

# ACM SIGGRAPH Executive Committee Minutes

6 March 2026 - 7 March 2026

Santa Clara, California

## 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  
Scott Owen, Governance Advisory Board Representative to the EC  
Dena DeBry, Nominations Committee Representative to the EC  
Erik Bruvand, 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  
Kristy Pron, SIGGRAPH 2027 Conference Chair  
Barb Helfer, Membership and Communications Committee Chair  
Jeff Jortner, Awards Committee Chair

<b><u>AGENDA ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>PRESENTER</u></b>
<p><b>Welcome and Icebreaker</b> The EC Chair welcomed the EC to Santa Clara and emphasized the value of meeting together in person. The Chair also reviewed the meeting guiding principles with the EC. He reviewed the agenda, noting a focus on industry relations and member benefits, with additional time built in for EC members to bring up additional agenda items. The EC was invited to bring up additional agenda items. The additional topics include: VDC, appointment of a new EC Director, Underrepresented Travel Grant, and a request that the Treasurer share future financial projections and that the EC draft an overarching financial strategy.</p> <p><b>Action: EC Treasurer to present on financial projections.</b></p>	Darin Grant
<p><b>NVIDIA</b> The EC engaged in an offsite meeting with NVIDIA representatives, learning more about NVIDIA offerings and engaging in a discussion about a strategic partnership.</p>	EC and NVIDIA
<p><b>Exhibition Experience</b> SIGGRAPH 2027 Conference Chair presented a proposed merger for the Exhibition and Experience Halls for SIGGRAPH 2027. She shared trend data, including declines in exhibitor numbers and reduced appeal of traditional booths, noting that</p>	Kristy Pron

<p>the goal is to create meaningful engagement between exhibitors and attendees. She also noted that the goal would be to begin marketing this new experience at SIGGRAPH 2026. Additionally, the Conference Chair requested feedback from the EC on an all-inclusive base conference pass that would retire the expo-hall only pass. She presented information including the potential benefits to updating the conference as presented, including curated learning tracks in conjunction with exhibitors, bringing in alternative audiences, and the creation of one cohesive system/experience within the conference. The changes would bring an “ecosystem of investment” and allow for expanded audiences and reinforce SIGGRAPH’s broader relevance to new or smaller audiences. The Conference Chair would like to take 90 days to discuss with exhibitors and sponsors to hear their feedback. Potential risks were discussed, including a reduction of attendees if the exhibition hall only passes are no longer available and thus the benefits of investing for exhibitors is reduced. 2025 challenges were also noted, such as empty pipe and draping within the exhibit hall, despite positive feedback from exhibitors who were present at the conference.</p> <p>The EC discussed the importance of adjusting the conference as needed and being flexible and affirmed that change is the right direction. The EC suggested integrating some of these ideas into S2026 as applicable/possible, though the S2026 Conference Chair will need to provide buy-in. Additionally, the EC discussed the benefits of having sponsored educational offerings. The EC affirmed their support of this change and suggested changing the outreach time to 60 days instead of 90.</p> <p><b>Action Items:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kristy Pron to discuss proposed 2027 changes with exhibitors, specifically including NVIDIA, within the next 60 days to get feedback on the unified show floor.</li> <li>2. Kristy Pron to discuss with 2026 SIGGRAPH Conference Chair options for integrating 2027 exhibition updates into 2026 to pilot the changes where possible.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>NVIDIA Recap</b></p> <p>The EC provided a recap of the NVIDIA meeting for those who missed it. The CAG Chair added perspective about ongoing communication challenges, noting that there have been challenges on both ends of the relationship. The group discussed how prioritizing other initiatives has limited investment in innovative areas, such as physical AI, which gained interest years ago but has not been actively developed since. SIGGRAPH continues to focus heavily on researchers and students, while practitioners and other industry groups have been less of a focus within the conference.</p> <p>The EC discussed a previous strategy document that was created with the intention of reaching different communities relevant to SIGGRAPH, but because of annual leadership changes, maintaining long-term strategy is challenging as priorities shift between EC Chairs. The EC also discussed potential opportunities to co-sponsor with other SIGs.</p> <p>Ideas for reaching out to practitioners were discussed, with EC members suggesting that they use their existing networks and connections to contact practitioners. The EC discussed collectively determining which companies and communities to target and focus on. The importance of talking to strategic partners working with practitioners was affirmed.</p>	All

