

Close Catching Team Communication Guide - Build a Reliable Baseline

Close Catching | Build a Reliable Baseline | Asset ID CRIC-17-09-01

Purpose: This original printable team communication guide helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with close catching while pursuing one defined outcome: understand the current skill before changing technique. 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 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	_____

Foundation Starting Brief

- Survey: Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Survey the present state before setting a target.
- Select: How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Select the smallest useful starting point.
- Bound: What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Bound the work by time, scope and available support.
- Prepare: Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Prepare the materials, conditions and owner.
- Begin: What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Begin with one observable action.
- Edition success means: record several comparable attempts and a clear starting measure

Team Communication Guide

This format is designed to make calls, roles and review language brief and respectful. For close catching, apply the method in a deliberate sequence: agree words, practise under pressure and reset without blame. The edition target is build a reliable baseline, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Survey Rebound Response	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?	Starting view / date	Open / checked
Select Difficulty Progression	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?	First priority / date	Open / checked
Bound Stance	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?	Boundary / date	Open / checked
Prepare Reaction Cue	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?	Readiness / date	Open / checked
Begin Hand Position	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?	First result / date	Open / checked
Confirm Body Line	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful?	Foundation check / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to close catching, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: use one repeatable drill at comfortable intensity
- Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: readiness is declared without evidence.
- 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-17-09-01 pairs team communication guide with the outcome 'Build a Reliable Baseline'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Facilitation and Handover x Foundation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a facilitation and handover method with a foundation 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 build a reliable baseline. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Brief / Survey reaction cue	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Survey the present state before setting a target.	Brief / Starting view
2	Assign / Select hand position	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Select the smallest useful starting point.	Roles / First priority
3	Demonstrate / Bound body line	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Bound the work by time, scope and available support.	Demonstration / Boundary
4	Monitor / Prepare rebound response	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Prepare the materials, conditions and owner.	Observation / Readiness
5	Resolve / Begin difficulty progression	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Begin with one observable action.	Resolution / First result
6	Handover / Confirm stance	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful? Confirm what is ready for the next cycle.	Handover / Foundation check

Common Failure Modes

- For reaction cue, watch for the purpose is misunderstood together with the starting state is assumed.
- For hand position, watch for a role has no owner together with the first target is too large.
- For body line, watch for the demonstration skips a critical step together with the scope has no boundary.
- For rebound response, watch for a stop condition is missed together with required support is missing.
- For difficulty progression, watch for an exception has no route together with several actions start together.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome question: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block: _____

Cricket Practice Plan for Build a Reliable Baseline

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs facilitation and handover with foundation to pursue this objective: understand the current skill before changing technique. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Build a Reliable Baseline
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Readiness	use one repeatable drill at comfortable intensity
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? Brief the purpose, limits and stop conditions.	Brief / Starting view
5-10 min	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Assign roles and communication routes.	Roles / First priority
10-18 min	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Demonstrate the critical routine.	Demonstration / Boundary
18-24 min	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Observe one supervised cycle.	Observation / Readiness
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Resolve questions and exceptions.	Resolution / First result
27-30 min	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful? Confirm ownership and follow-up.	Handover / Foundation check

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 - Foundation Lens

This comparison tests close catching against build a reliable baseline through two independent questions. Format: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

Evidence area	Baseline	Alternative	Interpretation prompt
Body Line	_____	_____	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?
Rebound Response	_____	_____	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?
Difficulty Progression	_____	_____	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?
Stance	_____	_____	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?
Reaction Cue	_____	_____	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?
Hand Position	_____	_____	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful?

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions?
Outcome question	Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?
Acceptance lens	record several comparable attempts and a clear starting measure
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Facilitation and Handover Confidence Check

- Starting view: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates roles accepted?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates next cycles approved?
- Challenge: could required support is missing explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about rebound response?

Facilitation and Handover x Foundation Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for build a reliable baseline. 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	Rebound Response: a role has no owner.	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?	Starting view
2	Difficulty Progression: the demonstration skips a critical step.	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?	First priority
3	Stance: a stop condition is missed.	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?	Boundary
4	Reaction Cue: an exception has no route.	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?	Readiness
5	Hand Position: follow-up ownership is unclear.	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?	First result
6	Body Line: the purpose is misunderstood.	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful?	Foundation check

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Facilitation and Handover and Foundation Evidence Tracker

Track build a reliable baseline across eight practice blocks using the facilitation and handover method and the foundation outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue?

#	Focus	Condition	Result	Next action
1	Rebound Response	_____	_____	_____
2	Difficulty Progression	_____	_____	_____
3	Stance	_____	_____	_____
4	Reaction Cue	_____	_____	_____
5	Hand Position	_____	_____	_____
6	Body Line	_____	_____	_____
7	Rebound Response	_____	_____	_____
8	Difficulty Progression	_____	_____	_____

Facilitation and Handover Evidence Dashboard

Measure	Baseline	Current	Evidence location
Stance: People Briefed / Starting Conditions Recorded	_____	_____	_____
Reaction Cue: Roles Accepted / First Priority Selected	_____	_____	_____
Hand Position: Routines Demonstrated / Scope Boundaries Stated	_____	_____	_____
Body Line: Cycles Observed / Readiness Items Confirmed	_____	_____	_____
Rebound Response: Exceptions Resolved / First Actions Completed	_____	_____	_____
Difficulty Progression: Handovers Confirmed / Next Cycles Approved	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I recorded a real starting point rather than an idealised one.
- I chose a first step that can be checked before the work expands.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for build a reliable baseline improves without hiding required support is missing.
- How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?
- Use a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional when the evidence crosses a safety, rights, health or authority boundary.

Facilitation and Handover x Foundation 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 build a reliable baseline; the outcome test is: Is the foundation small, clear and evidenced enough to continue? The close-out standard remains: record several comparable attempts and a clear starting measure.

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 gave the receiving person a clear exception and escalation route.
- Outcome check: I chose a first step that can be checked before the work expands.
- 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-17-09-01. 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.