

PILOT Framework Review Canvas

Five questions before you change the training.

A practical tool for investigating recurring performance and training challenges, from observation to a targeted, verifiable action.

Team / pilot: _____ Date: _____ Facilitator: _____

THE PROBLEM WE WANT TO SOLVE

What keeps happening that we want to understand or improve?

P

PERFORMANCE

What exactly are we observing?

Describe the specific performance gap. Avoid general labels.

Evidence / observations

I

INTERPRETATION

What could explain this performance?

List possible explanations. Distinguish evidence from assumptions.

Possible explanations

What evidence is missing?

L

LEARNING

Are we developing the right capability, in the right way?

Identify what needs to improve and how training should support it.

Capability to develop

Proposed intervention

O

OPERATIONAL TRANSFER

Will improvement transfer to realistic operational conditions?

Identify how you will check performance beyond the original training scenario.

How will we test transfer?

T

TRACEABILITY

How will we know what worked?

Connect the original problem, the intervention and the evidence of improvement.

What will we measure?

When will we review it?

OUR NEXT ACTION

One step, agreed.

What will we do?

Who is responsible?

Review date

Observe. Question. Develop. Test. Review.

MyWingman | Aviation Psychology & Human Factors · mywingman.eu/pilot-framework
Developed by Aleksandra Kapela | MyWingman

PILOT is a structured reflection and review framework. It is not a validated psychological assessment instrument. © 2026 MyWingman. Free to print and use within your organisation.

How to use the canvas

Suggested use: a 15–30 minute structured discussion during a training review, instructor meeting or performance development discussion. It works for a single pilot or a whole organisation.

- 1 Choose one problem**
Start with a recurring training or performance challenge. Avoid trying to solve several unrelated problems at once.
- 2 Work through the five questions**
Start with observable evidence, then examine possible explanations. Do not assume the first explanation is correct.
- 3 Agree on one targeted action**
Address the likely cause. If evidence is insufficient, the first action may be to collect better evidence rather than add more training.
- 4 Define how success will be checked**
Specify what improvement should look like and how it will be assessed.
- 5 Review and adjust**
Return to the canvas after the agreed period. If performance has not improved, revisit your assumptions before repeating the same intervention.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Inconsistent instructor grading: instructors assign different grades when assessing similar performance against the same competency.

P PERFORMANCE	Instructors assign inconsistent grades despite using the same competency framework.
I INTERPRETATION	They may differ in how they interpret behaviours, weigh evidence or apply performance thresholds. Review assessment records and discuss the reasoning behind grades.
L LEARNING	Introduce evidence-based calibration using common scenarios, structured debriefs and discussion of the reasoning behind assessments.
O OPERATIONAL TRANSFER	Check whether improved agreement carries over from calibration exercises into real training and assessment sessions.
T TRACEABILITY	Compare grading patterns, supporting evidence and assessment rationales before and after the intervention. Review remaining discrepancies.
NEXT ACTION	Conduct a structured instructor calibration session using three common scenarios.
OWNER	Head of Training / Instructor Development Lead
REVIEW	After the next agreed assessment cycle

The aim is not that instructors give identical grades. *It is that their grades rest on a shared interpretation of the relevant evidence and a common understanding of the performance standard.*

Want to use PILOT with your instructor team?

Calibration workshops and training reviews, facilitated by an aviation psychologist.

Contact us →

mywingman.eu/contact · contact@mywingman.eu