

研讨发言摘编：六个老师的观点为什么针锋相对

这次研讨最有价值的部分是吵起来了。摘编六段发言，按争议整理。

争议一：先解决没得写，还是先解决不会写。张老师主张观察先行：学生写不出真情，根子上是脑子里没有老师的形象，他现场让三位老师说出自己班主任的一个习惯动作，三位都想了十几秒，何况学生。陈老师主张表达先行：她上学期做过对照，同班两组学生，一组先练两周拆事，一组照常，期末写人作文两组素材差不多，但练过拆事的组段落平均多一百四十个字。她的结论是材料人人有，加工能力才拉开差距。两边没说服对方，组长把问题带进决议：观察和拆事同时启动，两周后用学生作文验证。

争议二：真情实感能不能量化。王老师提议把评分表里的感情分换成三个可查指标，真实经历、原话引用、独有细节。赵老师当场反对：可查指标会催生新的假，学生会编一件假事、塞一句假原话，指标全绿但文章还是死的。王老师回应：指标防不住造假，但素材本每天一条、有日期、要家长签字，造假成本比临时编一篇作文高。赵老师仍保留意见，记录里如实写了保留意见四个字。

争议三：统一评价表会不会把教学教死。年轻教师孙老师担心各组用同一张表，教学会趋同。组长回应：表只管评，不管怎么教，教法各年级自己定；而且表每月改一次，谁发现指标失灵，下次教研就提修改案。孙老师接受，但要求每次修改留名，方便追溯，这条写进了决议附注。

会后复盘，组长说了一句实在话：教研记录如果只记共识，下次开会没人再发言。这次把分歧原样记下来，两周后的二次教研才有真正的议题。没解决的问题也列了出来：素材本检查由谁做、家长签字是否必要、拆事练习占不占阅读课时间，三条都挂在下次会议议程上。

Highlights From the Discussion: Why Six Teachers Clashed Head-On

The most valuable part of this session was that people argued. Six remarks are excerpted below, organized by dispute.

Dispute one: fix having nothing to write, or fix not knowing how to write. Teacher Zhang argued observation first: students lack genuine feeling because they hold no image of the teacher in mind. On the spot he asked three teachers to name one habitual action of their own homeroom teacher, and all three hesitated for over ten seconds, let alone students. Teacher Chen argued expression first: last term she ran a comparison in one class, one group drilling event-breaking for two weeks and the other as usual; by the final character essay the two groups had similar material, but the trained group wrote paragraphs averaging one hundred forty characters more. Her conclusion: material is available to everyone; processing skill creates the gap. Neither side convinced the other, and the leader carried the question into the resolution: start observation and event-breaking together, and verify with student

essays in two weeks.

Dispute two: can genuine feeling be quantified. Teacher Wang proposed replacing the feeling score with three checkable indicators: a real experienced event, direct speech quoted, and details unique to the person. Teacher Zhao objected on the spot: checkable indicators breed new fakes; students will invent a false event and stuff in a false quote, all indicators green but the essay still dead. Wang replied: indicators cannot stop fabrication, but a material book with one dated entry a day and a parent signature costs more to fake than a single invented essay. Zhao kept his objection, and the record faithfully wrote the words kept his objection.

Dispute three: will a unified rubric kill teaching variety. Junior teacher Sun worried that one shared form across grades would homogenize teaching. The leader answered: the form governs assessment only, not instruction; methods stay with each grade, and the form is revised monthly, anyone finding an indicator broken raises a amendment at the next session. Sun accepted but required amendments to carry the proposer's name for traceability, and this went into the resolution's footnote.

At the debrief the leader said something honest: if research records only note consensus, nobody speaks at the next meeting. Recording the disagreements as they were gives the follow-up session real agenda items. Unresolved questions were listed too: who checks the material books, whether parent signatures are necessary, and whether event-breaking drills take reading class time. All three sit on the next agenda.