

Summer 2025 (2025) Summer I

Stony Brook University
Campus-wide

AMS 335 - 30 [61072] - GAME THEORY

Siyuan Lyu Evaluated Individual

Department: Applied Math and Statistics
Responsible Faculty: Siyuan Lyu

Response Rate 45.5 %
Received 5
Expected 11

1 - Course-Focused Questions

Course Questions - Overall

		Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Q1	The course content (assignments, readings, lectures, etc.) helped me meet the learning expectations set forth by the instructor.					
Mean	4.20	1	4	0	0	0
Median	4	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.40					
		Mean	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			Percent Rank
AMS 335 - 30 [61072]		4.20	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			----
Applied Math and Statistics		4.31	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			36 th
Engineering & Applied Sciences		4.11	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			43 rd
Summer 2025		4.33	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			30 th
Q2	The class environment was inclusive towards people of diverse backgrounds, identities, life experiences and diversity of thought.					
Mean	4.60	3	2	0	0	0
Median	5	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.49					
		Mean	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			Percent Rank
AMS 335 - 30 [61072]		4.60	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>			----

	Mean		Percent Rank
Applied Math and Statistics	4.55		50 th
Engineering & Applied Sciences	4.36		60 th
Summer 2025	4.56		39 th

Q3 The methods of evaluating my work were fair.

Mean	4.40	2	3	0	0	0
Median	4	40%	60%	0%	0%	0
Standard Deviation	0.49					

	Mean		Percent Rank
AMS 335 - 30 [61072]	4.40		----
Applied Math and Statistics	4.46		36 th
Engineering & Applied Sciences	4.21		46 th
Summer 2025	4.39		33 rd

	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Q4 I think the overall quality of the course was					
Mean	4.20	2	2	1	0
Median	4	40%	40%	20%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.75				

	Mean		Percent Rank
AMS 335 - 30 [61072]	4.20		----
Applied Math and Statistics	4.11		42 nd
Engineering & Applied Sciences	3.83		57 th
Summer 2025	4.06		41 st

Q5 The textbook, readings, and required resources were valuable.	Total: 5
Agree	4 80 %
Disagree	0 0 %
I did not read the required materials	1 20 %

No text, readings, or resources were required			0	0 %	
Q6	On average, how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class?	Total: 5			
0-3 Hours	3	60 %			
4-6 Hours	2	40 %			
7-9 Hours	0	0 %			
10+ Hours	0	0 %			

3 - Feedback

Student Feedback Questions

Q7	What did you find most valuable about this course?	Total: 2
The sample exam videos were the most helpful in understanding the questions and what was expected on the exam.		
The ability to look at everyday interactions as games and see how each action can affect the 'payoff'		
Q8	In what ways could the course be improved?	Total: 1
I think video lectures, I feel like just reading and studying slides, are a little boring and hard to concentrate.		

1 - Instructor-Focused Questions

Instructor Questions

		Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strc Disag
Q9	The instructor was effective in teaching the subject matter.					
Mean	4.20	1	4	0	0	
Median	4	20%	80%	0%	0%	0
Standard Deviation	0.40					
		Mean				Percent Rank
Siyuan Lyu		4.20				----
Applied Math and Statistics		4.41				36 th
Engineering & Applied Sciences		4.15				43 rd

	Mean					Percent Rank
Summer 2025	4.29	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	32 nd
Q10	The instructor clearly communicated what was expected of me in this course and the rules of classroom engagement.					
Mean	4.40	2	3	0	0	
Median	4	40%	60%	0%	0%	0
Standard Deviation	0.49					
	Mean					Percent Rank
Siyuan Lyu	4.40	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	----
Applied Math and Statistics	4.56	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	36 th
Engineering & Applied Sciences	4.37	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	46 th
Summer 2025	4.41	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	33 rd

Summer 2025 (2025) Summer I

Stony Brook University
Campus-wide

ECO 355 - 30 [63188] - GAME THEORY

Siyuan Lyu Evaluated Individual

Department: Economics
Responsible Faculty: Siyuan Lyu

Response Rate 42.3 %
Received 11
Expected 26

1 - Course-Focused Questions

Course Questions - Overall

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strong Disagree	
Q1	The course content (assignments, readings, lectures, etc.) helped me meet the learning expectations set forth by the instructor.					Total

Mean	4.27	6	3	1	1	0
Median	5	54.5%	27.3%	9.1%	9.1%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.96					

	Mean		Percent Rank
ECO 355 - 30 [63188]	4.27	<input type="text"/>	----
Economics	4.33	<input type="text"/>	29 th
College of Arts and Sciences	4.27	<input type="text"/>	34 th
Summer 2025	4.33	<input type="text"/>	34 th

Q2	The class environment was inclusive towards people of diverse backgrounds, identities, life experiences and diversity of thought.	Total
----	---	-------

