant, and from the teacher applicant to the interview team. Providing post-interview feedback offered both the teacher candidate and administrative interview team members an opportunity to gain understanding of the impression they make on others as they answer questions, exercise communication skills, and demonstrate knowledge about subject area content in a pressured environment (Peterson 2002). Administrative teams worked collaboratively to identify key points of feedback to encourage the teacher applicant while offering suggestions to strengthen future interviews in real-world environments. Similarly, teacher interviewees and peers assigned to observe the interview in progress collaborated to provide warm and cool feedback for the interview team (Clement 2013; Hughes 2014).

Including the application process as a component of the hiring simulation exercise served parallel purposes that were mutually beneficial for administrator and teacher participants. Teacher candidates gained knowledge regarding procedures for initial contact protocols and submitting completed applications with supporting documentation; school administrators benefitted from analyzing the qualifications, preparation of candidates, and self-described skill sets found in applications to the ideal candidate's qualities as advertised in the job description.

Participants were positive in their evaluation responses, which leads the authors to believe the simulation practice is a good one. Students in both programs benefitted from their respective roles in the simulation and felt better prepared for the real event of interviewing.

Benefits for regional school districts

Participation in the hiring simulation reaches beyond providing prospective teachers and leaders stronger skills in the interview process. Because participants include pre-service teachers and leadership candidates from schools and districts throughout the university service area, regional school districts gain a better understanding of the applicant pool from which they may draw ahead of the traditional spring hiring season. Additionally, pre-service teachers participating in the hiring simulation are provided an opportunity to interact with leadership candidates, many of whom are practicing principals or assistant principals at local schools. On occasion, participation in the hiring simulation has led to real-world employment opportunities at regional schools for some pre-service teachers.

Concluding Remarks

This is a winning proposition for all concerned. Professors collaborate across disciplines. Students in educational leadership and student teaching internships are exposed to and practice the art of interviewing successfully from their respective points of view. Pre-service teachers are allowed to practice in a “safe” environment for the adventure awaiting them after successfully interviewing for a teaching position. In addition, aspiring leaders practice a critical portion of their position, interviewing and evaluating teachers, again in a safe environment. The university, as a result, exposes its educational partners to its programs, as evidenced through the contributions of students in this event.

References

- Aaronson, Daniel, and Katherine Meckel. 2009. “How Will Baby Boomer Retirements Affect Teacher Labor Markets?” *Economic Perspectives* 33 (4): 2–15.
- Addis, Elizabeth A., Kathleen M. Quardokus, Diane C. Bassham, Philip W. Becraft, Nancy Boury, Clark R. Cofman, James T. Colbert, and Jo Anne Powell-Cofman. 2013. “Implementing Pedagogical Change in Introductory Biology Courses Through the Use of Faculty Learning Communities.” *Journal of College Science Teaching* 43 (2): 22–29.
- Bloom, Benjamin Samuel. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*. Harlow, England: Longman Group.
- Brooks, Katharine. 2010. “The Simulation Job Interview.” *Psychology Today Career Transitions Blog*, December 5. Accessed 3 November 2015. <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/career-transitions/201012/the-simulation-job-interview>
- Cairns, Kathleen. 1995. “Using Simulations to Enhance Career Education.” ERIC Digest. Accessed 3 November 2015. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED404583.pdf>
- Carroll, Tom. 2009. “The Next Generation of Learning Teams.” *Phi Delta Kappan* 91 (2): 8–13.
- Clement, Mary C. 2013. “Hiring Good Colleagues: What You Need to Know about Interviewing New Teachers.” *The Clearing House* 86 (3): 99–102.

