

Princeton Private Prison and Detention Divestment Proposal

This revised document details how Princeton University has clear reasons to move forward with divesting and disassociating from corporations that draw profit from incarceration, drug control and immigrant deportation policies, based on demonstrated 1) campus consensus for divestment, 2) sustained campus engagement with issues of mass incarceration and immigrant detention, and 3) a clear conflict between the actions of such corporations and our University values.

This document was compiled by Princeton Private Prison Divestment, a coalition consisting of Students for Prison Education and Reform (SPEAR), the DREAM Team, the Muslim Advocates for Social Justice and Individual Dignity (MASJID), the Alliance for Jewish Progressives (AJP), the Black Justice League (BJL), the Princeton University Latinx Perspectives Organization (PULPO), Progressive Christians at Princeton (PCAP) and the Princeton College Democrats.

This proposal includes an updated list of companies from which Princeton should divest, as they are either private prison and detention corporations, or corporations that contract exclusively with these corporations:

Carceral and Detention Corporations:

- Corrections Corporation of America (CCA)
- G4S PLC
- GEO Group

Treatment and In-Prison Service Corporations:

- MHM Services, of Vienna, Virginia (OTC: MHMI)
- Correct Care Solutions LLC., (formerly Geo Care)
- Corizon Health Inc., owned by Valitas Health Services, Inc., of St. Louis, MO (Private)
- Armor Correctional Health Services, Inc., of Miami, FL (Private)
- J-Pay
- Securus
- Global Tel Link

Probation and Supervision Services

- Providence Services Corporation

Campus Consensus

There is significant demonstrated campus consensus for divestment from corporations that run and contract exclusively with private prisons. In April 2016, as per new rules for referenda, students had forty-eight hours to vote on a referendum during the Undergraduate Student Government elections that posed the following question:

Should the Council of the Princeton University Community and the Princeton University Investment Company dissociate and divest from corporations that draw profit from incarceration, drug control and immigrant deportation policies, including (1) Corporations that operate private prisons, jails, halfway houses and/or immigration detention facilities in the United States, such as the Corrections Corporation of America, The GEO Group and G4S and (2) Corporations that contract exclusively with such correctional facilities, including Global Tel Link, JPay, Securus and Corizon?

1,639 students -- 30.1% of the undergraduate student body -- voted in the referendum with 1457 (89%) voting in favor and only 182 students voting no. Columbia University, which divested from private prisons in 2015, garnered fewer numbers to demonstrate consensus: a total of 971 students, faculty, and alumni signed a petition calling on the university to divest and 1,303 people signed a petition on change.org.¹ Moreover, more Princeton undergraduates voted on the divestment referendum than any other question on the ballot: the other referendum received 1,210 (23%) votes while elections received 1,498 (29%) votes. It is also noteworthy that after Princeton Private Prison Divest's original petition garnered enough signatures to move forward to a undergraduate student vote, all Princeton students were explicitly given a window of one week to create an opposition campaign, and no such opposition movement formed. The very definition of consensus means a lack of opposition. The absence of a counter movement is a clear demonstration of campus consensus that Princeton ought to divest from private carceral institutions.

In addition, in Spring of 2017, the coalition sponsored a graduate student referendum that was voted upon by graduate students from February 23rd to March 1st. The language of the referendum was as follows:

“Should the Council of the Princeton University Community and the Princeton University Investment Company dissociate and divest from corporations that draw profit from incarceration or immigrant deportation policies, including (1) Corporations that operate private prisons, jails, halfway houses and/or immigration detention facilities in the United States, such as the Corrections Corporation of America, The GEO Group and G4S and (2) Corporations that contract exclusively with such correctional facilities, including Global Tel Link, JPay, Securus and Corizon?”

¹ Columbia Prison Divest, “Proposal for Divestment to the Advisory Committee on Socially Responsible Investing”

Voter turnout was 26.9%, which was approximately three times the turnout of the 2016 election. The results of the election are as follows, with the vast majority of students voting in favor. As has been noted in *The Daily Princetonian*, this increase in turnout was due largely to the referendum:

“This year’s election also featured a SPEAR referendum to divest from private prisons which passed by 85 percent among voting graduate students. Former Academic Affairs Chair Daniel Vitek attributed this year’s high turnout of 26.9 percent to the energy from the divestment referendum. ‘We had a referendum this year. Usually we vote for people, but in this case we were voting for an idea,’ Vitek said. In previous years, election turnouts never surpassed 20 percent with 15.9 percent in 2016 and 13 percent in 2015.”

The breakdown of graduate student referendum voting was as follows:

Support: 606 (85%)
Oppose: 60 (8.4%)
Abstain: 47 (6.6%)
Turnout: 26.9% (721/2682)

Last, in January of 2016, PPPD circulated a faculty petition calling for divestment. The petition received in total 177 signatures, more than any other faculty petition in recent memory. In addition, it is important to note that unlike past faculty petitions, no counter-petition emerged concerning divestment from the corporations in question. A full list of signatures can be found in Addendum 4 of this document. The text of the petition is as follows:

“We, the faculty of Princeton University, call upon the Council of the Princeton University Community and the Princeton University Investment Company to dissociate and divest from corporations that draw profit from incarceration, drug control and immigrant deportation policies, including:

- (1) Corporations that operate private prisons, jails, halfway houses and/or immigration detention facilities in the United States, such as the Corrections Corporation of America, The GEO Group and G4S
- (2) Corporations that contract exclusively with such correctional facilities, including Global Tel Link, JPay, Securus, MHM Services, Correct Care Solutions, Corizon Health, Armor Correctional Health Services, and Providence Services Corporation.