Mean	4.36	5	5	1	0	0
Median	4	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.64					

	Mean		Percent Rank
ECO 355 - 30 [63188]	4.36	<input type="text"/>	----
Economics	4.40	<input type="text"/>	29 th
College of Arts and Sciences	4.48	<input type="text"/>	26 th
Summer 2025	4.56	<input type="text"/>	25 th

Q3	The methods of evaluating my work were fair.	Total
----	--	-------

Mean	4.82	9	2	0	0	0
Median	5	81.8%	18.2%	0%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.39					

	Mean		Percent Rank
ECO 355 - 30 [63188]	4.82	<input type="text"/>	----
Economics	4.38	<input type="text"/>	71 st
College of Arts and Sciences	4.27	<input type="text"/>	62 nd
Summer 2025	4.39	<input type="text"/>	60 th

		Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Q4	I think the overall quality of the course was					Total
Mean	4.18	5	3	3	0	0

Median	4	45.5%	27.3%	27.3%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.83					

	Mean		Percent Rank
ECO 355 - 30 [63188]	4.18	<div><div></div></div>	----
Economics	4.00	<div><div></div></div>	54 th
College of Arts and Sciences	3.96	<div><div></div></div>	45 th
Summer 2025	4.06	<div><div></div></div>	40 th

Q5	The textbook, readings, and required resources were valuable.	Total: 11
Agree	9 81.8 %	<div><div></div></div>
Disagree	1 9.1 %	<div><div></div></div>
I did not read the required materials	0 0 %	<div><div></div></div>
No text, readings, or resources were required	1 9.1 %	<div><div></div></div>

Q6	On average, how many hours per week did you spend on this course outside of class?	Total: 11
0-3 Hours	4 36.4 %	<div><div></div></div>
4-6 Hours	6 54.5 %	<div><div></div></div>
7-9 Hours	1 9.1 %	<div><div></div></div>
10+ Hours	0 0 %	<div><div></div></div>

3 - Feedback

Student Feedback Questions

Q7	What did you find most valuable about this course?	Total: 5
<p>Very helpful answering questions/emails. Very good correcting mistakes in homework and explaining what you did wrong! And the review session and Home work Answer keys are very helpful in understanding/preparing for materials and exams!</p>		
<p>Professor did a great job explaining concepts in the review videos. The discussion prompts were also always interesting and helped apply in class</p>		

concepts to real life.

The course was probably the most useful in helping me understand how logical decisions are made with different priorities/incentives in mind. Most of my learning and development occurred towards the start of the course while the content was relatively comprehensible.

Lyu's review videos for midterms were a game changer

Textbook

Q8	In what ways could the course be improved?	Total: 6
	Perhaps some more time on the exams would be nice, I didn't get to finish either of the last parts and having to submit a separate document in pdf takes time away from exam taking. That's my biggest gripe about the course other than that very fun and immersive course!	
	No critiques! I think this was a great course.	
	more practice question and tutorial video	
	I unfortunately found that post-first midterm, not only did the course material ramp up in complexity, but the complexity also prevented me from connecting with the material as much. In fact, I found myself turning to outside resources specifically due to the fact that there was a large difference between the overly technical nature of the textbook and the slides which tended to be leaner in informations. Although having attended office hours once earlier on in the course, I found myself more confused afterwards. I will admit, a fault on my part is that I didn't engage in more regular correspondence on my part, however it was not quite convenient due to my job. To provide potential solutions however: having practice midterm review was quite helpful, and I think that incorporating the video walk through of the steps taken to engage with each problem could be done for the homework as well.	
	I would like to finish off by making it clear that the instructor seemed quite positive and interested in helping, it just seemed that there was very little engagement from the class in communicating confusion to the instructor. When meeting with the instructor during office hours, Siyuan was quick to dispel most of my confusions, and therefore I hope for her to be considered in a positive light :)	
	More asynchronous lectures on the most complicated topics	
	Talk more	

1 - Instructor-Focused Questions

Instructor Questions

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strong Disagree
Q9	The instructor was effective in teaching the subject matter.				Total:

Mean	4.36	5	5	1	0	0
Median	4	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.64					

	Mean		Percent Rank
Siyuan Lyu	4.36	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	----
Economics	4.26	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	37 th
College of Arts and Sciences	4.18	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	40 th
Summer 2025	4.29	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	38 th

Q10	The instructor clearly communicated what was expected of me in this course and the rules of classroom engagement.	Total
-----	---	-------

Mean	4.82	9	2	0	0	0
Median	5	81.8%	18.2%	0%	0%	0%
Standard Deviation	0.39					

	Mean		Percent Rank
Siyuan Lyu	4.82	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	----
Economics	4.46	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	50 th
College of Arts and Sciences	4.31	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	59 th
Summer 2025	4.41	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	57 th