



**South Carolina Department
of Probation, Parole and
Pardon Services**

ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 2014

**JERRY B. ADGER
AGENCY DIRECTOR**

Proprietary Disclaimer

This document (including all data and statistical information represented herein) was compiled and reported by the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services. Any reproduction or republication of said report, data, or statistics is permitted only if reproduced in its entirety without modification, or omission, and must identify the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services as the source.

Jerry B. Adger, Director

Post Office Box 50666
Columbia, South Carolina 29250
803-734-9220
www.dppps.sc.gov

Office of Executive Programs and Grants Management

Arnise Moultrie, Program Administrator

Division of Field Operations

Marchar Stagg, Senior Statistical and Research Analyst

Saskia Santos, Statistical and Research Analyst

To the Reader

The Annual Statistical Report for Fiscal Year 2014 has been compiled for your review and reference. Fiscal Year 2014 (FY 2014) began July 1, 2013 and ended June 30, 2014. This report provides a statistical representation of the work of 632 employees of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS) including 402 caseload carrying Agents. During the fiscal year, 77% of our probationers and 94% of our parolees successfully completed supervision.

The Department operates its offender programs within a clear framework of public safety in supervising the 48,029 offenders under our legal jurisdiction. Legal jurisdiction includes offenders who were transferred out of state, absconded with active warrants, and others who are not under the active day-to-day supervision. At the end of the fiscal year, 32,208 offenders were under active supervision of the Department. The description of active supervision represents only those offenders who had at least one active case on June 30, 2014. Our responses to offender risks and needs in the community are focused to address present or potential problems that may interfere with the successful completion of supervision without compromising public safety. We maintain a fundamental belief that given support, resources, and service interventions, the offender has the ability to make positive changes in his or her life.

The following tables provide a description of the offender population and answer some commonly asked questions regarding the Department's programmatic efforts. Each table is preceded by a short description of its contents. The reader should be aware that there are different ways of reporting units of data depending upon the purpose. Admissions include only those offenders admitted to SCDPPPS who had no other active cases at the time of admission. Closures information reflects only the last order to close during the fiscal year.

In addition, due to rounding, some of the totals will not equal 100%. For additional information or clarification, please contact Arnise Moultrie in the Office of Executive Programs at 803-734-9220.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A---TOTAL POPULATION

TABLE 1-A	Total Admissions by Program Type	9
TABLE 2-A	Total Admissions by Type of Offense	10
TABLE 3-A	Total Admissions by Gender & Race	11
FIGURE 1	Total Admissions by Gender & Race	12
TABLE 4-A	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision	13
FIGURE 2	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision	14
TABLE 5-A	Total Closures by Type	15
TABLE 6-A	Total Admissions by Age	16

SECTION B---PROBATION

TABLE 1-B	Probation Admissions by Type of Offense	19
TABLE 2-B	Probation Admissions by Gender & Race	20
TABLE 3-B	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision	21
FIGURE 3	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision	22
TABLE 4-B	Probation Closures by Type	23
TABLE 5-B	Probation Admissions by Age	24

SECTION C---PAROLE

TABLE 1-C	Parole Admissions by Type of Offense	27
TABLE 2-C	Parole Admissions by Gender & Race	28
TABLE 3-C	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision	29
FIGURE 4	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision	30
TABLE 4-C	Parole Closures by Type	31
TABLE 5-C	Parole Admissions by Age	32

SECTION D---YOA

TABLE 1-D	YOA Admissions by Type of Offense	35
TABLE 2-D	YOA Admissions by Gender & Race	36
TABLE 3-D	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision	37
FIGURE 5	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision	38
TABLE 4-D	YOA Closures by Type	39
TABLE 5-D	YOA Admissions by Age	40

SECTION E---SEX OFFENDERS

TABLE 1-E Active Sex Offenders 43
FUGURE 6 Sex Offenders by Supervision Status 44

SECTION F---VIOLATIONS

TABLE 1-F Violations by County 47
TABLE 2-F Closures by Type 48
TABLE 3-F Administrative Hearing Collections 49

SECTION G---ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

FIGURE 7 Offenders on Passive GPS 52
FIGURE 8 Offenders on Active GPS 53

SECTION H---SUMMARY

FIGURE 9 Monthly DNA Collections 56
TABLE 1-H Offender Drug Testing 57
TABLE 2-H Population Characteristics 58
FIGURE 10 Admissions: A 20-Year Comparison 59
FIGURE 11 Violent Admissions by Program Status 60

SECTION A

**TOTAL
POPULATION**

FISCAL YEAR 2014

TOTAL POPULATION

Tables 1-A through 6-A and Figures 1 and 2, represent admissions to the SCDPPPS during FY 2014. These tables count admissions to a particular sanction, and include only those offenders admitted to SCDPPPS who had no other active cases at the time of admission. These tables also include only the main case even though an offender may have been admitted with more than one case. In FY 2014, there were 16,714 admissions. A state and county total is provided for each category of admission. Within the racial categories, due to the small number of offenders classified as "Asian, Hispanic, Native American, or Other", they have been grouped together and classified as "Other".