We call upon the University to divest from these corporations, as well as implement a negative screen against these corporations for future investments.”

Sustained Support

The work of Princeton students on and off campus demonstrates a sustained concern about the state of the criminal legal system in the United States. The student body's frustration with the unjust and discriminatory penal system has manifested itself in educational programs, campus events, conferences, Breakout trips, letter writing, and protests, hosted by students from a range of ideological backgrounds who all agree that the criminal legal system must be changed.

Since its inception over a year ago, PPPD has campaigned on campus through various events as well as by tabling in Frist to spread awareness and garner student support alongside its continued engagement with the Resources Committee. In addition, PPPD held a panel event on February 6, 2017, to discuss the impact of privatization of prisons and detention centers on facility conditions and on incarcerated and detained individuals. The panel featured Carl Takei, staff attorney at the ACLU National Prison Project, Judith Greene, director of Justice Strategies, and Christopher Petrella, lecturer at Bates College. Coverage of this event is available [here](#), and a video of the event can be seen [here](#).

Educational work in prisons has allowed Princeton students to develop relationships and learn alongside people who are directly impacted by mass incarceration. Over the past five years, Princeton students, as Petey Greene volunteers, have traveled to New Jersey youth prisons in order to work with incarcerated students in preparation for the high-school equivalency exam. There are now over 100 Petey Greene volunteers tutoring on a weekly basis. Other prison education programs have also developed, including the Prison Teaching Initiative, which runs accredited college classes in New Jersey state prisons, the Princeton Employment Project (PrEP), which assists in the job search, and the Prison Electives Project, which provides a wide variety of courses taught by Princeton undergraduates.

Princeton students have also shown their support for criminal justice reform through on-campus student activities, protests, and events. Over the past four years, SPEAR has had an annual membership of 60+ undergraduates and graduate students, and this year SPEAR has dedicated a committee solely to divestment. In the two years since its founding, Project Solidarity (P.S.), a letter writing program between Princeton students and people in solitary confinement, has grown to over 100 members. A spring Admissions Opportunity Campaign teach-in in 2015, requesting that Princeton remove barriers to a Princeton education for people with a criminal history, drew support from six different student organizations and 100+ students. Support for changes within the

criminal justice system have come from a range of ideological backgrounds and represent a portion of the student body that is both sizeable and diverse. For example, College Democrats was part of the coalition of support for the recent referendum, while a libertarian group staged an anti-solitary confinement demonstration last year.

Princeton DREAM Team, an immigrant rights advocacy group additionally has run a detention center visitation program for the past four years, in which around 40 students have participated. Princeton students spend their Saturday mornings visiting the nearby Elizabeth Detention Center and Delaney Hall in northern New Jersey to speak to detained individuals and provide them with emotional support. Students have had to contact family members and lawyers on behalf of detained immigrants several times due to restricted communication and poor administrative support within the detention centers. During the fall semester of the 2013-2014 academic year, 40 DREAM Team and community members staged a protest calling for the withdrawal of a deportation order placed on a community member who had been detained in the Elizabeth Detention Center for months beforehand. He was subsequently released.

Outside these core groups and their activities, other Princeton students have also shown concern for the way the criminal justice and immigration systems exacerbate existing inequalities. A spring 2016 Breakout trip, *Chained in Silence: The Mass Incarceration and Criminalization of the LGBTQ Community*, examined “the intersectionality of LGBTQ inmates’ identities and how they function within the prison system,” as well the increased risk of sexual assault and sexually transmitted diseases the LGBTQ community faces due to their incarceration. Another trip, “La Frontera: Humanitarian Immigration Crisis in Arizona” looked into the U.S./Mexico border crisis and examined Operation Streamline, a zero-tolerance border policy in which unauthorized migrants are charged with felonies and misdemeanors, effectively funneling them into the U.S. criminal justice system and its privatized immigration detention centers. Before Spring 2016, numerous Breakout groups had looked into the criminalization not only of undocumented immigrants and the LGBTQ Community, but also at the strict disciplinary policies in educational systems that disproportionately affect Black and Latino youth.

The spring 2016 conference, “Identity in the Age of Mass Incarceration,” was the culmination of campus collaboration and student interest. Co-hosted by SPEAR, the Black Justice League, DREAM Team, Muslim Advocates for Social Justice and Individual Dignity, and the Asian American Students Association, it attracted more than 200 attendees and explored the way identities are alternately constructed, persecuted, and criminalized in the modern-day U.S. carceral state.

While it has been noted that some of the above listed activities do not focus on the private prison industry exclusively, such an argument represents a misunderstanding of the work of these groups. In their advocacy against mass incarceration, the war on drugs, and punitive immigration policy, the students in these organizations have opposed systems of exploitation, disenfranchisement, and abuse in all of their manifestations. The privatized prison and detention industry, which draws profit from such indignities and actively advocates for their expansion, is not only the most perverse of these systems, it is the only one which PRINCO is likely invested in and thus that which we must divest from. That the same groups that have undertaken sustained advocacy on these issues are founding members of this coalition is a clear indication of the continuity in the campus' engagement. To argue otherwise is to misunderstand the depth of the passion of the university community when it comes to these pressing issues.

