

作文指导课教案设计的六个常见误区与改法

检查过不少作文指导课教案后，可以发现问题高度集中在六个地方。每个误区都给出表现、后果和改法，改法可以直接替换进自己的教案。

误区一，目标空泛不可测。表现是教学目标写成提高写作能力、培养观察习惯。后果是无法检测，评课时无话可说。改法是把每条目标换成行为动词加数量加时间，例如当堂写出一段一百五十字片段，含一个事例一处细节，十五分钟内完成。

误区二，游戏脱离目标。表现是猜老师游戏选的材料全是外貌搞笑特征，猜得热闹但与写法无关。后果是导入占七八分钟，正文环节被压缩。改法是游戏材料必须使用本课要教的手法，片段里埋入动作神态细节，猜中的依据恰好是细节描写，游戏成为写法的第一个例子。

误区三，范文只读不拆。表现是范文读两遍，问学生好不好、感不感动，学生齐声说好。后果是范文与练笔脱节，学生读完依然写不具体。改法是给范文配两个可执行任务，画事例句、画细节句，再追问这段细节让你看到什么，把注意力从情绪引向写法。

误区四，练笔时间不足。表现是前面环节讲满三十分钟，练笔只剩五六分钟，学生草草两行。后果是当堂写作形同虚设，问题课后才暴露。改法是倒排时间：先锁定练笔十五分钟、点评五分钟，剩余时间再分给导入、范文和提炼，任何环节超时都从范文环节扣。

误区五，板书沦为知识清单。表现是板书罗列好词好句或写作定义。后果是练笔时板书帮不上忙。改法是板书只画方法结构，人物特点居中，事例与细节为两枝，细节分出动作语言神态外貌，让学生写作时抬头可查。

误区六，点评缺少标准。表现是展示习作后教师即兴说好、生动、继续加油。后果是学生不知道好在哪、怎么改。改法是提前公布两条评价标准，有无具体事例、有无一处以上细节，点评时逐条对照，并现场示范修改一处平淡句。

最后附一份教案自查清单，交教案前逐项打勾：目标三条是否都含行为动词；重难点是否分开表述；导入材料是否体现本课手法；范文是否配了拆解任务；练笔是否不少于十二分钟；板书是否为方法结构；点评是否有书面标准。七项全勾，教案才算把课想明白了。

Six Common Mistakes in Designing a Composition Lesson Plan, and How to Fix Them

After reviewing many composition lesson plans, the problems turn out to cluster in six places. Each mistake below comes with its symptom, consequence, and a fix you can paste straight into your own plan.

Mistake one, vague untestable objectives. Symptom: objectives read improve writing ability or cultivate observation. Consequence: nothing can be checked, and lesson reviews go silent. Fix: rewrite each objective as action verb plus quantity plus time, for example write a 150-word passage in class with one example and one

detail, finished within fifteen minutes.

Mistake two, the game detached from the goal. Symptom: the guessing game uses only funny appearance features, lively but unrelated to craft. Consequence: the lead-in eats seven or eight minutes and squeezes the main stages. Fix: the game material must use the very technique being taught; bury action and expression details in the descriptions so that guessing correctly depends on detail writing, making the game the first worked example.

Mistake three, reading the model without taking it apart. Symptom: the model text is read twice and students chorus that it is good and touching. Consequence: the model stays disconnected from the drill; students still write vaguely. Fix: attach two executable tasks, underline the example sentence and the detail sentence, then ask what this detail lets you see, moving attention from emotion to craft.

Mistake four, too little writing time. Symptom: earlier stages run thirty minutes, leaving five minutes for the drill and two hasty lines per student. Consequence: in-class writing becomes a formality and problems surface only after class. Fix: count backwards, lock fifteen minutes for writing and five for feedback first, then split the rest among lead-in, model, and summary; if any stage runs over, cut the model stage.

Mistake five, the board as a knowledge list. Symptom: the board lists good words and phrases or definitions of writing. Consequence: it helps nobody during the drill. Fix: draw only the method structure, trait in the center, example and detail as two branches, detail splitting into action, speech, expression, appearance, so students can look up while writing.

Mistake six, feedback without criteria. Symptom: after sharing, the teacher improvises praise like good, vivid, keep it up. Consequence: students do not know what worked or how to revise. Fix: publish two criteria beforehand, is there a concrete example and at least one detail, evaluate against them line by line, and demonstrate rewriting one flat sentence on the spot.

Finally, a self-check list to tick before submitting the plan: do all three objectives contain action verbs; are key and difficult points stated separately; does the lead-in material embody the taught technique; does the model text come with deconstruction tasks; is the drill at least twelve minutes; is the board a method structure; does feedback have written criteria. Seven ticks mean the plan has truly thought the lesson through.