Table 1-A provides information on total admissions by program type. Charleston, Greenville, Richland and Spartanburg counties had the greatest number of total admissions, together accounting for 35.2% of all admissions.

EXPLANATION OF PROGRAM TYPES

Probation: Includes Probation, Conditional Discharged to Probation, Probation Terminated Upon Payment (PTUP), Split Probation (admitted to probation with a split sentence from prison), Monitor for the Court, and Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity (NGRI).

Parole: Includes Parole, Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), early release program, and Community Supervision Program cases.

YOA: Includes offenders sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act.

Table 2-A presents information on total admissions by type of offense. Violent refers to those offenses as defined by the Omnibus Crime Act, Section 16-1-60. Total admissions during the fiscal year were predominately non-violent with only 10% admissions for violent offenses. This figure increased one percentage point from the previous year.

Table 3-A and Figure 1 illustrate total admissions by gender and race. Admissions overall continue to be predominately male at 79%, with a racial composition of 49% black, 49% white, and 2% of other races.

Table 4-A and Figure 2 describe all active offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2014. This total does not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences. The level of supervision determines how often the Agent has contact with the offender. Among all offenders, standard supervision represented 55%, medium, 16%, and high level supervision represented 26%. Intensive supervision

represented only 1% and sex offender supervision accounted for 3% of all active offenders.

Table 5-A shows total closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). Closures include only those offenders in which all cases have completely closed out from SCDPPPS. Only the last order to close during FY 2014 and within that order only the main case, even though an offender may have had more than one case, is included. The overall success rate for all offenders closing during FY 2014 was 78%, an increase of 2% from last fiscal year. The unsuccessful rate, 22%, is defined as those offenders whose supervision was revoked due to a technical violation or new offense and those instances when the offender was sentenced to prison on a new offense.

Table 6-A describes offender admissions by age category.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 1-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY PROGRAM TYPE**

COUNTY	PROBATION	PERCENT PROBATION	PAROLE	PERCENT PAROLE	YOA	PERCENT YOA	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	107	92%	8	7%	1	1%	116
AIKEN	338	83%	67	17%	1	0%	406
ALLENDALE	25	86%	4	14%	0	0%	29
ANDERSON	553	89%	69	11%	2	0%	624
BAMBERG	39	81%	9	19%	0	0%	48
BARNWELL	60	87%	7	10%	2	3%	69
BEAUFORT	254	86%	34	11%	8	3%	296
BERKELEY	432	89%	46	9%	7	1%	485
CALHOUN	41	82%	7	14%	2	4%	50
CHARLESTON	1,030	85%	162	13%	14	1%	1,206
CHEROKEE	362	89%	37	9%	8	2%	407
CHESTER	101	77%	26	20%	4	3%	131
CHESTERFIELD	72	83%	10	11%	5	6%	87
CLARENDON	90	81%	20	18%	1	1%	111
COLLETON	172	89%	20	10%	2	1%	194
DARLINGTON	172	82%	36	17%	2	1%	210
DILLON	95	81%	21	18%	2	2%	118
DORCHESTER	329	86%	51	13%	2	1%	382
EDGEFIELD	103	91%	10	9%	0	0%	113
FAIRFIELD	52	80%	13	20%	0	0%	65
FLORENCE	499	82%	105	17%	7	1%	611
GEORGETOWN	102	71%	40	28%	1	1%	143
GREENVILLE	1,815	91%	167	8%	10	1%	1,992
GREENWOOD	308	87%	40	11%	5	1%	353
HAMPTON	54	90%	3	5%	3	5%	60
HORRY	686	82%	140	17%	10	1%	836
JASPER	63	82%	12	16%	2	3%	77
KERSHAW	156	87%	21	12%	2	1%	179
LANCASTER	163	84%	30	15%	2	1%	195
LAURENS	233	87%	35	13%	1	0%	269
LEE	54	78%	15	22%	0	0%	69
LEXINGTON	643	85%	106	14%	7	1%	756
McCORMICK	29	88%	2	6%	2	6%	33
MARION	138	86%	19	12%	3	2%	160
MARLBORO	88	80%	22	20%	0	0%	110
NEWBERRY	107	84%	19	15%	2	2%	128
OCONEE	202	93%	15	7%	1	0%	218
ORANGEBURG	411	89%	46	10%	3	1%	460
PICKENS	471	96%	20	4%	2	0%	493
RICHLAND	1,001	81%	226	18%	8	1%	1,235
SALUDA	71	91%	6	8%	1	1%	78
SPARTANBURG	1,265	87%	176	12%	7	0%	1,448
SUMTER	346	82%	75	18%	2	0%	423
UNION	161	89%	19	10%	1	1%	181
WILLIAMSBURG	120	80%	27	18%	3	2%	150
YORK	704	84%	128	15%	3	0%	835
TRANSITIONAL	7	9%	51	68%	17	23%	75
STATE TOTAL	14,324	86%	2,222	13%	168	1%	16,714