Conflict with Core University Values

Mass incarceration and immigrant detention are among the most pressing and severe human rights crises in the United States. The U.S. incarcerates more people in its prisons, jails, and immigrant detention centers per capita and in total than any other country in the world, and does so in a way that is heavily inflected by race and income. U.S. carceral practices have contributed to the ongoing disenfranchisement of low-income communities of color across the country. Companies that operate carceral facilities exploit this wholesale caging of bodies for economic gain. In doing so, they frequently lobby for more punitive state and federal criminal justice and immigration policies and provide unsafe and poorly regulated services. Although these companies have been described as “cost-cutting,” they merely pass the exorbitant prices of incarceration onto the very marginalized people they exploit. To be associated with, or derive profit from investments in these companies in any way is fundamentally at odds with the University's commitment to acting in the nation's service & the service of humanity, and promoting individual human rights. Leading up to this past year's election, various political leaders have condemned the privatization of the U.S.'s carceral system. Furthermore, Columbia University and the University of California system dissociated themselves from private prison corporations in 2015. To reduce its complicity in one of the greatest civil rights violations of the modern era, the University should join its peer institutions in dissociating from the above companies.

While private prisons and detention centers constitute only one component of the carceral system nationwide, they account for many of the system's most egregious and cruel practices. There is evidence of staff members at private prisons “selling drugs to

the youths in their care, brutally beating them and even engaging in sexual relationships with them”² or of staff who “frequently place vulnerable prisoners with predators” and “fail to protect prisoners who request and need protection from assault”.³ Addendum 1 and 2 of this document contain scholarly research on this industry and provide information about specific corporations.

While the exact wording of Princeton’s core values is unclear, by looking at our informal motto as well as past official University statements, we can see that the practices described above are clearly in opposition to these values. The most recent expression of Princeton’s values came in the form of our new informal motto: “Princeton in the nation’s service and the service of humanity.” Private prisons perpetuate a national civil rights crisis, one that falls disproportionately upon the most vulnerable people in our society. Supporting the private carceral industry does not support the wellbeing of our nation or of humanity. Divestment would begin to bring us closer to being in the service to humanity, and would be an important step in aligning Princeton with its purported values.

In addition, the Ombuds Office states online: “The values that the Ombuds Office holds and promotes are the same values that Princeton University espouses: integrity, respect for others, diversity, and freedom from bias and harassment.”⁴ The private prison and detention system is shown to be a system that disregards the dignity of human beings for the sake of profit; it exemplifies significant disrespect and harassment of one of our country’s most vulnerable populations. Princeton’s endorsement of this industry is a deviation from our values, particularly of those stated by the Ombuds Office.

Moreover, from Princeton’s Human Resources website comes an important statement on the University’s values: “In May of 1994 Princeton approved the following statement of our goals and aspiration in the important areas of diversity and community ... as a community, we respect the dignity, individuality and freedom of each member.”⁵ It is disturbing that while we apply this rhetoric to our community, it does not extend out to the members of our national community. Incarceration as it currently stands is a system that strips humans of their dignity and individuality; moreover, it does so in a way that targets individuals of a particular race, class, gender, or other people group. This is in direct opposition to the University’s commitments to diversity. Our university has no place investing in corporations not only profit off of such injustices, but also exacerbate

² <https://www.splcenter.org/seeking-justice/case-docket/cb-et-al-v-walnut-grove-correctional-authority-et-al>

³ <https://www.aclu.org/files/assets/2010-3-11-Riggs-SecondAmendedComplaint.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.princeton.edu/ombuds/values/>

⁵ https://www.princeton.edu/hr/policies/introduction/stmnt_div_comm/

them. Such corporations should not be affiliated with Princeton in any way. In light of Princeton's explicitly articulated values of diversity, dignity, individuality, and service, we call upon the University to divest from the private prison and detention industry.

Lastly, the results of the election bring with them a particular urgency to divestment. After Donald Trump's surprising victory, certain companies surged upward in stock value. According to an article written by the Guardian, "Private prison operator Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) surged by as much as 60% in early trading before settling back at a 41% increase. Rival operator GEO Group was also up 18%. The companies are soaring as analysts reckon that Trump will row back on the Department of Justice's ruling this summer to phase out privately run prisons. The companies could benefit still further from Trump's plan for the mass deportation of immigrants. Analysts at Height Securities projected that private prisons would likely be a clear winner under Trump, as his administration will likely rescind the DOJ's contract phase-out and ICE [Immigration and Customs Enforcement] capacity to house detainees will come under further stress."⁶ Given this information, the onus is on Princeton now more than ever to dissociate itself from corporations that engage in harmful practices of exploitation.

