

 Manager Tools	Interview Guideline www.managertools.com												
<table><tr><td>POSITION:</td><td>Production technician (permanent)</td><td>INTERVIEWEE:</td></tr><tr><td>DEPARTMENT:</td><td>Production</td><td>INTERVIEWED:</td></tr><tr><td>CREATION DATE:</td><td>2014-11-12</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>INTERVIEWER:</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>		POSITION:	Production technician (permanent)	INTERVIEWEE:	DEPARTMENT:	Production	INTERVIEWED:	CREATION DATE:	2014-11-12		INTERVIEWER:		
POSITION:	Production technician (permanent)	INTERVIEWEE:											
DEPARTMENT:	Production	INTERVIEWED:											
CREATION DATE:	2014-11-12												
INTERVIEWER:													
INTERVIEW GUIDE OVERVIEW (DO NOT READ OUT LOUD TO CANDIDATE) The purpose of this interview guide is to help you evaluate candidates. The questions shown here are drawn from a behavioral analysis of this position, conducted by you or a previous manager. Guidelines are suggested for evaluating the strength of candidates' answers. We recommend you ask the questions <i>exactly as they are worded</i>. This is particularly important if multiple interviewers are interviewing 1 or more candidates (which we also recommend). Please take notes in the space provided. <i>Write down what the candidate SAYS, rather than your impressions</i>. That will help you share the behavioral reasons for your conclusions and decision. <i>Remember to be as pleasant and friendly as you can be</i>. You can deliver a demanding interview while also being polite and kind. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT <i>(PLEASE READ THIS OUT LOUD)</i> Thank you for interviewing with me today. Here at Hospira we use a behavioral interviewing style. I'll be asking a series of questions about experiences you've had and how you handled them. I've got a series of between 10 and 15 questions, and this might take us an hour, perhaps a little more time. Don't be surprised if others here ask you the same questions in other interviews - that's normal. We want to be sure that every person we hire has the same qualities that have made us so successful. There will be times when I will ask you for more information, and don't worry, that's normal. I will be taking notes - please don't let it distract you. The way we'll do it is, first, I'll ask you some questions, and then I'll answer any questions you might have of me. When you're done with your questions, we'll finish up. I'm excited you're here - let's get started.													

 Manager Tools	Question 1														
Tell me about a time when you needed to follow instructions accurately. How did you ensure that your work was correct?															
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> What did the candidate do to ensure they understood the instructions? Did they write them down, or ask questions? What steps did they take to ensure that the work didn't get off track? Did they do anything to make sure the final product was what was expected? <table><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 527 321 548">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 527 873 548">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 573 537 594">Did not remember instructions</td><td data-bbox="808 573 899 594">Took notes</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 602 537 623">Did not ask questions or clarify</td><td data-bbox="808 602 997 623">Asked for clarification</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 632 521 653">Made errors left uncorrected</td><td data-bbox="808 632 1268 653">Open with communications about questions and issues</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 661 651 682">Had to be prompted with repeated guidance</td><td data-bbox="808 661 997 682">Validated assumptions</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 690 358 711">Hid errors</td><td data-bbox="808 690 1057 711">Planned quality into the work</td></tr><tr><td></td><td data-bbox="808 720 1036 741">Checked work for accuracy</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Did not remember instructions	Took notes	Did not ask questions or clarify	Asked for clarification	Made errors left uncorrected	Open with communications about questions and issues	Had to be prompted with repeated guidance	Validated assumptions	Hid errors	Planned quality into the work		Checked work for accuracy
WEAK	STRONG														
Did not remember instructions	Took notes														
Did not ask questions or clarify	Asked for clarification														
Made errors left uncorrected	Open with communications about questions and issues														
Had to be prompted with repeated guidance	Validated assumptions														
Hid errors	Planned quality into the work														
	Checked work for accuracy														

