

# Captaincy and Decisions Team Communication Guide - Perform Under Pressure

Captaincy and Decisions | Perform Under Pressure | Asset ID CRIC-22-09-06

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

## Team Communication Guide

This format is designed to make calls, roles and review language brief and respectful. For captaincy and decisions, apply the method in a deliberate sequence: agree words, practise under pressure and reset without blame. 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 Matchup Evidence | Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case?             | Anchor case / date         | Open / checked |
| Vary Communication      | How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?                       | Challenge condition / date | Open / checked |
| Observe Review Point    | What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change?        | Response / date            | Open / checked |
| Protect Toss Factors    | Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain?   | Invariant / date           | Open / checked |
| Evaluate Bowling Change | What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? | Fitness review / date      | Open / checked |
| Adapt Field Change      | What next check on field change would make the record about review point 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-22-09-06 pairs team communication guide 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.

## Facilitation and Handover x Robustness Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a facilitation and handover 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 | Brief / Anchor toss factors        | Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case? Anchor the test with a clear baseline and intended use.              | Brief / Anchor case            |
| 2 | Assign / Vary bowling change       | How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Vary one meaningful condition or perspective.                                  | Roles / Challenge condition    |
| 3 | Demonstrate / Observe field change | What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Observe what changes and what remains stable.                   | Demonstration / Response       |
| 4 | Monitor / Protect matchup evidence | Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Protect the essential boundary while testing alternatives. | Observation / Invariant        |
| 5 | Resolve / Evaluate communication   | What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Evaluate whether the method still serves its purpose.    | Resolution / Fitness review    |
| 6 | Handover / Adapt review point      | What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful? Adapt the plan without overstating the result.            | Handover / Robustness decision |

### Common Failure Modes

- For toss factors, watch for the purpose is misunderstood together with the baseline is weak.
- For bowling change, watch for a role has no owner together with too many conditions vary.
- For field change, watch for the demonstration skips a critical step together with the response is selectively recorded.
- For matchup evidence, watch for a stop condition is missed together with an essential boundary is sacrificed.
- For communication, watch for an exception has no route together with fitness is judged by preference.

### Independent Review Question

Format question: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? 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 facilitation and handover 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 matchup evidence from communication in this case? Brief the purpose, limits and stop conditions. | Brief / Anchor case            |
| 5-10 min  | How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors? Assign roles and communication routes.                   | Roles / Challenge condition    |
| 10-18 min | What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change? Demonstrate the critical routine.         | Demonstration / Response       |
| 18-24 min | Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain? Observe one supervised cycle.        | Observation / Invariant        |
| 24-27 min | What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? Resolve questions and exceptions.  | Resolution / Fitness review    |
| 27-30 min | What next check on field change would make the record about review point more useful? Confirm ownership and follow-up.    | Handover / Robustness decision |

### Handover Checkpoint Log

| Handover 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 |

## Handover Readiness Review - Robustness Lens

This comparison tests captaincy and decisions against perform under pressure through two independent questions. Format: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome: What remains dependable when one meaningful condition changes? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

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

### Format Decision Test

| Field                          | Record                                                                                        |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Review question                | Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? |
| 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    | _____                                                                                         |

### Facilitation and Handover Confidence Check

- Anchor case: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates people briefed?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates fitness tests completed?
- Challenge: could an essential boundary is sacrificed explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about matchup evidence?

## Facilitation and Handover x Robustness Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for perform under pressure. Each card joins a facilitation and handover 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: the purpose is misunderstood.        | Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case?             | Anchor case         |
| 2 | Communication: a role has no owner.                    | How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?                       | Challenge condition |
| 3 | Review Point: the demonstration skips a critical step. | What boundary on bowling change must be checked before relying on field change?        | Response            |
| 4 | Toss Factors: a stop condition is missed.              | Which observation links communication to bowling change, and what remains uncertain?   | Invariant           |
| 5 | Bowling Change: an exception has no route.             | What alternative explanation could account for both toss factors and matchup evidence? | Fitness review      |
| 6 | Field Change: follow-up ownership is unclear.          | What next check on field change would make the record about review point 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 Facilitation and Handover and Robustness Evidence Tracker

Track perform under pressure across eight practice blocks using the facilitation and handover 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 | Communication    | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 2 | Review Point     | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 3 | Toss Factors     | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 4 | Bowling Change   | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 5 | Field Change     | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 6 | Matchup Evidence | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 7 | Communication    | _____     | _____  | _____       |
| 8 | Review Point     | _____     | _____  | _____       |

### Facilitation and Handover Evidence Dashboard

| Measure                                                      | Baseline | Current | Evidence location |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|-------------------|
| Toss Factors: People Briefed / Anchor Cases Recorded         | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Bowling Change: Roles Accepted / Conditions Varied           | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Field Change: Routines Demonstrated / Responses Observed     | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Matchup Evidence: Cycles Observed / Boundaries Protected     | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Communication: Exceptions Resolved / Fitness Tests Completed | _____    | _____   | _____             |
| Review Point: Handovers Confirmed / 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 an essential boundary is sacrificed.
- Which evidence separates matchup evidence from communication in this case?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

## Facilitation and Handover x Robustness Next Step Plan

Finish by turning the paired format and outcome record into one owned action. For this team communication guide, 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 matchup evidence from communication in this case?
- Subject check: How does review point change the interpretation of toss factors?
- Format check: I confirmed understanding through demonstration or teach-back.
- 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-22-09-06. 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.