

Captaincy and Decisions Readiness and Workload Log - Review Performance

Captaincy and Decisions | Review Performance | Asset ID CRIC-22-08-10

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: convert notes and results into one practical next step. 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	_____

Learning and Adaptation Starting Brief

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

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 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 Toss Factors	Which evidence separates toss factors from bowling change in this case?	Review set / date	Open / checked
Align Bowling Change	How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?	Comparable record / date	Open / checked
Detect Field Change	What boundary on communication must be checked before relying on review point?	Learning pattern / date	Open / checked
Explain Matchup Evidence	Which observation links bowling change to communication, and what remains uncertain?	Bounded explanation / date	Open / checked
Prioritise Communication	What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors?	Next priority / date	Open / checked
Schedule Review Point	What next check on review point would make the record about field change 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-22-08-10 pairs readiness and workload log 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.

Comparison x Learning and Adaptation Focused Practice Lab

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

Common Failure Modes

- For communication, watch for the cases answer different questions together with the review set is selective.
- For review point, watch for units or dates do not align together with unlike records are compared.
- For toss factors, watch for a difference is hidden by an average together with noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- For bowling change, watch for the explanation lacks evidence together with contradictory evidence is omitted.
- For field change, watch for fitness criteria change together with too many adjustments are prioritised.

Independent Review Question

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

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 - Learning and Adaptation Lens

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

Format Decision Test

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

Comparison Confidence Check

- Review set: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates criteria applied?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates adjustments prioritised?
- Challenge: could noise or mistaken for a pattern explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about toss factors?

Comparison x Learning and Adaptation Scenario Cards

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

Track review performance across eight practice blocks using the comparison 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	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 / Records Gathered	_____	_____	_____
Bowling Change: Conditions Aligned / Conditions Aligned	_____	_____	_____
Field Change: Differences Recorded / Patterns Detected	_____	_____	_____
Matchup Evidence: Explanations Tested / Explanations Qualified	_____	_____	_____
Communication: Criteria Applied / Adjustments Prioritised	_____	_____	_____
Review Point: Choices Documented / 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 noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- What alternative explanation could account for both matchup evidence and toss factors?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Comparison x Learning and Adaptation 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 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 toss factors from bowling change in this case?
- Subject check: How does field change change the interpretation of matchup evidence?
- Format check: I aligned the cases before comparing their results.
- 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-22-08-10. 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.