

作文讲评课教案：《把老师写具体》四步教学流程

教学目标定三条：一是找出自己习作里写老师空洞的句子，明白空洞在哪里；二是学会用一件事加两三个细节把老师写具体；三是完成一段当堂修改，改后能读给同桌听。重点放在第二目标，难点是细节选得准不准。

课前准备两篇材料。病文假设这样开头：我的老师很好，她上课认真，关心同学，我很喜欢她。全文都是这类句子，没有一件具体的事。范文写同一位老师：她讲《草虫的村落》时把课文里的蝈蝈声放了两遍，第一遍让我们闭眼听，第二遍让我们睁眼记句子，放完她转身在黑板上写下三个词语，粉笔灰落在袖口上也没管。两篇都打印给学生，人手一份。

环节一，对比讲评，十五分钟。先让学生默读两篇，再抛三个问题：读了病文，你脑子里出现了老师的什么样子？读了范文呢？两篇差在哪里？学生答后板书结论：病文只有评价，范文有动作、有声音、有画面。接着给范文标出三处细节，告诉学生这就是把老师写具体的办法：选一件真实发生的事，把老师当时做了什么、说了什么、样子如何写出来。

环节二，学生互评，十分钟。同桌交换自己的作文，用三个符号批改：在空洞的评价句下面画横线，在有细节的地方画波浪线，在没细节又该有细节的地方画问号。互评要求每人至少找出对方三处画横线的句子，并口头说一处怎么改。

环节三，当堂修改，十二分钟。每人挑出自己作文里画横线的一处，按三步改：先想这件事不真实，再补老师的一个动作或一句话，最后补一个样子或声音的细节。改完读给同桌听，同桌对照评价表打分：事情具体得两星，细节有两处以上再得两星，语句通顺得一星。

作业设计分三层。基础层：把当堂没改完的另外两处空洞句改好，誊抄在作文本上。提高层：观察任课老师一节课，记下三个细节，第二天交流。拓展层：把修改后的段落扩成完整短文，题目自拟。

板书只写四行：空洞的句子、一件真实的事、两三个细节、改后读给同桌。下课前对照板书请学生复述修改步骤，检验目标是否达成。

Lesson Plan for an Essay Review Class: Four Steps to Make the Teacher Portrait Specific

Set three teaching objectives: first, students find the empty sentences about their teacher in their own drafts and understand why they are empty; second, they learn to make the portrait specific with one real event plus two or three details; third, they finish an in-class revision and read it to their deskmate. The key point is the second objective; the difficulty is choosing details accurately.

Prepare two texts before class. The flawed sample begins like this: my teacher is very good, she teaches carefully, she cares about students, and I like her. The whole text is full of such sentences without one concrete event. The model text describes

the same teacher: while teaching a lesson about a village of insects, she played the sound of a katydid twice, asking students to listen with eyes closed the first time and to note sentences with eyes open the second time; after the recording she turned and wrote three phrases on the blackboard, ignoring the chalk dust falling on her sleeve. Print both texts for every student.

Step one, comparative review, fifteen minutes. Students read both texts silently, then answer three questions: after the flawed text, what image of the teacher appears in your mind, and after the model text? What is the difference? Then write the conclusion on the board: the flawed text only gives judgments, while the model text has actions, sounds, and pictures. Mark three details in the model text and tell students this is the method: choose one event that really happened, and write what the teacher did, said, and looked like at that moment.

Step two, peer review, ten minutes. Deskmates exchange essays and mark with three symbols: a line under empty judgment sentences, a wave line under places with details, and a question mark where details should be but are missing. Each student must find at least three lined sentences in the partner's essay and suggest one improvement orally.

Step three, in-class revision, twelve minutes. Each student picks one lined sentence and revises in three moves: check whether the event is real, add one action or one sentence of the teacher, then add one detail of appearance or sound. Read the revision to the deskmate, who scores it with the rubric: two stars for a concrete event, two more for at least two details, one for smooth sentences.

Design homework in three tiers. Basic: revise the other two empty sentences and copy them into the exercise book. Advanced: observe a subject teacher for one class period, note three details, and share them the next day. Extension: expand the revised paragraph into a full short essay with a self-chosen title.

The board writing keeps only four lines: empty sentences, one real event, two or three details, read the revision to your deskmate. Before the bell, ask students to retell the revision steps against the board to check whether the objectives were met.