

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.

讲评课素材包：病文范文对比与互评量表怎么用

病文选段假设这样写：我的老师对工作很负责，对同学很关心，像妈妈一样。她讲课非常好，我们都爱听。有一次我生病了，她很关心我。我感谢我的老师。这段一百多字，评价词占了大半，唯一的事没有过程。

范文选段写同一件事：那天第三节课我趴在桌上，李老师摸了一下我的额头，没说话，领我去办公室，从包里翻出一板感冒冲剂，冲开放在我手边，又给我妈妈打电话，电话里只说三件事：孩子发烧、我先在办公室休息、放学她送我去医院。挂了电话她才回教室继续上课，出门前回头说了句：作业我帮你记在黑板侧边了。

批注符号约定三条，印在讲义页眉：横线画在只有评价没有事实的句子；波浪线画在写了动作、语言、样子的句子上；问号画在读者想知道却没写的地方，比如生病那段的后来呢。符号不超过三个，多了学生记不住。

对比提问链接顺序问四步。第一步问画面：读病文时你能看见老师的哪个动作？读范文呢？第二步问数量：范文里老师说了几句话、做了几个动作，数一数。第三步问位置：范文哪一句删掉后事情就不完整了？第四步问迁移：你作文里哪一句可以换成一件这样的事？每个问题给三十秒安静思考，再点名两三人回答。

互评量表四个维度，每项五星。事情真不真：是不是写了自己真正经历过的事。过程全不全：事情的开始、经过、结果能不能读出来。细节够不够：动作、语言、样子、声音至少两处。有没有空话：画横线的句子多不多。互评时先打星，再在量表背面写一句话建议，建议必须指向某一处具体的句子，不能写多写点细节这类笼统话。

量表和选段都做成A4一页，正面选段加符号说明，背面量表。一节课用这一页材料，避免学生翻来翻去找东西。范文里打电话只说三件事这个细节要保留，它示范了人物语言怎么写才像真人：短、直接、带具体信息。

A Material Pack for the Review Class: Flawed vs Model Texts and the Peer Review Form

Assume the flawed sample reads like this: my teacher is responsible about work and caring to students, just like a mother. Her classes are wonderful and we all love listening. Once I was ill and she cared about me a lot. I am grateful to my teacher. In this passage of a hundred-plus characters, judgment words take up most of it, and the only event has no process.

The model passage writes the same event: during the third period I lay on the desk, and Teacher Li touched my forehead, said nothing, led me to the office, took a strip of cold medicine granules out of her bag, mixed one with hot water beside my hand, then called my mother, saying only three things in the call: the boy has a fever, he is resting in the office first, and she will take him to the hospital after school. Only after hanging up did she return to class, and before leaving she turned back and said: I have written your homework on the side of the blackboard.

Agree on three annotation symbols and print them in the header of the handout: a straight line under sentences that are only judgment without facts; a wave line under

sentences with actions, speech, or appearance; a question mark where the reader wants to know more but the writer skipped it, such as what happened next in the illness part. Keep the symbols to three, or students cannot remember them.

Ask the comparison questions in a chain of four steps. First ask about pictures: which action of the teacher can you see in the flawed text, and in the model text? Second ask about numbers: count how many sentences the teacher speaks and how many actions she does in the model. Third ask about position: which sentence in the model, if deleted, makes the event incomplete? Fourth ask about transfer: which sentence in your essay could be replaced by one event like this? Give thirty seconds of quiet thinking for each question, then call on two or three students.

The peer review form has four dimensions, five stars each. Is the event real: did the writer describe something that truly happened to them? Is the process complete: can you read the beginning, course, and result? Are details enough: at least two of action, speech, appearance, or sound. Any empty words: how many lined sentences are there? When reviewing, give stars first, then write one suggestion on the back, and the suggestion must point to one specific sentence, never vague advice like add more details.