Addendum 1: Scholarly Literature and Relevant Sources

1. Contemporary Justice Review, "The criminalization of immigration and the privatization of immigration detention: implications for justice"
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10282580.2013.798506?needAccess=true>
 - 1.1. Dr. Alissa R. Ackerman and Dr. Rich Furman, professors of Social Work and Criminal Justice at the University of Washington, Tacoma write in an article published in the Contemporary Criminal Justice Review, "The criminalization of immigration and the privatization of prisons work hand in hand in shaping the American criminal justice response to immigration. Privatization creates a powerful opportunity for the social construction of the undocumented immigrant into a powerful potential source of revenue for for-profit corporations. Private prison corporations, such as Corrections Corporation of America and The GEO Group, stand to profit significantly from the private immigration detention center."
2. DOJ Announcement, Summer 2016
<https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2016/e1606.pdf>
 - 2.1. The Department of Justice announced in August 2016 that contracts with private correctional companies for private prisons housing federal inmates

⁶<https://www.theguardian.com/business/blog/live/2016/nov/09/stock-markets-on-edge-as-us-presidential-election-heads-for-tense-climax?page=with:block-58235d8ce4b0eda0192fdea8#block-58235d8ce4b0eda0192fdea8>

would be phased out, explaining: “We found that in a majority of the categories we examined, contract prisons incurred more safety and security incidents per capita than comparable Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) institutions...With the exception of fewer incidents of positive drug tests and sexual misconduct, the contract prisons had more incidents per capita than the BOP institutions in all of the other categories of data we examined. For example, the contract prisons confiscated eight times as many contraband cell phones annually on average as the BOP institutions. Contract prisons also had higher rates of assaults, both by inmates on other inmates and by inmates on staff.”

- 2.2. The Justice Department’s announcement, while an exciting step, does not solve the private prison issue, and two major problems remain. The first is that the decision applies only to federal prisons, and private *state* prisons are not affected. Second, while the Justice Department ending its contracts with these corporations may initially hurt them, the restricted nature of the announcement allows potential for these corporations to focus their resources on immigrant detention centers. The same week that the Justice Department made the announcement about private prisons, the Department of Homeland Security made a \$1 billion dollar deal with the Corrections Corporation of America to run immigration detention centers. In other words, while the government has taken some promising steps, this issue will not be solved by the government alone; the privatization of immigration detention centers is growing, along with private state prisons.
3. Wake Forest Journal of Law & Policy, Issue 2, June 2016
http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/wfilapo6&div=16&g_sent=1&collection=journals
 - 3.1. The Wake Forest Journal of Law released two issues, in February and June 2016, respectively, on a wide range of issues related to mass incarceration, disenfranchisement, civil rights, and criminal justice. One section of their June 2016 issue is called “Private Prisons and the New Marketplace for Crime”.
 - 3.2. One particularly notable quote is: “Private prison company directors, managers, and their lobbyists currently work doggedly to increase profits by: (1) influencing carceral policy so that greater numbers of Americans face incarceration; (2) exploiting those imprisoned through private prison labor contracts; (3) lobbying government officials tirelessly to privatize entire state and federal prison systems; (4) reducing the quality of food and degree of safety for prisoners to cut costs at privately run facilities; (5) drafting legislation and lobbying for passage of draconian sentencing

policies including mandatory minimums, three-strikes, and illegal immigration legislation; (6) bribing judges and government officials to fill private prison facilities with children on dubious charges; (7) requiring governments that contract for their services to maintain capacity in the private prisons at ninety percent or risk breach of contract and higher per diem fees; and (8) building new prison facilities despite no government contract or ready prisoners to fill them.”

4. Minnesota State DOC, 2013

http://www.doc.state.mn.us/pages/files/9613/9206/2382/MN_Private_Prison_Evaluation_Website_Final.pdf

4.1. The Minnesota State Department of Corrections conducted a study in 2013 that found that “offenders who had been incarcerated in a private prison had a greater hazard of recidivism in all 20 regression models...which may be attributable to fewer visitation and rehabilitative programming opportunities for offenders incarcerated at private facilities.”

5. Arizona State Department of Corrections, 2011

https://corrections.az.gov/sites/default/files/ars41_1609_01_biennial_comparison_report12211_e_v.pdf

5.1. In 2011 the Arizona State Department of Corrections released a report comparing the six private prison units operated under five exclusive prison contracts with the Department to six state-run prison units operated by the Department. The comparison showed that these private prisons provided levels of quality of service comparable to or below those of the state-run prisons, all at comparable costs.

6. American University, Washington School of Law Review, 2005

<http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=hrbrief>

6.1. Ira P. Robbins, Professor of Law and Justice at the Washington School of Law (WCL) at American University and Co-Director of the Criminal Justice Practice and Policy Institute, writes in an article published in the WCL Law Review that “private prisons have a double disincentive to aid in the rehabilitation of their charges: by skimping on programs they save money immediately and, by letting prisoners serve out their terms without access to proper rehabilitation programs, they increase the likelihood that those prisoners will become ‘repeat customers.’” Furthermore, “decisions to limit staff training are often based specifically on financial savings” and “medical offerings at private prisons are often bare-bones operations.”

7. University of Nevada Study, 2008

<http://arp.sagepub.com/content/36/2/189.short>

7.1. A study conducted in 2008 by Andrew L. Spivak of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and Susan F. Sharp of the University of Oklahoma,

Norman on private and state-run prisons in Oklahoma and Florida found that “in every categorical model, private prison inmate groups had a greater hazard of recidivism than did public inmate groups.”

8. Utah Criminal Justice Center at University of Utah, 2007

<http://ucjc.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/861.pdf>

- 8.1. A study conducted in 2007 by the Utah Criminal Justice Center at the University of Utah found that “cost savings from privatizing prisons are not guaranteed and appear minimal” while “publicly managed prisons deliver slightly better skills training and have slightly fewer inmate grievances.”

