

Captaincy and Decisions Drill Progress Tracker - Plan a Match Scenario

Captaincy and Decisions | Plan a Match Scenario | Asset ID CRIC-22-05-08

Purpose: This original printable drill progress tracker helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with captaincy and decisions while pursuing one defined outcome: turn scoreboard and resources into a bounded tactical plan. 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	_____

Scenario and Facilitation Starting Brief

- Frame: Which evidence separates bowling change from field change in this case? Frame a bounded scenario with a clear success measure.
- Assign: How does matchup evidence change the interpretation of communication? Assign roles, resources and stop conditions.
- Run: What boundary on review point must be checked before relying on toss factors? Run the scenario without adding hidden rules.
- Capture: Which observation links field change to review point, and what remains uncertain? Capture decisions, timing and exceptions.
- Debrief: What alternative explanation could account for both communication and bowling change? Debrief actions with evidence and balanced participation.
- Edition success means: run and review the scenario with a reason for each adjustment

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 plan a match scenario, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Frame Bowling Change	Which evidence separates bowling change from field change in this case?	Scenario brief / date	Open / checked
Assign Field Change	How does matchup evidence change the interpretation of communication?	Role map / date	Open / checked
Run Matchup Evidence	What boundary on review point must be checked before relying on toss factors?	Scenario run / date	Open / checked
Capture Communication	Which observation links field change to review point, and what remains uncertain?	Event record / date	Open / checked
Debrief Review Point	What alternative explanation could account for both communication and bowling change?	Debrief / date	Open / checked
Transfer Toss Factors	What next check on toss factors would make the record about matchup evidence more useful?	Transfer plan / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to captaincy and decisions, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: define the situation, roles, field and success measure
- Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: the debrief becomes blame.
- 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-22-05-08 pairs drill progress tracker with the outcome 'Plan a Match Scenario'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Quality Control x Scenario and Facilitation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a quality control method with a scenario and facilitation 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 plan a match scenario. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Define / Frame field change	Which evidence separates bowling change from field change in this case? Frame a bounded scenario with a clear success measure.	Standard / Scenario brief
2	Inspect / Assign matchup evidence	How does matchup evidence change the interpretation of communication? Assign roles, resources and stop conditions.	Finding / Role map
3	Flag / Run communication	What boundary on review point must be checked before relying on toss factors? Run the scenario without adding hidden rules.	Exception / Scenario run
4	Correct / Capture review point	Which observation links field change to review point, and what remains uncertain? Capture decisions, timing and exceptions.	Correction / Event record
5	Recheck / Debrief toss factors	What alternative explanation could account for both communication and bowling change? Debrief actions with evidence and balanced participation.	Recheck / Debrief
6	Release / Transfer bowling change	What next check on toss factors would make the record about matchup evidence more useful? Transfer the learning into the next owned action.	Disposition / Transfer plan

Common Failure Modes

- For field change, watch for the standard is undefined together with the scenario lacks a boundary.
- For matchup evidence, watch for inspection evidence is missing together with roles or stop conditions are unclear.
- For communication, watch for the gap affects several areas together with hidden rules appear during the run.
- For review point, watch for the correction changes scope together with only the final result is captured.
- For toss factors, watch for the recheck uses different criteria together with the debrief becomes blame.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one? Outcome question: Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block: _____

Cricket Practice Plan for Plan a Match Scenario

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs quality control with scenario and facilitation to pursue this objective: turn scoreboard and resources into a bounded tactical plan. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Plan a Match Scenario
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Event record	define the situation, roles, field and success measure
Evidence to capture	_____
Stop or review condition	_____

Thirty Minute Practice Shape

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

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 - Scenario and Facilitation Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against plan a match scenario through two independent questions. Format: Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one? Outcome: Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

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

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one?
Outcome question	Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt?
Acceptance lens	run and review the scenario with a reason for each adjustment
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Quality Control Confidence Check

- Scenario brief: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates gaps classified?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates debriefs evidenced?
- Challenge: could learning is not transferred explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about bowling change?

Quality Control x Scenario and Facilitation Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for plan a match scenario. 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	Bowling Change: the gap affects several areas.	Which evidence separates bowling change from field change in this case?	Scenario brief
2	Field Change: the correction changes scope.	How does matchup evidence change the interpretation of communication?	Role map
3	Matchup Evidence: the recheck uses different criteria.	What boundary on review point must be checked before relying on toss factors?	Scenario run
4	Communication: release authority is unclear.	Which observation links field change to review point, and what remains uncertain?	Event record
5	Review Point: the standard is undefined.	What alternative explanation could account for both communication and bowling change?	Debrief
6	Toss Factors: inspection evidence is missing.	What next check on toss factors would make the record about matchup evidence more useful?	Transfer plan

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Quality Control and Scenario and Facilitation Evidence Tracker

Track plan a match scenario across eight practice blocks using the quality control method and the scenario and facilitation outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt?

#	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 / Scenarios Framed	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Items Inspected / Roles Assigned	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Gaps Classified / Runs Completed	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Corrections Completed / Events Captured	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Rechecks Passed / Debriefs Evidenced	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Holds Explained / Learning Transferred	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I kept the scenario rules and success measure visible throughout the run.
- I converted the debrief into a specific action with an owner.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for plan a match scenario improves without hiding learning is not transferred.
- What boundary on review point must be checked before relying on toss factors?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Quality Control x Scenario and Facilitation 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 plan a match scenario; the outcome test is: Which decision from the scenario should change the next real attempt? The close-out standard remains: run and review the scenario with a reason for each adjustment.

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 bowling change from field change in this case?
- Subject check: How does matchup evidence change the interpretation of communication?
- Format check: I used the same acceptance criteria before and after correction.
- Outcome check: I kept the scenario rules and success measure visible throughout the run.
- 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-22-05-08. 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.