

ACM SIGGRAPH Executive Committee Minutes

Tuesday, 14-16 November 2025

Chicago, Illinois

Attendees:

Darin Grant, Executive Committee Chair
June Kim, Executive Committee Chair-Elect
David Spoelstra, Executive Committee Treasurer
Jenny Dana, Executive Committee Treasurer-Elect
Kalina Borkiewicz, Executive Committee Director
Elizabeth Baron, Executive Committee Director
Baoquan Chen, Executive Committee Director
Hugues Hoppe, Executive Committee Director
Alla Sheffer, Executive Committee Director
Scott Owen, Governance Advisory Board Representative to the EC
Dena DeBry, Nominations Committee Representative to the EC
Mikki Rose, Conference Advisory Group, (CAG) Chair
Tomasz Bednarz, SIGGRAPH Asia Conference Advisory Group Chair (SACAG Chair)
Courtney Starrett, Executive Committee Director
Marcia Daudelin, SIGGRAPH Conference Event Director
Katherine Ruff-Piccirilli, ACM SIGGRAPH Project Manager

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
<p>Welcome and Icebreaker The EC Chair welcomed the EC to Chicago and gave an overview of the agenda over the next two days. He thanked the EC for traveling in.</p> <p>The EC Chair outlined goals for the meeting which includes stating goals for each agenda item and summarizing action items at the end of each day, including assigning responsible EC members for those action items. The outcome of the meeting will be shared in the Chair's Corner within the next month.</p>	Darin Grant
<p>EC Strategy The goal of the agenda item is to align the EC on what their strategic priorities and focus should be. Dena reminded the EC that it's important to set strategic boundaries because, as volunteers, the EC will not be able to accomplish everything, and it's more effective strategically to focus their efforts. The EC should focus on setting guardrails and strategy, rather than the route and tactics.</p> <p>To facilitate this discussion, the EC engaged in a virtual card sorting exercise which consisted of sorting various organizational activities or actions into 4 categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EC Leads 2. EC Consults/Approves 3. EC Informed; and 4. In the Weeds <p>After sorting the cards, the EC reviewed and discussed strong areas of agreement and strong areas of disagreement. Areas of agreement include the conference budget, membership model, organization budget, representation with ACM/SGB, organization financial sustainability, and organization policies.</p> <p>The EC considered what a working agreement between the EC and CAG would look like, noting that it can be challenging to be nimble when there are contractors/contracts in place which is why consulting/approving is important as well as mutual trust and clear communication between different groups. The consult/approve category gives EC the ability to jump in if needed but rubber stamp activities when they run smoothly. EC buy-in does need to happen early enough to allow for changes to occur, especially considering long term contracts that tend to carry over multiple years. EC-informed would be areas of work where the EC couldn't craft themselves but the information would be important to have.</p> <p>There was a question about whether the conference budget was ever not approved: it has never not been approved but there have been issues when the EC tried to control the conference. Having a formalized relationship in place that standardizes the EC providing feedback to the conference would allow for changes to be requested without the ask being adversarial. The feedback loop should be constant/long enough that formal approval is easier. The EC Chair shared the idea of "Context not Control:" giving information on why something happened/needs to happen while not trying to control how it occurs.</p> <p>The EC discussed Professional Chapters, focusing on two separate points: the difference between Chapters, SCs, and affinity groups and discussing the</p>	Dena DeBry

effectiveness of chapters. Some members of the EC noted that they viewed Chapters as falling within the EC-informed because they are functioning year round. Chapters have specific requirements and criteria that they must meet in order to continue to be a chapter. Some EC members suggested that it could be beneficial for other SCs to have criteria to help them measure/evaluate success. The EC also discussed how chapters ultimately report to ACM, so while SIGGRAPH can make suggestions to close chapters, the organization does rely on ACM to step in if a chapter is not fulfilling its requirements.

The second part of the discussion on chapters focused on the difference between chapters, SCs, and affinity groups. Some members of the EC feel that some SCs serve a similar function to affinity groups because they are a subset of people who share a common interest, such as the Digital Arts Committee. It was noted that affinity groups do not receive funding from SIGGRAPH while SCs do. The EC also discussed how the Chapters Committee was at one point considering creating virtual chapters that would focus areas of interest/work rather than physical location which would be very similar to some SCs. The EC agreed that further discussion is needed to parse out the differences between SCs, Affinity Groups and Chapters and the needs they each fulfill. In the interest of time, and noting that SCs will be discussed during a later agenda item, the EC agreed to move to the next topic.