<p>The EC also discussed workshops, noting that workshops tend to be more on the technical side. It was clarified that SIGGRAPH has had workshops and continues to do so: both hands on, sponsored and short/long-form courses.</p> <p>The EC discussed the importance of having a singular point of contact for NVIDIA. It was decided that this point of contact should be at the EC-level to ensure longer-term oversight as well as coordination between conferences and year-round activities. Additional recommendations included ecosystem mapping, forming an industry board to oversee external relationships, and exploring donations and grant opportunities available to SIGGRAPH.</p>	
<p><b>Industry Relations</b></p> <p>The EC Chair presented on the history of SIGGRAPH’s relationship with the industry, noting the development and changes over time of the organization’s landscape. When reviewing the changes over time, it is clear that SIGGRAPH needs to consider strategic partnerships to support the organization for long-term success.</p> <p>The Chair-elect shared a comparison of SIGGRAPH to other conferences, showing changes over time, especially as companies have begun hosting their own conferences. SIGGRAPH should consider other types of sponsorships beyond a typical tradeshow dependent sponsorship, such as research-integrated sponsorships or a corporate sponsorship model, which may be discussed during the member benefits conversation.</p> <p>She shared a need for the EC to set direction and guardrails for next steps. Some of the suggestions shared were industry-funded fellowships, year-round initiatives, strengthening research-corporate integration, creating success metrics, and creating governance guardrails.</p> <p>The EC discussed several questions posed during the presentation, including how to leverage or expand industry participation. There was a suggestion to work closer with specialized conferences for deeper engagement, engaging with chapters for their non-juried events, and utilizing exhibitor talks which tend to be popular.</p> <p>The EC also discussed how many industry groups submit talks instead of technical papers as it’s easier to be accepted and they are only required to submit 2 page abstracts. The EC discussed the workshops at conferences, noting that workshops do invite people to talk, and that while there is an open submission, the courses chair does specifically curate or reach out to people who they would like to see submissions from. The EC considered the importance of curating excellent content which will drive companies to want to sponsor sessions and attract research into the conferences and for year-round engagement.</p> <p>Industry partnerships would require a change of mindset, but there are other engagement opportunities such as sponsored awards, and/or sponsored sessions that are branded as a separate workshop. The EC affirmed the importance of the content being educational in nature, though there have not been many complaints by attendees thus far that sponsored content is too much like a sales pitch. The EC could also consider a year-by-year initiative that gives a driver seat to a company instead of only sending out keynote slots.</p>	<p>June Kim</p>

<p>The EC affirmed needing a long term relationship with NVIDIA and facilitating an ecosystem that will drive all members of the community to come.</p> <p><b>Action: Select and determine a relationship manager on the EC side to manage industry relationships.</b></p>	
<p><b>Nominations</b></p> <p>The Nominations Committee Chair shared an update on the nominations process, noting the slate is almost finalized and will be submitted to ACM on 18 March. There was some individual outreach to try to find candidates, which is why an extension was granted. There has been concern about how light the EC is on researchers, and the EC discussed concerns about travel for researchers and the time commitment. There has been a question raised about whether or not in person attendance is required and whether not being able to travel at all disqualifies someone. Some EC members felt that it's very important to be in person, while others have concerns that disqualifying someone because they cannot attend is discriminatory. The EC agreed that it's important to have someone who is participating fully, and some expressed that not being able to be in person does not stop someone from participating fully. The prioritization should be full participation, though that can come in many forms. The EC will receive an FYI of the slate around 18 March.</p> <p>The EC discussed next steps for selecting someone to fill the vacant EC Director role. The EC discussed how to prioritize who to select, noting that it could be beneficial to select a former EC member who would already be familiar with the structure of the EC. Some felt it would be best to select someone who is a technical researcher. The EC discussed whether it is possible to consider nominating someone who has a role for S2026, considering the one position policy, with the GAB Chair reminding the EC that policies can be overridden with a supermajority of the EC.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. EC to share a list of names in the nominations Slack channel.</li> <li>2. EC Chair to write a Chair's Corner after the meeting and request that those interested in serving on the EC reach out to him.</li> </ol>	<p>Dena DeBry</p>
<p><b>Meeting Adjourned for the Day</b></p>	<p>Darin Grant</p>

