

诚信作文讲评课的六个常见误区，附课前一分钟自查清单

教了多年作文讲评，诚信题材的课最容易翻的车不在课堂上，在备课桌上。六个误区，按杀伤力排序。

误区一：只表扬，不治病。整节课读四五篇优作，念完学生鼓掌，回到座位一个字不改。一节课的修改量是零。对策：病文必须上正课，且占课堂时间的一半以上。

误区二：病文用网上下载的「差文」。网上病文假得离谱，学生一读就知道不是真作文，笑完没有痛感。对策：病文只从本班初稿里选，选之前数一遍「诚实是美德」类句子，出现三次以上的才够典型。

误区三：当堂修改不设上限。布置「把作文改好」，四十分钟根本改不完，最后人人留尾巴，下节课没人接。对策：限死两处，改完签字，看得见的完成比宏大的目标有用。

误区四：互评不给句式支架。放手让「互相提提意见」，收上来一半是「写得很好，继续加油」。对策：互评固定三问，必须引用原文作答，空评当场退回。

误区五：环节超时，修改被挤没。对比读和圈画讲嗨了，留给学生动笔只剩五分钟。对策：四个环节八、十、十、八分钟，投影倒计时，到点硬切。

误区六：讲评课与初稿脱节。初稿写《一件诚实的事》，讲评课却拿另一篇范文讲，学生发现自己的稿子没人管。对策：对比用的两篇都从本班同题作文里选，互评交换的就是自己的原稿，全程只处理学生真实写过的文字。

课前一分钟自查清单，逐项打勾：一，病文和范文是否都来自本班、字数差在五十字内；二，教案里修改环节是否不少于八分钟；三，互评纸条是否已印好三问；四，修改处数是否写死在教案里；五，板书是否写了「删口号、加动作、加身体反应」三招；六，作业是否要求誊清修改稿而不是重写一篇。六项全勾，这节课才可能真正改出东西；缺任何一项，先补教案再进教室。

Six Common Traps in Integrity Composition Review Lessons, with a One-Minute Pre-Class Checklist

After years of teaching composition review, the crashes in integrity-themed lessons happen on the prep desk, not in the classroom. Six traps, ranked by damage.

Trap one: praise only, no treatment. The whole period reads four or five excellent drafts; students clap and change not one word. Revision output for the lesson: zero. Fix: the weak draft must be main-course material and take over half the class time.

Trap two: using a downloaded 'bad essay' as the sick sample. Web-bad essays are so fake that students spot it instantly, laugh, and feel nothing. Fix: pick the weak draft only from your own class's first drafts; before choosing, count the 'honesty is

a virtue' sentences — three or more appearances is typical enough.

Trap three: no cap on in-class revision. Assigning 'improve your composition' cannot finish in forty minutes; everyone leaves a loose end and nobody picks it up next class. Fix: exactly two spots, signed off when done. Visible completion beats grand goals.

Trap four: peer review without sentence frames. Open-ended 'give each other suggestions' returns half 'well written, keep it up'. Fix: three fixed questions, every answer must quote the original; empty praise gets bounced back on the spot.

Trap five: segments overrun and revision gets squeezed out. The contrast reading runs long, leaving students five minutes to write. Fix: eight, ten, ten, eight minutes for the four segments, countdown projected, hard cut at the bell.

Trap six: the review lesson disconnects from the first draft. Drafts wrote 'One Honest Deed' but the lesson critiques some other model text, and students find nobody tending their own words. Fix: both contrast texts come from the class's same-topic drafts; peer review exchanges the actual drafts; the whole lesson touches only what students really wrote.

A one-minute pre-class checklist, tick each item: one, do both the weak and strong samples come from this class with a word gap under fifty; two, does the plan give revision at least eight minutes; three, are the three peer-review questions already printed on slips; four, is the number of revision spots hard-coded in the plan; five, does the board plan carry the three moves — delete slogans, add actions, add body reactions; six, does homework ask for a copied revision rather than a fresh rewrite. All six ticked and the lesson can actually change something; miss any one, fix the plan before entering the room.