Conference programs was an area of disagreement during the card sorting for how involved the EC should be. EC members shared that programs reflect where attendees fit into the conference and can tie into membership, which is why some EC members ranked it with higher levels of EC involvement. There was discussion over whether or not there should be a pathway for the EC to suggest a program being sunset or suggestion a program being started. The EC discussed the need to suggest communities that should be considered as part of the programming. The CAG Chair noted that the EC has done this within the past few years and SIGGRAPH has made program changes as a result. It was noted that the EC tends to be reluctant to cut programs but favors approving new programs: concrete data would help with the decision making process. The EC will be further discussing conference programs and how they can request programmatic changes on Saturday.

The EC also discussed conference content focus, as it was another area the EC disagreed on. Some EC members noted that they feel that conference content focus reflects the direction that SIGGRAPH is moving, so the EC should provide the strategy of requesting a program versus requesting specific content within a program. Many EC members felt that conference content focus is similar to conference programs in terms of how involved the EC should be in so far as the EC should not be making individual selections on content but should have opportunities to provide broad input when necessary.

Conference pricing strategies was another area of disagreement: the EC noted that there's a difference between specifying what pricing should be and approving the overall budget. By approving the overall budget, the EC is inherently approving the pricing strategies. The EC discussed whether the EC should be providing feedback on the budget as a whole or the pricing strategies individually, agreeing that it's

<p>important to provide and understand the context for pricing strategies but not control what pricing is.</p> <p>Conference volunteer recognition was another area of disagreement, where the EC agreed that it's important to align recognizing conference and organization volunteers but that they shouldn't be involved in determining the specifics.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Nominations Committee Chair to synthesize the responses to the sorting activity to share with the EC. 2. Project Manager to work with Membership & Communications Chair to list affinity groups as a separate page under the About section of the website. 	
<p>SIGGRAPH Site Selection Resolution</p> <p>The Chair provided a recap of previous activities related to the site selection guidelines. Few comments on the guidelines have been received; however, community members have shared positive feedback on the transparency and conversations the Chair and EC have been having with the community.</p> <p>The EC reviewed the final candidate site selection questionnaire and next steps, inviting EC feedback. There were concerns raised about some of the usage for the questionnaire. First, the EC discussed concerns with sharing the list of locations publicly, noting it could hurt the organization financially during the bidding process. The EC preferred having a list of generally potential cities, rather than a list of the top candidates. Concerns were also shared on listing cities that SIGGRAPH cannot host a conference in (such as cities with space limitations), noting that cities shouldn't be listed if the conference cannot feasibly be there. The EC instead discussed sharing the list of cities that conferences have been held in and inviting suggestions for new locations. It was also noted that it could be important to share the differences between SIGGRAPH Asia and SIGGRAPH.</p> <p>The EC discussed how the questions will be used to guide decisions. Answers to some of these questions will not immediately disqualify a city but will help justify selection of the city.</p> <p>There was discussion on the differences between specialized conferences and SIGGRAPH Asia and SIGGRAPH. The EC agreed that specialized conferences do not have to answer these questions as they go through a different process than SIGGRAPH and SIGGRAPH Asia. Other SIGGRAPH events, such as Chapters in in-person meetings will also not require the same level of city evaluation. The rationale being that these locations do not have as much career impact (value of publications and presentation on a CV) in comparison and thus the location is less impactful to our membership at large. Creating a barrier to publishing/presenting at a SIGGRAPH conference is impactful to one's career.</p> <p>The EC discussed the importance of allowing both positive and negative feedback for the questions and concerns of overcomplicating the process. The EC agreed that, while the site selection process will likely become longer, transparency is important. The EC will be better aligned and informed when making a decision to</p>	Darin Grant

feel more confident on making it by having these selection guidelines and questions outlined.

The EC discussed using indices to help evaluate answers to some of the questions, such as safety, noting that it's important to standardize which indices are used. The EC agreed to have a smaller team determine the indices that will be used, noting that it could be good to use indices from the major locations that attendees are traveling from. Using these will help with the arbitrary or ambiguity with some of the questions.

The EC discussed the timeline for voting on site selections. The location recommendation with site selection guideline questionnaire completed should be provided a month prior to the vote with a presentation two weeks before a vote is conducted.

A document detailing the selection details will be shared after a city is selected, even if a conference has been held at that location before. The EC discussed the importance of focusing on why a city was chosen, rather than comparing it to other alternatives. The EC underscored the importance of transparency in the decision after selection, though it was noted that after a vote is conducted it can take time to finalize contracts prior to releasing the selected location. The document does not have to be released in conjunction with announcing the location, but can be released after.

The EC Chair reminded the EC of the recent actions related to DEI: the DEI Committee is paused, the Rainbow Affinity was formed, and the learnings from DEI experts. He shared that he attended a presentation from ACM's DEI Council last week, and they shared various resources. The EC reviewed the DEI Council presentation from last week, highlighting key points and considering engaging their feedback on the discussed guidelines. The EC how to better engage with the DEI Council and the merits of reigniting the SIGGRAPH DEI Committee. Some members worried that, if there is an ACM DEI Council, the work would be duplicative, while other members felt that a SIGGRAPH DEI Committee would be focused only on the SIGs work.

