

Close Catching Team Communication Guide - Communicate as a Team

Close Catching | Communicate as a Team | Asset ID CRIC-17-09-07

Purpose: This original printable team communication guide helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with close catching while pursuing one defined outcome: make calls and feedback short, early and respectful. 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	_____

Continuity Starting Brief

- Mark: Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Mark a checkpoint that another person can recognise.
- Preserve: How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Preserve the context needed to interpret later work.
- Advance: What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Advance one bounded segment toward the outcome.
- Log: Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Log interruption, error or uncertainty when it occurs.
- Resume: What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Resume from evidence rather than memory alone.
- Edition success means: finish a session with fewer avoidable misunderstandings

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 communicate as a team, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Mark Rebound Response	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case?	Checkpoint / date	Open / checked
Preserve Difficulty Progression	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?	Context record / date	Open / checked
Advance Stance	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?	Completed segment / date	Open / checked
Log Reaction Cue	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?	Continuity note / date	Open / checked
Resume Hand Position	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?	Restart point / date	Open / checked
Verify Body Line	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful?	Chain review / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to close catching, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: agree roles and words before the drill
- Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: the final chain contains a gap.
- 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-17-09-07 pairs team communication guide with the outcome 'Communicate as a Team'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Facilitation and Handover x Continuity Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a facilitation and handover method with a continuity 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 communicate as a team. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Brief / Mark reaction cue	Which evidence separates rebound response from difficulty progression in this case? Mark a checkpoint that another person can recognise.	Brief / Checkpoint
2	Assign / Preserve hand position	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Preserve the context needed to interpret later work.	Roles / Context record
3	Demonstrate / Advance body line	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Advance one bounded segment toward the outcome.	Demonstration / Completed segment
4	Monitor / Log rebound response	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Log interruption, error or uncertainty when it occurs.	Observation / Continuity note
5	Resolve / Resume difficulty progression	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Resume from evidence rather than memory alone.	Resolution / Restart point
6	Handover / Verify stance	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful? Verify that the chain remains complete and understandable.	Handover / Chain review

Common Failure Modes

- For reaction cue, watch for the purpose is misunderstood together with the checkpoint is vague.
- For hand position, watch for a role has no owner together with context is lost.
- For body line, watch for the demonstration skips a critical step together with the segment has no completion rule.
- For rebound response, watch for a stop condition is missed together with an interruption goes unrecorded.
- For difficulty progression, watch for an exception has no route together with work resumes from a guess.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome question: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block:

Cricket Practice Plan for Communicate as a Team

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs facilitation and handover with continuity to pursue this objective: make calls and feedback short, early and respectful. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Communicate as a Team
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Continuity note	agree roles and words before the drill
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 / Checkpoint
5-10 min	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue? Assign roles and communication routes.	Roles / Context record
10-18 min	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line? Demonstrate the critical routine.	Demonstration / Completed segment
18-24 min	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain? Observe one supervised cycle.	Observation / Continuity note
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response? Resolve questions and exceptions.	Resolution / Restart point
27-30 min	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful? Confirm ownership and follow-up.	Handover / Chain review

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 - Continuity Lens

This comparison tests close catching against communicate as a team through two independent questions. Format: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing? 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	Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?
Acceptance lens	finish a session with fewer avoidable misunderstandings
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Facilitation and Handover Confidence Check

- Checkpoint: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates roles accepted?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates chains verified?
- Challenge: could an interruption goes unrecorded explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about rebound response?

Facilitation and Handover x Continuity Scenario Cards

Use these paired scenarios to rehearse judgement for communicate as a team. 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?	Checkpoint
2	Difficulty Progression: the demonstration skips a critical step.	How does stance change the interpretation of reaction cue?	Context record
3	Stance: a stop condition is missed.	What boundary on hand position must be checked before relying on body line?	Completed segment
4	Reaction Cue: an exception has no route.	Which observation links difficulty progression to hand position, and what remains uncertain?	Continuity note
5	Hand Position: follow-up ownership is unclear.	What alternative explanation could account for both reaction cue and rebound response?	Restart point
6	Body Line: the purpose is misunderstood.	What next check on body line would make the record about stance more useful?	Chain review

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Facilitation and Handover and Continuity Evidence Tracker

Track communicate as a team across eight practice blocks using the facilitation and handover method and the continuity outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing?

#	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 / Checkpoints Marked	_____	_____	_____
Reaction Cue: Roles Accepted / Contexts Preserved	_____	_____	_____
Hand Position: Routines Demonstrated / Segments Completed	_____	_____	_____
Body Line: Cycles Observed / Interruptions Logged	_____	_____	_____
Rebound Response: Exceptions Resolved / Restarts Evidenced	_____	_____	_____
Difficulty Progression: Handovers Confirmed / Chains Verified	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I left a checkpoint that is meaningful without relying on memory.
- I preserved interruptions and unresolved gaps as part of the record.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for communicate as a team improves without hiding an interruption goes unrecorded.
- 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 Continuity 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 communicate as a team; the outcome test is: Could another person reconstruct the sequence and continue without guessing? The close-out standard remains: finish a session with fewer avoidable misunderstandings.

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 preserved interruptions and unresolved gaps as part of the record.
- 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-17-09-07. 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.