

BJRI TRUSTEE ROLES GOVERNANCE RESPONSIBILITIES AND INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDSHIP FRAMEWORK

BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Trustee Governance and Institutional Stewardship Framework

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this framework is to establish the trustee roles, governance responsibilities, safeguarding obligations, institutional stewardship, and responsible oversight principles governing the Black Justice Research Institute ("BJRI").

The Institute recognises that institutional credibility depends substantially upon responsible governance, lawful conduct, evidential discipline, safeguarding awareness, and procedural fairness.

2. CORE GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

The Institute supports:

- responsible institutional stewardship,
- safeguarding awareness,
- evidential discipline,
- lawful conduct,
- procedural fairness,
- analytical restraint,
- and accountable governance practices.

The Institute rejects:

- corruption,
- coercive institutional behaviour,
- harassment,
- manipulative governance practices,
- inflammatory escalation behaviour,
- and speculative allegation presented as established fact.

3. TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

Trustees and governance personnel associated with the Institute should support:

- safeguarding seriousness,
- lawful conduct,
- procedural fairness,
- responsible oversight,
- evidential discipline,
- and reduction of unnecessary escalation risks.

Trustees should avoid conflicts of interest, reckless institutional conduct, discriminatory behaviour, coercive practices, and manipulative governance activity.

4. INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDSHIP

The Institute recognises that institutional stewardship includes responsibility for:

- governance frameworks,
- safeguarding policies,
- research standards,
- archive preservation,
- digital governance,
- and public-interest educational activity.

Institutional stewardship should therefore remain proportionate, evidence-based, safeguarding-aware, and consistent with lawful conduct obligations.

5. EVIDENTIAL DISCIPLINE

The Institute distinguishes between:

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

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

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

7. RESPONSIBLE DECISION-MAKING

Governance decisions associated with the Institute should support:

- proportionality,
- evidential discipline,
- procedural fairness,
- safeguarding awareness,
- lawful conduct,
- and transparency where reasonably appropriate.

The Institute recognises that responsible governance requires careful documentation and accountable review procedures.

8. PUBLIC TRUST AND INSTITUTIONAL CREDIBILITY

The Institute recognises that institutional legitimacy depends substantially upon:

- safeguarding seriousness,
- evidential discipline,
- lawful conduct,
- procedural fairness,
- proportionality,
- and responsible institutional stewardship.

9. CONCLUSION

The Institute's trustee and stewardship framework is grounded in evidential discipline, safeguarding awareness, procedural fairness, lawful conduct, analytical restraint, and responsible institutional governance.

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