

## 讲评片段复盘：那节我以为成功的课，卡在了哪一问

讲评课第二环节，我投影了一篇写观日出的作文片段，原文是：早上四点，我们爬山。五点到了山顶。太阳出来了，很红很圆。我们欢呼起来。我觉得大自然真伟大。我当时设想的教学路径分三步：先问这段写了几件事，学生答四件；再问哪件最该细写，学生答日出；最后问怎么改，学生应该说出把太阳写细。前两步都按剧本走，教室气氛热烈，我在教案上给自己记了一功。

第三步卡住了。我问怎么把日出写细，举手的答案是加好词，用金光闪闪、光彩夺目。我说这些词好，然后呢，读者能看见太阳是怎么出来的吗？没人接。我又问，你们看过日出吗，太阳是一下子跳出来的吗？这一问把问题挑明了：学生没有观察过日出，也没有观察过任何事物，他们脑子里的日出就是金光闪闪四个字。我让学生闭眼回忆自己见过的天亮，有学生说先看见窗上有白光，有学生说妈妈先开的灯。我说把窗上的白光写进去，比金光闪闪值钱十倍。

课后我把这个片段复盘了三遍。第一层结论：前两问是假问题，答案是我喂的，问几件事、哪件最该细写，学生凭常识就能猜中我的意图，热烈气氛是假象。第二层结论：学生不是不肯写细，是拿不出细节，细节的原料是观察，而观察这一步我的教学里从来没有出现过。第三层结论：我那句把窗上的白光写进去当时有效，但属于临场救火，救火能力不该依赖课堂灵感，应该提前变成教学环节。

复盘后我做了两个具体调整。一是给讲评课的提问做减法，删掉几件事这类数数问题，只保留两类真问题：这一段里你亲眼见过哪个画面？没有的话，这周去补看一次再写。二是给班级加一个观察作业，每周三布置五分钟的看，看水开、看蚂蚁、看放学时的校门口，写三行，不评好坏，只交流谁看到的画面别人没看到。观察原料有了，讲评课的慢动作才有东西可拆。

## Reviewing One Review Segment: The Question Where My Seemingly Successful Lesson Stalled

In segment two of the review lesson I projected a paragraph about watching sunrise: at four we climbed; at five we reached the top; the sun came out, very red and very round; we cheered; I feel nature is great. My planned teaching path had three steps: ask how many events, students say four; ask which deserved detail, students say the sunrise; ask how to make it detailed, and students should say describe the sun better. The first two steps went exactly to script, the room was lively, and I gave myself credit in the margin.

Step three stalled. When I asked how to write the sunrise in detail, the raised hands answered with fine words, glittering gold, dazzling radiance. I said those words are good, and then? Can the reader see how the sun actually comes out? Silence. I asked again: have you watched a sunrise, does the sun jump out all at once? That question exposed the core: students had never observed a sunrise, or anything else; the sunrise in their heads was four characters meaning dazzling. I asked them to close their eyes and recall any dawn they had seen; one said white light first

appeared on the window, another said mother switched on the lamp first. I said putting the white light on the window into the paragraph is worth ten times glittering gold.

After class I replayed the segment three times. First layer: the first two questions were fake, the answers were fed by me; how many events and which needs detail are guessable from social cues, and the lively atmosphere was an illusion. Second layer: students were not unwilling to write detail, they had no raw material, detail comes from observation, and observation never appeared anywhere in my teaching. Third layer: my save about the white light on the window worked in the moment but was improvisation; teaching should not depend on classroom inspiration, it should become a planned segment in advance.

Two concrete adjustments followed. First, subtract from review-lesson questions: delete counting questions like how many events, keep only two real questions, which picture in this paragraph did you actually see, and if none, go observe this week and then write. Second, add an observation assignment: every Wednesday, five minutes of watching, boiling water, ants, the school gate at dismissal, three lines, no grading, only sharing which pictures others missed. Once observation supplies exist, slow motion in the review lesson has something to split.