

教研活动记录怎么写：主题、发言、结论三块落实法

不少老师写教研活动记录，习惯从签到开始一路记到散会，写出来像一份会议流水账，回头看却抓不住重点。其实一份合格的记录只需要落实三块内容：研讨主题、教师发言要点、教研结论。写之前先搭好这三个小标题，现场记录就有了骨架。

第一块是研讨主题。主题要写成一句具体的问题，而不是一个宽泛的科目名称。比如把语文教研细化为叙事作文怎样写出真情，把数学教研细化为应用题审题步骤如何示范。主题具体，后面的发言和结论才有共同的靶子，不会各说各话。确定主题时，最好从近期课堂里真实出现的共性问题里挑，而不是凭空选一个时髦的说法。

第二块是教师发言要点。记录发言不是逐字转录，而是把每个人最有价值的一两句话提炼出来，写成观点加论据的形式。比如某老师指出学生作文流水账的根源是叙事缺少转折，另一位老师举出课堂提问无效的例子。要点后面可以括注发言人，方便日后追溯。如果现场有课例展示环节，先用三五句话交代课例的基本信息和最突出的特点，再进入发言记录，让没到场的读者也能看懂讨论针对什么。

第三块是教研结论和改进建议。结论要回答两个问题：这次讨论达成了什么共识，接下来怎么做。改进建议尽量写成可操作的条目，注明由谁负责、大致什么时间落实。三块都落实之后，记录既客观又有观点有结论。交稿前做一个简单检查：把记录放一周再重读，如果能还原现场讨论、看清后续行动，这份记录就站得住。日常写记录时还可以按三块分配篇幅：主题两三行带过，教师发言占去大半，结论干脆收尾，比例顺了，记录读起来就不会乱。

How to Write a Teaching Research Record: Fill in the Three Blocks of Theme, Comments and Conclusion

Many teaching research records read like a minute-by-minute transcript of a meeting, and the useful parts get buried. A qualified record only needs to fill in three blocks: the discussion theme, the key points of teacher comments, and the research conclusion. Set up these three headings before the meeting, and the on-site notes will have a skeleton.

The first block is the discussion theme. Write the theme as one specific question instead of a broad subject name. For example, narrow language research down to how narrative writing expresses true feelings, or narrow math research down to how to demonstrate the steps of reading a word problem. A specific theme gives the comments and the conclusion a shared target, so people stop talking past each other. Pick the theme from a real problem that recently appeared in classrooms, not from a fashionable slogan.

The second block is the key points of teacher comments. Do not transcribe every

word; extract the one or two most valuable sentences from each speaker and write them as an argument plus its evidence. One teacher may point out that flat essays come from stories without a turning point, while another may cite an example of ineffective classroom questioning. Put the speaker name in brackets so the note can be traced later. If the session includes a lesson demonstration, describe its basic information and its most striking feature in three or five sentences before the comments begin, so readers who were absent can still follow the discussion.

The third block is the conclusion and the improvement suggestions. The conclusion must answer two questions: what consensus the discussion reached, and what to do next. Write the suggestions as actionable items, noting who is responsible and roughly when things should happen. After the three blocks are filled in, the record is objective and still carries a viewpoint. Do one simple check before submitting: reread the record a week later, and if it lets you rebuild the scene and see the follow-up actions clearly, the record holds up.

一篇教研活动记录范文逐段点评：课例展示、问题研讨、改进建议怎么写

下面以一篇围绕叙事作文的教研活动记录为例，逐段点评三个环节各自该怎么落笔。这篇记录约七百字，结构清楚，适合作为参照。

第一段是课例展示。范文这样写：本周三上午第二节课，李老师执教五年级叙事作文起步课，课题是那一刻我长大了，课堂以一段学生生活视频导入，随后安排两次独立写作，中间插入一次互评。点评角度看，这段交代了时间、执教人、年级、课题和课堂流程，没有评价性形容词，客观性够。不足是最突出的特点没有点出来，读者不知道这节课特别在哪里，补一句本课把互评放在两次写作之间即可。

第二段是问题研讨。范文记录了三位教师的发言：第一位认为学生第二次写作改进不明显，问题出在互评标准太笼统；第二位补充说互评表上只有写得好与不好两栏，学生只会打勾；第三位把问题归结到教师示范环节，认为讲评时缺少修改前后的对照演示。点评角度看，这段做到了每人一个观点加一条现场证据，并且三个观点层层递进，从现象追到工具再到教法，这就是有观点的写法。记录时把发言顺序保留下来，逻辑链才不会断。

第三段是改进建议与结论。范文写道：经讨论达成共识，互评表改为三个具体维度，下周同题课由李老师先做修改前后对照演示，备课组全员听课并在课后二十分钟内完成二次研讨。点评角度看，这段把共识、动作、责任人、时间四要素写全了，结论因此可检验。整篇记录给我们的启示是：环节齐不等于写得好，每个环节都要有具体信息支撑。照着这个结构对照练习两三次，七百字左右的记录基本能在半小时内完成。

A Sample Teaching Research Record Reviewed Paragraph by Paragraph: Lesson Demo, Problem Discussion, Improvement Advice

Below is a paragraph-by-paragraph review of a teaching research record about narrative writing, showing how the three segments should be written so the record stays objective, carries viewpoints, and ends with a conclusion. The sample is about seven hundred words with a clean structure, suitable as a reference.