**TABLE 2-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE**


COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	14	12%	102	88%	116
AIKEN	46	11%	360	89%	406
ALLENDALE	3	10%	26	90%	29
ANDERSON	82	13%	542	87%	624
BAMBERG	7	15%	41	85%	48
BARNWELL	4	6%	65	94%	69
BEAUFORT	19	6%	277	94%	296
BERKELEY	48	10%	437	90%	485
CALHOUN	5	10%	45	90%	50
CHARLESTON	100	8%	1,106	92%	1,206
CHEROKEE	46	11%	361	89%	407
CHESTER	10	8%	121	92%	131
CHESTERFIELD	9	10%	78	90%	87
CLARENDON	8	7%	103	93%	111
COLLETON	18	9%	176	91%	194
DARLINGTON	24	11%	186	89%	210
DILLON	3	3%	115	97%	118
DORCHESTER	40	10%	342	90%	382
EDGEFIELD	3	3%	110	97%	113
FAIRFIELD	7	11%	58	89%	65
FLORENCE	50	8%	561	92%	611
GEORGETOWN	18	13%	125	87%	143
GREENVILLE	201	10%	1,791	90%	1,992
GREENWOOD	36	10%	317	90%	353
HAMPTON	3	5%	57	95%	60
HORRY	63	8%	773	92%	836
JASPER	9	12%	68	88%	77
KERSHAW	17	9%	162	91%	179
LANCASTER	16	8%	179	92%	195
LAURENS	28	10%	241	90%	269
LEE	8	12%	61	88%	69
LEXINGTON	79	10%	677	90%	756
McCORMICK	2	6%	31	94%	33
MARION	5	3%	155	97%	160
MARLBORO	8	7%	102	93%	110
NEWBERRY	12	9%	116	91%	128
OCONEE	29	13%	189	87%	218
ORANGEBURG	19	4%	441	96%	460
PICKENS	45	9%	448	91%	493
RICHLAND	167	14%	1,068	86%	1,235
SALUDA	5	6%	73	94%	78
SPARTANBURG	172	12%	1,276	88%	1,448
SUMTER	36	9%	387	91%	423
UNION	7	4%	174	96%	181
WILLIAMSBURG	14	9%	136	91%	150
YORK	85	10%	750	90%	835
TRANSITIONAL	32	43%	43	57%	75
STATE TOTAL	1,662	10%	15,052	90%	16,714

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 3-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
N=16,714

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	81%	19%	49%	1%	50%
AIKEN	78%	22%	42%	1%	57%
ALLENDALE	90%	10%	79%	0%	21%
ANDERSON	77%	23%	32%	0%	68%
BAMBERG	85%	15%	58%	0%	42%
BARNWELL	74%	26%	58%	0%	42%
BEAUFORT	81%	19%	54%	7%	39%
BERKELEY	81%	19%	45%	1%	54%
CALHOUN	86%	14%	50%	0%	50%
CHARLESTON	87%	13%	64%	1%	35%
CHEROKEE	77%	23%	32%	1%	67%
CHESTER	84%	16%	53%	2%	46%
CHESTERFIELD	71%	29%	40%	1%	59%
CLARENDON	82%	18%	69%	2%	29%
COLLETON	79%	21%	60%	2%	38%
DARLINGTON	78%	22%	60%	1%	39%
DILLON	76%	24%	57%	7%	36%
DORCHESTER	81%	19%	45%	2%	53%
EDGEFIELD	81%	19%	53%	1%	46%
FAIRFIELD	89%	11%	71%	2%	28%
FLORENCE	82%	18%	69%	1%	30%
GEORGETOWN	86%	14%	59%	1%	39%
GREENVILLE	72%	28%	38%	5%	57%
GREENWOOD	78%	22%	49%	2%	50%
HAMPTON	90%	10%	82%	0%	18%
HORRY	79%	21%	33%	3%	64%
JASPER	84%	16%	58%	4%	38%
KERSHAW	84%	16%	56%	0%	44%
LANCASTER	78%	22%	45%	2%	53%
LAURENS	73%	27%	37%	1%	62%
LEE	91%	9%	80%	0%	20%
LEXINGTON	78%	22%	34%	2%	64%
McCORMICK	73%	27%	58%	3%	39%
MARION	81%	19%	76%	0%	24%
MARLBORO	86%	14%	65%	2%	34%
NEWBERRY	85%	15%	59%	1%	41%
OCONEE	77%	23%	16%	2%	82%
ORANGEBURG	81%	19%	81%	1%	18%
PICKENS	70%	30%	14%	1%	85%
RICHLAND	83%	17%	79%	1%	19%
SALUDA	81%	19%	45%	0%	55%
SPARTANBURG	76%	24%	40%	2%	57%
SUMTER	83%	17%	75%	0%	24%
UNION	73%	27%	41%	1%	57%
WILLIAMSBURG	80%	20%	79%	0%	21%
YORK	77%	23%	39%	3%	58%
TRANSITIONAL	89%	11%	52%	1%	47%
STATE TOTAL	79%	21%	49%	2%	49%

