

BJRI INFORMATION REQUESTS DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSIBLE INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATION FRAMEWORK

BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Information Requests and Disclosure Governance Framework

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this framework is to establish the information request handling, disclosure principles, safeguarding responsibilities, evidential discipline, and responsible institutional communication standards governing the activities of the Black Justice Research Institute (“BJRI”).

The Institute recognises that responsible communication and disclosure procedures are necessary to support procedural fairness, safeguarding awareness, lawful conduct, public confidence, and institutional credibility.

2. CORE INSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

The Institute supports:

- procedural fairness,
- responsible communication standards,
- safeguarding awareness,
- evidential discipline,
- lawful conduct,
- analytical restraint,
- and proportionate disclosure practices.

The Institute rejects:

- manipulative communication behaviour,
- harassment campaigns,
- coercive escalation practices,
- inflammatory rhetoric,
- reckless disclosure behaviour,
- and speculative allegation presented as established fact.

3. INFORMATION REQUEST PRINCIPLES

Information requests associated with the Institute should support:

- procedural clarity,
- safeguarding awareness,
- responsible review procedures,
- evidential transparency where reasonably appropriate,
- and lawful conduct obligations.

The Institute recognises that information requests may arise within research, governance, safeguarding, archive management, and public-interest educational contexts.

4. DISCLOSURE PRINCIPLES

Disclosure activity associated with the Institute should remain:

- proportionate,
- safeguarding-aware,
- evidence-based,
- procedurally fair,
- and consistent with lawful conduct obligations.

The Institute recognises that disclosure obligations may require careful balancing between:

- transparency,
- safeguarding considerations,
- procedural fairness,
- evidential integrity,
- and responsible information governance.

5. EVIDENTIAL DISCIPLINE

The Institute distinguishes between:

- verified fact,
- allegation,
- disputed claim,
- reported experience,

- hypothesis,
- inference,
- perception,
- and speculation.

Institutional communication and publication activity should therefore avoid presenting allegation or speculation as verified fact without appropriate evidential foundation.

6. SAFEGUARDING RESPONSIBILITIES

The Institute recognises safeguarding obligations within:

- governance activity,
- digital conduct,
- archive management,
- research activity,
- publication practices,
- and public communications.

Institutional activity should therefore avoid unsafe escalation practices and support responsible safeguarding standards.

7. RESPONSIBLE COMMUNICATION STANDARDS

Communication associated with the Institute should support:

- procedural fairness,
- evidential clarity,
- analytical restraint,
- safeguarding awareness,
- lawful conduct,
- and reduction of unnecessary escalation risks.

The Institute rejects inflammatory rhetoric, manipulative communication practices, harassment campaigns, and coercive escalation behaviour.

8. PUBLIC TRUST AND INSTITUTIONAL CREDIBILITY

The Institute recognises that institutional legitimacy depends substantially upon:

- safeguarding seriousness,
- evidential discipline,
- procedural fairness,
- lawful conduct,
- transparency where reasonably appropriate,
- and responsible institutional communication standards.

9. CONCLUSION

The Institute's information requests and disclosure framework is grounded in evidential discipline, safeguarding awareness, procedural fairness, lawful conduct, analytical restraint, and responsible institutional communication.

The Institute supports calm, proportionate, evidence-based, and procedurally fair communication and disclosure practices consistent with long-term institutional credibility.