9. Boston University Law Review, “Private Prisons, Private Records”

<http://www.bu.edu/bulawreview/files/2014/10/TARTAGLIA.pdf>

- 9.1. This report discusses the problems associated with the lack of transparency in private prisons. “In the vast majority of United States jurisdictions, private prisons are not required to disclose information pursuant to public records requests in the same manner as government prisons...The need for greater oversight is especially pronounced for private prisons, which have incentives to cut corners and are funded primarily by tremendous taxpayer investments.” This creates dangerous environments that become difficult to monitor for human rights and unconstitutional abuses.

10. Duke Law Journal, “State Punishment and Private Prisons”

<http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1274&context=dj>

- 10.1. This article from the Duke Law Journal discusses the problems associated with comparing public and private prisons. “To date, the debate over private prisons has focused largely on the relative efficiency of private prisons as compared to their publicly-run counterparts, and has assumed that, if private contractors can run the prisons for less money than the state without a drop in quality, then states should be willing to privatize. This ‘comparative efficiency’ approach, however, has two significant problems. First, it is concerned exclusively with efficiency, despite the fact that the privatization of prisons arguably implicates more urgent values. Second, it accepts the current state of public prisons as an unproblematic baseline, thus failing to consider the possibility that neither public prisons as presently constituted nor private prisons in the form currently on offer are adequate to satisfy society's obligations to those it incarcerates.”

11. Oliver Hart, The Proper Scope of Government Theory and An Application to Prisons

<http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/112/4/1127.short>

11.1. In this article, Hart explains that the privatization of prisons is not an issue of competition but of control rights of the facility. Given that control rights grants the owner the ability to “invest [either] his time to improve the quality of the service or to reduce its costs”, Hart argues that private firms, having control rights to their prison, no longer need government approval to reduce cost for services. Although private contractors may have a stronger incentive to both improve the quality of services and reduce costs, often their “incentive to engage in cost reduction is typically too strong since he ignores the adverse impact on quality”. Essentially, private prisons have an incentive to cut cost often at the expense of the quality of their labor, and amenities. For instance, private prisons can hire lower quality workers without a premium or at lower costs than public prisons, while adhering to vague American Correctional Association regulations and contracts. Lower quality, poorly trained workers often can lead to more inmate abuses. Hart explains that “in many instances, private contractors worked inmates to death, beat or killed them for minor rule infraction or failed to provide inmates with the quality and quality of life’s necessities”. Through reducing costs, private owners adversely affects the quality of the prison. Granted that not all private prisons have more inferior qualities to public prisons, Hart found that the greater incentive to cut costs amongst private prison owners most often has negative effects on the conditions of prisons.

Addendum 2: Information on Specific Corporations

- 1) Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) (recently renamed “CoreCivic”
<http://investigate.afsc.org/company/corrections-corporation-america>
<https://www.aclu.org/files/assets/2010-3-11-Riggs-SecondAmendedComplaint.pdf>
 - a) CCA is the largest private prison corporation in the United States. CCA owns or controls 66 correctional and detention facilities in 18 states and the District of Columbia, and manages 11 facilities owned by government agencies. As of 2015 filings, they hold nearly 42% of all beds under contract with private operators of correctional and detention facilities in the US.
 - b) CCA owns TransCor America, a detainee/prisoner transportation company.
 - c) CCA is a Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT). As such, the company separates the operational side of prison management from the real estate side of owning/generating income from facilities. REITs generally pay no income tax, and must distribute at least 90% of income to shareholders in the form of dividends.
 - d) From the first quarter of 2010 to the fourth quarter of 2014, CCA spent \$9,345,000 lobbying the federal government on budgetary appropriations for immigrant detention and federal incarceration contracts.

- e) A 2010 Associated Press Report revealed that CCA's Idaho Correctional Center had more assaults than all other Idaho prisons combined. Many CCA facilities have been found to be in violation of state and federal standards, as found in the attached report.
- 2) G4S plc
- <http://investigate.afsc.org/company/g4s-plc>
- a) G4S plc is a British-Danish global security company. G4S Secure Solutions inc. is the U.S. arm of the company, with 20% of its global revenues.
 - b) G4S provides security systems and technology for prisons, and runs youth detention facilities across the US, the majority of which are in Florida.
 - c) In Florida, there have been consistent reports of abuse, use of excessive force, recurring riots, and there are numerous lawsuits against the company.
 - d) G4S announced in March of 2016 that it would sell its US Youth Justice Services within the next two years.
 - e) From 2010 to 2013, G4S spent \$110,000 lobbying the federal government on issues related to border security and liability. In 2014, G4S was made to sell one of its divisions after charges of complicity in human rights violations.
- 3) GEO Group
- <http://investigate.afsc.org/company/geo-group-inc>
<https://www.splcenter.org/seeking-justice/case-docket/cb-et-al-v-walnut-grove-correctional-authority-et-al>
- a) GEO Group manages about 81,000 beds in 73 correctional and detention facilities.
 - b) GEO Group is a Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT), and therefore follows the same mold discussed under "Corrections Corporation of America (CCA)".
 - c) From 2010 to 2014, GEO Group spent \$1.95 million lobbying the federal government on issues of federal appropriations, closure of federal prisons, alternatives to ICE detention, and transportation of prisoners and detainees.
- 4) MHM Services
- <http://investigate.afsc.org/company/mhm-services-inc>
- a) MHM provides mental health services in more than 250 facilities across 14 states, as well as pharmacy management operations.
 - b) In 2014, MHM was sued for failure to provide adequate care, medicating prisoners against their will, violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Rehabilitation Act, and cruel and unusual punishment. Former employees charge that a "culture of abuse" persists in care-related services.
 - c) Multiple audits and investigations have shown inadequate and at times abusive treatment as well of violation of contracts, death as a result of starvation, denial of necessary medication, neglect, and improper use of restraints. All of the cases brought by families of the deceased prisoners have been won or are ongoing.

