

Captaincy and Decisions Readiness and Workload Log - Perform Under Pressure

Captaincy and Decisions | Perform Under Pressure | Asset ID CRIC-22-08-06

Purpose: This original printable readiness and workload log helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with captaincy and decisions while pursuing one defined outcome: preserve routine when score, time or consequence changes. Its method is to warm up progressively, stop for warning signs and seek qualified help when needed. 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	_____

Robustness Starting Brief

- Anchor: Which evidence separates field change from matchup evidence in this case? Anchor the test with a clear baseline and intended use.
- Vary: How does communication change the interpretation of review point? Vary one meaningful condition or perspective.
- Observe: What boundary on toss factors must be checked before relying on bowling change? Observe what changes and what remains stable.
- Protect: Which observation links matchup evidence to toss factors, and what remains uncertain? Protect the essential boundary while testing alternatives.
- Evaluate: What alternative explanation could account for both review point and field change? Evaluate whether the method still serves its purpose.
- Edition success means: complete the scenario without abandoning the agreed process

Readiness and Workload Log

This format is designed to record preparation, effort, rest and discomfort without giving medical advice. For captaincy and decisions, apply the method in a deliberate sequence: warm up progressively, stop for warning signs and seek qualified help when needed. The edition target is perform under pressure, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Anchor Field Change	Which evidence separates field change from matchup evidence in this case?	Anchor case / date	Open / checked
Vary Matchup Evidence	How does communication change the interpretation of review point?	Challenge condition / date	Open / checked
Observe Communication	What boundary on toss factors must be checked before relying on bowling change?	Response / date	Open / checked
Protect Review Point	Which observation links matchup evidence to toss factors, and what remains uncertain?	Invariant / date	Open / checked
Evaluate Toss Factors	What alternative explanation could account for both review point and field change?	Fitness review / date	Open / checked
Adapt Bowling Change	What next check on bowling change would make the record about communication more useful?	Robustness decision / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to captaincy and decisions, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: add one pressure condition only after a stable baseline
- What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: fitness is judged by preference.
- 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-22-08-06 pairs readiness and workload log with the outcome 'Perform Under Pressure'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Comparison x Robustness Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a comparison method with a robustness 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 perform under pressure. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Align / Anchor toss factors	Which evidence separates field change from matchup evidence in this case? Anchor the test with a clear baseline and intended use.	Cases / Anchor case
2	Compare / Vary bowling change	How does communication change the interpretation of review point? Vary one meaningful condition or perspective.	Alignment / Challenge condition
3	Detect / Observe field change	What boundary on toss factors must be checked before relying on bowling change? Observe what changes and what remains stable.	Difference / Response
4	Explain / Protect matchup evidence	Which observation links matchup evidence to toss factors, and what remains uncertain? Protect the essential boundary while testing alternatives.	Explanation / Invariant
5	Judge / Evaluate communication	What alternative explanation could account for both review point and field change? Evaluate whether the method still serves its purpose.	Judgement / Fitness review
6	Document / Adapt review point	What next check on bowling change would make the record about communication more useful? Adapt the plan without overstating the result.	Decision / Robustness decision

Common Failure Modes

- For toss factors, watch for the cases answer different questions together with the baseline is weak.
- For bowling change, watch for units or dates do not align together with too many conditions vary.
- For field change, watch for a difference is hidden by an average together with the response is selectively recorded.
- For matchup evidence, watch for the explanation lacks evidence together with an essential boundary is sacrificed.
- For communication, watch for fitness criteria change together with fitness is judged by preference.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice? Outcome question: What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block: _____

Cricket Practice Plan for Perform Under Pressure

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs comparison with robustness to pursue this objective: preserve routine when score, time or consequence changes. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Perform Under Pressure
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Invariant	add one pressure condition only after a stable baseline
Evidence to capture	_____
Stop or review condition	_____

Thirty Minute Practice Shape

Stage	Action	Evidence
0-5 min	Which evidence separates field change from matchup evidence in this case? Define the two cases and shared question.	Cases / Anchor case
5-10 min	How does communication change the interpretation of review point? Align units, dates and conditions.	Alignment / Challenge condition
10-18 min	What boundary on toss factors must be checked before relying on bowling change? Record meaningful differences.	Difference / Response
18-24 min	Which observation links matchup evidence to toss factors, and what remains uncertain? Investigate the likeliest explanation.	Explanation / Invariant
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both review point and field change? Judge fitness for the intended use.	Judgement / Fitness review
27-30 min	What next check on bowling change would make the record about communication more useful? Document the choice and limitation.	Decision / Robustness decision

Comparison Case Log

Comparis on Case	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

Controlled Case Comparison - Robustness Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against perform under pressure through two independent questions. Format: Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice? Outcome: What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

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

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice?
Outcome question	What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes?
Acceptance lens	complete the scenario without abandoning the agreed process
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Comparison Confidence Check

- Anchor case: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates cases defined?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates fitness tests completed?
- Challenge: could the response is selectively recorded explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about field change?

Comparison x Robustness Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for perform under pressure. Each card joins a comparison 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	Field Change: the cases answer different questions.	Which evidence separates field change from matchup evidence in this case?	Anchor case
2	Matchup Evidence: units or dates do not align.	How does communication change the interpretation of review point?	Challenge condition
3	Communication: a difference is hidden by an average.	What boundary on toss factors must be checked before relying on bowling change?	Response
4	Review Point: the explanation lacks evidence.	Which observation links matchup evidence to toss factors, and what remains uncertain?	Invariant
5	Toss Factors: fitness criteria change.	What alternative explanation could account for both review point and field change?	Fitness review
6	Bowling Change: the losing option is not documented.	What next check on bowling change would make the record about communication more useful?	Robustness decision

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Comparison and Robustness Evidence Tracker

Track perform under pressure across eight practice blocks using the comparison method and the robustness outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes?

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

Comparison Evidence Dashboard

Measure	Baseline	Current	Evidence location
Toss Factors: Cases Defined / Anchor Cases Recorded	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Conditions Aligned / Conditions Varied	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Differences Recorded / Responses Observed	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Explanations Tested / Boundaries Protected	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Criteria Applied / Fitness Tests Completed	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Choices Documented / Adaptations Justified	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I changed one meaningful condition while protecting the essential boundary.
- I limited the conclusion to the conditions that were actually tested.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for perform under pressure improves without hiding the response is selectively recorded.
- Which evidence separates field change from matchup evidence in this case?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Comparison x Robustness Next Step Plan

Finish by turning the paired format and outcome record into one owned action. For this readiness and workload log, the intended result was perform under pressure; the outcome test is: What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes? The close-out standard remains: complete the scenario without abandoning the agreed process.

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 field change from matchup evidence in this case?
- Subject check: How does communication change the interpretation of review point?
- Format check: I aligned the cases before comparing their results.
- Outcome check: I changed one meaningful condition while protecting the essential boundary.
- 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-22-08-06. 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.