- Donaldson, Morgaen. 2013. "Principals' Approaches to Cultivating Teacher Effectiveness: Constraints and Opportunities in Hiring, Assigning, Evaluating, and Developing Teachers." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 49 (5): 838–882.
- DuFour, Richard. 2007. "Professional Learning Communities: A Bandwagon, an Idea Worth Considering, or Our Best Hope for High Levels of Learning?" *Middle School Journal* 39 (1): 4–8.
- Eddy, Pamela L. 2010. "Partnerships and Collaborations in Higher Education." *ASHE Higher Education Report* 36 (2): 1–115.
- Eston, Lois Brown. 2012. "Principles of Design Energize Learning Communities: Practical Tips Put the Emphasis on Learning." *Journal of Staff Development* 33 (4): 49–54.
- Hansen, Katharine, Gary C. Oliphant, Becky J. Oliphant, and Randall S. Hansen. 2009. "Best Practices in Preparing Students for Mock Interviews." *Business Communication Quarterly* 72 (3): 318–327.
- Hughes, Thomas Ross. 2014. "Hiring at Risk: Time to Ensure Hiring Really Is the Most Important Thing We Do." *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation* 9 (1): 1–13.
- Ingersoll, Richard, Lisa Merrill, and Henry May. 2012. "Retaining Teachers: How Preparation Matters." *Educational Leadership* 69 (8): 30–34.
- Kolb, David A. 1983. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lee, Dennis M. 2005. "Hiring the Best Teachers: Gaining a Competitive Edge in the Teacher Recruitment Process." *Public Personnel Management* 34 (3): 263–270.
- Linder, Roberta A., Gina Post, and Kathryn Calabrese. (2012). "Professional Learning Communities: Practices for Successful Implementation." *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin* 78 (3): 13–22.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. 2003. *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children*. Accessed 3 November 2015. http://nctaf.org/wpcontent/uploads/no-dream-denied_summary_report.pdf
- Newberry, Robert, and Marianne K. Collins. 2012. "A Recruiting and Hiring Role-Play: An Experiential Simulation." *Marketing Education Review* 22 (1): 67–72.
- Oh, Hans, and Phyllis Solomon. 2014. "Role-playing as a Tool for Hiring, Training, and Supervising Peer Providers." *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research* 41 (2): 216–230.
- Peterson, Kenneth D. 2002. *Effective Teacher Hiring: A Guide to Getting the Best*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

- Schaff, John F., and H. E. Randles. 1972. "Simulated Interviews for Teaching Positions Conducted by Student Teachers and Administrative Interns." *Science Education* 56 (2): 227–230.
- Sill, David J. 1996. "Integrative Thinking, Synthesis, and Creativity in Interdisciplinary Studies." *The Journal of General Education* 50 (4): 129–151.
- Smith, Deborah A., and Regina Glover. 2002. "Teaching Job Application and Personnel Selection Skills." *College Teaching* 50 (3): 82–84.
- Wells, Quentin T. 1982. "Job Simulation: The Future in Business and Office Education." ERIC. Accessed 3 November 2015. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED227260>.

Appendix 1. Hiring fair simulation teacher candidate evaluation rubric

Hiring Fair Simulation Teacher Candidate Interview Evaluation Rubric

Interview Panel Members:

Complete one rating form for each teacher candidate interviewed. The candidate receiving the highest total score upon completion of all interviews will receive a certificate awarding them an “employment offer.” In the event of a tie, the highest average score for Preparation will determine the winning candidate.

Circle the appropriate rating:

1 – Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly Agree

Introduction					
Arrived on time	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered a firm handshake	1	2	3	4	5
Arrived dressed appropriately	1	2	3	4	5
Greeted interview panel members using proper names	1	2	3	4	5
Poise					
Demonstrated good eye contact	1	2	3	4	5
Demonstrated appropriate posture	1	2	3	4	5
Was courteous	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered good non-verbal feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Stated verbal thanks immediately following interview	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation					
Demonstrated preparation for interview question responses	1	2	3	4	5
Applied appropriate learning theory to question responses	1	2	3	4	5
Asked insightful follow-up questions	1	2	3	4	5
Spoke from “experiences” rather than “what I would do”	1	2	3	4	5
Asked about next steps following the interview process	1	2	3	4	5
Subtotal: Interview score ____ / 70					

Application Paperwork					
Pre-interview revisions made as recommended by interview team	1	2	3	4	5
Résumé and cover letter described candidate accurately	1	2	3	4	5
Résumé and cover letter ready for real-world job market use	1	2	3	4	5
References with complete contact information provided	1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of state teaching certification held or in progress	1	2	3	4	5
Thank-you letter in proper business format included in packet	1	2	3	4	5
Subtotal: Application score ____ / 30					
TOTAL: Interview and Application ____ / 100					

Comments:

Appendix 2. Hiring fair simulation administrator evaluation rubric

Hiring Fair Simulation Administrator Interview Evaluation Rubric

Teacher Candidate:

Complete one rating form for each member of your interview panel.

