

BJRI COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE AND ESCALATION FRAMEWORK

BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Procedural Fairness and Accountability Framework

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this framework is to establish the complaints handling, procedural fairness, escalation, and institutional accountability principles of the Black Justice Research Institute ("BJRI").

The Institute recognises that complaints procedures are necessary to support transparency, accountability, safeguarding, public confidence, and lawful institutional conduct.

2. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS

Complaints associated with the Institute should be considered fairly, proportionately, and with recognition of evidential uncertainty where appropriate.

The Institute does not support predetermined conclusions, retaliatory conduct, ideological bias, or procedural unfairness.

3. COMPLAINT SUBMISSION PRINCIPLES

Complaints should, where reasonably possible, contain:

- a clear explanation of the concern,
- relevant dates and communications,
- supporting evidence where available,
- and the outcome sought where appropriate.

The absence of complete information does not automatically invalidate a complaint where safeguarding or public-interest concerns may reasonably exist.

4. EVIDENTIAL DISCIPLINE

The Institute distinguishes between:

- verified fact,
- allegation,
- disputed claim,
- reported experience,
- perception,
- and speculation.

Complaints should not automatically be treated as verified conclusions without appropriate review and evidential assessment.

5. COMMUNICATION STANDARDS

The Institute supports:

- respectful communication,
- procedural clarity,
- analytical restraint,
- lawful conduct,
- and reduction of unnecessary escalation.

The Institute does not support harassment, intimidation, inflammatory conduct, abusive communications, or coercive escalation tactics.

6. ESCALATION PRINCIPLES

Escalation procedures should remain proportionate, evidence-based, lawful, and procedurally fair.

The Institute recognises that escalation may sometimes be necessary where:

- safeguarding concerns arise,
- serious procedural irregularities appear to exist,
- communication breakdown persists,
- or lawful review mechanisms become necessary.

7. SAFEGUARDING CONSIDERATIONS

Safeguarding obligations apply throughout complaints and escalation procedures.

The Institute recognises:

- vulnerability,
 - mental distress,
 - communication difficulties,
 - trauma,
 - and conflict escalation risks,
- as potentially relevant safeguarding considerations.

8. RECORD KEEPING

The Institute supports careful documentation and preservation of relevant records associated with complaints procedures, communications, safeguarding concerns, and escalation processes.

9. INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The Institute recognises that institutional credibility depends substantially upon:

- transparency,
- procedural fairness,
- safeguarding seriousness,
- lawful conduct,
- evidential discipline,
- and accountability mechanisms.

10. CONCLUSION

The Institute's complaints and escalation framework is grounded in proportionality, lawful conduct, analytical restraint, safeguarding awareness, and procedural fairness.

The Institute supports careful review processes rather than inflammatory or ideologically driven escalation practices.