

写人作文指导课教案怎么写：目标、重难点、过程、板书四要素设计法

写一节作文指导课的教案，最容易犯的错误是把教案写成讲课稿：通段都是教师要说的话，却看不出学生要做什么、学到什么程度。规范的作文指导课教案由四个要素构成：教学目标、重难点、教学过程、板书设计。四个要素各管一件事，环环相扣，缺一环课就会散。

第一个要素是教学目标。目标要用可观察、可检测的行为动词来写，而不是培养能力、提高素养这类空话。以写老师为例，可以写成三条：能说出表现人物特点需要具体事例加细节描写；能从范文中找出至少两处细节描写并说明其作用；能在十五分钟内写出一段一百五十字左右的老师片段，做到有事例、有一处以上动作或神态细节。三条目标分别对应知方法、会赏析、能写作，课后对照作业就能检测，这就是可检测的含义。

第二个要素是重难点。重点一般就是目标的核心，即通过具体事例和细节描写表现人物特点；难点则是学生做不到但本课要够到的地方，比如把概括评价转化为具体画面。学生常写我的老师很负责，却写不出负责长什么样，把评价变成画面正是难点所在。重点难点要分开写，考试检查教案时也看这两项是否区分清楚。

第三个要素是教学过程，这是教案的主体。指导课的过程要排成有梯度的环节链，每个环节写明教师活动、学生活动和预计时间。以四十分钟课时为例：导入环节用猜老师小游戏，教师念三段描写本班某位老师的片段，学生猜是谁，约五分钟，目的是让学生体会描写即特征；范文引路环节选一篇写老师的短文，师生共同找出事例和细节，追问这段细节让你看到了什么，约十二分钟；方法提炼环节把发现归纳成板书要点，约三分钟；当堂片段练笔环节学生写自己的老师，约十五分钟；展示点评环节用评价标准读一到两篇习作，约五分钟；总结延伸布置完整作文，约两分钟。环节之间要写清衔接语，说明为什么下一步接这一步。

第四个要素是板书设计。作文课的板书不是知识清单，而是写作方法的支架。可以用一个简图：中间写人物特点，向两侧引出具体事例和细节描写两个分支，细节分支再分出动作、语言、神态、外貌四个小枝。学生练笔时抬头就能看见这张图，板书真正发挥了支架作用。写教案时把板书用文字加箭头描述出来即可。

最后检查教案的完整性：目标是否可检测、重难点是否分开、环节是否有时间和衔接、板书是否支撑练笔。四项都过关，这份教案才既符合规范，又真的能上好课。

How to Write a Character-Description Composition Lesson Plan: Designing Objectives, Key Points, Process and Board Notes

The most common mistake when writing a composition lesson plan is turning it into a speech script: pages of what the teacher will say, with no sign of what students

will do or how well they must learn. A standard lesson plan has four elements: teaching objectives, key and difficult points, teaching process, and board design. Each element does one job, and they chain together; miss one and the lesson falls apart.

The first element is teaching objectives. Write them with observable, testable action verbs instead of vague phrases like cultivate ability. For a lesson on writing about a teacher, three objectives work: students can state that showing a character trait requires a concrete example plus detail description; students can find at least two details in a model text and explain their effect; students can write a passage of about 150 words about their own teacher within fifteen minutes, with one example and at least one action or expression detail. The three lines cover method, appreciation, and writing, and can be checked against the homework afterwards.

The second element is key and difficult points. The key point is the core of the objectives: showing character traits through concrete examples and details. The difficult point is what students cannot yet do but the lesson reaches for, such as turning a general judgment into a concrete scene. Students often write my teacher is responsible without showing what responsibility looks like; turning judgment into scene is exactly the difficulty. Keep the two points separate, since reviewers check whether they are distinguished.

The third element is the teaching process, the body of the plan. Arrange it as a stepped chain of stages, each with teacher activity, student activity, and estimated time. In a forty-minute lesson: a five-minute guessing game where the teacher reads three descriptions of one local teacher and students guess who it is, proving that description is feature; a twelve-minute model-text stage where class finds examples and details in a short essay and asks what the detail lets you see; a three-minute method summary written on the board; a fifteen-minute in-class writing drill; a five-minute sharing and feedback stage using the rubric; and a two-minute wrap-up assigning the full essay. Write the transition lines between stages so the sequence makes sense.

The fourth element is board design. In a composition lesson the board is a writing scaffold, not a knowledge list. Draw a simple map: character trait in the center, branching into concrete example and detail description, with the detail branch splitting into action, speech, expression, and appearance. Students can look up at this map while writing, so the board truly supports them. In the plan, describe it in words with arrows.

Finally check completeness: are objectives testable, are key and difficult points separated, do stages carry time and transitions, does the board support the drill. If all four pass, the plan is both standard and genuinely teachable.