- 5) Correct Care Solutions LLC., (formerly Geo Care)
http://www.privateci.org/rap_correct_care.html
 - a) Correct Care Solutions, formerly known as Geo Care, a subsidiary of GEO Group, is a health care corporation that has contracts in 38 states across the U.S.
 - b) Correct Care Solutions' "rap sheet" can be found on the link provided. One lawsuit was on behalf of a man who was denied medical treatment even after being found shaking and gasping for air, saying that he was going to die.
- 6) Corizon Health Inc., owned by Valitas Health Services, Inc.
http://www.privateci.org/rap_phs.html
 - a) In 2014, the Southern Poverty Law Center and the Alabama Disabilities Advocacy Program filed the 140-page complaint against the Alabama Department of Corrections (ADOC).
 - b) The complaint contains a laundry list of allegations rooted in ADOC's "routine and systematic failure" to provide adequate medical care, which the complaint says has led to the death and severe injury of multiple inmates. A significant portion of the suit was aimed at ADOC's noncompliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, stating that prisoners with disabilities are often housed in facilities that do not accommodate them.
 - c) See attached link for a multitude of complaints, law suits, and scandals surrounding Corizon.
- 7) Armor Correctional Health Services, Inc.
<http://newsok.com/article/5504189>
<http://www.beckershospitalreview.com/legal-regulatory-issues/ny-state-sues-armor-correctional-health-services-over-12-inmate-deaths.html>
 - a) Armor Correctional Health Services is a corporation that provides medical and behavioral health services, as well as pharmacy services.
 - b) Armor has had similar instances of deaths of inmates due to lack of adequate medical care, and has been sued by the state of New York for inadequate medical care.
- 8) JPay
<http://www.occupy.com/article/jpay-scam-prison-bankers-cash-captive-customers#sthash.Hxr9l3eq.dpbs>
 - a) JPay provides services related to communication, video visitation, parole, probation and post-release services, and money transfers. JPay is a subsidiary of Securus.
 - b) The Center for Public Integrity found in a study that because JPay collects so much from inmates' families in fees for basic financial services, some families are forced to forgo medical care, skip utility bills, and limit contact with their incarcerated relatives.
- 9) Securus Technologies Company
 - a) Securus is the parent corporation of JPay, and provides similar services accompanied by similar complaints.

10) Global Tel Link

http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/31/us/steep-costs-of-inmate-phone-calls-are-under-scrutiny.html?_r=0

- a) Global Tel Link provides telephone, communication, and payment services for family members of incarcerated individuals. Global Tel Link controls 50% of the market for correctional institutions, and has faced the same complaints that JPay and Securus have.

11) Providence Services Corporation

<http://investigate.afsc.org/company/providence-services-corporation>

- a) Providence contracts with state and local governmental agencies to provide probation and other court-mandated services. Through its subsidiaries, Providence provides these services to justice departments in 12 states in the form of monitoring, drug testing, pre-sentence investigations, case management, rehabilitative services, and the collection of court-ordered fines and fees.
- b) Providence operates as an “offender-funded” probation company, meaning that its revenue comes from charging probationers monthly supervision fees; if probationers are unable to pay these fees, they are arrested.
- c) In a recent lawsuit, the plaintiff reported that the Supreme Court ruling that one cannot be incarcerated due to inability to pay a fine is routinely ignored, and that the company fabricates reasons to claim probation violations that lead to arrests.
- d) Multiple suits have been filed against Providence for charges of racketeering, embezzlement, and fraud, as can be seen in the referenced source.

Addendum 3: Common Questions:

1. In the list of proposed businesses and companies to divest from, are there a string of companies that are the worst? Are the particular companies we’ve talked about the problem, or the whole industry?
 - 1.1. While there are a host of corporations that work in some way within the private prison and detention industry (which can be found at <http://investigate.afsc.org/screens/prisons>), we have chosen to name the corporations that directly incarcerate or detain individuals, or that contract exclusively with corporations that incarcerate and detain individuals. We have identified these corporations as particularly egregious offenders, though ideally Princeton would disentangle itself from the web of corporations that has become the private prison and detention industrial complex.
2. Are there regulatory measures or disincentives for private prisons that lobby for more punitive sentences? Who pays the bill to incarcerate people?