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 2												
Describe a situation when it's been necessary for you to create and maintain data accurately. What did you do to ensure the data began and remained accurate?													
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> Did they build a process to make sure errors were reduced? Or did they just "try to be careful." What steps did they take when changes were made or possible errors were identified? <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="272 531 321 552">WEAK</th> <th data-bbox="808 531 873 552">STRONG</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 579 367 600">No process</td> <td data-bbox="808 579 980 600">Built a clear process</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 606 444 627">Efforts were ad-hoc</td> <td data-bbox="808 606 1097 627">Implemented process deliberately</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 634 453 655">Errors were systemic</td> <td data-bbox="808 634 1243 686">Errors self-identified, corrected and communicated openly</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 661 651 682">Corrections were implemented case-by-case</td> <td data-bbox="808 690 1203 711">Validated data and work with external sources</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 688 537 709">Denied responsibility for errors</td> <td data-bbox="808 718 1135 739">Verbally owned process and outcomes.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		WEAK	STRONG	No process	Built a clear process	Efforts were ad-hoc	Implemented process deliberately	Errors were systemic	Errors self-identified, corrected and communicated openly	Corrections were implemented case-by-case	Validated data and work with external sources	Denied responsibility for errors	Verbally owned process and outcomes.
WEAK	STRONG												
No process	Built a clear process												
Efforts were ad-hoc	Implemented process deliberately												
Errors were systemic	Errors self-identified, corrected and communicated openly												
Corrections were implemented case-by-case	Validated data and work with external sources												
Denied responsibility for errors	Verbally owned process and outcomes.												

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 3				
Tell me about a time when you've needed to focus in an environment where that was difficult. Why was it necessary and how did you achieve focus?					
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> Was there a personal approach to maintaining attention? Did they overcome distractions, and if so, how? When they were distracted, what was the cause? How did they regain focus? <table border="0"><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 531 321 552">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 531 873 552">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 579 565 688">Easily distracted Mentions varied distractions Blames results on external factors Denies responsibility</td><td data-bbox="808 579 1279 688">Addressed all distractions quickly Not afraid to be creative to stay focused Takes responsibility for outcomes despite distractions Enjoys the challenge of difficult-to-focus environments</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Easily distracted Mentions varied distractions Blames results on external factors Denies responsibility	Addressed all distractions quickly Not afraid to be creative to stay focused Takes responsibility for outcomes despite distractions Enjoys the challenge of difficult-to-focus environments
WEAK	STRONG				
Easily distracted Mentions varied distractions Blames results on external factors Denies responsibility	Addressed all distractions quickly Not afraid to be creative to stay focused Takes responsibility for outcomes despite distractions Enjoys the challenge of difficult-to-focus environments				

NOTES:

	Question 4											
Tell us about a time when you need to make a decision which engendered emotional responses in others. How did you remain rational?												
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> Did they have a clear process that stayed objective? Did they consider the possible responses and attempt to address them? Did they attempt to persuade detractors with tailored facts that addressed their concerns, versus simply restating basic information? <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="272 554 321 573">WEAK</th> <th data-bbox="808 554 873 573">STRONG</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 600 675 623">Did not make a clear, easily explained decision</td> <td data-bbox="808 600 1084 623">Explains logic of decision clearly</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 630 672 653">Did not succeed in avoiding emotions in others</td> <td data-bbox="808 630 1276 653">Developed strategy which considered others' responses</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 659 727 682">Did not care or got wrapped up in emotions of others</td> <td data-bbox="808 659 1138 682">Handled emotions of others effectively</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 688 586 711">Did not succeed in persuading others</td> <td data-bbox="808 688 1268 711">Decision was accepted by others despite their feelings</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			WEAK	STRONG	Did not make a clear, easily explained decision	Explains logic of decision clearly	Did not succeed in avoiding emotions in others	Developed strategy which considered others' responses	Did not care or got wrapped up in emotions of others	Handled emotions of others effectively	Did not succeed in persuading others	Decision was accepted by others despite their feelings
WEAK	STRONG											
Did not make a clear, easily explained decision	Explains logic of decision clearly											
Did not succeed in avoiding emotions in others	Developed strategy which considered others' responses											
Did not care or got wrapped up in emotions of others	Handled emotions of others effectively											
Did not succeed in persuading others	Decision was accepted by others despite their feelings											

