RemoteHeR · Module 4 · Decision game

MODULE 4 DECISION GAME

The interview room

A structured online interview, one question at a time. You choose the probe, the follow-up and when to move on, and see what you learn or lose each time.



DRAFT – partner review

Drafted from the curriculum. The build lead reviews it before release.

Before you start

You are chairing a 45-minute video interview for the Remote Recruitment Coordinator at Mosaic Bridge Services. The candidate is Inés, shortlisted at screening as C10. The hiring manager, Tomás, is on the panel as note-taker. You built the interview guide and scorecard in lesson 4.4: four criteria, scores from 1 to 4.

Nothing here is graded. Every choice leads to a consequence and then to the next moment in the interview. Some choices take you to a different moment. Play it once making the choices you would actually make, then play it again and take a different route.

Decision 1 · 08:55 — five minutes before the call

Inés asked for captions when she accepted the invitation. Tomás messages you: "Let's just start on time, captions are fiddly. She'll be fine."

What do you do?

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. Switch on captions now, test them, and open the guide and scorecard	It takes two minutes. When Inés joins, you confirm the captions are working and explain the structure: four core questions, the same for every candidate, and notes being taken. She relaxes visibly. An agreed adjustment is part of the process, not a favour.	good
B. Start on time and offer captions	Inés joins and waits for captions that do not come. She	bad

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

if she asks again	mishears the first question and answers a different one. You have made the interview harder for one candidate than for the others. Her first answer is now weaker for a reason that has nothing to do with the criterion.	
C. Ask Tomás to set up captions while you start the introductions	Tomás finds the setting three minutes in. The introductions were not captioned, so Inés missed how the interview would run. Better than nothing, but the adjustment arrived late, and the panel now has two people doing two jobs.	mixed

Decision 2 · Question 1 — planning and coordination

You ask: "Tell us about a recruitment process, or a similar project, that you coordinated remotely."

Inés answers for two minutes: "We ran two community hiring campaigns with about ninety applications. We had a tracker, we kept everyone updated, and we finished on time." Every sentence says "we".

What do you say next?

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. "What was your own part in that?"	"I built the tracker and set the deadlines for each stage. When a manager went on leave, I moved his interviews and wrote to the eight candidates the same day." Now you have her actions and a problem she solved. The neutral probe did not suggest the answer. It asked for the missing piece.	good
B. "So you led the whole thing?"	"Yes, I suppose so." You now have a yes, and nothing to score. A leading probe hands the candidate the answer you were hoping for, and you cannot tell whether it is true.	bad
C. Move on. Ninety applications sounds like plenty of evidence.	The answer was long, but long is not complete. When you score it later, you will find a team's achievement and no individual action. You may end up scoring her lower than her real evidence,	mixed

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

	or higher than you can justify.	

Decision 3 · Question 2 — written candidate communication

You ask: "A candidate emails to say she has heard nothing for three weeks and is upset. What would you write back?"

The line goes quiet. Five seconds. Seven. Inés's video has frozen on a half-smile.

What do you do?

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. Wait a little longer, then check the connection calmly	After ten seconds her picture moves again. "Sorry, I lost you. Could you repeat the question?" You repeat it word for word. She gives a clear answer: check the record first, apologise, give the status and a date, then fix why it happened. Silence online is often the connection, not the candidate.	good
B. Rephrase the question in simpler words straight away	She reconnects halfway through your new version, which is now a slightly different question from the one other candidates heard. She answers well, but you have quietly changed the test. Repeat the agreed wording instead of improvising a new one.	mixed
C. Skip to question 3 to save time	Inés reconnects to a different question. She never answers question 2. You now have no evidence for one of your four criteria. Whatever score you give it will be a guess.	bad

Decision 4 · Question 3 — digital recruitment tools

You ask: "Candidates are receiving interview invitations at the wrong time. How do you find and fix the problem?"

Inés starts with a story about her last employer's chaotic system change. Then she adds: "And with my

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

two at school, I know how a wrong time can wreck a whole day."

Tomás leans in to his microphone.

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. Acknowledge briefly and restate the question: "Thank you. How would you find and fix the wrong times?"	"I would check the time-zone setting first, then make a test booking to see what candidates see, correct it, and write to everyone who got the wrong time." You allowed, acknowledged, returned and moved on. Her children are not part of any criterion, and you did not turn them into one.	good
B. Let Tomás ask how she manages childcare around the overlap hours	Tomás asks. Inés hesitates, then explains her arrangements in detail. The interview has turned into a conversation about her family. The question has no link to any criterion, and in your country it may be unlawful. It is also now in the panel's notes.	bad
C. Cut in: "We need to stay on the question, please."	She stops mid-sentence, apologises and answers briefly. You get some evidence, but less than you would have. Redirecting is right. Doing it without acknowledging her first can make a candidate guarded for the rest of the interview.	mixed

Decision 5 · Still question 3 — repairing the moment

Tomás's question is in the notes. Inés looks uncomfortable. You still have no answer to the digital tools question.