**FIGURE 1
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
FISCAL YEAR 2014**




■ WHITE MALES ■ BLACK MALES ■ OTHER MALES
■ WHITE FEMALES ■ BLACK FEMALES ■ OTHER FEMALES

**TABLE 4-A
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	63%	18%	16%	0%	3%	141
AIKEN	44%	6%	43%	1%	5%	1,071
ALLENDALE	59%	18%	18%	0%	4%	76
ANDERSON	55%	19%	23%	1%	3%	1,751
BAMBERG	52%	8%	32%	3%	5%	130
BARNWELL	67%	17%	14%	1%	1%	162
BEAUFORT	62%	20%	15%	0%	3%	413
BERKELEY	56%	13%	26%	1%	3%	859
CALHOUN	62%	21%	12%	3%	2%	103
CHARLESTON	48%	11%	38%	1%	2%	2,547
CHEROKEE	59%	15%	23%	2%	2%	748
CHESTER	47%	15%	35%	1%	2%	196
CHESTERFIELD	61%	18%	17%	1%	3%	122
CLARENDON	64%	17%	15%	1%	5%	199
COLLETON	49%	23%	25%	1%	2%	355
DARLINGTON	65%	13%	19%	1%	3%	341
DILLON	83%	10%	4%	1%	1%	147
DORCHESTER	56%	14%	27%	1%	3%	874
EDGEFIELD	60%	13%	24%	0%	2%	255
FAIRFIELD	66%	15%	12%	1%	5%	170
FLORENCE	56%	18%	22%	0%	3%	980
GEORGETOWN	68%	12%	16%	1%	2%	244
GREENVILLE	52%	16%	30%	1%	2%	4,344
GREENWOOD	43%	12%	41%	1%	2%	564
HAMPTON	65%	15%	16%	0%	4%	141
HORRY	61%	14%	19%	0%	5%	1,330
JASPER	55%	19%	22%	1%	3%	204
KERSHAW	48%	21%	27%	0%	4%	316
LANCASTER	53%	18%	25%	1%	3%	461
LAURENS	54%	19%	23%	1%	3%	467
LEE	62%	16%	18%	1%	4%	130
LEXINGTON	63%	15%	18%	2%	3%	1,158
McCORMICK	65%	18%	13%	0%	5%	80
MARION	78%	14%	6%	1%	2%	198
MARLBORO	70%	17%	9%	1%	3%	126
NEWBERRY	42%	21%	31%	2%	4%	236
OCONEE	60%	17%	14%	2%	6%	443
ORANGEBURG	57%	14%	28%	1%	1%	1,029
PICKENS	47%	19%	30%	1%	3%	904
RICHLAND	59%	14%	23%	2%	2%	2,574
SALUDA	69%	9%	12%	2%	7%	121
SPARTANBURG	52%	19%	25%	1%	3%	2,770
SUMTER	58%	20%	19%	0%	2%	846
UNION	40%	11%	48%	0%	1%	332
WILLIAMSBURG	50%	14%	30%	1%	5%	311
YORK	52%	21%	24%	1%	2%	1,235
TRANSITIONAL	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	4
STATE TOTAL	55%	16%	26%	1%	3%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	17,568	5,050	8,391	309	890	32,208