Action Items:

1. Alla Sheffer to create two questions for the SIGGRAPH attendee survey:
 - a. Lists all previous locations and invites attendees to suggest an additional location
 - b. Lists potential cities and allows for attendees to provide feedback on those cities
2. The CAGs to meet together to filter down the guidelines questions prior to the SACAG's site selection in December. If the questions are not reduced by site selection in December, SACAG will use the existing list.
3. The EC reps to CAG and SACAG will work to finalize the list and guide communication with the broader SIGGRAPH community.
4. To re-start the paused DEI efforts, a subset of the EC (Darin Grant, Courtney Starrett and Kalina Borkiewicz) to reach out to the ACM Diversity Council to request information on how they track metrics and learn if SIGGRAPH can have a rep on the Council.

Standing Committees

The EC reviewed the current state of SCs. The Chair-Elect reviewed the committees that have been sunset in the last few years and listed the in-flux committees. The EC Chair-Elect introduced several questions for the EC to consider and discuss:

1. What causes committees to sunset or become unstable and how can the EC better support and sustain the work of SCs?
2. How can SCs rebalance conference participation with year-round engagement?
3. Building a system to manage and measure committee KPIs.
4. The effectiveness of current groupings
5. How can SC activities increase membership?

The EC discussed whether or not SCs should be presenting at the conference, noting that their jobs are to provide year round engagement. Their focus should be on what members want year-round.

The EC also noted that some committees feel like precursors to affinity groups. They discussed evaluating which committees feel like they're providing *organizational* benefits/services (ITS, Nominations) or providing *member* benefits.

The EC then discussed the difference between affinity group events versus SC events. Some EC members felt that there are minimal differences between affinity groups and some SCs, as they both aim to provide activities for a group of individuals with common interest. For example, Chapters recently came up with an idea for having topic based chapters that were virtual which feels very similar to some affinity groups.

The EC considered useful KPIs and how to standardize committee review/evaluation every few years to evaluate effectiveness at providing year-round benefits. There were concerns raised over asking volunteers to do additional work: any additional asks must be useful but also not burn out volunteers. The Annual Report and report outs could help facilitate some of this evaluation and information gathering. There is already a structure for completing this report. The EC also discussed outlining or standardizing best practices for how committees function, though some concerns were raised over committees that primarily only have a chair doing the work and may not need larger committees. Having EC Liaisons be more involved with their committees could help reduce some of the burden on reporting to the EC, as liaisons can provide that support. Because each SCC is different, each EC Liaison should work with their chair to develop a system or checklist to assess the committee.

The EC also reviewed the budget trends for the SCs and discussed how budget usage illustrates committees' activities. Other committee suggestions were provided, such as helping to increase overall membership by providing additional discounts to join an event. The EC also discussed providing discounts to the conference to attend at the exhibits-only level for attending a chapters event: the CAG Chair confirmed this is possible and the Treasurer-elect will reach out to Chapters confirm that this is an option.

June Kim

The EC considered a workshop that invites all SC participants to attend that helps identify what a members-only page should have. Some members of the EC also proposed focusing on member benefits at the next in person meeting. Concerns were raised over not having a flat management structure, noting that the current structure is flatter than desired.

The EC attempted to reconsider the groupings based on a 2023 chart that was shared. This chart had some outdated committees, but attempted to determine the best groupings so that committee chairs could lean on each other for ideas. Ultimately, the EC agreed that the structure is messy and agreed that in order to make changes, the EC must first agree on what the values for the organization are. Once those are determined, it allows the EC to move forward with an idea of what it wants the organization to be rather than trying to fit existing committees within a box.

The EC discussed the difference between strategy groups, SCs, and affinity groups. EC members haven't noticed the decline in exhibitors at other conferences like SIGGRAPH has. The ones that have successful show floors are often for-profit conferences. B2B events also tend to perform well. Affinity groups used to be called community groups and strategy groups were supposed to only exist for a few years.

Motion to dissolve the nurturing communities strategy group.

1. Motion made by Elizabeth Baron.
2. Dave Spoelstra seconded.
3. Motion passed: 11 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain
 - a. Voting yes are Darin Grant, June Kim, David Spoelstra, Jenny Dana, Elizabeth Baron, Courtney Starrett, Kalina Borkiewicz, Hugues Hoppe, Alla Sheffer, Mikki Rose, Tomasz Bednarz
 - b. Voting to abstain is Baoquan Chen

Actions:

1. Project Manager and Treasurer-elect to create a tracking document for SCs to list out all committee members and work with David as he collects that in December.
2. The EC Chair-Elect to create a Slack conversation to facilitate discussion between the EC on the values that SIGGRAPH wants to focus on prior to regrouping committees.
3. Treasurer-elect to reach out to Chapters Chair to confirm that chapter event attendees can receive a discounted exhibits-only pass to SIGGRAPH 2026.
4. EC Liaisons to work with their committees to develop a checklist or system to assess their committee at the end of each year. Liaisons should review the annual report with the committee chair and create KPIs that coordinate with the budget.