What do you do now?

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. Say the question is not part of the assessment, ask the panel to disregard it, and return to the scored question	"That question isn't part of our assessment, and nothing you said will be considered. Let's go back to the scheduling problem." She answers it well. You cannot unask a question. You can make sure it does not reach a score, record that it was asked and what you did,	good

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

	and talk to Tomás afterwards.	
B. Move on and say nothing about it	The interview continues. The question stays in the notes, unremarked. If Inés is not appointed and asks why, the panel's own notes show that her childcare was discussed. Nothing in the process shows it was set aside.	bad

Decision 6 · Question 4 — fair and documented decisions

You ask: "Tell us about a time you had to make sure a selection decision was fair and recorded."

Inés answers precisely: she challenged an inconsistent rejection, recorded evidence for every criterion, and the decision was reversed. It is the strongest answer you have heard all week.

Tomás types in the shared notes: "Excellent. Brilliant all round."

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. Note her actions and the result under this criterion only	Your note reads: "Challenged inconsistent rejection; recorded evidence per criterion; decision reversed." One strong answer is evidence for one criterion. It does not lift the others.	good
B. Go back and raise your notes on the earlier questions	Your earlier notes now look better than the answers were. That is the halo effect. If her digital tools answer was partial, it still is. A brilliant final answer does not change what she said ten minutes ago.	bad
C. Leave Tomás's note as it is; it is his note	Your own note is fine, but the shared record now contains "brilliant all round", which no one can check against a criterion. As chair, you can ask the note-taker to record what was said rather than how it felt.	mixed

Decision 7 · Ten minutes after the call — scoring

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

You close the interview by telling Inés that every candidate will hear by email by Friday. Ten minutes later, Tomás calls you. "Let's just talk it through and agree a score. Saves time."

Your notes are open. His are too.

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. "Let's each score independently first, then compare."	You score 4, 4, 3, 4. Tomás scores 4, 4, 4, 4. You differ on digital tools. You return to the notes: she named the setting, the test booking and writing to candidates, but nothing on preventing it next time. You agree 3, and record why.	good
B. Talk it through together first	Tomás speaks first: "Fours across the board, surely." You agree, because it is easier. The first opinion spoken has become the panel's opinion. Nobody went back to the notes.	bad
C. Score it tomorrow after the other two interviews	Tomorrow you remember her last answer clearly and her second answer vaguely. You also find yourself comparing her with the candidates you have just seen. Recency and comparison have entered the score. Score each interview straight after it ends.	mixed

Decision 8 · Friday — the written assessment

Another candidate is appointed. Inés scored well and is not progressing this time. She asks for feedback.

Which sentence do you open your reply with?

Choice	What happens	Verdict
A. "You gave strong evidence on coordination and fair decisions. On digital tools, your answer fixed the setting but did not cover preventing it again."	Specific, tied to the criteria and to what she said. She replies to thank you and says she will use it. This sentence would survive a challenge, because every part of it can be traced to the scorecard and the notes.	good
B. "It was very close. The other candidate was just a slightly better fit."	She asks what "fit" means. You do not have an answer that is in the scorecard.	bad

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

	Comparisons with other candidates and "fit" cannot be defended, and they tell her nothing she can use.	
C. "Thank you for applying. We are unable to give individual feedback."	Polite and safe, and of no use to her. She reached interview and asked directly. Where you can give feedback, return to the criteria. Check your organisation's policy, and remember that she can also ask for her personal data.	mixed

Ending · An assessment that would survive a challenge

Every score has evidence behind it, the adjustment was in place, the structure held when the conversation drifted, and the feedback goes back to the criteria. If Inés, Tomás or an equality body asks why, your notes answer them.

Ending · Mostly sound, with gaps to close

The decision is probably right, but parts of the record would need explaining: a missing answer, a note that is an impression, or a score agreed by conversation. Nothing unlawful reached the assessment, but the process relied on goodwill in places where it should have relied on structure.

Ending · An assessment that would not survive a challenge

Somewhere on your route, something that is not evidence reached the decision: an unlawful question left standing, a halo, a score agreed before anyone looked at the notes, or feedback built on "fit". If Inés asks for her data, she will see it. Play again and find the moment where it went wrong.

Debrief

The adjustment is part of the test. An interview without the agreed adjustment is a different interview.

A neutral probe asks for the missing piece. A leading probe supplies it.

Silence online is often the connection. Repeat the agreed wording rather than inventing a new question.

Allow, acknowledge, return, move on. Personal information a candidate volunteers never becomes a question, a note or a score.

One strong answer evidences one criterion. Anything else is a halo.

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Score alone, then compare. The first opinion spoken should not become the panel's opinion.

Feedback goes back to the criteria. If you cannot point to it on the scorecard, do not say it.

My decision log

What I chose on my first play, and what happened

What I changed on a second play, and why

Co-funded by the European Union

Erasmus+ 2025-1-PT01-KA220-VET-000365831 · CC BY-SA 4.0

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.