



POLICY BRIEF · ASPC-PB-020

Public Confidence, Transparency and Corrective Action

Which information practices help institutions earn confidence
through performance and correction?

EVIDENCE-INFORMED ASPC ANALYSIS

Supporting publication to ASPC-PP-002

August 2026 · 7-page edition

Status, question and scope

ASPC RESEARCH SYNTHESIS.

Research question

Which information practices help institutions earn confidence through performance and correction?

Scope

Confidence is not a communications output. It is supported when institutions provide usable information, explain authority and uncertainty, preserve records and correct material errors.

Evidence cutoff: August 21, 2026. Government findings, agency-reported information and ASPC analysis are distinguished throughout.

Key findings

The reviewed sources support the following bounded findings.

- GAO links quality program and spending information to policymaking, oversight and public trust.
- NARA treats records as essential evidence for accountability, rights and institutional memory.
- Digital.gov plain-language guidance emphasizes audience, organization, active voice, descriptive headings and testing for understanding.

Findings are paraphrased from the cited official records. Source scope and date remain controlling.

Evidence interpretation

What the evidence establishes

- GAO links quality program and spending information to policymaking, oversight and public trust.
- NARA treats records as essential evidence for accountability, rights and institutional memory.

What requires judgment

Confidence is not a communications output. It is supported when institutions provide usable information, explain authority and uncertainty, preserve records and correct material errors.

Application beyond the source setting is ASPC analysis and should be tested against the authority, capability, risk and conditions of the institutions involved.

Implementation considerations

Implementation should connect responsibility, evidence and review.

- Publish purpose, authority, evidence, limitations, status, revisions and correction channels.
- Use plain language without removing necessary technical precision.
- Maintain a visible correction and revision record rather than silently replacing material claims.

Decision record

Document the responsible institution, required authority, resources, risks, measures, review date and basis for continuation, adjustment or conclusion.

ASPC application and limitations

Proposed application

- Publish purpose, authority, evidence, limitations, status, revisions and correction channels.
- Use plain language without removing necessary technical precision.
- Maintain a visible correction and revision record rather than silently replacing material claims.

Limitations

- Transparency must be balanced with privacy, security, legal restrictions and ethical data management.

These applications are proposed by ASPC. Citation does not imply endorsement by any source institution.



Public Confidence, Transparency and Corrective Action

Supporting publication to ASPC-PP-002

ASPC RELEVANCE

This research supports institutional stability and reliable international cooperation where capable institutions abroad can advance shared interests with the United States.

GAO Federal Information Transparency

[Official source →](#)

NARA Strategic Directions

[Official source →](#)

Digital.gov Plain Language

[Official source →](#)

ASPC IS A U.S.-BASED STRATEGIC INITIATIVE AND NOT A UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ENTITY.

ASPC-PB-020 · Version 1.0 · August 2026