

Captaincy and Decisions Readiness and Workload Log - Communicate as a Team

Captaincy and Decisions | Communicate as a Team | Asset ID CRIC-22-08-07

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: make calls and feedback short, early and respectful. 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	_____

Continuity Starting Brief

- Mark: Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case? Mark a checkpoint that another person can recognise.
- Preserve: How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Preserve the context needed to interpret later work.
- Advance: What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Advance one bounded segment toward the outcome.
- Log: Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Log interruption, error or uncertainty when it occurs.
- Resume: What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Resume from evidence rather than memory alone.
- Edition success means: finish a session with fewer avoidable misunderstandings

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 communicate as a team, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Mark Matchup Evidence	Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case?	Checkpoint / date	Open / checked
Preserve Communication	How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?	Context record / date	Open / checked
Advance Review Point	What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change?	Completed segment / date	Open / checked
Log Toss Factors	Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain?	Continuity note / date	Open / checked
Resume Bowling Change	What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence?	Restart point / date	Open / checked
Verify Field Change	What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful?	Chain review / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to captaincy and decisions, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: agree roles and words before the drill
- Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: work resumes from a guess.
- 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-22-08-07 pairs readiness and workload log with the outcome 'Communicate as a Team'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Comparison x Continuity Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a comparison method with a continuity 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 communicate as a team. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Align / Mark bowling change	Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case? Mark a checkpoint that another person can recognise.	Cases / Checkpoint
2	Compare / Preserve field change	How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Preserve the context needed to interpret later work.	Alignment / Context record
3	Detect / Advance matchup evidence	What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Advance one bounded segment toward the outcome.	Difference / Completed segment
4	Explain / Log communication	Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Log interruption, error or uncertainty when it occurs.	Explanation / Continuity note
5	Judge / Resume review point	What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Resume from evidence rather than memory alone.	Judgement / Restart point
6	Document / Verify toss factors	What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful? Verify that the chain remains complete and understandable.	Decision / Chain review

Common Failure Modes

- For bowling change, watch for the cases answer different questions together with the checkpoint is vague.
- For field change, watch for units or dates do not align together with context is lost.
- For matchup evidence, watch for a difference is hidden by an average together with the segment has no completion rule.
- For communication, watch for the explanation lacks evidence together with an interruption goes unrecorded.
- For review point, watch for fitness criteria change together with work resumes from a guess.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice? Outcome question: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block: _____

Cricket Practice Plan for Communicate as a Team

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs comparison with continuity to pursue this objective: make calls and feedback short, early and respectful. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Communicate as a Team
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Continuity note	agree roles and words before the drill
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 two cases and shared question.	Cases / Checkpoint
5-10 min	How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Align units, dates and conditions.	Alignment / Context record
10-18 min	What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Record meaningful differences.	Difference / Completed segment
18-24 min	Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Investigate the likeliest explanation.	Explanation / Continuity note
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Judge fitness for the intended use.	Judgement / Restart point
27-30 min	What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful? Document the choice and limitation.	Decision / Chain review

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 - Continuity Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against communicate as a team through two independent questions. Format: Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice? Outcome: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

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

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice?
Outcome question	Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?
Acceptance lens	finish a session with fewer avoidable misunderstandings
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Comparison Confidence Check

- Checkpoint: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates conditions aligned?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates restarts evidenced?
- Challenge: could the segment has no completion rule explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about match-up evidence?

Comparison x Continuity Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for communicate as a team. 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	Matchup Evidence: units or dates do not align.	Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case?	Checkpoint
2	Communication: a difference is hidden by an average.	How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?	Context record
3	Review Point: the explanation lacks evidence.	What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change?	Completed segment
4	Toss Factors: fitness criteria change.	Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain?	Continuity note
5	Bowling Change: the losing option is not documented.	What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence?	Restart point
6	Field Change: the cases answer different questions.	What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful?	Chain review

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Comparison and Continuity Evidence Tracker

Track communicate as a team across eight practice blocks using the comparison method and the continuity outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?

#	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 / Checkpoints Marked	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Conditions Aligned / Contexts Preserved	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Differences Recorded / Segments Completed	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Explanations Tested / Interruptions Logged	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Criteria Applied / Restarts Evidenced	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Choices Documented / Chains Verified	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I left a checkpoint that is meaningful without relying on memory.
- I preserved interruptions and unresolved gaps as part of the record.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for communicate as a team improves without hiding the segment has no completion rule.
- How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Comparison x Continuity 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 communicate as a team; the outcome test is: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing? The close-out standard remains: finish a session with fewer avoidable misunderstandings.

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 aligned the cases before comparing their results.
- Outcome check: I left a checkpoint that is meaningful without relying on memory.
- 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-22-08-07. 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.