

Close Catching Team Communication Guide - Perform Under Pressure

Close Catching | Perform Under Pressure | Asset ID CRIC-17-09-06

Purpose: This original printable team communication guide helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with close catching 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 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	_____

Robustness Starting Brief

- Anchor: Which evidence separates body line from rebound response in this case? Anchor the test with a clear baseline and intended use.
- Vary: How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance? Vary one meaningful condition or perspective.
- Observe: What boundary on reaction cue must be checked before relying on hand position? Observe what changes and what remains stable.
- Protect: Which observation links rebound response to reaction cue, and what remains uncertain? Protect the essential boundary while testing alternatives.
- Evaluate: What alternative explanation could account for both stance and body line? 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 close catching, 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 Body Line	Which evidence separates body line from rebound response in this case?	Anchor case / date	Open / checked
Vary Rebound Response	How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance?	Challenge condition / date	Open / checked
Observe Difficulty Progression	What boundary on reaction cue must be checked before relying on hand position?	Response / date	Open / checked
Protect Stance	Which observation links rebound response to reaction cue, and what remains uncertain?	Invariant / date	Open / checked
Evaluate Reaction Cue	What alternative explanation could account for both stance and body line?	Fitness review / date	Open / checked
Adapt Hand Position	What next check on hand position would make the record about difficulty progression more useful?	Robustness decision / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to close catching, 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: adaptation is presented as universal proof.
- 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-17-09-06 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 - prepare early, watch the ball and use progressive safe practice - into evidence for perform under pressure. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Brief / Anchor stance	Which evidence separates body line from rebound response in this case? Anchor the test with a clear baseline and intended use.	Brief / Anchor case
2	Assign / Vary reaction cue	How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance? Vary one meaningful condition or perspective.	Roles / Challenge condition
3	Demonstrate / Observe hand position	What boundary on reaction cue must be checked before relying on hand position? Observe what changes and what remains stable.	Demonstration / Response
4	Monitor / Protect body line	Which observation links rebound response to reaction cue, and what remains uncertain? Protect the essential boundary while testing alternatives.	Observation / Invariant
5	Resolve / Evaluate rebound response	What alternative explanation could account for both stance and body line? Evaluate whether the method still serves its purpose.	Resolution / Fitness review
6	Handover / Adapt difficulty progression	What next check on hand position would make the record about difficulty progression more useful? Adapt the plan without overstating the result.	Handover / Robustness decision

Common Failure Modes

- For stance, watch for the purpose is misunderstood together with the baseline is weak.
- For reaction cue, watch for a role has no owner together with too many conditions vary.
- For hand position, watch for the demonstration skips a critical step together with the response is selectively recorded.
- For body line, watch for a stop condition is missed together with an essential boundary is sacrificed.
- For rebound response, 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 body line from rebound response in this case? Brief the purpose, limits and stop conditions.	Brief / Anchor case
5-10 min	How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance? Assign roles and communication routes.	Roles / Challenge condition
10-18 min	What boundary on reaction cue must be checked before relying on hand position? Demonstrate the critical routine.	Demonstration / Response
18-24 min	Which observation links rebound response to reaction cue, and what remains uncertain? Observe one supervised cycle.	Observation / Invariant
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both stance and body line? Resolve questions and exceptions.	Resolution / Fitness review
27-30 min	What next check on hand position would make the record about difficulty progression 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 close catching 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
Body Line	_____	_____	Which evidence separates body line from rebound response in this case?
Rebound Response	_____	_____	How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance?
Difficulty Progression	_____	_____	What boundary on reaction cue must be checked before relying on hand position?
Stance	_____	_____	Which observation links rebound response to reaction cue, and what remains uncertain?
Reaction Cue	_____	_____	What alternative explanation could account for both stance and body line?
Hand Position	_____	_____	What next check on hand position would make the record about difficulty progression 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 adaptations justified?
- Challenge: could an essential boundary is sacrificed explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about body line?

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	Body Line: the purpose is misunderstood.	Which evidence separates body line from rebound response in this case?	Anchor case
2	Rebound Response: a role has no owner.	How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance?	Challenge condition
3	Difficulty Progression: the demonstration skips a critical step.	What boundary on reaction cue must be checked before relying on hand position?	Response
4	Stance: a stop condition is missed.	Which observation links rebound response to reaction cue, and what remains uncertain?	Invariant
5	Reaction Cue: an exception has no route.	What alternative explanation could account for both stance and body line?	Fitness review
6	Hand Position: follow-up ownership is unclear.	What next check on hand position would make the record about difficulty progression 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	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 / Anchor Cases Recorded	_____	_____	_____
Reaction Cue: Roles Accepted / Conditions Varied	_____	_____	_____
Hand Position: Routines Demonstrated / Responses Observed	_____	_____	_____
Body Line: Cycles Observed / Boundaries Protected	_____	_____	_____
Rebound Response: Exceptions Resolved / Fitness Tests Completed	_____	_____	_____
Difficulty Progression: 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 body line from rebound response 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 body line from rebound response in this case?
- Subject check: How does difficulty progression change the interpretation of stance?
- Format check: I gave the receiving person a clear exception and escalation route.
- Outcome check: I limited the conclusion to the conditions that were actually tested.
- 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-17-09-06. 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.