

ACM SIGGRAPH Executive Committee Minutes

Tuesday, 21 October 2025

5 - 6 PM PT/8 - 9 PM ET

Attendees:

June Kim, Acting Executive Committee Chair
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
Mikki Rose, Conference Advisory Group, (CAG) Chair
Marcia Daudelin, SIGGRAPH Conference Event Director

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER
<p>Chair's Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The EC was reminded that Katherine Ruff is out of the office through 26 October and that Marcia Daudelin will be covering the Project Manager activities during that time.The EC was reminded to review the draft of the 2024-2025 Annual Report <p>The EC was provided the final decisions for two recent votes that were conducted virtually. The motions and final votes for those two items are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Motion was made to approve the OSAG Nominations committee of Richard Chuang, Slivia Sellan, Tao Ju, Surapong (Ben) Lertsithichai, and Saskia Groenewegen. Motion made by Darin Grant. Seconded by Kalina Borkiewicz.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Passed with 9 votes, 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstainYes: Tomasz Bednarz, Baoquan Chen, Jenny Dana, Darin Grant, Hugues Hoppe, June Kim, Alla Sheffer, David Spoelstra, Courtney StarrettMotion was made to dissolve the Research and Practitioner Career Development Committees. Motion made by David Spoelstra and Jenny Dana.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Passed with 12 votes, 8 yes, 2 no, 2 abstainYes: Tomasz Bednarz, Kalina Borkiewicz, Jenny Dana, Hugues Hoppe, June Kim, Mikki Rose, Alla Sheffer, David SpoelstraNo: Elizabeth Baron, Courtney StarrettAbstain: Baoquan Chen, Darin Grant <p>The EC discussed the impact of dissolving the Research Development Committee on the Doctoral Consortium and Thesis Fast Forward initiatives. The Thesis Fast Forward initiative has received positive feedback in the past but visibility and</p>	June Kim

<p>engagement have declined due to lack of continuity and committee support. It was noted that the Education Committee had been approached to potentially take over management of the two initiatives, though several members expressed concern that the initiatives align more closely with the research community. A recommendation was made to clarifying the purpose and history, reaching out to past organizers for insights to determine the most appropriate home for the initiatives. The group emphasized the importance of supporting practitioner and research career development and suggested that clearer committee roles and inter-committee communication could help resolve the current ambiguity.</p> <p>ACTION- Alla Sheffer offered to reach out to the organizer of the Thesis Fast Forward from SIGGRAPH 2025 to collect more information about the needs of that initiative in light of the Research Development Committee being dissolved</p>	
<p>November Meeting</p> <p>The EC reviewed the draft agenda for the upcoming in-person EC meeting in November. The EC was asked to provide feedback on the proposed topics and timing within the agenda. The EC was also asked to provide recommendations for potential Standing Committee chairs, Standing Committee members or other guests to virtually join parts of the meeting based on the topics being discussed.</p>	<p>June Kim</p>
<p>EC Proxy Votes</p> <p>The Governance Advisory Board Representative to the EC shared a proposal for EC proxy voting. The proposal and rationale are as follows:</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EC Directors can assign a proxy vote to another EC Director. An EC Director should choose a proxy if not attending a meeting, and also if indisposed for virtual votes. The Director must inform the EC Chair beforehand. <p>Rationale for this Proposal was explained as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having all EC Directors participate in votes is important, especially for votes that require a supermajority (66% of all EC Directors). Sometimes EC members cannot participate in a meeting because of travel, timezone issues or other reasons. Even using a rotating schema of meeting times, there are some EC Directors who cannot attend all meetings. While the EC is shifting towards virtual votes with written summaries of the input into those votes, there are still times when a proxy will be useful. • The Governance Advisory Board Representative to the EC noted the use of the word “should” rather than “shall” when describing choosing a proxy. The reason for using “should” is that the EC Director may not want anyone else to represent their vote. The EC Director is not required to use a proxy. <p>After discussing the proposal, the following motion was made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve the allowance of proxy voting for an EC Director by prior arrangement with the EC Chair. The motion was made by Alla Sheffer. The motion was seconded by Elizabeth Baron. 	<p>Scott Owen</p>

<p>ACTION- Marcia Daudelin to provide June Kim and Darin Grant with a virtual poll for the EC to vote on this EC Proxy item.</p>	
<p>EC Access to RFP Documents, Contracts, and Contract Cost Breakdowns</p> <p>The EC reviewed a proposal from an EC Director that centered around the EC's access to financial data and contract details related to initiatives like the SIGGRAPH conferences. An issue raised was the limited visibility the EC has into cost breakdowns and finalized contracts, which are currently stored in a Google Share accessible to the CAG. The limited access was seen as problematic to the EC Director who developed the proposal.</p> <p>Several members emphasized that the EC, according to the bylaws, should have oversight over all SIGGRAPH activities, including financial decisions. While some were supportive of the model in with the three EC representatives on the CAG serving as conduits for this information, others felt that relying solely on representatives is insufficient.</p> <p>Recommendations emerged throughout the discussion. One was to establish regular, dedicated sessions where financial data, including cost breakdowns and contract details, would be presented and discussed with both EC and CAG members. Another suggestion was to incorporate brief (10-15 minute) updates during the biweekly EC meetings to improve transparency and understanding. Some participants advocated for broader access to data that is available to be referenced throughout the year.</p> <p>There was also a proposal to allow EC members to vote on whether they should have direct access to financial documents, with the rationale that increased access would support better strategic planning, especially in light of recent financial challenges. While concerns about data security and miscommunication with contractors were acknowledged, the prevailing sentiment leaned toward enhancing transparency and trust within the EC by making financial data more readily available.</p>	<p>Hugues Hoppe</p>
<p>Meeting Adjourned</p>	<p>June Kim</p>