

Forgive speech-recognition errors in this document.

1. My "informal" (= " 'formal' second") teaching approach: explain *why* I'm teaching something (which hopefully corresponds somewhat to why *you should know* something) **before** introducing the actual content.

I've also stayed pretty high-level in lecture.

- a. a grad course should give you some exposure and background, but graduate training should train you to teach yourself
 - b. I assume students are more motivated and able to retain material if they know what it's good for
 - c. **Life lesson:** if people aren't given a reason for something you do, they can come up with surprisingly different interpretations of your actions
2. most important (to me):
 - a. mind expansion/creativity inspiration:
 - i. two very different novel formalisms for modeling a phenomenon
 - ii. and as for how you might develop, critique, or evaluate your own or someone else's formalism
 - b. dynamic programming ideas - break situations into states, and try to keep the states "small"
 3. icing:
 - a. an appreciation for the complexities of language
 - i. Glossed over: individual lexical features are really important. Properties of languages other than English (although we briefly glanced at Korean XTAG)
 - b. inspiration for ways to combine syntax and semantics

From Christopher Potts, [A case for deep learning in semantics: Response to Pater](#), *Language* 2019: "I see two angles on the preference for RNNs over more richly structured models..... However, I suspect DL [Deep Learning] researchers would eagerly adopt tree-structured models if they showed consistent benefits, but so far they have not. It would be hasty to conclude that this tells us that language is not tree-structured, though. It is safer to conclude that the tree structures we are assuming are simply incorrect enough that they get in the way. Data-driven techniques like those of DL could help us discover the right trees."