Circle the appropriate rating:

1 – Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly Agree

Introduction					
Began on time	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered a firm handshake	1	2	3	4	5
Dressed appropriately	1	2	3	4	5
Greeted candidate using proper name	1	2	3	4	5
Poise					
Demonstrated good eye contact	1	2	3	4	5
Demonstrated appropriate posture	1	2	3	4	5
Was courteous	1	2	3	4	5
Made an attempt to enable candidate to feel at ease	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered good non-verbal feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Stated verbal thanks immediately following interview	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation and Process					
Demonstrated preparation for interview questions asked	1	2	3	4	5
Asked questions relevant to candidate's area(s) of expertise	1	2	3	4	5
Asked insightful follow-up questions	1	2	3	4	5
Gave background information about the school, district, and/or position	1	2	3	4	5
Offered next steps following the interview process	1	2	3	4	5
Total score ____ / 75					

Comments:

Appendix 3. Hiring fair simulation survey questions for teacher candidates

Hiring Fair Simulation Survey Questions (Teacher Candidates)

Take a few minutes and reflect back on the hiring fair simulation. Please respond to the following questions.

Please circle the most appropriate response:

- 1 – Strongly Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Neutral
- 4 – Agree
- 5 – Strongly Agree

The interview panel seemed prepared to interview me.	1	2	3	4	5
The interview panel asked relevant questions pertaining to my content area.	1	2	3	4	5
The interview panel seemed familiar with my résumé and asked about my experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
Participating in the hiring fair simulation sets me at ease for future interviews.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to give important feedback to the interview panel that they may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to receive important feedback from the interview panel that I may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I believe I have become a better interviewee after participating in the hiring fair simulation process.	1	2	3	4	5

As you prepare for “real” interviews, what will you take with you from this experience?

If you were to be involved with this process again, what could be done differently to make it more meaningful?

Appendix 4. Hiring fair simulation survey questions for leadership candidates

Hiring Fair Simulation Survey Questions (Leadership Candidates)

Take a few minutes and reflect back on the hiring fair simulation. Please respond to the following questions.

Please circle the most appropriate response:

- 1 – Strongly Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Neutral
- 4 – Agree
- 5 – Strongly Agree

Did you feel prepared with respect to the candidate’s content area of certification during the interview?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you feel knowledgeable with respect to the candidate’s experiences, education, etc. during the interview?	1	2	3	4	5
The interview process set me at ease and made it easier for me to improve on my questioning technique.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to give important feedback to the teacher candidate that they may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to receive important feedback from the teacher candidate that I may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I believe I have become a better interviewer after participating in the hiring fair simulation process.	1	2	3	4	5

As you prepare for “real” interviews, what will you take with you from this experience?

If you were to be involved with this process again, what could be done differently to make it more meaningful?

Appendix 1. Hiring fair simulation teacher candidate evaluation rubric

Hiring Fair Simulation Teacher Candidate Interview Evaluation Rubric

Interview Panel Members:

Complete one rating form for each teacher candidate interviewed. The candidate receiving the highest total score upon completion of all interviews will receive a certificate awarding them an “employment offer.” In the event of a tie, the highest average score for Preparation will determine the winning candidate.