Smithbucklin Trends Presentation

Smithbucklin contractors joined the meeting to discuss conference trends and evaluate how they compare to SIGGRAPH. Following the conference, there was a request to better understand conference trends; other contractors also shared their trend documents.

Smithbucklin

The EC watched a recorded presentation giving a high level overview of current association conference trends:

1. Costs have risen substantially 25-35% higher than 2019 to 2024
2. Per attendee per day looking at costs well over 1000
3. Registration, sponsorship & exhibit rates have not kept pace with rising costs thus the profitability is starting to shrink
4. Factors include economic uncertainty, including budget cuts for travel, marketing, and advertising.
5. Attendees tend to wait to register because of the uncertainties and desire for quality content because attending conferences have become more challenging. Attendees have to work harder to justify funds.

The EC reacted to the presentation, noting that it's discouraging. Attendees are looking for brands they can trust and it's important to put yourself in the customer's shoes to focus on what they want. Ultimately attendees and partners are seeking connection and relationships.

It was noted that some The EC discussed how a CRM could track attendee data year over year to determine who's attending different events and to market to them, though some members of the EC were opposed to having a CRM.

There were also questions on year-over-year follow up with vendors and why vendors may have chosen not to attend a particular conference. Tradeshow Logic does year over year follow up: in 2024, exhibitors raised concerns over the location and some wanted to focus on Tokyo rather than Denver. Vancouver had a slightly stronger pull, but some vendors raised travel concerns. It was also noted that some companies are focusing on their own events more often and that business suites are starting to become a stronger pull for companies to develop focused relationships during conferences, such as business suites. Business suites bring in revenue but do not necessarily bring in more registrations.

The EC raised questions on how elastic price is. A competitive pricing analysis was done last year for SIGGRAPH against other similar organizations and offering and current registration prices are in line with those prices. The EC also reviewed trends specific to SIGGRAPH:

- Registration fees have not come back up to pre-pandemic levels
- Virtual experience fees were reduced but there are almost no differences between virtual registrations numbers regardless of the fee
- Revenue per person has generally increased since 2019 but expense also has disproportionately
- Not a lot of local audience in 2024
- Exhibition and sponsor trends: fewer booths and more business suites
- Abstract submissions are way up but there was a dip post-pandemic
- Wider variety of geographical reach

Attendee Pressure:

- Geopolitical: some attendees unlikely to attend in the US because of political climate
- Budget Constraints: too expensive if the company is not paying for it
- Custom Experience: hard to meet people who are aligned with you
- Quality over Quantity: too many things happening at the same time

<p>Community Engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance: Attendees generally feel that it's a positive and welcoming; people come because it feeds passion and helps them stay informed • Community Connections: 70% of website traffic to conference website driven by marketing efforts and 2 of top 3 topics were AI and generative AI • Personalization: attendees want to map out a schedule by interest areas, keywords and segmented apps <p>The EC acknowledged that SIGGRAPH's traditional appeal has diminished and discussed the need for greater inclusivity, stronger PR, and enhanced networking options to restore its value proposition.</p>	
<p>Affinity Groups Review</p> <p>The GAB Chair reminded the EC what the current affinity groups are. He presented the issues to discuss: are all affinity groups the same; could they potentially receive financial support; is it ok if most/all activity occurs at SIGGRAPH/SA. When affinity groups were created, the impression was that these are a catch all other category, but that may not be the case.</p> <p>The EC discussed the merits of them being viewed as an “other” category besides SCs and Advisory Groups. Some EC members noted that viewing them as a catch all other category means that their MOUS should be more flexible since they will have different needs. EC members shared how officially recognizing them as a group allows them to receive more support, such as having space at conferences, though some EC members raised that if the affinity group activity is only at a conference then they should present a BoF.</p> <p>There was discussion over the financial support affinity groups receive: some EC members noted that they do receive non-direct financial support such as space at conferences. Other EC members shared that it may be good to create a grant program for affinity groups to apply for which is another argument for why they need to be officially recognized. Being officially recognized also allows them to solicit funds and allows them to have SIGGRAPH hold their funds. Generally, the affiliation with SIGGRAPH is important for non-direct financial reasons, despite the groups focusing on different activities.</p> <p>Every affinity group has to submit an MOU and get it approved by the EC. Pioneers does not have an approved MOU. The EC debated whether the MOU should state “shall not” or “should not” ask for financial support. A straw poll indicated that MOUs should list “should not,” especially considering the non-direct financial support that affinity groups receive.</p> <p>Action: GAB Chair to share the Pioneers MOU in the new template form with the EC for review and approval.</p>	<p>Scott Owen</p>
<p>Meeting Adjourned for the day.</p>	<p>Darin Grant</p>