<p><b><u>AGENDA ITEM</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>PRESENTER</u></b></p>
----------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p><b>Welcome Back</b></p> <p>The EC Chair shared a recap of action items from Day 1. The EC was reminded to share nominations in the Slack channel. The EC also engaged in an activity designed to build teamwork and cohesiveness, sharing insights into the importance of building trust within teams.</p>	<p>Darin Grant</p>
<p><b>SIGGRAPH Value</b></p> <p>The Chair-elect shared that the goal of this is to define the core of SIGGRAPH's identity. The EC was posed the question: if SIGGRAPH disappeared tomorrow, who would notice and why? The EC first reviewed the brainstorming activity they engaged in yesterday, reviewing how each EC member would communicate SIGGRAPH's mission and value. Highlights from that activity include EC members sharing the importance of serving the community and the people and serving various groups within the broader community. There was discussion over the evolution of the field, with computer graphics no longer encompassing the full work of SIGGRAPH's members.</p> <p>The EC discussed the existing mission statement, with concerns being raised that it's too narrow and lists out specific groups of people, which could be exclusionary. The existing statement is both too broad but too limiting. The future of computer graphics will change over time and it's difficult to predict what those changes will be. It always goes back to who the people are and the relationships between people. Computer graphics and interactive techniques do bring people together and there's something about people and world building in addition to bringing in the digital world. The EC grappled with the challenge to be vague enough to encompass future challenges while ensuring that the mission and vision still communicates who SIGGRAPH is.</p> <p>Some of the EC felt that the existing statement is much too long, and the EC considered options to reduce the statement. The group discussed terminology related to science, technology, and engineering, as well as SIGGRAPH's global reach, exploring whether language such as "visual computing" or the concept of "rendering" could serve as the foundation for a concise message. Proposals such as "render the world," "rendering visual intelligence," and "render the unimaginable" were considered. The EC acknowledging the SIGGRAPH brings together many different groups: practitioners, researchers, artists, engineers, and students who may initially appear to represent disparate groups. The EC concluded the session by synthesizing the brainstorming insights into preliminary drafts of a revised mission statement that can guide the organization's future positioning and strategic direction.</p> <p>Action: EC Chair-Elect to share a finalized draft vision and mission statement for the EC to react to.</p>	<p>June Kim</p>
<p><b>Pioneers MOU</b></p> <p>The GAB Chair presented the Pioneers MOU. Previously, there was a sentence that states that if Pioneers receives a donation over \$1,000 then any unused funding will roll over to the next year. That has been removed from this MOU. Following feedback from ACM, we understand that all activities of ACM SIGGRAPH are the legal and financial responsibility of ACM. There are no scenarios in which ACM SIGGRAPH acts simply as a "bank" for programs or activities. Thus, the request from ACM is that if Pioneers receive a grant, it has to be spent that year. Unused</p>	<p>Scott Owen</p>

