

Captaincy and Decisions Drill Progress Tracker - Build a Reliable Baseline

Captaincy and Decisions | Build a Reliable Baseline | Asset ID CRIC-22-05-01

Purpose: This original printable drill progress tracker helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with captaincy and decisions while pursuing one defined outcome: understand the current skill before changing technique. Its method is to set a baseline, repeat a defined drill and compare like with like. Use the pages as a working record, not as a substitute for current competition rules, safe facilities, suitable equipment and qualified coaching or health guidance where those are needed.

Resource Map

The subject focus is to make transparent choices using conditions, resources and current match information. The six working areas below define the scope for this specific resource. Complete only the rows that matter to the present practice block, and date any observation that may change.

#	Working area	Current evidence	Next check
1	Toss Factors	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
2	Bowling Change	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
3	Field Change	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
4	Matchup Evidence	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
5	Communication	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
6	Review Point	Known / estimated / not checked	_____

Foundation Starting Brief

- Survey: Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case? Survey the present state before setting a target.
- Select: How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence? Select the smallest useful starting point.
- Bound: What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point? Bound the work by time, scope and available support.
- Prepare: Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain? Prepare the materials, conditions and owner.
- Begin: What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors? Begin with one observable action.
- Edition success means: record several comparable attempts and a clear starting measure

Drill Progress Tracker

This format is designed to measure consistency across sessions instead of chasing one best attempt. For captaincy and decisions, apply the method in a deliberate sequence: set a baseline, repeat a defined drill and compare like with like. The edition target is build a reliable baseline, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Survey Toss Factors	Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case?	Starting view / date	Open / checked
Select Bowling Change	How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?	First priority / date	Open / checked
Bound Field Change	What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point?	Boundary / date	Open / checked
Prepare Matchup Evidence	Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain?	Readiness / date	Open / checked
Begin Communication	What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors?	First result / date	Open / checked
Confirm Review Point	What next check on review point would make the record about field change more useful?	Foundation check / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to captaincy and decisions, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: use one repeatable drill at comfortable intensity
- Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: several actions start together.
- Use original notes and explanations; quote only when necessary, lawful and properly attributed.
- Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional to challenge one material assumption where appropriate.
- Close with one decision and one follow-up rather than an unranked list of ideas.

Working Note

Edition CRIC-22-05-01 pairs drill progress tracker with the outcome 'Build a Reliable Baseline'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Quality Control x Foundation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a quality control method with a foundation outcome lens. Work through the six actions to turn the subject focus - make transparent choices using conditions, resources and current match information - into evidence for build a reliable baseline. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Define / Survey bowling change	Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case? Survey the present state before setting a target.	Standard / Starting view
2	Inspect / Select field change	How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence? Select the smallest useful starting point.	Finding / First priority
3	Flag / Bound matchup evidence	What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point? Bound the work by time, scope and available support.	Exception / Boundary
4	Correct / Prepare communication	Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain? Prepare the materials, conditions and owner.	Correction / Readiness
5	Recheck / Begin review point	What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors? Begin with one observable action.	Recheck / First result
6	Release / Confirm toss factors	What next check on review point would make the record about field change more useful? Confirm what is ready for the next cycle.	Disposition / Foundation check

Common Failure Modes

- For bowling change, watch for the standard is undefined together with the starting state is assumed.
- For field change, watch for inspection evidence is missing together with the first target is too large.
- For matchup evidence, watch for the gap affects several areas together with the scope has no boundary.
- For communication, watch for the correction changes scope together with required support is missing.
- For review point, watch for the recheck uses different criteria together with several actions start together.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one? Outcome question: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block: _____

Cricket Practice Plan for Build a Reliable Baseline

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs quality control with foundation to pursue this objective: understand the current skill before changing technique. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Build a Reliable Baseline
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Readiness	use one repeatable drill at comfortable intensity
Evidence to capture	_____
Stop or review condition	_____

Thirty Minute Practice Shape

Stage	Action	Evidence
0-5 min	Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case? Define the acceptance standard.	Standard / Starting view
5-10 min	How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence? Inspect against the same criteria.	Finding / First priority
10-18 min	What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point? Classify the gap and its consequence.	Exception / Boundary
18-24 min	Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain? Apply one controlled correction.	Correction / Readiness
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors? Repeat the original check.	Recheck / First result
27-30 min	What next check on review point would make the record about field change more useful? Release, hold or escalate with a reason.	Disposition / Foundation check