《我的老师》作文指导课教案范文：八百字完整教案与逐段点评

以下是一份适用于小学五年级、课时四十分钟的《我的老师》作文指导课教案，每个环节后附一段点评，说明设计意图，教师可对照修改用于自己的班级。

教学目标：一、能说出表现人物特点需要具体事例和细节描写。二、能从范文中找出两处细节描写并说出其作用。三、当堂写出一段描写老师的片段，一百五十字左右，包含一个事例和一处动作或神态细节。点评：三条目标分别用说出、找出、写出开头，全部可当堂检测，没有一条是空话，这是教案合格的第一关。

重点：用具体事例加细节描写表现人物特点。难点：把概括评价转化为具体画面。点评：重点与目标一致，难点抓住了学生写不具体的真实症结，两者分开表述，符合规范。

环节一，导入，猜老师游戏，约五分钟。教师提前写三段描写本班语文老师的片段，只念片段不点名，学生猜是谁；猜中后追问你是从哪句话猜出来的。点评：游戏不是热闹，猜中的依据就是特征描写，学生自己悟出写人要抓特点，导入与写作目标直接挂钩，这才是环节设计的正确逻辑。

环节二，范文引路，约十二分钟。出示短文《王老师的粉笔灰》，短文写王老师上课总爱用袖子擦黑板、粉笔灰落在袖口也不在意一件事。学生默读后完成两个任务：用横线画出写事例的句子，用波浪线画出细节描写的句子；同桌互说这段细节让你看到了一位怎样的老师。教师板书学生找到的关键词。点评：范文只写一件事，避免事例堆砌；画线和互说让每个都参与，追问让你看到怎样的老师把阅读指向写法，不是泛泛谈感动。

环节三，方法提炼，约三分钟。师生共同把发现归纳为：先想特点，再选事例，最后放慢镜头写动作神态。点评：三分钟把感性发现变成可操作口诀，为练笔搭桥，这一步常被省略，省略后学生练笔质量明显下降。

环节四，当堂片段练笔，约十五分钟。要求写一位老师的一个瞬间，一百五十字左右，写完自查有无事例、有无一处细节。点评：十五分钟是当堂写作的底线时间，低于十二分钟多数学生写不完；自查表把评价标准前置，减轻后续点评负担。

环节五，展示点评，约五分钟。投影一到两篇习作，全班按有无事例、有无细节两条标准评，教师示范改一处平淡句。点评：用标准评而不是说好，学生学会用尺子量文章；示范改一处比泛评十处更有效。

环节六，总结，约两分钟。布置完整作文《我的老师》，要求写两到三个事例。板书设计：中间写人物特点，左分支具体事例，右分支细节描写，细节下分动作、语言、神态、外貌。点评：板书即方法地图，练笔时学生抬头可见，作业要求与课堂目标形成梯度衔接。

A Complete 800-Word Lesson Plan for Writing About My Teacher, with Paragraph-by-Paragraph Commentary

Below is a complete lesson plan for a fifth-grade, forty-minute composition lesson on writing about a teacher. Each stage is followed by a short commentary explaining the design intent, so teachers can adapt it to their own classes.

Objectives: one, students can state that showing a character trait needs a concrete example plus detail description; two, students can find two details in the model text and explain their effect; three, students write a passage of about 150 words about a teacher, containing one example and one action or expression detail. Commentary: the three objectives begin with state, find, and write, all testable in class, none vague, which is the first pass a plan must clear.

Key point: showing traits through examples plus details. Difficult point: turning a general judgment into a concrete scene. Commentary: the key point matches the objectives, and the difficult point hits the real reason writing stays vague; stating them separately meets the standard.

Stage one, lead-in, a guessing game, about five minutes. The teacher reads three descriptions of the class Chinese teacher without naming her; students guess who, and the teacher asks which sentence gave it away. Commentary: the game is not for noise; the guess works because the description captures features, so students discover that writing people means catching features. The lead-in connects directly to the writing goal, which is the right logic for stage design.

Stage two, model text, about twelve minutes. The short essay Teacher Wang's Chalk Dust tells one event: Teacher Wang wipes the blackboard with her sleeve and never minds the dust on her cuff. Students underline the example sentence, wave-line the detail sentence, then tell a partner what kind of teacher the detail shows. The teacher writes found keywords on the board. Commentary: one event in the model avoids piling up examples; underlining and pair talk involve everyone; asking what teacher you see points reading toward craft instead of vague sentiment.

Stage three, method summary, about three minutes. Class condenses findings into: first pick the trait, then choose the example, then slow the camera to write actions and expressions. Commentary: three minutes turn intuition into an operable formula and bridge into writing; this step is often skipped, and skipping it visibly lowers drill quality.

Stage four, in-class writing drill, about fifteen minutes. Students write one moment of a teacher, about 150 words, then self-check for an example and a detail. Commentary: fifteen minutes is the floor for in-class writing; under twelve minutes

most students cannot finish; the self-check list front-loads the rubric and lightens later feedback.

Stage five, sharing and feedback, about five minutes. Project one or two drafts; the class evaluates against two criteria, example and detail; the teacher demonstrates rewriting one flat sentence. Commentary: judging by criteria instead of saying it is good teaches students to measure writing; one demonstrated rewrite beats ten general comments.

Stage six, wrap-up, about two minutes. Assign the full essay My Teacher with two or three examples. Board design: character trait in the center, left branch concrete example, right branch detail description, with detail splitting into action, speech, expression, appearance. Commentary: the board is the method map, visible while students write, and the homework requirement extends the class goal in steps.

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.