

Captaincy and Decisions Readiness and Workload Log - Plan a Match Scenario

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

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: turn scoreboard and resources into a bounded tactical plan. 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	_____

Scenario and Facilitation Starting Brief

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

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 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 Communication	Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case?	Scenario brief / date	Open / checked
Assign Review Point	How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?	Role map / date	Open / checked
Run Toss Factors	What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?	Scenario run / date	Open / checked
Capture Bowling Change	Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain?	Event record / date	Open / checked
Debrief Field Change	What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?	Debrief / date	Open / checked
Transfer Matchup Evidence	What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors 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-22-08-08 pairs readiness and workload log 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.

Comparison x Scenario and Facilitation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a comparison 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	Align / Frame field change	Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case? Frame a bounded scenario with a clear success measure.	Cases / Scenario brief
2	Compare / Assign matchup evidence	How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change? Assign roles, resources and stop conditions.	Alignment / Role map
3	Detect / Run communication	What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence? Run the scenario without adding hidden rules.	Difference / Scenario run
4	Explain / Capture review point	Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain? Capture decisions, timing and exceptions.	Explanation / Event record
5	Judge / Debrief toss factors	What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication? Debrief actions with evidence and balanced participation.	Judgement / Debrief
6	Document / Transfer bowling change	What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors more useful? Transfer the learning into the next owned action.	Decision / Transfer plan

Common Failure Modes

- For field change, watch for the cases answer different questions together with the scenario lacks a boundary.
- For matchup evidence, watch for units or dates do not align together with roles or stop conditions are unclear.
- For communication, watch for a difference is hidden by an average together with hidden rules appear during the run.
- For review point, watch for the explanation lacks evidence together with only the final result is captured.
- For toss factors, watch for fitness criteria change together with the debrief becomes blame.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice? 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 comparison 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 communication from review point in this case? Define the two cases and shared question.	Cases / Scenario brief
5-10 min	How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change? Align units, dates and conditions.	Alignment / Role map
10-18 min	What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence? Record meaningful differences.	Difference / Scenario run
18-24 min	Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain? Investigate the likeliest explanation.	Explanation / Event record
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication? Judge fitness for the intended use.	Judgement / Debrief
27-30 min	What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors more useful? Document the choice and limitation.	Decision / Transfer plan

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 - Scenario and Facilitation Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against plan a match scenario through two independent questions. Format: Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice? 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
Field Change	_____	_____	Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case?
Matchup Evidence	_____	_____	How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?
Communication	_____	_____	What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?
Review Point	_____	_____	Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain?
Toss Factors	_____	_____	What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?
Bowling Change	_____	_____	What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors more useful?

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Are the two cases comparable enough to support the stated choice?
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	_____

Comparison Confidence Check

- Scenario brief: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates differences recorded?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates debriefs evidenced?
- Challenge: could hidden rules appear during the run explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about communication?

Comparison x Scenario and Facilitation Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for plan a match scenario. 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	Communication: a difference is hidden by an average.	Which evidence separates communication from review point in this case?	Scenario brief
2	Review Point: the explanation lacks evidence.	How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?	Role map
3	Toss Factors: fitness criteria change.	What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?	Scenario run
4	Bowling Change: the losing option is not documented.	Which observation links review point to field change, and what remains uncertain?	Event record
5	Field Change: the cases answer different questions.	What alternative explanation could account for both bowling change and communication?	Debrief
6	Matchup Evidence: units or dates do not align.	What next check on matchup evidence would make the record about toss factors 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 Comparison and Scenario and Facilitation Evidence Tracker

Track plan a match scenario across eight practice blocks using the comparison 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	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 / Scenarios Framed	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Conditions Aligned / Roles Assigned	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Differences Recorded / Runs Completed	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Explanations Tested / Events Captured	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Criteria Applied / Debriefs Evidenced	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Choices Documented / 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 hidden rules appear during the run.
- What boundary on field change must be checked before relying on matchup evidence?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Comparison x Scenario and Facilitation 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 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 communication from review point in this case?
- Subject check: How does toss factors change the interpretation of bowling change?
- Format check: I aligned the cases before comparing their results.
- 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-22-08-08. 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.