<p>money goes into the fund balance for ACM SIGGRAPH. It was clarified that the Pioneers Chair is aware and in support of this change.</p> <p>Motion: A motion was made to approve the Pioneers MOU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion made by David Spoelstra</li> <li>• Motion seconded by June Kim</li> <li>• Motion passed with all in favor; 10 votes, 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Voting yes are Darin Grant, June Kim, David Spoelstra, Jenny Dana, Elizabeth Baron, Courtney Starrett, Tomasz Bednarz, Erik Bruvand, Kalina Borkiewicz, Boaquan Chen</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Pioneers Membership Challenge</b></p> <p>The EC discussed challenges with becoming a Pioneer member, noting that it's challenging to become a member because they must reach out to ACM. The primary challenge is that if a SIGGRAPH member wants to become a Pioneer member to attend the Pioneers reception at the conference, there is no easy way to do so while at the conference. There was some debate over how important it is for someone to be able to join at the last minute and concerns that discussing this is too in the weeds for the EC. A few EC members noted that they have reached out to ACM about this challenge in the past. Some EC members raised that some of ACM's technology appears to be out of date, with it being difficult to become a member. Some on the EC also shared that EC members should help facilitate conversations between ACM and ACM SIGGRAPH members when necessary and that it's important to advocate on behalf of the membership.</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The Membership and Communications Chair to reach out to ACM to inquire about options to make joining and/or upgrading as a Pioneer member easier.</b></li> </ol>	<p>Scott Owen</p>
<p><b>Treasurer Ex-Officio</b></p> <p>With the recently approved decision for the immediate past Treasurer to stay on the EC as an ex-officio member, David Spoelstra would be serving in two roles on the EC once he becomes GAB Chair, which violates the one position policy. The EC can either vote to extend Scott's term as GAB Chair for another year, or vote to allow David to serve in both roles.</p> <p><b>Motion: A motion was made to allow Scott to continue as GAB Chair for another year.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motion passed with all in favor; 9 votes, 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstaining</li> </ol>	<p>Darin Grant</p>
<p><b>Affinity Groups as Global Chapters</b></p> <p>The EC discussed the roles of chapters versus affinity groups, with some EC members suggesting that affinity groups could become global chapters. There was debate over whether or not Chapters could house affinity groups: chapters have typically been locally based and served city-specific needs, whereas affinity groups tend to focus on a group of people sharing a common demographic. Some EC members were in favor of affinity groups becoming global chapters, while others were opposed. There was discussion over Chapters' relationship with ACM, noting that Chapters gets certain legal and insurance protections from ACM. Most chapters are under ACM and not considered SIG Chapters.</p>	

**Underrepresented Travel Grant**

The EC discussed a few components related to the travel grant:

1. The Name of the Grant:
  - a. The legal name is Underrepresented Communities Travel Grant, but there were previous discussions about renaming the grant. The EC discussed various potential name changes, ultimately agreeing on "Opportunity Travel Grant."
2. Scope of the Grant:
  - a. The grant was originally focused on SIGGRAPH and not SIGGRAPH Asia, with the goal to eventually expand it to SIGGRAPH Asia. The EC discussed options to split the fund between both groups, with there being concerns raised that the application is due well before SIGGRAPH Asia registration is opened. Ultimately, the EC agreed that it should be shared based on the applications received for each conference.
3. The EC discussed what "opportunity means" with the name change. Some criteria changes were made such as:
  - a. An applicant does not need to have an active membership in order to apply but will need to become a member after being selected. This addresses the concerns of it feeling like an application fee.
  - b. Student volunteers should be not excluded but cannot accept funding from both student volunteer travel grant and Opportunity Grant

The EC discussed other challenges with the travel grant, noting that the award should be stated as competitive because not all candidates will receive funding. The goal will be to ensure that enough funding is provided to the winner(s) so that they can actually attend. The EC also discussed where the committee should be living, with some noting that it's targeted toward early career and could live under the Early Career Development Committee. The individuals reviewing applications can stay the same but if there are questions about details of the grant, it should be handled by EDCD. The EC agreed that there should be a cross core set up so that SCs work with both conferences.

**Actions:**

1. Courtney Starrett to make the changes discussed above to the grant.
2. Courtney Starrett to work to house the committee under EDCD.

