

作文讲评课教案：用对比讲评法治流水账

讲评课建立在学生已经写完《难忘的一天》初稿的基础上，课前老师做一件事：从全班作文里挑出两类片段，一类是典型的流水账，从早写到晚全是赶时间、上课、吃饭、回家；另一类是某个学生把其中一个小时写具体的真实片段。两类片段各抄一份放大，不署名，只编号为甲和乙。教案按40分钟设计。

教学目标三条：能说出流水账的两个特征，平均用力、只有事件没有细节；能用对比讲评法指出病文至少两处具体毛病并给出改法；能当堂修改自己的作文，把最难忘的一段加进动作和心理描写。重点是让学生自己说出毛病，难点是修改时学生容易把加细节理解成加形容词。

第一环节病文与范文对比，12分钟。先读片段甲，学生边听边记它写了几件事，通常能记出五六件。再读片段乙，只写一件事，读完后问：两段写的事哪个多？甲多。哪个让你记住了画面？乙。板书对比结论：写得多不等于写得好。接着小组讨论五分钟，用两个问题给甲会诊，哪一段最可惜，本来可以写细却一笔带过了？乙用了什么办法把那一刻留住？交流时把学生说的办法写在黑板上，通常是慢动作、加心里话、加对话。

第二环节学生互评，10分钟。同桌交换作文，每人只带两个任务：在对方作文里找出最难忘的那一刻，画一条竖线标记；在竖线后面写一句建议，建议必须落到动作上，比如把他犹豫的样子写成三个动作。互评时老师巡视，专挑只写写得真好这类空建议的纸条，当场示范改成可操作的话。

第三环节当堂修改，13分钟。每人从自己作文里选竖线标记的那一段，现场重写，要求删掉这一段里表示时间的过渡句，换上至少三个连续动作和一句心理活动。写完后同桌再读一遍修改前后，说出差别。下课前布置作业，作业分两层，必做：把修改过的段落誊抄进作文，整篇誊清；选做：给作文换一个开头，从最紧张的一刻直接写起，把时间顺序往后排。

板书设计两栏，左栏流水账特征，平均用力、只有事件；右栏修改办法，慢动作、心里话、对话。两栏之间画一个箭头，箭头上方写一个字，选。

A Composition Review Lesson Plan: Curing the Running Account with Contrast Feedback

This review lesson builds on students having finished the first draft of An Unforgettable Day. Before class the teacher does one thing: pick two kinds of excerpts from the class drafts, one a typical running account that rushes from morning to night, all hurry-up, class, meals, home; the other a real excerpt where one student wrote a single hour in detail. Enlarge one copy of each, anonymous, labeled A and B only. The plan runs 40 minutes.

Three objectives: students can name two features of a running account, even

effort everywhere and events without details; they can use contrast feedback to point out at least two specific flaws in the weak excerpt and suggest fixes; they can revise their own composition in class, adding action and inner description to the most unforgettable paragraph. The focus is letting students state the flaws themselves; the difficulty is that students tend to confuse adding detail with adding adjectives.

Segment one, weak text versus strong text, 12 minutes. Read excerpt A first; students listen and count how many events it covers, usually five or six. Then read excerpt B, which covers one event. Ask: which had more events? A. Which one left you with a picture? B. Write the contrast on the board: writing more does not mean writing better. Then five minutes of group diagnosis with two questions: which part of A is most regrettable, a moment that could have been detailed but was brushed off? What did B use to hold that moment? During sharing, write students' answers on the board, usually slow motion, inner thoughts, dialogue.

Segment two, peer review, 10 minutes. Deskmates exchange drafts, each with two tasks only: find the most unforgettable moment in the partner's piece and mark it with a vertical line; after the line write one suggestion that must land on actions, for example, turn his hesitation into three actions. While they review, the teacher circulates and picks out notes that only say well written, then demonstrates on the spot how to turn praise into an actionable sentence.

Segment three, in-class revision, 13 minutes. Each student rewrites the marked paragraph live, deleting the time-transition sentences in it and replacing them with at least three consecutive actions and one line of inner thought. Afterwards the deskmate reads the before and after versions aloud and states the difference. Before the bell assign two-tier homework: required, copy the revised paragraph back and write out the whole piece neatly; optional, replace the opening by starting straight at the most tense moment and pushing the time order back.