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>
<p>Welcome Back and Icebreaker</p> <p>The EC Chair reviewed the agenda with the EC for Saturday, highlighting the goal of each session. To begin the second day of the meeting, the EC Chair asked the EC to share one thing that could be improved upon from the previous day. The EC agreed to assign action items to EC members and end discussions with an overview of next steps. Some EC members raised the importance of providing historical knowledge for context during conversations, noting that good ideas are suggested but oftentimes not captured or follow up on.</p> <p>There was a discussion on an orientation that EC reps to the CAG received when being onboarded and the importance of this orientation being available to everyone. Action items were reviewed and owners assigned if necessary. Additional conversation was had on the whether or not affinity group members and SC committee members should have to be SIGGRAPH members. Affinity group leaders should be members. The EC agreed that if member benefits are improved then it would be reasonable to require committee members to be SIGGRAPH members.</p>	Darin Grant
<p>Conference Updates</p> <p>The SACAG Chair presented on SIGGRAPH Asia 2025. He first shared historical data on SIGGRAPH Asia, highlighting its growth and previous successes. He highlighted the importance of having local attendees and a strong community in the location. He also shared submission information from accepted sessions. Some programs reduced the number of accepted submissions to ensure quality presentations. The number of technical paper submissions continues to increase, a trend seen with both SIGGRAPH Asia 2025 and for SIGGRAPH 2025. Increasing the number of technical papers accepted would likely require SIGGRAPH Asia to add an additional day of the conference. There was a question about who reviews the BoF for SIGGRAPH Asia. The Conference Committee Chair ultimately reviews them and makes the acceptance decisions.</p> <p>The SACAG Chair also provided registration data, showing the number of registrations four weeks out. In conjunction with the registration data, the EC reviewed where attendees are traveling from, the top organizations with accepted papers, and the list of sponsors and exhibitors. There was a conversation about the differences between SIGGRAPH Asia's and SIGGRAPH's exhibition hall, noting that SIGGRAPH Asia's hall has typically been smaller and has more locally based companies in attendance.</p> <p>The make up of the SACAG was also reviewed, including outgoing members. Other key dates were shared, including the bidding process for SA2027 with the note that the EC will receive the location recommendation in January.</p> <p>The CAG Chair presented information about SIGGRAPH 2026. She shared program updates, noting that labs and courses are being combined into one program because of the crossover between the two. There was discussion over continuing to have hands-on courses available, which will still be an option for presenters under the combined program structure. Additional program changes include technical workshops being separated from frontiers. They will also be full conference in 2026. Art Galley is being moved to a double blind jury and ACM</p>	Mikki Rose and Tomasz Bednarz

SIGGRAPH 365 Community Showcase is being rebranded to ACM SIGGRAPH 365. Deferred technical papers will be new in 2026. Some calls for submissions are open and general submissions, production sessions & SVs calls opening soon.

The job fair has been shrinking significantly, leading to a proposal to remove it for now and revisit later. While companies are still hiring, there is a misalignment between job seekers and available positions at SIGGRAPH. These conversations may also be happening in business suites now. Alternatives were considered, such as career-focused sessions or BoFs, possibly in collaboration with ECDC, and promoting these to exhibit-only attendees. Companies often engage with students through SV sponsorships, and EC suggested exploring an online jobs portal as a member benefit, tied to the members-only section of the website, though activity through Linklings has been minimal.

The CAG Chair also informed the EC that the conference is considering cutting the virtual experience. Registration numbers have been steadily declining, and it could be a way to reduce costs. There were discussions over the merits of keeping the virtual experience, with access and equity concerns raised for those who cannot attend in person. A loss of registration revenue for the conference if all sessions are recorded and available in the Digital Library is also a concern. The EC discussed the merits of reducing versus entirely cutting recording and virtual access, but wanted more data on cost savings before making a decision. It was noted that tracking virtual engagement is difficult (full conference attendees watching vs virtual only viewership), but papers, keynotes, and courses tend to be the most viewed. EC debated whether videos should remain behind a paywall and agreed to review cost savings and engagement data before making changes. A straw poll was conducted on how does the EC feel overall about entirely cutting virtual access? The EC wants to better understand what the cost savings would be and without additional data it is hard to agree to cut. The EC is open to considering reducing the virtual experience pending a review of cost data.

The CAG Chair also shared there is an expansion underway at the Los Angeles Convention Center. While construction is ongoing, some spaces will be unavailable, but the conference doesn't expect substantial impact to the rooms available to SIGGRAPH.

