

学游泳作文讲评课教案：用对比讲评法把过程写具体

教学目标定三条。一、通过病文与范文对比，能说出「过程笼统」的具体表现：只写结果、缺动作、缺顺序。二、能用「动作分解」方法把一句话扩成一段话，把「我练了很久终于学会了」拆成练腿、呛水、放手三个具体瞬间。三、互评时能依据三条标准给出至少一条可操作的修改建议。

重点：用对比发现差距，知道笼统在哪。难点：把差距转成修改动作，学生知道不好却不知怎么改，突破办法是提供固定句式「先……接着……突然……最后……」加「身体反应清单」（手、呼吸、眼睛、腿）。

环节一，病文范文对比，十二分钟。投影病文《我学会了游泳》：全文一百二十字，只有「我学了很久，呛了水，最后学会了」三句主干。全班默读，教师问：这篇告诉你学会了吗？告诉你怎么学会的吗？学生发现只有结果没有过程。接着投影范文同题片段：教练放手那一刻「我身子一歪，手忙脚乱扒水，鼻子灌了水，呛得站不稳，可我发现自己正浮着」。两文并排，学生在病文上用波浪线标出「该有过程却只有结果」的三处。教师板书诊断结论：病文病在「只有骨架没有肉」，范文好在「一个瞬间拆成四个动作」。

环节二，学生互评，十二分钟。同桌交换自己的作文草稿，互评表三条标准：有没有按顺序写三件事？有没有一处动作分解？有没有一处身体反应？每条后面打勾或画叉，并写一条建议，建议必须落到句子，比如「第二段的『练了很久』可以改成练什么动作」。教师巡视，挑一组典型互评投影给全班示范读。

环节三，当堂修改，十一分钟。每人只改一处，选自己作文里最笼统的一段，用「先接着突然最后」句式加身体反应清单重写。改完在段首画一颗星，表示已修改。教师收草稿抽查，下节课开头反馈修改质量。

板书：左边贴病文片段标三处波浪线，右边贴范文片段圈四个动词，中间写「一个瞬间等于四个动作」。作业分层：基础作业是把课上改的那段誊正并仿写一处动作分解；提高作业是给作文补一个开头，要求开头不写时间天气，直接从一个动作开始。

A Feedback Lesson Plan for Swimming Essays: Using Contrast to Make the Process Concrete

Set three goals. One: through contrasting a sick essay with a model, be able to name what a vague process looks like: result only, no actions, no order. Two: use action decomposition to expand one sentence into one paragraph, splitting I practiced long and finally learned into three concrete moments: kicking drills, choking, being let go. Three: in peer review, give at least one workable suggestion based on the three criteria.

The key point: find the gap through contrast and know where the vagueness sits. The hard part: turning the gap into revision moves, since students know it is bad but not how to fix it. The fix is a fixed sentence frame, first, then, suddenly, finally, plus a body reaction list of hands, breath, eyes, legs.

Segment one, sick versus model contrast, twelve minutes. Project the sick essay: one hundred and twenty words with only three trunk sentences, I practiced long, I choked, I finally learned. Silent reading, then ask: does this tell you that you learned, or how you learned? Students find only results and no process. Then project the model on the same topic: the moment the coach let go, my body tilted, hands scrambled through the water, water ran into my nose, I choked and staggered, yet I found I was floating. The two texts side by side; students wave-line three places in the sick essay where process should be but only result is. The teacher writes the diagnosis: the sick essay has a skeleton but no flesh; the model splits one moment into four actions.

Segment two, peer review, twelve minutes. Desk partners exchange drafts with a three-line review sheet: does it write three events in order? Is there one action decomposition? Is there one body reaction? Tick or cross each line and write one suggestion that lands on a sentence, for example the practiced long in paragraph two can become which drill. The teacher walks around and projects one typical review to read aloud as a demo.

Segment three, on-the-spot revision, eleven minutes. Each student revises exactly one place, choosing the vaguest paragraph, rewriting it with the sentence frame plus the body list. After revising, draw a star at the paragraph head to mark it done. The teacher collects drafts for spot checks and reports revision quality at the start of next class.