Print the form and the passages on one A4 page: passages plus symbol notes on the front, the form on the back. One page serves the whole lesson so students do not search around. Keep the detail that the phone call contains only three items; it shows how character speech sounds real: short, direct, and full of concrete information.

讲评课最容易失手的五个地方

第一个失误是范文太完美。范文如果写得像发表过的散文，学生读完只剩佩服，学不来。纠正办法是控制范文难度：只用一件小事，细节不超过三处，句子保持小学生口吻。范文的作用是示范一步，不是展示天花板。

第二个失误是病文太夸张。有的老师把病文写成通篇假话大空话，学生一眼看出是编的，讲评就失去针对性。真实的病文长这样：事情是真的，但写得太粗，比如我帮老师擦黑板，老师表扬了我，后面没了。让学生认得出这就是自己的写法，对比才有痛感。

第三个失误是互评只打星不指句。学生拿着量表五分钟打完星就聊天。纠正办法是把任务写死在量表上：必须抄出对方一句画横线的原句，并在旁边写出改法的前半句，比如这句可以接着写老师当时手里拿着什么。任务具体，互评才不空转。

第四个失误是修改只改字词。学生把很好改成非常优秀，就算完成修改，内容还是空的。纠

正办法是规定修改动作：每处修改必须增加至少一句话，这句话里必须有老师的动作或原话。只许增不许换，改完数一数段落字数有没有变多，字数没变多半是没改到点上。

第五个失误是讲评变成教师独白。教师对着投影逐句分析范文二十分钟，学生记笔记。检验办法很简单：下课前随机请五名学生说出一处自己改掉的句子和怎么改的，说不出来两个以上，说明课上教师讲多了。把分析时间压到十五分钟以内，省下的时间全部给学生互评和修改。

还有一条隐性失误：教案写得很全，课堂时间却不够用。四十五分钟的课，教师讲解合计不要超过二十分钟，三个环节各留足操作时间，宁可环节少一个，也不要每个环节都赶。讲评课的产出在学生手里，不在教案纸上。

Five Places Where This Review Class Most Often Goes Wrong

The first mistake is a model text that is too perfect. If the model reads like a published essay, students can only admire it and cannot imitate it. The fix is to control its difficulty: use one small event, keep details to no more than three, and keep sentences at an elementary school voice. A model text should demonstrate one step, not display a ceiling.

The second mistake is a flawed text that is too exaggerated. Some teachers write the flawed text as pure empty slogans, and students see at once it is fake, so the review loses its point. A real flawed text looks like this: the event is true but written too roughly, for example I helped the teacher wipe the blackboard and she praised me, then nothing more. Students must recognize it as their own writing, or the comparison causes no reaction.

The third mistake is peer review that only gives stars without pointing to sentences. Students finish the form in five minutes and then chat. The fix is to pin the task on the form: they must copy one lined sentence from the partner and write the first half of a fix beside it, such as this sentence could continue with what the teacher was holding at that moment. When the task is concrete, peer review works.

The fourth mistake is revising only words. A student changes very good to extremely excellent and calls it done, while the content stays empty. The fix is to define the revision action: each revision must add at least one sentence, and that sentence must contain an action or the original words of the teacher. Adding is allowed, swapping is not. After revising, count whether the paragraph grew; if the word count did not change, the revision probably missed the point.

The fifth mistake is the review class turning into a teacher monologue. The teacher analyzes the model sentence by sentence for twenty minutes while students

take notes. The test is simple: before the bell, randomly ask five students to say one sentence they changed and how; if more than two cannot, the teacher talked too much. Keep analysis under fifteen minutes and give all saved time to peer review and revision.

There is also a hidden mistake: the lesson plan looks complete but class time runs out. In a forty-five minute lesson, total teacher talk should stay under twenty minutes, and each of the three steps needs enough working time. Better to drop one step than to rush every step. The output of a review class is in students' hands, not on the lesson plan paper.