

# Captaincy and Decisions Match Scenario Planner - Review Performance

Captaincy and Decisions | Review Performance | Asset ID CRIC-22-06-10

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

## Match Scenario Planner

This format is designed to rehearse a bounded situation with roles, rules and a success measure. For captaincy and decisions, apply the method in a deliberate sequence: define score and field, run the scenario and debrief the decision. 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 Communication      | Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case?                    | Review set / date          | Open / checked |
| Align Review Point        | How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?                        | Comparable record / date   | Open / checked |
| Detect Toss Factors       | What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?         | Learning pattern / date    | Open / checked |
| Explain Bowling Change    | Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain?         | Bounded explanation / date | Open / checked |
| Prioritise Field Change   | What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?     | Next priority / date       | Open / checked |
| Schedule Matchup Evidence | What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors 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-22-06-10 pairs match scenario planner 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.

## Strategy x Learning and Adaptation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a strategy 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 | Map / Gather communication         | Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly.                          | Factor map / Review set        |
| 2 | Link / Align review point          | How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison.                       | Cause path / Comparable record |
| 3 | Rank / Detect toss factors         | What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point.              | Ranking / Learning pattern     |
| 4 | Select / Explain bowling change    | Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence.     | Choice / Bounded explanation   |
| 5 | Simulate / Prioritise field change | What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value.   | Scenario / Next priority       |
| 6 | Adapt / Schedule matchup evidence  | What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors more useful? Schedule the next check and preserve the review trail. | Trigger / Review date          |

### Common Failure Modes

- For communication, watch for a key factor was omitted together with the review set is selective.
- For review point, watch for two consequences conflict together with unlike records are compared.
- For toss factors, watch for the top priority changes together with noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- For bowling change, watch for the fallback is unavailable together with contradictory evidence is omitted.
- For field change, watch for the adverse case occurs together with too many adjustments are prioritised.

### Independent Review Question

Format question: Which trade-off justifies the chosen strategy over the strongest alternative? 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 strategy 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 communication from review point in this case? Map the factors that shape the situation.          | Factor map / Review set        |
| 5-10 min  | How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change? Link actions to likely consequences.                   | Cause path / Comparable record |
| 10-18 min | What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence? Rank priorities and constraints.        | Ranking / Learning pattern     |
| 18-24 min | Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain? Select a strategy with a fallback.      | Choice / Bounded explanation   |
| 24-27 min | What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication? Simulate one adverse scenario.      | Scenario / Next priority       |
| 27-30 min | What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors more useful? Set the trigger for adaptation. | Trigger / Review date          |

### Strategy Checkpoint Log

| Strategy C checkpoint | 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 |

## Strategy and Trade-off Matrix - Learning and Adaptation Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against review performance through two independent questions. Format: Which trade-off justifies the chosen strategy over the strongest alternative? 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                                                                     |
|------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Toss Factors     | _____    | _____       | Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case?                    |
| Bowling Change   | _____    | _____       | How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?                        |
| Field Change     | _____    | _____       | What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?         |
| Matchup Evidence | _____    | _____       | Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain?         |
| Communication    | _____    | _____       | What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?     |
| Review Point     | _____    | _____       | What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors more useful? |

### Format Decision Test

| Field                          | Record                                                                        |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Review question                | Which trade-off justifies the chosen strategy over the strongest alternative? |
| 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    | _____                                                                         |

### Strategy Confidence Check

- Review set: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates scenarios rehearsed?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates adjustments prioritised?
- Challenge: could the review set is selective explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about communication?

## Strategy x Learning and Adaptation Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for review performance. Each card joins a strategy 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 | Communication: the adverse case occurs.         | Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case?                    | Review set          |
| 2 | Review Point: the adaptation trigger is missed. | How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?                        | Comparable record   |
| 3 | Toss Factors: a key factor was omitted.         | What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?         | Learning pattern    |
| 4 | Bowling Change: two consequences conflict.      | Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain?         | Bounded explanation |
| 5 | Field Change: the top priority changes.         | What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?     | Next priority       |
| 6 | Matchup Evidence: the fallback is unavailable.  | What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors 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 Strategy and Learning and Adaptation Evidence Tracker

Track review performance across eight practice blocks using the strategy 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 | Bowling Change   | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 2 | Field Change     | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 3 | Matchup Evidence | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 4 | Communication    | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 5 | Review Point     | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 6 | Toss Factors     | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 7 | Bowling Change   | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 8 | Field Change     | _____     | _____  | _____       |

### Strategy Evidence Dashboard

| Measure                                                       | Baseline | Current | Evidence location |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|-------------------|
| Toss Factors: Factors Mapped / Records Gathered               | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Bowling Change: Cause Paths Tested / Conditions Aligned       | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Field Change: Priorities Ranked / Patterns Detected           | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Matchup Evidence: Fallbacks Prepared / Explanations Qualified | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Communication: Scenarios Rehearsed / Adjustments Prioritised  | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Review Point: Triggers Recorded / 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 review set is selective.
- What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

## Strategy x Learning and Adaptation Next Step Plan

Finish by turning the paired format and outcome record into one owned action. For this match scenario planner, 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 communication from review point in this case?
- Subject check: How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?
- Format check: I recorded both the chosen strategy and its strongest trade-off.
- 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-22-06-10. 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.