Board: on the left, the sick excerpt with three wave lines; on the right, the model excerpt with four verbs circled; in the center, one moment equals four actions. Homework in two tiers: the base tier copies the revised paragraph neatly and imitates one more action decomposition; the advanced tier adds an opening that starts with an action, no time or weather allowed in the first line.

对比讲评的材料准备：一篇病文和一篇范文怎么选、怎么标

对比讲评课上一半的成败在备课阶段选材料。选错一篇，整节课变成教师独角戏。

病文的选择标准有三条。一、毛病要典型：只写结果、过程笼统，这正是全班共病，学生一看就认得出「这也是我的写法」。二、不能差到离谱：全文错别字连篇或跑题的病文会把讨论带

偏，讲评课讲的是「写不具体」，不是「写不端正」。三、篇幅要短：一百二十字以内，投影后全班十秒读完，省下的时间全给对比。最好的病文来源是本届学生上学期的旧作文，匿名处理后使用，学生知道这是自己班写的，代入感最强。

范文的选择标准也有三条。一、够得着：范文水平是「比全班好一点」，不是发表级美文，否则学生只会说「人家写得好」而不知道好在哪。二、同题同素材：也写学游泳，也写泳池，连泳姿都尽量一致，对比才公平。三、只强在一点：范文只在「一个瞬间拆成多个动作」这一点上强，其他方面与全班持平，一节课只解决一个病。

标注方法固定三样。病文用波浪线标出三句主干，让学生一眼看到全文只有骨架；范文用圆圈圈出动词，一节课圈四个以内，圈多了学生记不住重点；两文之间画顺序箭头，病文的箭头只有三个点，范文的箭头下面每个点挂着两三个动作，差距可视化。

挑材料的三个渠道：本届旧作文按毛病筛，上学期的作文里专挑「只有结果」的；教师自己下水写病文，按全班典型毛病定制，缺点是代入感弱一点；教参范文库做兜底，只在前两个渠道都没有时用。学生作文入投影前做脱敏：改名字、改班级、改学校地名，涉及真实事故（如溺水经历）的段落不用。

备课自测一句话：把两文并排给搭班老师看三十秒，问「差距在哪」，对方能用一句话说出「一个有动作一个没有」，材料就算选对了；对方若说「范文写得好」，说明范文超纲，换掉重选。

Preparing Contrast Materials: How to Choose and Mark a Sick Essay and a Model Essay

Half of a contrast feedback lesson is won or lost at the material-picking stage. Pick one wrong text and the whole period becomes a teacher solo.

Three standards for the sick essay. One: the fault must be typical, result only and process vague, the shared illness of the whole class, so students recognize it as their own way of writing. Two: not catastrophically bad, an essay covered in misspellings or off topic drags the discussion away, the lesson treats vagueness, not sloppiness. Three: keep it short, under one hundred and twenty words, readable in ten seconds on the projector, and every saved second goes to the contrast. The best source is last term compositions of the same students, used after anonymizing, since knowing it was written by their own class gives the strongest immersion.

Three standards for the model. One: reachable, a level of just a bit better than the class, not publishable beauty, or students only say they write well without knowing where. Two: same topic and same material, also swimming, also a pool, ideally the same stroke, so the contrast is fair. Three: strong in exactly one point, splitting one moment into several actions, while everything else stays at class

level, one lesson cures one illness.

Three fixed markings. Wave lines under the three trunk sentences of the sick essay, so the skeleton is visible at a glance; circles around the verbs of the model, no more than four per lesson, more than that and the point is lost; order arrows between the two texts, three bare dots on the sick side, each dot on the model side hanging two or three actions, the gap made visible.

Three channels for materials: filter old compositions of this cohort for the result-only fault; the teacher writes a custom sick essay targeting the class illness, slightly weaker in immersion; a teaching reference library as fallback, only when the first two channels fail. Anonymize before projecting: change names, classes, and place names, and never use passages about real accidents such as drowning experiences.

One self-test while preparing: show the two texts side by side to a colleague for thirty seconds and ask where the gap is. If they answer in one sentence, one has actions and one does not, the materials are right. If they say the model is well written, the model is out of reach, replace it.

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.