

ACM SIGGRAPH Executive Committee Minutes

Tuesday, 27 January 2026

3 - 4 PM PT/6 - 7 PM ET

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
Mikki Rose, Conference Advisory Group, (CAG) Chair
Erik Brunvand, Incoming Conference Advisory Group (CAG) Chair
Dena DeBry, Nominations Committee Chair
Scott Owen, GAB Chair
Marcia Daudelin, SIGGRAPH Conference Event Director

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER
Chair's Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Action Item Tracker<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ EC was asked to please add items to the action item tracker and keep an eye on items that they have coming up.● ACM Open Update	Darin Grant
Bylaws Changes <p>The GAB Chair presented bylaw changes to 2026, noting that the treasurer change is to be consistent with the policies, but that the Chair/Vice Chair vote is a consensus from the GAB. Some EC members raised concerns with the three year term for the EC Chair.</p>	Scott Owen
Conference Survey Questions <p>The EC discussed the options for conference survey questions. David shared the list of questions with the EC for them to review. There were 9 questions total. The EC discussed whether or not they wanted the same questions for both. They did agree that they should ask the same questions. If it's just open ended, then people will choose places that are not possible and easier to parse out. Without a negative, it's difficult to have a temperature check. It's important to note that none of this is going to be shared with the public. The impression is that SACAG is trying not to select specific cities to be reviewed because they don't want some cities to be seen as "losers." There are pros and cons with it being open ended vs not being open ended. Even though the list is not just the cities being considered, it's up to the CAGs to</p>	Darin Grant

<p>create that list. The list should be large and not only be a list of cities that are immediately being considered. SACAG feels very strongly that there should be no questions that are in the negative. The list would be shared with every attendee but the results would not be shared publicly. One of the fears is that a small group could influence the results for the survey. This goes along with the accessibility guidelines whereas it becomes part of the rationale rather than a yes/no or final say for any of them. The list would be the same for the pros and cons. The list would be gigantic, but could do it at the country level not at the city level. We don't necessarily want to make it a popularity contest on what's important, and it's important for people to be able to have some guidelines for selecting a city rather than it just becoming a popularity contest. It was noted that, similarly to the selection guidelines, the feedback would be taken into consideration but not necessarily something that prohibits a particular location from being selected. It was also confirmed that the results would not be shared publicly, but would only be available internally. Some factors might be more intangible/less obvious (like just having charm) rather than it being obvious and without having specific destinations being selectable we might lose out on that fact.</p>	
<p>Underrepresented Travel Grant The EC discussed that there have been challenges with the underrepresented travel grant, such as defining what underrepresented means. The committee reviewing applications needs additional direction on how to select who this money goes to. There were discussions in Slack that talked about some of the challenges, with EC members raising issues with how selections are currently made. There were questions around where the money comes from, noting that the EC set aside an endowment a few years ago. The endowment is named Underrepresented Travel Grant, so changing the name may be challenging. The EC discussed other challenges, such as whether the grant should apply to both SIGGRAPH and SIGGRAPH Asia and needing more information about who has previously received the grant and how much. The EC agreed that grant recipients should be willing to be interviewed after attending the conference. In the interest of time, the EC agreed to discuss again after receiving additional data points.</p> <p>Action: Courtney Starrett to provide the EC with details on who the grants have been provided to and how much they received.</p>	<p>Courtney Starrett</p>
<p>No Contractors Discussion Notes captured by the EC.</p>	<p>EC</p>
<p>November Action Items Not discussed in the interest of time.</p>	<p>Darin Grant</p>
<p>Specialized Conferences Policy Changes Not discussed in the interest of time.</p>	<p>Kalina Borkiewicz and Baoquan Chen</p>
<p>Meeting Adjourned.</p>	<p>Darin Grant</p>

