

Close Catching Readiness and Workload Log - Plan a Match Scenario

Close Catching | Plan a Match Scenario | Asset ID CRIC-17-08-08

Purpose: This original printable readiness and workload log helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with close catching 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 prepare early, watch the ball and use progressive safe practice. 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	Stance	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
2	Reaction Cue	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
3	Hand Position	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
4	Body Line	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
5	Rebound Response	Known / estimated / not checked	_____
6	Difficulty Progression	Known / estimated / not checked	_____

Scenario and Facilitation Starting Brief

- Frame: Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Frame a bounded scenario with a clear success measure.
- Assign: How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Assign roles, resources and stop conditions.
- Run: What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Run the scenario without adding hidden rules.
- Capture: Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Capture decisions, timing and exceptions.
- Debrief: What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? 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 close catching, 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 Rebound Response	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?	Scenario brief / date	Open / checked
Assign Difficulty Progression	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?	Role map / date	Open / checked
Run Stance	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?	Scenario run / date	Open / checked
Capture Reaction Cue	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?	Event record / date	Open / checked
Debrief Hand Position	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?	Debrief / date	Open / checked
Transfer Body Line	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful?	Transfer plan / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to close catching, 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: learning is not transferred.
- 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-17-08-08 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 - prepare early, watch the ball and use progressive safe practice - into evidence for plan a match scenario. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Align / Frame hand position	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Frame a bounded scenario with a clear success measure.	Cases / Scenario brief
2	Compare / Assign body line	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Assign roles, resources and stop conditions.	Alignment / Role map
3	Detect / Run rebound response	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Run the scenario without adding hidden rules.	Difference / Scenario run
4	Explain / Capture difficulty progression	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Capture decisions, timing and exceptions.	Explanation / Event record
5	Judge / Debrief stance	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Debrief actions with evidence and balanced participation.	Judgement / Debrief
6	Document / Transfer reaction cue	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful? Transfer the learning into the next owned action.	Decision / Transfer plan

Common Failure Modes

- For hand position, watch for the cases answer different questions together with the scenario lacks a boundary.
- For body line, watch for units or dates do not align together with roles or stop conditions are unclear.
- For rebound response, watch for a difference is hidden by an average together with hidden rules appear during the run.
- For difficulty progression, watch for the explanation lacks evidence together with only the final result is captured.
- For stance, 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 rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Define the two cases and shared question.	Cases / Scenario brief
5-10 min	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Align units, dates and conditions.	Alignment / Role map
10-18 min	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Record meaningful differences.	Difference / Scenario run
18-24 min	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Investigate the likeliest explanation.	Explanation / Event record
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Judge fitness for the intended use.	Judgement / Debrief
27-30 min	What next check on body line would make the record about stance 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 close catching 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
Hand Position	_____	_____	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?
Body Line	_____	_____	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?
Rebound Response	_____	_____	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?
Difficulty Progression	_____	_____	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?
Stance	_____	_____	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?
Reaction Cue	_____	_____	What next check on body line would make the record about stance 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 learning transferred?
- Challenge: could hidden rules appear during the run explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about rebound response?

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	Rebound Response: a difference is hidden by an average.	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?	Scenario brief
2	Difficulty Progression: the explanation lacks evidence.	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?	Role map
3	Stance: fitness criteria change.	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?	Scenario run
4	Reaction Cue: the losing option is not documented.	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?	Event record
5	Hand Position: the cases answer different questions.	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?	Debrief
6	Body Line: units or dates do not align.	What next check on body line would make the record about stance 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	Body Line	_____	_____	_____
2	Rebound Response	_____	_____	_____
3	Difficulty Progression	_____	_____	_____
4	Stance	_____	_____	_____
5	Reaction Cue	_____	_____	_____
6	Hand Position	_____	_____	_____
7	Body Line	_____	_____	_____
8	Rebound Response	_____	_____	_____

Comparison Evidence Dashboard

Measure	Baseline	Current	Evidence location
Stance: Cases Defined / Scenarios Framed	_____	_____	_____
Reaction Cue: Conditions Aligned / Roles Assigned	_____	_____	_____
Hand Position: Differences Recorded / Runs Completed	_____	_____	_____
Body Line: Explanations Tested / Events Captured	_____	_____	_____
Rebound Response: Criteria Applied / Debriefs Evidenced	_____	_____	_____
Difficulty Progression: 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 hand position must be checked before relying on body line?
- 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 rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?
- Subject check: How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?
- Format check: I documented why the unselected option was not preferred.
- Outcome check: I converted the debrief into a specific action with an owner.
- 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-17-08-08. 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.