The budget development is underway, with the budget meeting planned for December 5-6. After, the CAG will finalize the budget and share with the EC in early January to review. The EC will plan to submit questions prior to the full budget presentation at the end of January and vote by mid-February. There were concerns raised with the ability to adjust contracts within the budget: the major contracts are signed at this point. A volunteer will now be managing the donation process to develop relationships with larger donors instead of exhibition management.

Actions:

1. The EC-Chair to start to compare and discuss registration types/levels between SIGGRAPH and SIGGRAPH Asia over Slack.
2. The CAG Chair to share data to help the EC make a decision on cutting the virtual experience. Data should include engagement numbers and cost savings.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. CAG and SACAG Chairs ensure SIGGRAPH and SIGGRAPH Conference Chairs for 2026 to connect on deferred papers. 4. SACAG Chair to review the number of registrations that SA2024 had four weeks out to compare against SA2025's registration data 4 weeks out. 	
<p>Treasurer Update</p> <p>The Treasurer shared an update on budgeting. First, he reviewed the budgeting process, noting that it's the best guess of the future and difficult to guess who expensive things will be in advance. Best practice for budgeting is to be conservative: the default answer to request for funds is no without justification. The budget allows SIGGRAPH to track SCs records' and accomplishments over the next year.</p> <p>The Treasurer asked for input on several areas to help develop the budget, noting the EC asked the conference to reduce expenses, and asked "how much should EC's and SC's budgets be reduced by?" Revenue changes and challenges are expected because ACM Open will impact Digital Library revenue. SGB also has new overhead rates.</p> <p>The Treasurer reviewed the timeline: next week he will be kicking off the budgeting process with an email to SC Chairs. In December, he'll meet with SC Chairs and Liaisons. The preliminary budget must be sent to ACM the first week of January with the expectation that SIGGRAPH will receive it in mid-January with edits. The EC will vote in February to send it to the ACM Treasurer March 1.</p> <p>The Treasurer requested input on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much should SIGGRAPH require SCs and EC to reduce their budget? • ERC: does this committee need full TRB? It needs some direction from the EC. • Awards: Can awards chair or conference chair give the awards and reduce the costs of additional awards chairs get TRB? Make it comparable to other subcommittees. • SC Chair travel to SA? SC Chairs used to receive travel to SA, but that was cut. Chairs may request it. Should the Treasurer add it back into the budget? <p>The EC discussed the proposed cuts and the pros and cons. There were discussions on the value of SC Chairs traveling to SIGGRAPH Asia, with some EC members stating that it could be beneficial to have a greater SIGGRAPH presence there. Ultimately, the EC decided that, without concrete budget numbers on how much any of these cuts would produce savings, they were unable to make a decision. There are ways for volunteers to request funding for travel if necessary, and the Finance Committee and Chair reviews those requests. There was also conversation about how the annual report can help the Treasurer identify committee activities for the subsequent year.</p> <p>EC Liaisons were reminded that budget calls must be completed in December. SCs and EC Liaisons will be expected to share what their year-round activities are during those calls.</p> <p>The Treasurer also shared a new expense report format, requesting that expenses must be submitted as one PDF with the receipts in categorical order. Formulas have been simplified and compatibility for the report is being updated.</p>	David Spoelstra

<p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Manager to confirm whether the annual report includes planning for the next year or only a look back in future years. 2. Treasurer to provide data visualization for future reports when requesting EC feedback on budget numbers. Data should include information such as what the cost savings would be, what the previous year's budget was, and/or what the new amount being added to the budget would be. The data should provide the EC with context of how the change would positively or negatively affect the budget. 	
<p>Specialized Conferences Review</p> <p>One of the EC Liaisons to the Specialized Conferences Committee presented an overview of specialized conferences, noting that the number of conferences varies year to year and there are three types of conferences (sponsored, co-sponsored and in cooperation). Generally speaking, specialized conferences are profitable, though there have been instances where that has not been the case.</p> <p>The committee primarily works via email, reviewing requests submitted to ACM and then shared with the chair. The chair meets with the SCC periodically as a kind of subcommittee, but each conference tends to manage its own work. The Chair does have a spreadsheet that provides various data about each conference and tracks important due dates.</p> <p>There have been some challenges raised by some of the conferences: DigiPro is concerned about ACM Open and there were challenges with VRCAI last year. If challenges continue to arise with VRCAI, the EC may need to become more involved. It was also noted there were some data discrepancies between what ACM reports and direct reports from conferences to the chair.</p> <p>The EC reviewed potential strategic initiatives for the committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A symposium on generative AI which would require a critical mass of generative AI leaders but would be an opportunity for a new specialized conference. It was highlighted that this is occurring at the ACM level already. 2. Awards presented at specialized conferences. These would be non-ACM awards and would help elevate the conferences. <p>Questions to consider were shared with the EC. In the interest of time, the EC did not discuss all of them. There were questions over whether or not SIGGRAPH members receive discounts at specialized conferences: sponsored and co-sponsored conferences provide discounts to members. The EC also discussed whether or not SIGGRAPH CARES should have a presence at specialized conferences: it is a year round alias and CARES reps should be available online. The EC also discussed options for encouraging specialized conferences to co-locate with SIGGRAPH: there were concerns raised that it's expensive to stay for two conferences in one location, though hotels that get booked would be credited to the conference.</p>	<p>Kalina Borkiewicz</p>