- 2.1. Evidence shows that private prisons do not save a significant amount of tax dollars in comparison to publicly-run prisons.⁷ But more importantly, as long as American voters directly or indirectly support policies of mass incarceration that place a disproportionately large number of individuals from marginalized communities behind bars, then taxpayers need to pay the full cost of every available safety measure, no matter what the price-tag. The cost-cutting tendencies of private prisons are deadly, leading to high rates of assault and infrastructural safety deficiencies.⁸ In addition, cheapening the bill (by at most a small amount) for mass incarceration will only make it more difficult to galvanize support around necessary alternatives to incarceration.
3. If public policy questions are addressed and reform steps are taken, would divestment still be necessary? What if prisons were private, but gained a lower level of profit, and better quality compared to public prison? Would public prisons still be better?
 - 3.1. As discussed earlier, given a Trump presidency, it is now extremely unlikely that the proper steps will be taken in criminal justice reform, and more likely that the flaws in the carceral system will be exacerbated. In addition, it is crucial that Princeton's investments are based on present realities as opposed to what we hope will come in the future. If private prison and detention corporations ceased to profit off of incarcerating and detaining individuals, then they would not stay in business, as they are for-profit corporations. This is an opportunity for Princeton to be on the right side of history, and we as students want to see this institution make decisions based on morals and ethics just as much as profit and practicality. PPPD's position is not based on whether people should be moved from private prisons to state and federal ones, it is based on a conviction that private prison and detention corporations are inherently morally and ethically flawed, and therefore contradict the university's core values.
4. Is there an incentive for public prison guard unions to paint a negative picture of private prisons?
 - 4.1. The majority of criticism directed at private prisons comes from academics, journalists, researchers, community activists, and not-for-profit organizations that have an overall interest in shrinking federal and state prison systems and rolling back the harmful policies driving mass incarceration. Such individuals have targeted the private

⁷ https://corrections.az.gov/sites/default/files/ars41_1609_01_biennial_comparison_report122111_e_v.pdf

⁸ <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2016/e1606.pdf>

prison industry not because they seek to align themselves with prison guard unions, but because this industry constitutes a particularly egregious manifestation of carceral policy.

- 4.2. Unlike a private prison corporation, which first and foremost serves the interests of its shareholders, a prison guard union represents working people whose safety is threatened by the kind of cost-cutting measures and poor conditions common to private prisons. Issues such as high rates of assault and infrastructural safety deficiencies harm guards as well as prisoners.⁹
- 4.3. There are cases in which the interests of private prisons and unions may be reconciled, allowing for the further expansion of mass incarceration at the expense of socio-economically vulnerable communities. In California, a state known having for one of the most politically influential prison guard unions, governor Jerry Brown announced a \$315 million plan to expand the state's prison system's capacity that involved staffing private prisons targeted for expansion with state employees. This case is a model for the ways that the powerful private prison lobby and the prison guard union lobby can work together to expand policies of mass incarceration in ways that benefit each sector.

⁹ <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2016/e1606.pdf>

Addendum 4: Faculty Petition Signatures

1. Janet Currie, Economics
2. Ilyana Kuziemko, Economics
3. Alan Krueger, Economics
4. Peter Andolfatto, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Lewis-Sigler Institute
5. Christina Riehl, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
6. Andrea Graham, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
7. Frederik Simons, Geosciences
8. Ruha Benjamin, African American Studies
9. Naomi Murakawa, African American Studies
10. Chika Okeke-Agulu, African American Studies, Art & Archaeology
11. Anna Arabindan-Kesson, African American Studies/Art and Archaeology
12. Joshua Guild, African American Studies & History
13. Wendy Belcher, Comparative Literature, African American Studies
14. Susana Draper, Comparative Literature
15. Karen Emmerich, Comparative Literature
16. Jim Smith, Civil and Environmental Engineering
17. George W. Scherer, Civil and Environmental Engineering, PRISM
18. Elie Bou-Zeid, Civil and Environmental Engineering
19. Shaun Marmon, Religion
20. Judith Weisenfeld, Religion
21. Liane Carlson, Religion
22. AnneMarie Luijendijk, Religion
23. Jeffrey L. Stout, Religion
24. Sonya Legg, Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences
25. Miguel Angel Centeno, Sociology and Woodrow Wilson School
26. Dalton Conley, Sociology
27. Maggie Frye, Sociology
28. Mala Murthy, Neuroscience
29. Asif Ghazanfar, Neuroscience
30. Yael Niv, Neuroscience
31. John J Hopfield, Neuroscience
32. Philip Holmes, MAE, PACM, Neuroscience
33. Diana Tamir, Psychology
34. Jordan Taylor, Psychology
35. Alexander Todorov, Psychology
36. Adele Goldberg, Psychology
37. Lauren Emberson, Psychology

38. Casey Lew-Williams, Psychology
39. Susan Sugarman, Psychology
40. Ilana Witten, Psychology
41. Betsy Levy Paluck, Psychology, Woodrow Wilson School
42. Johannes Haushofer, Psychology, Woodrow Wilson School
43. Elliott Ash, Woodrow Wilson School
44. Sarah Staszak, Woodrow Wilson School
45. Jennifer Widner, Woodrow Wilson School
46. Beth English, Woodrow Wilson School, Liechtenstein Institute on
Self-Determination
47. Jérémie Lumbroso, Computer Science
48. Zeev Dvir, Mathematics and Computer Science
49. Bernard Chazelle, Computer Science
50. Mona Singh, Computer Science
51. Christiane Fellbaum, Computer Science
52. John Pardon, Mathematics
53. Elliott Lieb, Mathematics and Physics
54. Isabelle Clark-Deces, Anthropology
55. Rena Lederman, Anthropology
56. Carolyn Rouse, Anthropology
57. Elizabeth Davis, Anthropology
58. John Borneman, Anthropology
59. Andrew Alan Johnson, Anthropology
60. Irene Small, Art & Archaeology
61. Beatrice Kitzinger, Art & Archaeology
62. Hal Foster, Art & Archaeology
63. Esther da Costa Meyer, Art and Archaeology
64. Clarence Schutt, Chemistry
65. Michael Smith, Philosophy
66. Gideon Rosen, Philosophy
67. Grace Helton, Philosophy
68. Daniel Garber, Philosophy
69. Hans Halvorson, Philosophy
70. Sarah McGrath, Philosophy
71. Delia Graff Fara, Philosophy
72. Johann Frick, Philosophy & UCHV
73. Alexander Nehamas, Philosophy and Comparative Literature
74. Gayle Salamon, English and Gender & Sexuality Studies
75. Dara Strolovitch, Gender & Sexuality Studies

