

BJRI PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS CULTURAL COMPETENCE AND NON COERCIVE INSTITUTIONAL ENGAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Institutional Communication and Procedural Fairness Framework

1. PURPOSE

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

The Institute recognises that institutional trust and public confidence depend substantially upon fairness, proportionality, lawful conduct, safeguarding awareness, and responsible communication practices.

2. CORE INSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

The Institute supports:

- procedural fairness,
- evidential discipline,
- safeguarding awareness,
- analytical restraint,
- lawful conduct,
- cultural competence where reasonably appropriate,
- and reduction of unnecessary escalation risks.

The Institute rejects:

- coercive conduct,
- harassment,
- intimidation,
- inflammatory rhetoric,
- ideological extremism,
- and speculative allegation presented as established fact.

3. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS PRINCIPLES

Institutional activity associated with the Institute should support:

- fair process,
- proportionality,
- careful review procedures,
- transparency where reasonably appropriate,
- and recognition of evidential uncertainty where appropriate.

The Institute recognises that procedural fairness is necessary to support institutional legitimacy and responsible public-interest engagement.

4. CULTURAL COMPETENCE

The Institute recognises that cultural, social, historical, and communication differences may sometimes influence:

- institutional trust,
- communication clarity,
- safeguarding considerations,
- conflict escalation risks,
- and procedural participation.

The Institute supports culturally competent communication approaches where reasonably appropriate and consistent with lawful conduct obligations.

5. NON-COERCIVE ENGAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

The Institute supports:

- voluntary participation,
- respectful communication,
- safeguarding awareness,
- reduction of unnecessary escalation,
- and evidence-based engagement practices.

The Institute rejects:

- coercive manipulation,
- intimidation tactics,
- harassment campaigns,
- inflammatory escalation behaviour,
- and exploitative institutional practices.

6. EVIDENTIAL DISCIPLINE

The Institute distinguishes between:

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

Institutional communications and engagement practices should therefore avoid presenting uncertainty or allegation as verified fact without appropriate evidential foundation.

7. SAFEGUARDING RESPONSIBILITIES

The Institute recognises safeguarding obligations within:

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

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

8. PUBLIC TRUST AND RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT

The Institute recognises that long-term institutional credibility depends substantially upon:

- procedural fairness,

- safeguarding seriousness,
- evidential discipline,
- lawful conduct,
- proportionality,
- analytical restraint,
- and responsible institutional behaviour.

9. CONCLUSION

The Institute's procedural fairness and engagement framework is grounded in safeguarding awareness, evidential discipline, lawful conduct, proportionality, and responsible institutional communication.

The Institute supports calm, evidence-based, non-coercive, and procedurally fair institutional engagement practices.