

Captaincy and Decisions Drill Progress Tracker - Review Performance

Captaincy and Decisions | Review Performance | Asset ID CRIC-22-05-10

Purpose: This original printable drill progress tracker helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with captaincy and decisions while pursuing one defined outcome: convert notes and results into one practical next step. 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	_____

Learning and Adaptation Starting Brief

- Gather: Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly.
- Align: How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison.
- Detect: What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point.
- Explain: Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence.
- Prioritise: What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value.
- Edition success means: choose a small next target supported by the session record

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 review performance, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Gather Matchup Evidence	Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case?	Review set / date	Open / checked
Align Communication	How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?	Comparable record / date	Open / checked
Detect Review Point	What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change?	Learning pattern / date	Open / checked
Explain Toss Factors	Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain?	Bounded explanation / date	Open / checked
Prioritise Bowling Change	What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence?	Next priority / date	Open / checked
Schedule Field Change	What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful?	Review date / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to captaincy and decisions, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: separate context, execution and outcome
- Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: too many adjustments are prioritised.
- 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-22-05-10 pairs drill progress tracker with the outcome 'Review Performance'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Quality Control x Learning and Adaptation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a quality control method with a learning and adaptation 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 review performance. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Define / Gather communication	Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly.	Standard / Review set
2	Inspect / Align review point	How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison.	Finding / Comparable record
3	Flag / Detect toss factors	What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point.	Exception / Learning pattern
4	Correct / Explain bowling change	Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence.	Correction / Bounded explanation
5	Recheck / Prioritise field change	What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value.	Recheck / Next priority
6	Release / Schedule matchup evidence	What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful? Schedule the next check and preserve the review trail.	Disposition / Review date

Common Failure Modes

- For communication, watch for the standard is undefined together with the review set is selective.
- For review point, watch for inspection evidence is missing together with unlike records are compared.
- For toss factors, watch for the gap affects several areas together with noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- For bowling change, watch for the correction changes scope together with contradictory evidence is omitted.
- For field change, watch for the recheck uses different criteria together with too many adjustments are prioritised.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one? Outcome question: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block: _____

Cricket Practice Plan for Review Performance

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs quality control with learning and adaptation to pursue this objective: convert notes and results into one practical next step. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Review Performance
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Bounded explanation	separate context, execution and outcome
Evidence to capture	_____
Stop or review condition	_____

Thirty Minute Practice Shape

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

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 - Learning and Adaptation Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against review performance through two independent questions. Format: Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one? Outcome: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

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

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Did the correction resolve the defined gap without creating another one?
Outcome question	Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
Acceptance lens	choose a small next target supported by the session record
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Quality Control Confidence Check

- Review set: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates rechecks passed?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates adjustments prioritised?
- Challenge: could the next review has no date or owner explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about matchup evidence?

Quality Control x Learning and Adaptation Scenario Cards

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

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Quality Control and Learning and Adaptation Evidence Tracker

Track review performance across eight practice blocks using the quality control method and the learning and adaptation outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?

#	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 / Records Gathered	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Items Inspected / Conditions Aligned	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Gaps Classified / Patterns Detected	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Corrections Completed / Explanations Qualified	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Rechecks Passed / Adjustments Prioritised	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Holds Explained / Reviews Scheduled	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I included evidence that challenged the most convenient explanation.
- I selected one next adjustment and scheduled when it will be reviewed.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for review performance improves without hiding the next review has no date or owner.
- What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and 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 Learning and Adaptation 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 review performance; the outcome test is: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? The close-out standard remains: choose a small next target supported by the session record.

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 matchup evidence from communication in this case?
- Subject check: How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?
- Format check: I used the same acceptance criteria before and after correction.
- Outcome check: I included evidence that challenged the most convenient explanation.
- 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-22-05-10. 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.