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 5										
Tell us about a time when you've been able to make something complex more simple in order to aid decision making.											
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> Did they use reasonable judgment in determining how to simplify? Did they weigh the risks associated with reducing precision? Were they able to communicate their process in a way that made others support it? Did the simplified communication or approach create a better decision? <table border="0"><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 527 321 548">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 527 873 548">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 573 678 594">Situation was not appropriate for simplification</td><td data-bbox="808 573 1239 594">Describes clearly why simplification was necessary</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 602 505 623">Simplified situation too far</td><td data-bbox="808 602 1287 623">Made an appropriate simplification which aided decision</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 632 589 653">Did not succeed in persuading others</td><td data-bbox="808 632 1125 653">Persuaded others to support decision</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 661 594 682">Did not make an appropriate decision</td><td data-bbox="808 661 1182 682">Decision was born out by subsequent results</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Situation was not appropriate for simplification	Describes clearly why simplification was necessary	Simplified situation too far	Made an appropriate simplification which aided decision	Did not succeed in persuading others	Persuaded others to support decision	Did not make an appropriate decision	Decision was born out by subsequent results
WEAK	STRONG										
Situation was not appropriate for simplification	Describes clearly why simplification was necessary										
Simplified situation too far	Made an appropriate simplification which aided decision										
Did not succeed in persuading others	Persuaded others to support decision										
Did not make an appropriate decision	Decision was born out by subsequent results										

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 6										
Describe a situation when you had to work to consider all relevant information, even some that others might have not valued, to make a better decision											
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> Did they use a framework to capture all information that might bear on the problem? Did they have an analytical framework to stay objective, or did they find information to support their gut? Did they present all of what they found? <table border="0"><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 554 321 573">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 554 873 573">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 600 633 623">Is not able to clearly explain the situation</td><td data-bbox="808 600 1088 623">Analyzed the information clearly</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 630 428 653">Analysis is cursory</td><td data-bbox="808 630 1195 653">Ensures all relevant information is considered</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 659 583 682">Decision is not based on information</td><td data-bbox="808 659 1187 682">Able to decide which information is relevant</td></tr><tr><td data-bbox="272 688 711 711">Bullied others into agreeing rather than persuading</td><td data-bbox="808 688 1263 711">Persuades others effectively to the required outcome</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Is not able to clearly explain the situation	Analyzed the information clearly	Analysis is cursory	Ensures all relevant information is considered	Decision is not based on information	Able to decide which information is relevant	Bullied others into agreeing rather than persuading	Persuades others effectively to the required outcome
WEAK	STRONG										
Is not able to clearly explain the situation	Analyzed the information clearly										
Analysis is cursory	Ensures all relevant information is considered										
Decision is not based on information	Able to decide which information is relevant										
Bullied others into agreeing rather than persuading	Persuades others effectively to the required outcome										

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 7				
Tell me about a time where your communication with others - type, frequency, with whom, about what - helped you build rapport or create better relationships and outcomes?					
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> How did they learn about the other person? Were their exchanges based on respect, or simply getting an outcome? Did they continue the effort? Did they only do so to get a result, or do they show a pattern of always working at relationships? <table border="0"><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 554 321 573">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 554 873 573">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 600 735 709">Only interested in other person for potential outcome Does not consistently build relationships Only calls when they want something Cannot demonstrate clear business benefit</td><td data-bbox="808 600 1279 709">Creates strategy for building relationships Articulates benefit of wide ranging relationships Gives before getting Maintains relationships without near term business gain</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Only interested in other person for potential outcome Does not consistently build relationships Only calls when they want something Cannot demonstrate clear business benefit	Creates strategy for building relationships Articulates benefit of wide ranging relationships Gives before getting Maintains relationships without near term business gain
WEAK	STRONG				
Only interested in other person for potential outcome Does not consistently build relationships Only calls when they want something Cannot demonstrate clear business benefit	Creates strategy for building relationships Articulates benefit of wide ranging relationships Gives before getting Maintains relationships without near term business gain				

NOTES:

