**SPJ Special Meeting, July 23, 2012, via teleconference**

Cindy Simoneau, Jamie DeLoma, Jodie Mozdzer, Daniela Forte, Ricky Campbell and Lila Carney were present prior to 7:30 p.m.

J. Mozdzer begins discussion at 7:33 p.m. in regards to the Roy Gutterman report on Paresh Jha’s SPJ awards and possible source fabrication. It should be noted that there was no quorum.

J. Mozdzer concluded that we should have an online discussion and vote following the teleconference, so everyone would have a say.

Zach Janowski joined at 7:36 p.m.

Don Stacom joined at 7:39 p.m.

Board members gave their thoughts on R. Gutterman’s report, one-by-one, in alphabetical order by last name.

R. Campbell said the report was thorough, however, if the board chose to request more information from R. Gutterman, it should be completed in one week’s time. R. Campbell supported rescinding Jha’s first place award based on the Gutterman report, but was not willing to make a motion until more discussion ensued.

L. Carney said she wouldn’t support rescinding Jha’s Mark Twain award, but would support rescinding the first place award. L. Carney said Gutterman should spend more time to locate Jha and speak with him, adding that, if CT SPJ revoked any awards, Gutterman’s report wouldn’t have substantial evidence against Jha.

J. DeLoma said the Gutterman report should be finalized after this discussion and, based on the report, should revoke Jha’s first place award, but not the third place award.

D. Forte thought the report should be finalized after this discussion, but was unsure of which direction the board should go with rescinding the awards.

Khrystyne Keane joined at 7:48 p.m.

Z. Janowski said he believed the report was complete and the board should rescind the first place award, but felt that the board should approach Hearst Corporation and ask them if they believe the third place award should be rescinded “as an option.”

K. Keane said Hearst should be asked if they would be willing to rescind the award since they paid for its entry fee and they submitted it. K. Keane said she supported rescinding the first place award and also added that Jha’s former publication (New Canaan News) should be prohibited from submitting any work to CT SPJ award for three to five years. This could be used as “enticement” to see if Hearst would revoke the award.

C. Simoneau passed on the discussion.

D. Stacom referenced his email to board members earlier in the day, saying the initial Gutterman report was “incomplete and poor” and CT SPJ should ask him to discuss more information and Gutterman should contact Jha. D. Stacom said the board should reference the Pulitzer Prize judges who would only revoke awards for “clear and convincing evidence” that there was ill intent.

J. Mozdzer read a statement on behalf of Cara Baruzzi, who was unable to attend the teleconference. According to J. Mozdzer, C. Baruzzi said the Gutterman report was complete and she supported rescinding the first place award.

J. Mozdzer read a statement on behalf of Paul Gough, who was unable to attend the teleconference, but had sent out an email to board members prior to the special meeting. P. Gough warned about rescinding any award at all, but rather, would support putting an asterisk by Jha’s name on the awards list.

C. Simoneau said that Hearst did their part on their investigation, and is likely not to do much more, based on legal grounds. C. Simoneau said if the Gutterman report went public as it stood, it wouldn’t hold up to SPJ standards and would leave some logical holes. She mentioned that CT SPJ has never revoked an award, but that doesn’t mean the board can’t, also suggesting that the underage drinking story (first place award recipient) was fabricated.

J. Mozdzer said she agreed with D. Stacom that Gutterman’s report should “reach out” to Jha and get information from him. J. Mozdzer said more information in the report would make her, and other board members, more comfortable before making the Gutterman report public.

D. Stacom said Gutterman should document the ways he tried to reach out to sources and to Jha, including what measures were taken with Hearst.

The consensus voiced that CT SPJ should ask Gutterman for more information and that he should finish his report no later than July 31, 2012.

C. Simoneau mentioned there was an upcoming Contest Committee meeting on Aug. 5 open to all CT SPJ board members, who should be thinking about changes that can be made to the contest to ensure a similar Jha situation doesn’t happen in the future.

J. Mozdzer clarified that the committee meeting would be discussing the upcoming 2013 contest (i.e. categories and mediums), but members are more than welcome to discuss contest alterations.

K. Keane made a MOTION to adjourn at 8:28 p.m., J. DeLoma seconded it. Unanimous approval.