The EC also discussed that the Finance Committee is supposed to review budgets for each specialized conference: this has not been occurring. They are also supposed to write a proposal to receive half of their revenue returned to them.

Actions:

1. Project Manager to review who's on the CARES alias and ensure the S2025 chair is replaced with SA2025 chair.
2. Consider and adjust the policy for SCC budgets being viewed by the Finance Committee.
3. SCC EC liaisons to work with the chair to create and/or update policies for specialized conferences that would provide the EC with a framework on when specialized conferences should be reviewed. Policies should also be updated to ensure consistency with what review is currently happening, specifically considering the policy that the Finance Committee reviews budgets for each specialized conference.

Industry Relations

The goal of this session is to establish alignment on creating an industry relations strategy group or ad hoc committee. Currently, Tradeshow Logic manages sponsorships and exhibitor relationships, but the landscape is shifting toward multi-year partnerships rather than one-off vendor arrangements. SIGGRAPH needs a stable, year-round model that offers tangible benefits for partners to engage with the broader SIGGRAPH community. The EC discussed how current discussions with vendors focus on companies wanting to be considered partners rather than being limited to a conference. Having multi-year relationships would help with streamlining the contracting experience for recurring partners. This could include streamlined contracting for recurring partners and improved relationship management through a CRM system, which was widely supported. Historically, sponsorship efforts were volunteer-driven, but there were challenges with overlap between the conference and volunteers. The EC emphasized the need for clearer communication about SIGGRAPH's unique value and a more functional website. The EC also discussed focusing on newer companies that may have funding available who are not established partners. Additional feedback was shared, such as industry partners wanting data on conference attendees or numbers: SIGGRAPH does have guidelines approved by ACM that addresses this. The EC also discussed how a CRM would be useful to track this data.

June Kim and
Darin Grant

Action: June Kim to head a task force exploring industry relations options which should include the CAGs. Any changes will likely not occur until 2027.

Free Form Conversation

The EC engaged in a free form discussion where each EC member had 90 seconds to raise a topic/issue not on the agenda. Topics that were raised are as follows:

- SIGGRAPH Identity & Vision: SIGGRAPH needs to define its identity and move beyond traditional concepts and speak with experienced folks in the field.
- The next CAG Chair will be discussed in a future meeting.
- Fraudulent Student Discounts: The CAG has been working on this and plans to verify students IDs at the time of registration.
- SIGGRAPH should strengthen industry relations and growing industry

<p>partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social media channels need to be more active year round. • SCs: More discussion is needed over what SCs mean to the organization and what makes up ACM SIGGRAPH. • Member Benefits: more discussion is needed on what member benefits are. Learning what members want is doable but time intensive. It could be beneficial to form a group to look into this. • Expanded connections between SIGGRAPH and SIGGRAPH Asia: exchanging a small number of passes between the two. SACAG and CAG can discuss ways to connect the two conferences more. • Suggestions were made to move back to a single biweekly meeting time instead of alternating times. The majority of the EC was in agreement. • The website needs to encourage volunteerism more to focus on organizational volunteering. Attracting new volunteers may be one of the most important things to keep the organization moving forward. • Volunteers may be receiving too many perks of the conference. • Policy guidelines are not always enforced, though the EC has spent a lot of time developing them. Who is supposed to enforce them? 	
<p>Conference Programs</p> <p>The EC Chair reminded the EC that some of the data presented by Smithbucklin today will be an estimate. The EC received numerous reports to review with final data following SIGGRAPH 2025. Historical information on conference program evaluation was provided: a few years ago the CAG completed a survey to evaluate who is being effectively served by conference programs. The EC at the time also completed the survey and the responses were reviewed to help direct any program changes.</p> <p>Data was shared on current SIGGRAPH Programs through a “data given valuation lens”, organized into the following groupings for ease of analysis: session-based programs, experience/performance-based programs, operations & onsite programs, and other. The goal of reviewing these groupings through this lens is so that programmatic change can happen from the bottom up but also top down as necessary. The EC reviewed the VR Theater as an example, noting that it served a limited audience but was highly valued by those who experienced it. Over eight years, however, costs, volunteer involvement, and technology evolved, making sustainability difficult without significantly altering the attendee experience.</p> <p>The group also explored a product portfolio review approach. Decisions should be based on more than costs, incorporating factors like member value and audience reach. However, there is currently no clear process for flagging programs for review or defining triggers for adjustments. The EC discussed creating indicators and possibly boiling them down to a score to track trends over time. Data points such as attendee level, registration type, and stratified data could help, though not all indicators will apply to every program. The EC reviewed the potential options for these data points with many EC members raising concerns over how to define the KPIs and what the priorities should be. The EC discussed completing a survey to outline the top 2-3 KPIs for each program area.</p> <p>Budgeting and expenses were another point of discussion. The conference uses</p>	<p>Brenda, Marcia, Darin</p>

