Your report should have the following components:

* Use the ICLR latex template (<https://github.com/ICLR/Master-Template/raw/master/iclr2025.zip>)
* In iclr2025\_conference.tex, uncomment the line \iclrfinalcopy.
* Just one author block

\author{Student 1 Name \& Student 2 Name \\

245/445-Team Name\\ % pick either 245 or 445, pick 445 if mixed 245 and 445 students in a team

University of Rochester\\

Rochester, NY 14627, USA\\

\texttt{Your Emails}

}

- a descriptive Title

- a short Abstract to highlight your work   
    - sections in the order of Introduction, Related Work, Methods, Experiments, and Conclusion   
    - a list of References at the end   
    - insert figures and tables wherever needed

**Grading Rubrics**

* **Below are score landmarks with examples and feel free to do interpolation**
* **We will use 10-point scoring, 2.5 points for each of C, Q, E, P.**
* Completeness
  + Excellent (2.5) – contains all components listed above with the ICLR template and has at least 3.5 pages of the main content
  + Good (2.0) – misses one or two components / does not follow the CVPR template / less than 3.5 but more than 3 pages of the main content
  + Fair (1.5) – misses three or four components / less than 3 but more than 2 pages of the main content
  + Poor (1.0) – misses five or more components / less than 2 pages of the main content
* Quality of writing and experiments
  + Excellent (2.5) – writing is ok, reports some quantitative and qualitative results
  + Good (2.0) – writing is ok, reports limited quantitative or qualitative results
  + Fair (1.5) – writing is poor, reports limited quantitative or qualitative results
  + Poor (1.0) – writing is poor, reports no results
* Evidence of student learning
  + Excellent (2.5) – a hard project and fair execution with limited results / an easy project and good execution with many results
  + Good (2.0) – a hard project and fair execution with very limited results / an easy project and fair execution with limited results
  + Fair (1.5) – a hard project and poor execution with no results / an easy project and fair execution with very limited results
  + Poor (1.0) – an easy project and poor execution with no results

(hard/easy depends on many factors, e.g., training, code, datasets, etc; use your best judgment)

* Possible contributions to the literature
  + All CSC 245 students get 2.5
  + Excellent (2.5 ) – potentially one or more interesting results
  + Good (2.0) – good efforts to reproduce the state-of-the-art even though failed
  + Fair (1.5) – all others