

# **BJRI INSTITUTIONAL ARCHIVE DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION AND EVIDENTIAL PRESERVATION FRAMEWORK**

## **BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

### **Institutional Archive Preservation and Documentation Framework**

---

#### **1. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this framework is to establish the archive preservation, document classification, evidential integrity, safeguarding, and institutional continuity principles governing the archival activities of the Black Justice Research Institute (“BJRI”).

The Institute recognises that responsible archival preservation is necessary to support institutional continuity, public-interest research, evidential integrity, procedural fairness, and lawful conduct.

#### **2. CORE ARCHIVAL PRINCIPLES**

The Institute supports:

- responsible archival preservation,
- evidential discipline,
- methodological neutrality,
- safeguarding awareness,
- lawful conduct,
- analytical restraint,
- and careful institutional documentation.

The Institute rejects:

- reckless publication practices,
- manipulative archival presentation,
- distortion of evidence,
- inflammatory conduct,
- and speculative assertion presented as established fact.

#### **3. DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION PRINCIPLES**

The Institute recognises the importance of careful classification between:

- institutional governance documents,
- research publications,
- methodological frameworks,
- safeguarding materials,
- historical archive materials,
- external references,
- and public-interest documentation.

Classification systems should support evidential clarity, transparency where appropriate, and responsible archive management.

#### **4. EVIDENTIAL INTEGRITY**

The Institute distinguishes between:

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

Archived materials should therefore not automatically be interpreted as verified conclusions without appropriate evidential assessment and contextual review.

#### **5. SAFEGUARDING RESPONSIBILITIES**

Archival activity associated with the Institute should avoid:

- harassment,
- inflammatory escalation,
- coercive conduct,
- ideological hostility,
- and unsafe publication behaviour.

The Institute supports careful safeguarding consideration within:

- publication activity,
- digital preservation,
- public access systems,
- and institutional archive management.

## **6. DIGITAL ARCHIVE MANAGEMENT**

The Institute recognises:

- cyber-security risks,
- digital safeguarding obligations,
- reputational safeguarding concerns,
- and information governance responsibilities.

Digital archive systems should therefore support:

- responsible information handling,
- lawful conduct,
- public protection,
- and evidential preservation.

## **7. INSTITUTIONAL CONTINUITY**

The Institute supports responsible preservation of:

- governance frameworks,
- safeguarding policies,
- methodological publications,
- research documentation,
- and institutional records.

Archival preservation should support institutional continuity, historical clarity, and careful evidence-based review where appropriate.

## **8. PUBLIC ACCESS AND RESPONSIBLE USE**

Public access systems associated with the Institute should support:

- procedural fairness,

- safeguarding awareness,
- proportionality,
- lawful conduct,
- and responsible research access.

The Institute recognises that archived material may require contextual interpretation and should not automatically be treated as establishing verified conclusions.

## **9. CONCLUSION**

The Institute's archive and preservation framework is grounded in evidential discipline, safeguarding awareness, methodological neutrality, lawful conduct, procedural fairness, and responsible institutional stewardship.

The Institute supports careful evidence-based archival preservation rather than inflammatory, manipulative, or ideologically driven archive practices.