Quality Check Log

Quality Check	Condition	Observation	Decision
1	Same / changed	_____	Keep / change / check
2	Same / changed	_____	Keep / change / check
3	Same / changed	_____	Keep / change / check
4	Same / changed	_____	Keep / change / check
5	Same / changed	_____	Keep / change / check

Before and After Quality Check - Foundation Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against build a reliable baseline through two independent questions. Format: Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one? Outcome: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

Evidence area	Baseline	Alternative	Interpretation prompt
Review Point	_____	_____	Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case?
Toss Factors	_____	_____	How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?
Bowling Change	_____	_____	What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point?
Field Change	_____	_____	Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain?
Matchup Evidence	_____	_____	What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors?
Communication	_____	_____	What next check on review point would make the record about field change more useful?

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one?
Outcome question	Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?
Acceptance lens	record several comparable attempts and a clear starting measure
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Quality Control Confidence Check

- Starting view: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates items inspected?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates first actions completed?
- Challenge: could readiness is declared without evidence explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about toss factors?

Quality Control x Foundation Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for build a reliable baseline. Each card joins a quality control failure mode to an outcome-specific risk. State what remains open and which evidence named in the final column should be collected next.

#	Situation	Review question	Decision
1	Toss Factors: inspection evidence is missing.	Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case?	Starting view
2	Bowling Change: the gap affects several areas.	How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?	First priority
3	Field Change: the correction changes scope.	What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point?	Boundary
4	Matchup Evidence: the recheck uses different criteria.	Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain?	Readiness
5	Communication: release authority is unclear.	What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors?	First result
6	Review Point: the standard is undefined.	What next check on review point would make the record about field change more useful?	Foundation check

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Quality Control and Foundation Evidence Tracker

Track build a reliable baseline across eight practice blocks using the quality control method and the foundation outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?

#	Focus	Condition	Result	Next action
1	Toss Factors	_____	_____	_____
2	Bowling Change	_____	_____	_____
3	Field Change	_____	_____	_____
4	Matchup Evidence	_____	_____	_____
5	Communication	_____	_____	_____
6	Review Point	_____	_____	_____
7	Toss Factors	_____	_____	_____
8	Bowling Change	_____	_____	_____

Quality Control Evidence Dashboard

Measure	Baseline	Current	Evidence location
Toss Factors: Standards Defined / Starting Conditions Recorded	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Items Inspected / First Priority Selected	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Gaps Classified / Scope Boundaries Stated	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Corrections Completed / Readiness Items Confirmed	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Rechecks Passed / First Actions Completed	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Holds Explained / Next Cycles Approved	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I recorded a real starting point rather than an idealised one.
- I chose a first step that can be checked before the work expands.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for build a reliable baseline improves without hiding readiness is declared without evidence.
- How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Quality Control x Foundation Next Step Plan

Finish by turning the paired format and outcome record into one owned action. For this drill progress tracker, the intended result was build a reliable baseline; the outcome test is: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue? The close-out standard remains: record several comparable attempts and a clear starting measure.

Close-out field	Record
Most useful evidence	_____
Important limitation	_____
Decision	Keep / adapt / pause / seek review
Next action	_____
Owner and date	_____
Evidence location	_____

Completion Review

- Subject check: Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case?
- Subject check: How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?
- Format check: I used the same acceptance criteria before and after correction.
- Outcome check: I recorded a real starting point rather than an idealised one.
- I used a progressive warm-up and did not ignore pain, unsafe surfaces, heat or fatigue.
- I kept the drill generic and did not imply affiliation with a player, team, league or governing body.

Originality and Responsible Use

Original independent resource. This general practice, observation and review aid was written specifically for asset CRIC-22-05-01. It does not reproduce a book passage, manual, official form, commercial question bank, branded training plan, broadcast, photograph, logo, artwork, map, proprietary diagram or third-party worksheet. Any user-added quotation, image, question or source material remains the user's responsibility and may require attribution or permission.

Educational use only. Verify current facts, rules, competition requirements, local regulations, health and safety conditions with authoritative sources and a suitably qualified person where consequences matter. This workbook does not grant approval, certification, legal rights or permission to use third-party material.