zero-based budgeting, but costs vary yearly due to shared resources and shifting priorities. Expenses are categorized into areas such as program, operations, onsite, MCS, exhibits and sponsors, and committee. Within program expenses, 60% go to sessions and 40% to experiences, with technical papers being the largest cost driver. Operations primarily cover onsite logistics like hotel contracts. Some costs are hard to allocate because they are shared across programs, and removing a program does not eliminate all associated expenses.

Challenges include limited trend data, which is often point-in-time and incomplete. Discounts and contributor recognition are not reflected in current cost data. Virtual costs remain high due to streaming and staffing requirements, even if content is reduced. The group noted that reducing content while keeping virtual options may not significantly lower costs, and accessibility for remote attendees must be considered.

The EC also discussed attempting to assign revenue data to some of the programs, though it is extremely difficult to break these down because it's not as easy to parse out who would attend specific programs. The EC also discussed production sessions having challenges with permission issues for the virtual experience, though it depends on the topic, year, and company. It was noted that it requires quite some time to follow up for recording permissions.

The EC emphasized aligning program evaluation with SIGGRAPH's mission and adapting to shifts in audience values. They also discussed the importance of defining triggers for program review and identifying additional data points needed for decision-making. The EC agreed that there's two key data collection points: the registration form and attendee survey. The attendee survey should be made to help evaluate value while not losing its current purpose. If possible, the registration form could be updated, but the EC would need to identify updated questions in December prior to the build in January. The EC discussed tracking how long attendees spend in certain areas, but this would be difficult with SIGGRAPH. Manual counts are done to determine how many people are attending each session. There is also some data within Linklings on what attendees add to their schedule, though attendees often don't build out their schedule until 1-2 days before.

The EC discussed challenges with being good proxies for attendees who are unaware of what's offered. Some EC members suggested having an option for attendees to sit and have a cup of coffee to complete an informal survey to determine interest and value of programs.

Action: Data visualization EC members to work together to determine what questions should be asked to determine how to assign value to various conference programs. The survey would then need to be completed by EC members.

Long Term Contracts

The EC discussed how to improve coordination and communication with the CAG regarding long-term contracts and the RFP process. The EC agreed that receiving periodic, high-level updates on RFP progress would help provide context and maintain strategic alignment. While EC liaisons to the CAG are valuable, the EC

Mikki Rose and
June Kim

<p>emphasized the importance of keeping the full committee informed, particularly early in the process and when new scopes of work are being developed.</p> <p>The EC acknowledged the need to balance trust in the CAG's work with the EC's oversight responsibilities. Members discussed ways to provide input efficiently, such as through concise summaries or designated review periods, without slowing the contracting process.</p> <p>Action items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contract expiration dates and milestones to be added to the timeline tracker by the CAG and SACAG Chairs. 2. The EC and CAG to create a working agreement with terms of use around data sharing when it comes to the RFP process. 3. Darin to get existing signed contracts from Ashley and share with the EC. 	
<p>Bylaws Changes Review Not discussed in the interest of time.</p>	Scott Owen
<p>Wrap Up The EC reviewed major themes that came up today in order to identify two themes to focus on in the coming meetings. The potential themes were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member Benefits 2. Industry Relations Task Force 3. EC Director Onboarding 4. Standing Committee/Ad Hoc/Affinity Group differences 5. Values of SIGGRAPH and Selling SIGGRAPH 6. Volunteer Development <p>The EC conducted a straw poll to determine the top two: member benefits and an industry relations task force. Member benefits will be discussed at the next multi-day leadership meeting. Industry relations and SIGGRAPH Values/Selling SIGGRAPH can be smaller task forces.</p> <p>The EC discussed challenges with having alternating times for biweekly meetings</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Manager to send a new poll to identify a singular meeting time for the biweekly meetings. 2. Member benefits should be included on the next multi-day agenda 3. SIGGRAPH Values/Selling SIGGRAPH task force to be created to review the values and value of the organization. <p>The EC Chair thanked the EC for their time and efforts this weekend and adjourned the meeting.</p>	Darin Grant
<p>Meeting Adjourned</p>	Darin Grant