

讲评课的六个常见失误与补救清单

讲评课的失误大多不是知识问题，而是课堂组织问题。下面六条按发生频率排列，每条附补救做法，课前对照教案自查一遍。

失误一：课上成念分数课。老师开场念这次作文平均分、最高分，再念几个好词好句，一节课就过去一半。分数和好句不能代替指导，学生听完只知道别人写得好，不知道自己下一篇怎么改。补救：开场不超过两分钟，直接进病文对比环节，分数单独写在成绩册里，不在课上念。

失误二：用批语代替指导。老师把批改时写的批语念一遍，这个开头太空、这里详略不当，术语齐全，学生低头抄批语。批语是结果，不是过程。补救：把批语翻译成学生能执行的动作，详略不当改成最难忘的那一刻至少写四个动作，空改成开头三句里必须出现一个具体画面。

失误三：只评写得好的学生。讲评课全程围绕三篇优秀作文展开，其余学生当观众。写流水账的学生最需要讲评课，却整节课没被提到。补救：病文对比环节用的就是中等偏下学生的片段，互评环节保证每人拿到一条建议，优秀作文只在结尾展示三十秒。

失误四：修改留到课后。课上只讲不改，布置回去修改，结果交上来的二稿和一稿几乎一样，因为学生忘了课上讲的方法。补救：当堂修改至少留十分钟，且修改范围限定在一段，一段改透比全篇过一遍有效得多。

失误五：病文选得一无是处。有的老师挑的病文错字连篇、语句不通，全班花二十分钟改错别字，与写具体的目标无关。补救：病文必须选内容通顺但写得平的片段，毛病集中在平均用力、缺细节上，这样的病文才对症。

失误六：互评流于形式。给同桌画个五角星、写句加油，两分钟结束。补救：互评发任务条，只写两个任务，找到最难忘一刻画线、在横线后写一条落到动作上的建议；老师巡视时收走空建议当场示范改写。互评质量取决于任务是否具体，不取决于时间长短。

自查顺序建议：先看教案里当堂修改有没有保住十分钟，再看病文是不是通顺但平淡，最后看互评有没有任务条。这三条立住，讲评课的方向就不会偏。

Six Common Mistakes in Review Lessons and a Recovery Checklist

Most mistakes in review lessons are not knowledge problems but classroom organization problems. The six below are ordered by how often they happen, each with a recovery move; check them against your plan before class.

Mistake one: the lesson becomes a scores reading. The teacher opens with the average score, the top score, and a few good sentences, and half the period is gone. Scores and good sentences cannot replace instruction; students leave knowing others wrote well but not how to fix their own next piece. Recovery: keep the opening under two minutes and go straight into the contrast segment; scores stay in the grade book,

not on the tongue.

Mistake two: reading margin comments instead of teaching. The teacher reads aloud what was written during marking, this opening is too vague, the detail balance is off, all jargon, while students copy comments. Comments are results, not process. Recovery: translate each comment into an executable action; unbalanced detail becomes at least four actions in the most unforgettable moment, vague becomes a concrete picture within the first three sentences.

Mistake three: only reviewing strong writers. The whole lesson revolves around three excellent drafts while the rest watch. Students who write running accounts need the review lesson most yet are never mentioned. Recovery: the contrast segment uses excerpts from mid-to-lower drafts, peer review guarantees every student receives one suggestion, and excellent drafts get only thirty seconds at the end.

Mistake four: leaving revision as homework. The lesson only talks, revision goes home, and the second drafts come back nearly identical because students forgot the method. Recovery: protect at least ten minutes of in-class revision, limited to one paragraph; one paragraph done thoroughly beats a pass over the whole piece.

Mistake five: choosing a hopeless weak text. Some teachers pick excerpts full of misspellings and broken sentences, and the class spends twenty minutes fixing typos, unrelated to writing in detail. Recovery: the weak text must be fluent but flat, with flaws concentrated in even effort and missing detail, so the diagnosis matches the treatment.

Mistake six: peer review as ritual. Deskmates draw a star, write keep it up, and finish in two minutes. Recovery: hand out task slips with exactly two tasks, find the most unforgettable moment and mark a line, then write one action-level suggestion after the line; during circulation the teacher collects empty suggestions and demonstrates rewriting on the spot. Peer review quality depends on task specificity, not on time allotted.

Suggested self-check order: first confirm the plan protects ten minutes of in-class revision, then confirm the weak text is fluent but flat, then confirm peer review has task slips. With these three standing, the lesson will not drift.