**Member Benefits**

The Membership and Communications Committee Chair joined to share information on membership. She shared a presentation that reviewed the benefits of increasing membership, noting financial benefits, greater visibility, stronger community and network, and an opportunity to have a greater depth in the volunteer leadership pipeline. She presented ideas on why people should want to join the organization, noting her own experience.

She then shared information regarding core challenges that ACM SIGGRAPH faces for membership, noting that it's important to determine a strategy for membership next steps as a strategic pillar of the organization. She shared previous results from the 2024 membership survey, noting that conference discounts, professional development discounts, and networking opportunities are the most used benefits,

Barb Helfer

while members would like to see discounts on goods and services, open forum discussion, and digital subscriptions to industry publications.

The EC discussed the information presented, raising questions on whether some of the listed benefits are still accurate, such as the changes with open access. Other member benefits that were discussed were discount programs, such as the relationship with Eurographics, the ACM health insurance, with some of these not necessarily being obvious as member benefits or not providing a true discount or benefit, but more just providing information on how to access something (in the case of insurance). A suggestion was raised to research or reach out to companies and organizations to determine what they're willing to offer members as a benefit. The EC discussed other opportunities for change within the member benefits, such as expanding corporate partnerships and memberships to allow companies to engage their employees in the SIGGRAPH ecosystem to receive benefits. There was also discussion over having member-level only attendance at certain events and creating a member wall on the website to share information behind the scenes.

The EC acknowledged challenges within the existing membership landscape, noting that individuals often hold a chapter membership along with an ACM SIGGRAPH membership. There was a discussion over how large chapters used to fund events by charging a fee to be a member, but many are no longer doing that. The EC discussed the potential of giving funding to chapters based on the number of members associated with a chapter, though concerns were raised that there are not chapters readily available for all members and that member engagement should be an initial priority.

**Actions:**

1. EC and Membership and Communications Committee to discuss options to create Member Portal on the website to house member only benefits. NOTE (3/13/26 DAS): Aaron says that ACM can do this, but we haven't gained any traction with them on it.
2. Membership and Communications Committee to review the website and ensure benefits are clearly articulated and accurate.
3. EC to reach out to companies to inquire about potential discounts for goods and services.

**Program Evaluation Questions**

The EC reviewed two questions to consider adding it to the registration form, noting it's too late to add these questions into this year's S2026 registration form, so they would be added to the post-conference survey. The EC discussed alternative options such as intercept surveys or follow-up emails to registrants, confirming that outreach after registration is possible, though it would not capture data as comprehensively as the registration form. The conversation highlighted that SIGGRAPH currently measures attendee satisfaction with programs but does not evaluate whether individuals actually attended specific sessions, nor which programs are driving their attendance, limiting the insights that can be drawn. The EC discussed whether direct survey questions provide better insight than utilizing analysis through AI, with

Kalina Borkiewicz

there being some note that data cannot necessarily be put into an AI tool to analyze. The EC acknowledged that the post-conference survey is already lengthy and may not capture all necessary information when discussing adding a question asking “which programs do you consider essential to SIGGRAPH’s identity?” They also noted correlations between pass level and return rates, with expo-only passes sometimes belonging to individuals not directly involved in the field, so they might not be the best data on return rates. The EC agreed that sending a separate survey email after registration rather than embedding these questions into the registration workflow would be better to not hinder registration rates.

**Actions:**

1. CAG to investigate whether or not a pass-through survey is an option.
2. CAG to create a separate survey to send these questions out after registration.

**CRM Presentation**

The Project Manager gave a presentation to the EC on the benefits of them using a CRM, along with challenges. A Customer Relationship Management (CRM) would allow ACM SIGGRAPH to track data of members, attendees, and others in the community to learn how they interact with different components of the organization. It would also allow for targeted marketing outreach and streamlined communications between different areas of the organization. Challenges with implementation include but are not limited to cost, having complete data sets, volunteer training, and integration questions with ACM’s system housing membership data.

The EC discussed the pros and cons, discussing how the customers in question are members and attendees. It is also important to ensure the product (membership, conferences, other benefits) and being improved to help sell them. The EC noted that it’s been challenging to change the product beyond expanding conference programs because it’s been challenging to track and review data year over year as it’s a manual process. A CRM could also be used to help manage relationships between industry partners.

The EC considered software that currently exists, noting that it’s possible ACM does have access to some of these tools already that SIGGRAPH could lean on. The Nominations Committee Chair noted that it’s been challenging to get complete answers about software, noting previous questions about the voting software and cost savings associated with adjusting the voting cycle for SIGGRAPH.

The EC discussed that they will need to reach out to ACM to ask some of the questions raised today. Those questions are:

1. How could data be integrated?
2. Does ACM have a CRM or other type of software that SIGGRAPH could lean on?
3. What is ACM’s software roadmap?

**Actions:**

1. The EC to create a document that notes what information they would like a CRM to be able to provide based on the data currently collected.
2. The Nominations Committee Chair to reach out to ACM to ask the questions raised above, and to ask about cost savings for changing the voting cycle.

Project Manager

<p><b>Conference Questions</b></p> <p>The CAG and SACAG chairs finalized the questions to add to the post-conference surveys. These questions solicit feedback for past locations and future locations. The EC reviewed the questions and provided feedback, discussing the pros and cons of naming city locations when soliciting negative feedback, but concerns were raised with how that would be received by some locations. The EC ultimately made changes to the questions directly on the question document.</p> <p><b>Motion: A motion was made to ask the four questions listed on the location survey questions document on every post-conference survey.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motion made by David Spoelstra</li> <li>2. Seconded by Kalina Borkiewicz</li> <li>3. Motion passed with 100% in favor, 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Voting yes are Darin Grant, June Kim, David Spoelstra, Jenny Dana, Elizabeth Baron, Courtney Starrett, Tomasz Bednarz, Erik Bruvand, Kalina Borkiewicz, Boaquan Chen</li> </ol> <p><b>Action:</b> EC Chair to share questions with contractors to ensure they're included on the post-conference surveys.</p>	<p>Erik Bruvand, Tomasz Bednarz</p>
<p><b>SIGGRAPH Asia 2027</b></p> <p>The SACAG Chair noted that the goal is to vote on the SIGGRAPH Asia 2027 location. Site selection guidelines and bidding documents were previously shared with the EC. Site selection documents to share publicly are currently being cleaned up to ensure no confidential financial information will be shared, and the EC discussed the pros and cons of the proposed location.</p> <p><b>Motion to approve the SIGGRAPH Asia 2027 location.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Motion made by Baoquan Chen</li> <li>2. Seconded by Jenny Dana</li> <li>3. Motion passed with 100% in favor, 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain</li> </ol>	<p>Tomasz Bednarz</p>
<p><b>SIGGRAPH 2030 and 2031</b></p> <p>The CAG Chair shared that the CAG is considering negotiating a multi-year deal for a conference location. He shared that there are many pros to locking in the price early. The EC discussed how locations had previously been selected, including timing of whether convention centers had SIGGRAPH's preferred dates available and past conference performance. The EC ultimately decided that the CAG should explore a multi-year deal.</p> <p>The EC also discussed business suite options, wanting to ensure ample room for those at future locations. It was noted that ACM shared that SIGGRAPH cannot sell a business suite at a hotel but can control their access (whether or not they can book there), but is not allowed to take the revenue from selling a suite.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> CAG Chair to move forward with exploring a multi year deal for SIGGRAPH 2030 and 2031.</p>	<p>Erik Bruvand</p>
<p><b>Committee Discussions</b></p> <p>The EC discussed the Volunteer Development Committee, noting that the chair had been sending emails to the previous liaison who is no longer on the EC. There was discussion over how VDC is under the Chair's Grouping, noting that the idea was</p>	<p>David Spoelstra</p>