Board design in two columns: left, features of a running account, even effort, events only; right, revision tools, slow motion, inner thoughts, dialogue. Draw an arrow between the columns and write one word above it: choose.

对比讲评现场实录：一段流水账是怎么被改活的

下面的课堂实录来自假设的讲评课，病文片段甲写接力赛，原文是这样的：下午，我们去看接力赛。第一棒，我们班的李明跑了个第三。第二棒，王强超了一个。第三棒，又被人超了。最后一棒，张亮冲过去，我们赢了。我们很高兴。全班鼓掌，老师笑了。

老师先带全班给这段做体检。第一个问题：这段写了几棒？四棒。每一棒写了多少字？差不多都是二十来个字。第二个问题：哪一棒最该细写？学生七嘴八舌，多数说最后一棒。第三个问题：那张亮冲过去的样子，原文里有没有？学生找，只有冲过去三个字。老师板书：四棒平均用力，最要紧的一棒只有三个字。

接着进入修改。第一个学生提议加形容词，把冲过去改成飞快地冲过去。老师不否，追问：飞快地，然后呢？读者看见他怎么快了吗？全班笑。第二个学生说写他的腿，腿摆得特别快。老师把这句写上黑板，问能不能再加一个动作，让腿之前有个起点。第三个学生接：他先蹲下来，攥紧拳头，枪响以后蹿出去，腿越摆越快。老师把三句连起来念，蹲、攥、蹿、摆，问现在几个动作了？四个。心里呢？有学生补：他心里就一个念头，别掉棒。

修改稿读出来是：最后一棒，张亮蹲在起跑线后，攥紧拳头，眼睛盯着交接区。棒递到手里那一瞬，他蹿了出去，胳膊甩起来，腿越摆越快，离终点还有十米时全班的声都变了调。冲线那一刻他吼了一声，我们班赢了。老师把修改稿和原文并排贴在黑板上，让学生说差别从哪来。有学生说，原文是报告结果，修改稿是让人看见过程。这句话被写上班书，成为这节课的结论。

实录里有两个细节值得注意。老师从头到尾没有给一个现成的好词，所有动作都是学生自己掏出来的。学生提议加形容词时老师没有批评，只用一个然后呢把思路推到了动作上，这比直接纠正更能让学生记住。

A Live Contrast Review: How a Running-Account Paragraph Came Alive

The classroom transcript below comes from an assumed review lesson. The weak excerpt A is about a relay race, and reads: In the afternoon we went to watch the relay. First leg, our classmate Li Ming ran third. Second leg, Wang Qiang passed one runner. Third leg, we were passed. Anchor leg, Zhang Liang charged through and we won. We were very happy. The class applauded and the teacher smiled.

The teacher first gives the paragraph a checkup. Question one: how many legs does it cover? Four. How many characters per leg? Roughly twenty each. Question two: which leg deserved the most space? Most students say the anchor leg. Question three: is there any picture of Zhang Liang charging through in the original? Students search and find only the three words charged through. The board note: four legs with even effort, and the crucial leg has only three words.

Then revision. The first student suggests an adjective, changing charged through to charged through very fast. The teacher does not reject it, just asks: very fast, and then? Can the reader see how fast he was? The class laughs. A second student says write his legs, pumping incredibly fast. The teacher writes it up and asks whether one more action can give the legs a starting point. A third student continues: he

crouched down first, clenched his fists, and when the gun cracked he sprang out, legs pumping faster and faster. The teacher reads the three sentences joined, crouch, clench, spring, pump, and asks how many actions now. Four. And inside his head? A student adds: one thought only, do not drop the baton.

The revised version reads: On the anchor leg, Zhang Liang crouched behind the starting line, fists clenched, eyes fixed on the exchange zone. The instant the baton hit his hand he sprang out, arms swinging, legs accelerating; ten meters from the line the whole class's voices changed pitch. As he crossed the line he shouted one shout, and our class had won. The teacher posts the revision beside the original and asks where the difference comes from. One student says the original reports results while the revision lets you see the process. That sentence goes onto the board as the lesson's conclusion.

Two details in the transcript deserve attention. The teacher never supplied a single ready-made good word; every action came out of the students. When a student proposed an adjective, the teacher did not scold but used one question, and then?, to push the thinking toward actions, which sticks better than direct correction.

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.