

互评与当堂修改怎么组织：讲评课上的三个实操细节

顽疾一：互评流于形式，两人互相打勾写「写得很好」。解法在互评表设计。表格只有三行，每行一个问句：按顺序写三件事了吗？找到一处动作分解了吗？找到一处身体反应了吗？每行只有两个格子，打勾或画叉，没有「好」「较好」这种模糊等级。关键在第四行：「给一条建议，必须写出具体句子」，这一行不许写空话，教师巡视时先查这一行，写「多写点」的直接退回，示范一条合格的：「第三段『后来我游起来了』可以加上手怎么划、腿怎么蹬」。

顽疾二：当堂修改不动笔，学生转两圈铅笔就玩别的。解法是缩小任务加显性标记。全班只改一处，改多了抄不完也改不深；改完在段首画星，教师进教室扫一眼星数就知道完成度。对画不出星的学生，给「半句起步」选项：先把「先」字句写出来，先……接着……，写到一半自然往下走。修改不是灵感问题，是启动问题。

顽疾三：互评建议质量参差，好的建议没人看见。解法是互评后加两分钟「最佳建议朗读」：教师巡视时把写得具体的建议用「S」记在记录本上，环节末尾投影两三条，署名朗读，被记名字的学生下次互评更认真。巡视记录用三个符号：S 是好建议，Q 是典型问题段落，星是已完成修改，下节课开头按符号反馈，不用重新翻草稿。

互评配对规则：同桌优先，同桌缺席时按「写作水平相近」配对，不按高低配。高低配的坏处是高水平学生替低水平学生重写，修改痕迹全是别人的；相近配对才会出现「你也笼统我也笼统」的共同语言，建议才提得具体。

时间分配参考：对比环节十二分钟，互评十二分钟含两分钟朗读，当堂修改十一分钟，机动五分钟。三个环节都压不满时，宁可提前下课，也不把修改环节挤到三分钟——修改需要动笔时间，三分钟只够抄题。

最后留一个课后闭环：把课上两三条最佳建议抄在教室后墙的作文栏里，标题写「本班同学给自己的修改招」，一学期攒下来就是十几条本班自己的写作标准，比贴名家语录管用，因为每一条都出自身边同学的真实毛病，下届学生看着墙上的建议写学游泳，讲评课的病文素材也就一年比一年少。

Organizing Peer Review and Live Revision: Three Practical Details in a Feedback Lesson

Chronic problem one: peer review turns formal, partners tick boxes and write well done. The fix is in the review sheet design. The sheet has three lines, each one question: three events in order? one action decomposition found? one body reaction found? Each line has two boxes only, tick or cross, no vague grades like good or fairly good. The key is line four: give one suggestion, it must name a concrete sentence. Empty words are banned on this line; during the walk-around the teacher checks this line first, returns anything like write more, and demos a passing one: the line later I started swimming in paragraph three can add how the hands pulled and

how the legs kicked.

Chronic problem two: nobody writes during live revision, students twirl pencils. The fix is shrinking the task plus a visible marker. Everyone revises exactly one place, since revising many places cannot be finished and stays shallow; after revising, draw a star at the paragraph head, and the teacher counts stars on entering the room. For students who cannot start, offer the half-sentence option: write the first frame first, then, the writing continues naturally once it is half done. Revision is not an inspiration problem, it is a startup problem.

Chronic problem three: suggestion quality varies and good suggestions go unseen. The fix is a two-minute best suggestion reading after review: during the walk-around the teacher marks concrete suggestions with S in the notebook, then projects two or three at the segment end and reads them with the author named, and named students review more seriously next time. Use three walk-around symbols: S for good suggestion, Q for a typical problem paragraph, star for revision done, and report by symbol at the start of next class without re-reading drafts.

Pairing rule: desk partners first, and when one is absent pair by similar writing level, never high with low. The harm of high-low pairs is the strong student rewriting for the weak one, leaving revision marks that belong to someone else; similar pairs share the language of you are vague and so am I, which produces concrete suggestions.

Time reference: twelve minutes for contrast, twelve for review including two minutes of reading, eleven for live revision, five spare. When segments run short, end class early rather than squeeze revision into three minutes, since revision needs writing time and three minutes is enough only to copy the title.

One last after-class loop: copy the two or three best suggestions onto the class essay wall, titled tricks our own classmates wrote for their own revisions. Over one term this becomes a dozen writing standards born in this class, more useful than quotes from famous authors, because every line came from a real fault of a classmate nearby. Next year, students who read the wall while writing about swimming will make the sick-essay material for the next feedback lesson, and the pile of faults shrinks year by year.