

BJRI MENTAL WELLBEING VULNERABILITY SAFEGUARDING AND NON COERCIVE SUPPORT FRAMEWORK

BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mental Wellbeing and Vulnerability Safeguarding Framework

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this framework is to establish the mental wellbeing, vulnerability safeguarding, non-coercive support, procedural fairness, and responsible institutional engagement principles governing the activities of the Black Justice Research Institute (“BJRI”).

The Institute recognises that vulnerability, distress, communication breakdown, institutional mistrust, and escalation risks may arise within socially sensitive and high-conflict contexts.

2. CORE SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES

The Institute supports:

- safeguarding awareness,
- procedural fairness,
- evidential discipline,
- non-coercive engagement,
- lawful conduct,
- analytical restraint,
- and reduction of unnecessary escalation risks.

The Institute rejects:

- coercive manipulation,
- harassment,
- intimidation,
- exploitative conduct,
- inflammatory escalation behaviour,
- and reckless institutional practices.

3. VULNERABILITY AND DISTRESS CONSIDERATIONS

The Institute recognises that individuals may experience:

- mental distress,
- trauma,
- communication difficulties,
- institutional mistrust,
- social isolation,
- and escalation-related stress.

Institutional engagement should therefore remain proportionate, procedurally fair, safeguarding-oriented, and consistent with lawful conduct obligations.

4. NON-COERCIVE SUPPORT PRINCIPLES

The Institute supports:

- voluntary participation,
- respectful communication,
- culturally competent engagement where reasonably appropriate,
- safeguarding awareness,
- and evidence-based institutional conduct.

The Institute rejects:

- coercive pressure,
- exploitative influence,
- intimidation tactics,
- manipulative engagement practices,
- and inflammatory escalation behaviour.

5. EVIDENTIAL DISCIPLINE

The Institute distinguishes between:

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

- hypothesis,
- perception,
- and speculation.

Institutional communication and safeguarding 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,
- research practices,
- publication activity,
- public communication,
- digital conduct,
- and institutional engagement.

Safeguarding considerations should therefore remain integrated within institutional procedures and communication standards.

7. RESPONSIBLE COMMUNICATION STANDARDS

Communication associated with the Institute should support:

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

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

8. PUBLIC TRUST AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Institute recognises that institutional credibility depends substantially upon:

- safeguarding seriousness,
- lawful conduct,

- evidential discipline,
- procedural fairness,
- proportionality,
- and responsible institutional behaviour.

9. CONCLUSION

The Institute's mental wellbeing and safeguarding framework is grounded in evidential discipline, safeguarding awareness, procedural fairness, lawful conduct, analytical restraint, and responsible non-coercive institutional engagement.

The Institute supports calm, evidence-based, proportionate, and safeguarding-oriented approaches to vulnerable and high-conflict situations.