

Close Catching Team Communication Guide - Review Performance

Close Catching | Review Performance | Asset ID CRIC-17-09-10

Purpose: This original printable team communication guide helps players, coaches, clubs, schools and families work with close catching while pursuing one defined outcome: convert notes and results into one practical next step. 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	_____

Learning and Adaptation Starting Brief

- Gather: Which evidence separates reaction cue from hand position in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly.
- Align: How does body line change the interpretation of rebound response? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison.
- Detect: What boundary on difficulty progression must be checked before relying on stance? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point.
- Explain: Which observation links hand position to difficulty progression, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence.
- Prioritise: What alternative explanation could account for both rebound response and reaction cue? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value.
- Edition success means: choose a small next target supported by the session record

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 review performance, so each entry should show what was noticed, what was tried and what changed.

Working step	What to record	Evidence or source	Status
Gather Reaction Cue	Which evidence separates reaction cue from hand position in this case?	Review set / date	Open / checked
Align Hand Position	How does body line change the interpretation of rebound response?	Comparable record / date	Open / checked
Detect Body Line	What boundary on difficulty progression must be checked before relying on stance?	Learning pattern / date	Open / checked
Explain Rebound Response	Which observation links hand position to difficulty progression, and what remains uncertain?	Bounded explanation / date	Open / checked
Prioritise Difficulty Progression	What alternative explanation could account for both rebound response and reaction cue?	Next priority / date	Open / checked
Schedule Stance	What next check on stance would make the record about body line more useful?	Review date / date	Open / checked

Completion Standard

- Keep the work tied to close catching, not to a vague general intention.
- Apply this adjustment: separate context, execution and outcome
- Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
- Expose this outcome risk if it appears: the next review has no date or owner.
- 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-17-09-10 pairs team communication guide with the outcome 'Review Performance'. That pairing is the boundary for this workbook: material that does not help that outcome belongs in a separate record.

Facilitation and Handover x Learning and Adaptation Focused Practice Lab

This lab pairs a facilitation and handover method with a learning and adaptation 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 review performance. Preserve any gap that prevents a supported conclusion.

#	Action	Constraint	Record
1	Brief / Gather rebound response	Which evidence separates reaction cue from hand position in this case? Gather enough records to review the work fairly.	Brief / Review set
2	Assign / Align difficulty progression	How does body line change the interpretation of rebound response? Align dates, conditions and measures before comparison.	Roles / Comparable record
3	Demonstrate / Detect stance	What boundary on difficulty progression must be checked before relying on stance? Detect a repeated strength, gap or turning point.	Demonstration / Learning pattern
4	Monitor / Explain reaction cue	Which observation links hand position to difficulty progression, and what remains uncertain? Explain the pattern without hiding contradictory evidence.	Observation / Bounded explanation
5	Resolve / Prioritise hand position	What alternative explanation could account for both rebound response and reaction cue? Prioritise one adjustment with the highest useful value.	Resolution / Next priority
6	Handover / Schedule body line	What next check on stance would make the record about body line more useful? Schedule the next check and preserve the review trail.	Handover / Review date

Common Failure Modes

- For rebound response, watch for the purpose is misunderstood together with the review set is selective.
- For difficulty progression, watch for a role has no owner together with unlike records are compared.
- For stance, watch for the demonstration skips a critical step together with noise is mistaken for a pattern.
- For reaction cue, watch for a stop condition is missed together with contradictory evidence is omitted.
- For hand position, watch for an exception has no route together with too many adjustments are prioritised.

Independent Review Question

Format question: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome question: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? Ask a qualified coach, safeguarding lead or health professional where appropriate, then answer before the next practice block:

Cricket Practice Plan for Review Performance

Use one defined practice block to test the outcome rather than attempting every possible task. This edition pairs facilitation and handover with learning and adaptation to pursue this objective: convert notes and results into one practical next step. Preserve the starting condition and both evidence trails.

Plan field	Entry
Purpose	Review Performance
Starting condition	_____
Chosen working area	_____
Bounded explanation	separate context, execution and outcome
Evidence to capture	_____
Stop or review condition	_____

Thirty Minute Practice Shape

Stage	Action	Evidence
0-5 min	Which evidence separates reaction cue from hand position in this case? Brief the purpose, limits and stop conditions.	Brief / Review set
5-10 min	How does body line change the interpretation of rebound response? Assign roles and communication routes.	Roles / Comparable record
10-18 min	What boundary on difficulty progression must be checked before relying on stance? Demonstrate the critical routine.	Demonstration / Learning pattern
18-24 min	Which observation links hand position to difficulty progression, and what remains uncertain? Observe one supervised cycle.	Observation / Bounded explanation
24-27 min	What alternative explanation could account for both rebound response and reaction cue? Resolve questions and exceptions.	Resolution / Next priority
27-30 min	What next check on stance would make the record about body line more useful? Confirm ownership and follow-up.	Handover / Review date

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 - Learning and Adaptation Lens

This comparison tests close catching against review performance through two independent questions. Format: Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions? Outcome: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? Record material setting differences instead of averaging them away.

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

Format Decision Test

Field	Record
Review question	Can the receiving person explain and perform the critical routine without hidden assumptions?
Outcome question	Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
Acceptance lens	choose a small next target supported by the session record
Conditions held steady	_____
Evidence supporting the choice	_____
Evidence against the choice	_____

Facilitation and Handover Confidence Check

- Review set: what was actually seen, heard, measured or read?
- Format evidence: which record best demonstrates exceptions resolved?
- Outcome evidence: which record best demonstrates reviews scheduled?
- Challenge: could contradictory evidence is omitted explain the result?
- Subject boundary: what does this comparison leave unresolved about reaction cue?

Facilitation and Handover x Learning and Adaptation Scenario Cards

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

Decision Record

Field	Notes
Chosen format scenario	_____
Outcome lens	Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?
Evidence available	_____
Evidence missing	_____
Controlled next step	_____
Person / review date	_____

Eight Facilitation and Handover and Learning and Adaptation Evidence Tracker

Track review performance across eight practice blocks using the facilitation and handover method and the learning and adaptation outcome lens. Keep conditions visible and use this review question: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record?

#	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 / Records Gathered	_____	_____	_____
Reaction Cue: Roles Accepted / Conditions Aligned	_____	_____	_____
Hand Position: Routines Demonstrated / Patterns Detected	_____	_____	_____
Body Line: Cycles Observed / Explanations Qualified	_____	_____	_____
Rebound Response: Exceptions Resolved / Adjustments Prioritised	_____	_____	_____
Difficulty Progression: Handovers Confirmed / Reviews Scheduled	_____	_____	_____

Interpret the Trend

- I included evidence that challenged the most convenient explanation.
- I selected one next adjustment and scheduled when it will be reviewed.
- Keep the method only when the evidence for review performance improves without hiding contradictory evidence is omitted.
- What alternative explanation could account for both rebound response and 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 Learning and Adaptation 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 review performance; the outcome test is: Which single adjustment is best supported by the complete review record? The close-out standard remains: choose a small next target supported by the session record.

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 reaction cue from hand position in this case?
- Subject check: How does body line change the interpretation of rebound response?
- Format check: I gave the receiving person a clear exception and escalation route.
- Outcome check: I selected one next adjustment and scheduled when it will be reviewed.
- 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-17-09-10. 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.