Circle the appropriate rating:

1 – Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly Agree

Introduction					
Arrived on time.	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered a firm handshake.	1	2	3	4	5
Arrived dressed appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5
Greeted interview panel members using proper names.	1	2	3	4	5
Poise					
Demonstrated good eye contact.	1	2	3	4	5
Demonstrated appropriate posture.	1	2	3	4	5
Was courteous.	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered good non-verbal feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
Stated verbal thanks immediately following interview.	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation					
Demonstrated preparation for interview question responses.	1	2	3	4	5
Applied appropriate learning theory to question responses.	1	2	3	4	5
Asked insightful follow-up questions.	1	2	3	4	5
Spoke from “experiences” rather than “what I would do.”	1	2	3	4	5
Participating in the hiring fair simulation sets me at ease for future interviews.	1	2	3	4	5
Subtotal: Interview score ____ / 70					

Application Paperwork					
Pre-interview revisions made as recommended by interview team.	1	2	3	4	5
Résumé and cover letter described candidate accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
Résumé and cover letter ready for real-world job market use.	1	2	3	4	5
References with complete contact information provided.	1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of state teaching certification held or in progress.	1	2	3	4	5
Thank-you letter in proper business format included in packet.	1	2	3	4	5
Subtotal: Application score _____ / 30					
TOTAL: Interview and Application _____ / 100					

Comments:

Appendix 2. Hiring fair simulation administrator evaluation rubric

**Hiring Fair Simulation
Administrator Interview Evaluation Rubric**

Teacher Candidate:
Complete one rating form for each member of your interview panel.

Circle the appropriate rating:

1 – Strongly Disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neutral 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly Agree

Introduction					
Began on time.	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered a firm handshake.	1	2	3	4	5
Dressed appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5
Greeted candidate using proper name.	1	2	3	4	5
Poise					
Demonstrated good eye contact.	1	2	3	4	5
Demonstrated appropriate posture.	1	2	3	4	5
Was courteous.	1	2	3	4	5
Made an attempt to enable candidate to feel at ease.	1	2	3	4	5
Delivered good non-verbal feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
Stated verbal thanks immediately following interview.	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation and Process					
Demonstrated preparation for interview questions asked.	1	2	3	4	5
Asked questions relevant to candidate’s area(s) of expertise.	1	2	3	4	5
Asked insightful follow-up questions.	1	2	3	4	5
Gave background information about the school, district, and/or position.	1	2	3	4	5
Offered next steps following interview process.	1	2	3	4	5
Total score ____ / 75					

Comments:

Appendix 3. Hiring fair simulation survey questions for teacher candidates

Hiring Fair Simulation Survey Questions (Teacher Candidates)

Take a few minutes and reflect back on the hiring fair simulation. Please respond to the following questions.

Please circle the most appropriate response:

- 1 – Strongly Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Neutral
- 4 – Agree
- 5 – Strongly Agree

The interview panel seemed prepared to interview me.	1	2	3	4	5
The interview panel asked relevant questions pertaining to my content area.	1	2	3	4	5
The interview panel seemed familiar with my résumé and asked about my experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
Participating in the hiring fair simulation sets me at ease for future interviews.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to give important feedback to the interview panel that they may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to receive important feedback from the interview panel that I may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I believe I have become a better interviewee after participating in the hiring fair simulation process.	1	2	3	4	5

As you prepare for “real” interviews, what will you take with you from this experience?

If you were to be involved with this process again, what could be done differently to make it more meaningful?

Appendix 4. Hiring fair simulation survey questions for leadership candidates

Hiring Fair Simulation Survey Questions (Leadership Candidates)

Take a few minutes and reflect back on the hiring fair simulation. Please respond to the following questions.

Please circle the most appropriate response:

- 1 – Strongly Disagree
- 2 – Disagree
- 3 – Neutral
- 4 – Agree
- 5 – Strongly Agree

Did you feel prepared with respect to the candidate’s content area of certification during the interview?	1	2	3	4	5
Did you feel knowledgeable with respect to the candidate’s experiences, education, etc. during the interview?	1	2	3	4	5
The interview process set me at ease and made it easier for me to improve on my questioning technique.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to give important feedback to the teacher candidate that they may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
I was able to receive important feedback from the teacher candidate that I may not have gotten without this experience.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I believe I have become a better interviewer after participating in the hiring fair simulation process.	1	2	3	4	5

As you prepare for “real” interviews, what will you take with you from this experience?

If you were to be involved with this process again, what could be done differently to make it more meaningful?