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**Introduction**

The Centre for Career Action (CCA) provides many services to students, alumni, and staff. The one resource that is always available, regardless of status or time is CareerHub. CareerHub hosts thorough information on everything we offer in person and then some. There is a large selection of useful topics and content that students can access as long as they have a WatIAM account. However, most students don’t know of its existence, or don’t use it for its full benefits. For those who do, the average user on CareerHub spends only about 5 minutes going through material (Woodside, 2018). With a lower retention rate, a user may not get the information they need. Therefore, a simulation can be implemented to engage students while providing the necessary help the student needs.

**Simulation Promotes Proper Practice**

One major issue on CareerHub is that there is a wealth of knowledge that students can access, but not necessarily apply and receive feedback. There are various points across the website where students may test their knowledge by submitting responses or answering quizzes. However, there is no direct feedback. Instead, a template for an example response is given to the student to reflect upon, as well as a rationale as to why the example response would be used. This method of feedback is not engaging to the student, and they may not see what is wrong with their response. As a result, many students may not be applying their knowledge to the best it can be since they are not getting proper feedback on their progress.

Additionally, material on CareerHub lacks interaction that a real interview would have. That is why job mock interviews are so useful; they present a mock interview in a real encounter. While a simulation cannot replicate all the specifics of an actual interview, it can be very close. The simulation can have an avatar that interacts with the student, which can mimic a real in-person or skype interview. The benefit of a simulation is that the brain can treat it as a real interview scenario and treat it as such. Medical simulations have been a great tool for new doctors to practice in “immersive” procedures without actual risk, yet they still know to practice as if it were real (Lateef). While an interview simulation may not be as complex as a medical one, there is still an “immersive” experience that students can explore.

Therefore, having a simulation can provide the student with more practice, which can curb nervousness and increase success. Like a last minute presentation, it is obvious when someone has not practiced their part. Often, these students fumble their way through or they sound unnatural and stressed. With more practice, this is less of an issue. CareerHub agrees that practice is crucial, as there are activities that test the user’s knowledge (Practising interview responses). However, practice must be instrumental to the success of students, since the CCA offers drop-ins and appointments for job mock interviews. If students cannot attend drop-ins or cannot book an appointment, the best alternative would be to practice using a simulation. According to Reigeluth, learning comes with doing, not just knowing the task or subject (168). While friends and family may seem like another obvious alternative, there are a plethora of details in an interview that friends and family may not know. Thus, having career advisor-approved content in an interview simulation would be beneficial in providing the right type of practice for students.

**A Simulation has an objective**

What makes games so successful? Whether it’s points or ranks or leaderboards, there is an incentive to win. A simulation with a clear objective (you are given a job offer or declined) will lead to a richer learning experience according to Reigeluth (170). Learning with can active objective is much more

**A Simulation is a Supplement not a Substitute**

One major aspect of simulations is that they are not substitutes to a proper mock interview, rather a supplement that can aid the content that CareerHub and Job mock interviews provide.

**Type of Simulation**

There are three main types of simulation that vary in complexity and cost. Each type has its own advantage and disadvantage.

Type I

*Progress System*

The progression of the simulation is completely linear. There are a set of questions with a multiple choice-style answer system. Each answer has a value based on its correctness. There is a scoring system that keeps the score based on the answer collected and the user is evaluated on their performance.

*Content*

All the answers are pre-made, and their correctness will be chosen by career advisors as well as which types of questions to include. CareerHub will also be consulted for some example questions or scenarios. Content will be generic as not to exclude certain programs or job types.

*Feedback*

Based on the question and which answer was chosen, there will be an appropriate CareerHub link and short blurb on why the answer was correct/incorrect. This will be kept as short as possible to minimize distraction from the simulation. The employer avatar may respond with these suggestions.

*Format*

* The simulation will be embedded into CareerHub directly. This is the easiest implementation as there is little need to fix issues with formatting issues and relying on external sources. But this would have to be created by a Co-op Student or someone who has coding knowledge. As a result, the look and functionality of the simulation may be limited.
* The simulation is made using the technology the CEL has available. Andrew Brunet has more information on the technologies regarding this. However, this method would require more time and coordination between the CCA and the CEL. The end product will look more like a PD simulation/activity.
* Any other method would be more appropriate for a more complex simulation; one that is not linear or simple.

*Cost*

* The cost will be minimal as this can be programmed directly and easily through HTML5 with use of JS and CSS. A complex system does not need to be implemented as there is no branching of options or customized paths based on responses. A co-op student may do this or it can be passed on to someone with coding knowledge.
* The cost to have CEL do it may be higher. Additionally, if the CCA or CEL no longer have access to the technologies used to create the simulations, then there are subscription fees

*Time Investment*

The time investment is also minimal, since the code is straightforward and minimal. There is not a lot of complexity, so the bulk of time would be to integrate the simulation into CareerHub (with permission of CEL). Any additional question and answers can be added directly since there is no relation of one question to the next.

*Value to Student*

Being in PD1, I experienced the Office Olympics simulation. Among all the other activities, this was the most enjoyable and most engaging. I felt that I was able to remember more of the activity as well as understand the consequences of my actions. For a student, a simulation that gives feedback to students and imitates a real scenario is extremely important.

*Disadvantages*

* There is a lack of tailored feedback to the student since the student cannot create their own responses
* The simulation can be too easy if there is an obvious answer that would be chosen
* The student many not learn the process of conducting a proper interview, rather they will memorize the answers
* The student is not punished for their actions. For example, a question is still asked, regardless of their previous response.

Type II

*Progress System*

The progression of the simulation will have a linear progression as a skeleton, however, there will be some options that are only available after certain choices are made. This would be similar to the progression of Office Olympics, where there were some parts that were only accessible after choosing a certain answer. There will be choices that also lead to a premature ending (e.g. getting rejected instantly)

*Content*

Like Type I, there will be premade answers to all scenarios. The content will still rely on the CCA advisors and CareerHub for scenarios and selection of questions and answers.

*Feedback*

There will be the same type of feedback, like in Type I. The main difference is that there will be some differences in the way the avatar will react to certain questions based on the previous responses. For instance, if there was mention of showing up late earlier in the simulation, there will be some answers later on where answering a question meant the student lied, there will be more severe consequences.

*Format*

* The simulation can be embedded directly into CareerHub via someone creating the simulation by themselves. The next co-op student can be responsible or a new role can be created just to create this project in addition to any others.
* The simulation can be created using DecisionSim, which can be provided by CEL, Andrew has had some experience with it.
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