	Question 8												
Tell me about an effective relationship you have created and kept over a long period. How did you achieve that?													
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> What do they describe as "long"? What actions did they take to keep the relationship active? Was there reciprocity - a willingness to share as well as benefit? What different forms of communication do they use? How do they communicate in ways that are helpful to the other person? <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="272 527 321 546">WEAK</th> <th data-bbox="808 527 873 546">STRONG</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 573 496 594">Long is less than 1-2 years</td> <td data-bbox="808 573 1170 594">Has a strategy for maintaining relationship</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 600 610 621">Relies on other person to make contact</td> <td data-bbox="808 600 1092 621">Gives without prospect of getting</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 627 586 648">Does not offer to give before getting</td> <td data-bbox="808 627 1076 648">Communicates in multiple ways</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 655 542 676">Communicates in a limited way</td> <td data-bbox="808 655 1243 676">Has relationships in different companies/industries</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="272 682 532 703">Has only internal relationships</td> <td data-bbox="808 682 1195 703">Demonstrates different communication styles</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		WEAK	STRONG	Long is less than 1-2 years	Has a strategy for maintaining relationship	Relies on other person to make contact	Gives without prospect of getting	Does not offer to give before getting	Communicates in multiple ways	Communicates in a limited way	Has relationships in different companies/industries	Has only internal relationships	Demonstrates different communication styles
WEAK	STRONG												
Long is less than 1-2 years	Has a strategy for maintaining relationship												
Relies on other person to make contact	Gives without prospect of getting												
Does not offer to give before getting	Communicates in multiple ways												
Communicates in a limited way	Has relationships in different companies/industries												
Has only internal relationships	Demonstrates different communication styles												

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 9				
Tell me about your methods for following through on projects and details. How do you measure your success in this area?					
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> How complex was the project? How many details were there? Did they have a clear way of keeping track of the details? What was their approach to managing multiple, conflicting priorities and projects? <table border="0"><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 506 321 525">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 506 873 525">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 552 719 688">Project is less complex than reasonable for this role Details not proactively or methodically tracked Does not have a method for managing conflicting priorities Follows through only after aware of crises</td><td data-bbox="808 552 1271 661">Project complexity is significant for this role Follow through systems lead to improved performance Systematic approach reduces errors and delays Approach improves learning and future performance</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Project is less complex than reasonable for this role Details not proactively or methodically tracked Does not have a method for managing conflicting priorities Follows through only after aware of crises	Project complexity is significant for this role Follow through systems lead to improved performance Systematic approach reduces errors and delays Approach improves learning and future performance
WEAK	STRONG				
Project is less complex than reasonable for this role Details not proactively or methodically tracked Does not have a method for managing conflicting priorities Follows through only after aware of crises	Project complexity is significant for this role Follow through systems lead to improved performance Systematic approach reduces errors and delays Approach improves learning and future performance				

NOTES:

 Manager Tools	Question 10				
Tell me about your methods for assigning and tracking work tasks and those responsible. How did you do it?					
<i>What behaviors to look for:</i> How did they make assignments/choose whom to assign work to? Was it based on skills, or need, or just urgency? Was there consideration of developmental needs? How did their system or approach improve the quality of the outcome? <table border="0"><thead><tr><th data-bbox="272 527 321 548">WEAK</th><th data-bbox="808 527 873 548">STRONG</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td data-bbox="272 573 721 682">Cannot clearly describe a method for assigning work Assigns work according to personal preference Does not consider needs/skills of team Assignments do not improve outcomes</td><td data-bbox="808 573 1252 682">Assigns work according to a defined method Uses effective discriminators: skill, need, growth Willing to describe assignment rationale with others Assignments show improved outcomes</td></tr></tbody></table>		WEAK	STRONG	Cannot clearly describe a method for assigning work Assigns work according to personal preference Does not consider needs/skills of team Assignments do not improve outcomes	Assigns work according to a defined method Uses effective discriminators: skill, need, growth Willing to describe assignment rationale with others Assignments show improved outcomes
WEAK	STRONG				
Cannot clearly describe a method for assigning work Assigns work according to personal preference Does not consider needs/skills of team Assignments do not improve outcomes	Assigns work according to a defined method Uses effective discriminators: skill, need, growth Willing to describe assignment rationale with others Assignments show improved outcomes				

NOTES: