

## **NaSTA exec meeting minutes - Leicester - 13/11/2011 12:00pm - 7:00pm**

### Attendance:

Michael Perry - Chair  
Matt Capone - Marketing  
Dax Wood - Development  
Chris Leyland - Host representative  
Stuart Wood - Technical  
James Goldburn - Returning officer/ Constitution adviser  
Dan Hamilton - Constitution adviser

### **Affiliation Update from Chris Leyland:**

affiliation was launched on Saturday (5th November)

Collecting station details through form when signing up

Address section ambiguous, need to change so that it is clear that we want postal address -

Chris Leyland to **action**

### **Currently affiliated stations:**

3 old ones, 2 new ones

- PSTV - new

- SUSU

- UPSU - new

- YSTV

- Guild TV

£60 + 50p transaction therefore £300 currently in NaSTA account

Write explanation on why to affiliate to explain to potential members the benefits - Chris Leyland

**action**

Put logos on website in 2 tone colour until they affiliate then put in colour, for website re-development. Idea taken based on when SUSU hosted NaSTA - Stuart to **action**

Re-assess mailing list once a month and add new affiliates Stuart Wood to **action**

Add mailing list for [stations@nasta.tv](mailto:stations@nasta.tv) and keep affiliates mailing list only stations affiliated.

Stuart **action**

Dax and Matt to finish affiliation pack goodies, DVD and booklet. **action**

### **Regional Meetings:**

At end of exams?

Dax and Stuart to investigate further.

Structure, trip or meetup?

Talk to RTS for help perhaps.

Need to consider any costs.

Discuss on skype in few weeks time

### **Advent Calendar:**

Good last year

## Spotlight stations

Want to bring it back this year

Send email to stations asking for content

If no content from station find off of website

Host station on last day

Perry to send email this week about calendar **action**

Christmas message, film from home? exec **action**

## Training Videos:

Idea proposed to collaboratively make training videos

Ask stations to select a category, defined by exec members

then make 4 minute tutorial video on that category

generic videos so that they relate to student television

Need to decide about whether it would be better than YouTube video

Possibly add them to the YouTube channel?

Need to define categories

NaSTA behind the scenes?? - name

Flag up possible videos when writing Wiki

NaSTA confidential? - name

Dax and Stuart to investigate further

Competition idea suggested - best movie made from windows movie maker Matt Capone to investigate.

Stuart **action** look at Way back website for NaSTA history

## Facebook usage:

- Michael Perry to make every exec member admin on Facebook page **action**

## Constitution:

- Aim - Sort rules for submission of awards and how process works

- if rules are set they must be followed, if it is too much effort for host stations to police the rules then the rules need to be re-assessed (taken from Loughborough's experience last year)

- Discussion on how current rules stand

- current constitution is the version on website

- At AGM, the whole rule set was voted in, however there is now a review of this included in the whole constitution

- Andy Clarke to get minutes to exec tonight (13/11/11) - James

- Discussion of why rules are set in the constitution and currently there is a clause which says that the host can change it all, contradiction.

- Everything discussed will need to be passed through General Meeting in December

- Can use this year as a test for rules, if there are any changes required this can be actioned at the AGM ready for the next year.

- Based on work from Loughborough last year (rules that were developed)

- Issue of repeated footage rule

- Issue of technical specifications

- Coursework submission rule issue

- Information to be submitted with each video, need to consider generalising submission form rule

- Joint submissions from stations - how should these be allowed?
- Technical specifications - should conform to the set format, any variations should be discussed with host station
- Make rules as a separate "chapter" in constitution as well as a separate document for sending out at submission time
- Need some flexibility on categories
- Title card must be included but information is defined by the host (Information required and length) but title card length does not count towards total length of the entry.
- Technical specs must be adhered to as defined by host station
- Issue of repeated footage, discussion follows:
  - Initial idea: Video should not be allowed to be used for two categories
  - However some footage should be used multiple times but in different ways - Matt
  - The repeat footage rule makes it hard for the judging of awards and policing the rules
  - In some situations the footage is required to support the entry - Matt Capone gives example of "history documentary on TV station"
  - How long should the repeated clips be? - Goldie
  - Same footage could be edited in totally different ways - Dan Hamilton
  - Would be hard to judge if it was different enough - ambiguous - Michael
  - One show could win multiple awards
  - How different is different footage? - Perry
  - Need to make sure we don't penalise stations for re-using footage - Matt
  - Each station could use a set amount of repeat footage? Not really a good idea.
  - Look at Oscars/Baftas - Dan - they re-use entries for different categories.
  - Could ask stations to specify where footage has been repeated use across the entries - Matt
  - How do we distinguish between same programme, can add a small extra piece of footage and according to the rules it would be different - Perry
  - Declare main programme entry, then tell us where footage has been reused with a maximum allowance of 50% - Dan
  - The whole awards are very subjective - Dan
  - Judges are external people without a direct connection to student TV - Michael
  - Bring in independent person to judge rule, someone who doesn't have a link to student TV - Dan
  - Rules must be written in a way which does not focus on one host station (eg currently NUTS) they should be able to cope with different host station situations - Chris
  - Who would that independent person be and how would we guarantee they are removed from student TV - Michael
  - Procedure for rule breaks as Chris sees it:
    - Host are the check for rule breaks - Chris
    - Then goes to the NaSTA exec to verify - Chris
    - Independent person noted above should be exec as we are accountable - Michael
    - Returning officer present to check for correct procedure, five people to vote on decision - Michael
    - Still need to decide on the rule! Before deciding rule breaks - Stuart
    - Don't want you to not be able to use repeat footage - Michael
    - Can't enter show twice - Michael
    - Need to find middle ground! - Michael
    - 50% identical to another show but the other part could be different - Michael
    - or 50% of another show re-edited into a new format - Michael
    - Lower percentage of footage? - Michael

- Look at what issues people had from last year - Michael
- Various issues, repeated footage re-edit and repeated
- Rules not read by stations properly, after last year hopefully would be better in future - Michael
- Need to educate stations on the rules set so they are aware - Matt
- Tick box for rules acceptance on awards entries - Dax
- Document needs to be precise and easy to read - Dax
- Where is the other footage allowed to be used? - Michael
- 10% of footage allowed to be repeated? - Chris
- Clips or footage? Ensure differentiation
- Need a rule that is quantitative - Dan
- Define one entry as primary - Chris
- May then repeat max of 10% of clips in any other category - Chris
- Can the footage then be used multiple times, ie multiple primary videos - Michael
- Examples might be useful, but still grey areas? - Dax
- Declaration as part of entry that you are using footage from another entry, explain why/how it is different. Justify it. - Dan
- Needs to be defined for stations so that we can say if they pass a certain point then it is unacceptable - Michael
- 90% of video must be unique - look at it from the other direction and make it simpler to follow and police, also suggests we want as much unique content entered to the awards as possible - Stuart
- What reason is there for not entering one thing into multiple categories - Dax?
- Caused issues in the past, a show must fit into one category and one category only, not just able to send one good show into every category - Matt
- Should stations be allowed to enter the same show into more than one category?
- Are the categories different enough? Open to interpretation - Michael
- Chris leaning towards Stuart's idea, with omissions for set categories
- Dax still for the idea of allowing shows to be submitted to multiple categories
- Chris - producers from stations could get ignored because one show is better than the rest (as a comment) the rule encourages more involvement. Depends on different stations
- the awards are about the best for that category not the programmes
- Dan agrees with rule proposed by Stuart as it provides some leeway without allowing too much issue
- Matt doesn't agree with Dax's point on the allowing multiple categories with one show, too big a change, would need to be brought before an AGM.
- Matt agrees with rule proposed by Stuart
- James agrees with rule, 90% seems the right amount
- Michael agrees, thinks it would go down well with stations as it is a simple rule.
- Rule 1 confirmed by exec
- Rule 2 confirmed by exec
- Question about the definition of footage, does this cover audio as well as video - Chris to define covers video and audio
- Rule 2 should cover any audio and any video
- Rule 3 issue raised with the word matriculated and the problem of policing this rule
- Rule has worked well in the past, just requires judgement call from hosts/exec
- Change word "matriculated" to registered.
- Issue of paid work being entered discussed
- Final product/show must be owned by the station submitting
- Who should be allowed to be able to help when producing shows?

- Removing “students” from rule 3, could allow staff and external people to contribute to shows, is this a problem?
- Key point - must not be for an academic project - Dax
- Need to make a document that must last - Chris
- Decided on rule 3 - exec agreed
- Change rule 5 - exclude title slides from overall video entry length
- Rule 8 brought into question - how is “within reason” defined
- Rule 8 destroys the idea of B-roll and archive footage being used
- ok for buildings, but not for example celebrity's
- Host to deal with footage used from years before
- At end of document have section on how complaint procedure would work - Michael
- Rule 8 is the last ambiguous rule still needs work - Chris
- Discussed using 90% rule here too, but would be so hard to police
- Why is there a problem with using old footage - Dax
- Don't want to award people for the same submission as last year
- Need to consider history documentaries etc - Matt
- Swap to looking at rule from the other side - Chris
- Allow stock footage to be used in context
- Want to sort this now rather than wait for the problem to arise later in the year - Chris
- All content cannot be have been submitted in previous year awards - Dax proposal
- All entries must have been completed within the past 12 months or within a set date - Dax proposal
- All shows must have been finalised since the submission deadline of last year awards. - clarify finalised brackets (ie completed for viewing)
- Decided against rule for can't have been submitted in previous years
- Need to define “produced” - Chris
- Redefined “produced” to mean the show has been created for viewing
- Still issue a station could use 99% of of the same show from last year, just changing 1% - would not be acceptable
- Discussed that this issue of re-using shows year after year has never come up before, and in the spirit of NaSTA we believe no station would try to do this.
- Change rule 8 to all entries must have been produced (ie finalised and completed for viewing) since last years deadline. Then include exceptions
- Archived footage needs to be allowed
- Remove exceptions from rule 8 - leaves archive footage use open. There is still the problem of re-entering same episodes year after year.
- Exec to uphold fairness, principals and opportunities of NaSTA
- Add to rule 8 - It is expected that a station will not enter the same entry to more than one

year's NaSTA awards, This will be assessed on a case by case basis.

- Dan suggests including the deterrent that the Judge will be told that it is a repeat entry
- Matt points out that if any rule breaks are just blanked in the footage, it makes the judges automatically think bad thoughts about entry
- Rule 8 passed in new form
- Discussion moves on to the sanctions for rule breaks
- Host station take responsibility for checking for rule breaks - Michael
- any suspected rule breaks will be referred to the NaSTA exec suggested - Michael
- Do we contact stations to let them know they are suspected of rule break to allow defence, you have x number of words to confirm why you feel you haven't broken the rules. - suggestion Michael
- James suggested having the Exec as a court of appeal, exec agreed
- If rule break spotted, host station recommends a course of action to exec and station who submitted video, the station can then appeal -suggestion Michael
- Exec then finalise decision
- Most issues are going to be more major if reported so could be dealt with by host station - Dan
- Exec to find out first before station to check for fairness from host station - Suggestion Michael
- Host station contacts the station to highlight issue for rule break, then host can provide a punishment and the station can then appeal to the exec - James
- [Exec@nasta.tv](mailto:Exec@nasta.tv) should be cc'd into all rule break emails
- How many days for stations to respond?
- Collect phone number of station manager at time of submission use this to phone and let manager know there is the email in their inbox if rule break occurs
- 5 working days to respond to rule breaks - Michael
- Michael not involved in any decision making with NUTS entries
- The exec's decision is final, Returning officer will be there to check fairness
- Who checks host station entries? Another station? or individual uninvolved person? Old person from the exec.- discussion point
- An independent person, not from the host station will be nominated by the exec to check host station entries - decision
- Reply for rule breaks must be a written response with a maximum number of words as 300
- The reply is to offer them the chance to make grounds for appeal
- Each appeal is then discussed by the exec, decision is made, if no rule break is decided then entry is passed to judges.
- If a rule break is decided what should happen?
  - remove completely
  - re-edit and remove illegal content
  - tell the judge about rule break
  - submit a certain amount of points - decided against
- All rule breaks are quite serious
- Course work should be straight disqualification
- If professionals used to produce programme, decided on case by case
- If rule can't be proven to be broken then entry cannot be disqualified - Matt
- Rule 8 leads to disqualification or option of blacking footage out
- Station will have option of removing entry from the awards on any rule break
- Sanctions : disqualification, blacking out, informing judges (lightest sanction)
- Constitution should have sanctions in order of seriousness - Chris
- Judge will be informed on screen blanking with the reason why
- Should issue of equal opportunities etc be included in rules - Stuart suggested
- Agreed they should be in rules, but obvious difference in opinions amongst NaSTA as to what

is racist sexist etc this is primarily to protect NaSTA, especially from the industry, don't really want to restrict creativity, but need a good image to progress with NaSTA development

- Where should nudity etc come in? Should it be in the rules?
- Don't want to send stuff to judges which are offensive - Michael
- Comment that is deemed to be illegal or cause offense may face a sanction - Chris (if it's ok for industry standards)
- Don't want to upset member stations with changing NaSTA too radically
- add rule - If entry breaches policy in the constitution (ie equality) then it will be disqualified
- ad rule - host station holds the right to not host videos which may breach law, submissions will be still sent to judges.
- add point that host can add a disclaimer at the start of any offensive videos to pre-warn judges and viewers

- need to take time over the constitution review - Dan
- Need constitution to be a working document by handover in July
- All of exec have responsibility to educate stations on rules, don't want to scare off new stations.
- Few people read rules last year before submissions
- Any grey areas in rules will be decided in the best interest of the NaSTA

- Create working document online for constitution for exec to collaborate on
- Discussed structure of constitution - split into chapters with contents - Google doc from Michael by 15th November
- rights for members and for stations first
- look at roles of exec
- Define chapters first
- Start chapters from scratch taking parts from old constitution - Michael
- Need candidate hustings section needs to be documented
- Create ideas document over next three weeks to then discuss and bring together

- Chris **action** prepare rules to put into constitution (by the 16th November)
- Next to fix date of General meeting to decide on rules decision (within 4 weeks)
- Quorsy - at EGM requires only 43% of member stations required to pass
- EGM done by skype
- Electronic EGM
- Skype for discussion, then vote by email or on the skype - Michael
- Must of been member station this year or last
- Leaving voting open allows as many people to vote as possible (7 days after skype)
- Sunday 4th of December for EGM 6pm **action** Michael to call EGM
- Recording GM skype - Stuart responsibility - get multiple exec members to record the meeting
- Dan to give Stuart gmail account for access to Google docs
- Re-affirmed host can add/remove 2 categories for awards
- Shortlisting judges suggested for when high profile judges involved (decision on whether to get a good judge with shortlist, or not due to workload) - Chris

- Nothing in rules which suggests this can't be decided by host - James
  - Chris was just checking in case of necessity - would need further debate
  - Matt against idea, would require more discussion
  - Decisions made in the GM then need to be ratified at AGM
- 
- Other points to change on constitution to be voted on at same time as rule changes vote changes separately to rules votes
  - Adding when standard calendar year is - **action** James
  - Change to use STV. - **action** James
  - Exec to promote the constitutional changes
- 
- Minutes to be put online by Stuart