76. Regina Kunzel, History and Gender & Sexuality Studies
77. Catherine Clune-Taylor, Gender and Sexuality Studies
78. Kevin Kruse, History
79. Joseph Fronczak, History
80. Margot Canaday, History
81. Beth Lew-Williams, History
82. Anthony T. Grafton, History
83. Matthew Karp, History
84. Wendy Warren, History
85. James Alexander Dun, History
86. Tera W. Hunter, History and African American Studies
87. William B. Russel, Chemical and Biological Engineering
88. Hendrik Hartog, History, American Studies
89. Janet Y. Chen, History and East Asian Studies
90. Max Weiss, History, Near Eastern Studies
91. Cyrus Schayegh, Near Eastern Studies
92. Patrick Moran, Writing Program
93. Dmitri Tymoczko, Music
94. Maria Paula Saffon, Politics
95. Marc Ratkovic, Politics
96. Mark Beissinger, Politics
97. Tali Mendelberg, Politics
98. Deborah Yashar, Politics & Woodrow Wilson School
99. Paul Frymer, Politics
100. Lynn T. White III, Politics, Woodrow Wilson School, East Asian Studies Program
101. Stefan Eich, Politics and Society of Fellows
102. Sara Poor, German
103. Joseph Vogl, German
104. Brigid Doherty, German and Art & Archaeology
105. Olga Peters Hasty, Slavic Languages and Literatures
106. Irena Gross, Slavic Languages and Literatures
107. Margaret Beissinger, Slavic Languages & Literatures
108. Elena Fratto, Slavic Languages and Literatures
109. Su Friedrich, Visual Arts Program, The Lewis Center for the Arts
110. Eve Aschheim, Visual Arts
111. James Welling, Visual Arts James Welling Program, Lewis Center for the Arts
112. Jason Treuting- Edward T Cone Performer-in-Residence
113. Shawn Jaeger, Music, The Lewis Center for the Arts

114. Alexandra Geiger, Lewis Center for the Arts
115. Robert Kaplowitz, The Lewis Center for the Arts
116. Joe Scanlan, Visual Arts Program, Lewis Center for the Arts
117. Rebekah Rutkoff, Lewis Center for the Arts
118. Rebecca Lazier, Program in Dance, Lewis Center for the Arts
119. Gillian Knapp, Astrophysics
120. David Spergel, Astrophysics
121. Bruno Carvalho, Spanish and Portuguese
122. Nicole Legnani, Spanish and Portuguese
123. Christina Lee, Spanish and Portuguese
124. Arcadio Díaz-Quñones. Spanish and Portuguese
125. Alberto Bruzos-Moro, Spanish and Portuguese
126. Rachel Price, Spanish and Portuguese
127. Gorka Bilbao, Spanish and Portuguese
128. German Labrador Mendez, Spanish and Portuguese
129. Pedro Meira Monteiro, Spanish and Portuguese
130. Miguel Dominguez, Spanish and Portuguese
131. Elizabeth Bergman, American Studies & Freshman Seminars
132. Yelena Baraz, Classics
133. Dan-el Padilla Peralta, Classics
134. Alain Kornhauser, ORFE
135. Fernando Acosta-Rodríguez, Library
136. Catherine Riihimaki, Council on Science and Technology
137. Daniel Notterman, Molecular Biology
138. Martin Jonikas, Molecular Biology
139. Daniel Notterman, Molecular Biology
140. Mark Rose, Molecular Biology
141. Paul Schedl, Molecular Biology
142. Jane Flint, Molecular Biology
143. Simone Marchesi, French and Italian
144. Christy Wampole, French and Italian
145. André Benhaïm, French and Italian
146. Katie Chenoweth, French and Italian
147. Anna Cellinese, French and Italian
148. Fanny Raineau, French and Italian
149. Sara Teardo, French and Italian
150. Daniele De Feo, French and Italian
151. Alessandro Giammei, French and Italian
152. Ben Baer, Comparative Literature

153. Spyros Papapetros, Architecture
154. Guy Nordenson, Architecture
155. Victoria McGeer, University Center for Human Values
156. Daniel Marlow, Physics
157. Peter Meyers, Physics
158. Chiara Nappi, Physics
159. Frans Pretorius, Physics
160. Zahid Chaudhary, English
161. Esther Schor, English
162. Tamsen Wolff, English
163. Joshua Kotin, English
164. Jeff Dolven, English
165. Orlando Reade, English
166. Bradin Cormack, English
167. Susan Wolfson, English
168. Clair Wills, English
169. Meredith Martin, English
170. William Gleason, English
171. Andrew Cole, English; Gauss Seminars in Criticism
172. Susan Stewart, English and Society of Fellows
173. Nijah Cunningham, Society of Fellows
174. R. Sandberg, English, Theater
175. Anya Klepikov, Theater
176. Mark Nelson, Theater
177. Suzanne Agins, Theater