The first segment is the lesson demonstration. The sample says: on Wednesday morning period two, Teacher Li taught a fifth-grade narrative writing starter lesson titled The Moment I Grew Up; the class opened with a short life video of a student, then arranged two independent writing rounds with one peer review in between. From a review angle, this paragraph gives time, teacher, grade, topic, and lesson flow, with no evaluative adjectives, so it is objective enough. The gap is that the most striking feature is not pointed out; adding one sentence that this lesson places peer review between the two writing rounds would fix it.

The second segment is the problem discussion. The sample records three teachers: the first thinks the second draft improved little because the peer review criteria were too vague; the second adds that the review form only has good or bad columns, so students just tick boxes; the third traces the problem to the teacher demonstration, noting the feedback session lacked a before-and-after revision comparison. From a review angle, each speaker contributes one claim plus one piece of on-site evidence, and the three claims build from symptom to tool to teaching method. That layered progression is what having viewpoints looks like. Keep the speaking order so the logic chain stays intact.

The third segment is improvement advice and conclusion. The sample states: the group agreed to change the review form to three concrete dimensions; next week the same-topic lesson will open with a before-and-after revision demo by Teacher Li; all group members will observe and finish a second discussion within twenty minutes after class. From a review angle, this paragraph covers consensus, action, owner, and deadline, which makes the conclusion testable. The lesson of the whole record: having all segments is not enough; every segment needs concrete information behind it.

教研活动记录的五个常见毛病：对照自查清单逐个改

写教研活动记录踩的坑大体逃不出五个，下面按毛病列出自查问题和改法，写完记录对照一遍即可。

毛病一：主题空泛。自查方法是只看记录第一行，问自己这次到底讨论的是什么问题。如果主题写的是教研活动或作文教学这类词，等于没有主题。改法是把它改写成一个问题句，问题来自最近课堂里的真实现象。

毛病二：发言逐字转录。自查方法是数一数发言段落里有没有某个人超过四行的连续引语。逐字记录看似完整，实际把有价值的观点埋进了口头语和重复句里。改法是每人只保留观点加证据的一两句话，其余删掉，括注发言人。

毛病三：结论口号化。自查方法是把结论单独抄出来，检查里面有没有加强、提升、重视这类没有动作的词。口号式结论过两周就没人记得要做什么。改法是每条结论都补上谁来做、做什么、什么时候完成。

毛病四：要素缺失。自查方法是核对记录里能否找到时间、地点、参与人、主题四个要素，缺一个都会被质疑记录的真实性。改法是在记录开头用一行集中交代，不要散落在正文里。

毛病五：记录滞后。自查方法是看记录完成日期与活动日期相差几天，超过三天，细节就开始失真。改法是现场只记关键词和短句，当天用二十分钟扩写成完整记录，宁可当天写得粗，也不要一周后凭想象补。

五个毛病里，前三个影响记录的质量，后两个影响记录的可用性。对照清单改完，记录基本能达到客观、有观点、有结论的要求。如果时间紧，优先处理结论口号化和记录滞后这两个毛病，它们对后续教学的伤害最直接，改起来也最见效。

Five Common Flaws in Teaching Research Records: Fix Them One by One with a Self-Check List

The traps in writing teaching research records mostly fall into five flaws. Each flaw below comes with a self-check question and a fix; run through the list once your draft is done.

Flaw one: a vague theme. Self-check by reading only the first line and asking what problem was actually discussed. If the theme reads as teaching research or writing instruction, there is no theme at all. Fix it by rewriting the theme as a question drawn from a real phenomenon in recent classes.

Flaw two: word-for-word transcription of comments. Self-check by counting any speaker with more than four consecutive quoted lines. Verbatim notes look complete

but bury the useful claims inside filler and repetition. Fix it by keeping one or two sentences of claim plus evidence per speaker, deleting the rest, and noting the speaker in brackets.

Flaw three: slogan-style conclusions. Self-check by copying the conclusion alone and looking for action-free words such as strengthen, improve, or attach importance. Slogans are forgotten within two weeks. Fix it by adding who does it, what exactly, and by when to every conclusion.

Flaw four: missing basics. Self-check whether the record states time, place, participants, and theme; missing any one invites doubt about authenticity. Fix it by putting all four in one line at the top instead of scattering them through the body.

Flaw five: late write-up. Self-check how many days passed between the activity and the finished record; beyond three days, details start to distort. Fix it by capturing only keywords and short phrases on site, then expanding them into a full record within twenty minutes the same day. A rough same-day draft beats an imagined one written a week later.

The first three flaws affect the quality of the record; the last two affect its usability. After fixing them against the checklist, the record should meet the standard of being objective, viewpoint-bearing, and conclusive.