**FIGURE 2
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2014**



CONTACT STANDARDS

STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Progress Report every quarter • Following the initial home contact, additional field contacts will be conducted in the event of community complaints or a violation investigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Progress report every other month • One additional progress report must be conducted every six months as a Field Visit or Home Visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Progress Report Every Other Month • An additional progress report must be conducted as a Field Visit or Home Visit every quarter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Progress Reports per Month • One of the two progress reports must be conducted as a Field Visit or Home Visit

**TABLE 5-A
TOTAL CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	97	88%	13	12%
AIKEN	283	73%	103	27%
ALLENDALE	28	82%	6	18%
ANDERSON	485	89%	57	11%
BAMBERG	33	60%	22	40%
BARNWELL	48	70%	21	30%
BEAUFORT	198	85%	36	15%
BERKELEY	372	84%	72	16%
CALHOUN	27	87%	4	13%
CHARLESTON	1,090	82%	242	18%
CHEROKEE	188	64%	104	36%
CHESTER	123	76%	39	24%
CHESTERFIELD	66	83%	14	18%
CLARENDON	87	79%	23	21%
COLLETON	149	77%	45	23%
DARLINGTON	151	77%	44	23%
DILLON	102	79%	27	21%
DORCHESTER	250	84%	46	16%
EDGEFIELD	89	87%	13	13%
FAIRFIELD	78	77%	23	23%
FLORENCE	488	76%	157	24%
GEORGETOWN	146	75%	48	25%
GREENVILLE	1,272	75%	427	25%
GREENWOOD	178	70%	75	30%
HAMPTON	42	79%	11	21%
HORRY	543	76%	173	24%
JASPER	65	92%	6	8%
KERSHAW	97	73%	36	27%
LANCASTER	151	70%	64	30%
LAURENS	204	72%	80	28%
LEE	65	83%	13	17%
LEXINGTON	474	69%	209	31%
MCCORMICK	27	79%	7	21%
MARION	118	77%	36	23%
MARLBORO	55	69%	25	31%
NEWBERRY	103	79%	28	21%
OCONEE	142	76%	44	24%
ORANGEBURG	274	84%	54	16%
PICKENS	369	88%	52	12%
RICHLAND	792	66%	413	34%
SALUDA	55	87%	8	13%
SPARTANBURG	877	70%	375	30%
SUMTER	316	77%	97	23%
UNION	120	70%	51	30%
WILLIAMSBURG	137	85%	24	15%
YORK	524	78%	152	22%
TRANSITIONAL	986	99%	5	1%
STATE TOTAL	12,564	78%	3,624	22%

**TABLE 6-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	26	22%	90	78%
AIKEN	84	21%	322	79%
ALLENDALE	4	14%	25	86%
ANDERSON	127	20%	497	80%
BAMBERG	4	8%	44	92%
BARNWELL	20	29%	49	71%
BEAUFORT	103	35%	193	65%
BERKELEY	142	29%	343	71%
CALHOUN	14	28%	36	72%
CHARLESTON	308	26%	898	74%
CHEROKEE	97	24%	310	76%
CHESTER	29	22%	102	78%
CHESTERFIELD	20	23%	67	77%
CLARENDON	27	24%	84	76%
COLLETON	70	36%	124	64%
DARLINGTON	70	33%	140	67%
DILLON	37	31%	81	69%
DORCHESTER	105	27%	277	73%
EDGEFIELD	26	23%	87	77%
FAIRFIELD	16	25%	49	75%
FLORENCE	170	28%	441	72%
GEORGETOWN	27	19%	116	81%
GREENVILLE	381	19%	1611	81%
GREENWOOD	94	27%	259	73%
HAMPTON	19	32%	41	68%
HORRY	231	28%	605	72%
JASPER	23	30%	54	70%
KERSHAW	49	27%	130	73%
LANCASTER	43	22%	152	78%
LAURENS	54	20%	215	80%
LEE	21	30%	48	70%
LEXINGTON	182	24%	574	76%
McCORMICK	9	27%	24	73%
MARION	51	32%	109	68%
MARLBORO	33	30%	77	70%
NEWBERRY	29	23%	99	77%
OCONEE	38	17%	180	83%
ORANGEBURG	110	24%	350	76%
PICKENS	130	26%	363	74%
RICHLAND	344	28%	891	72%
SALUDA	14	18%	64	82%
SPARTANBURG	303	21%	1145	79%
SUMTER	115	27%	308	73%
UNION	57	31%	124	69%
WILLIAMSBURG	30	20%	120	80%
YORK	244	29%	591	71%
TRANSITIONAL	25	33%	50	67%
STATE TOTAL	4,155	25%	12,559	75%

SECTION B

PROBATION

FISCAL YEAR 2014

PROBATION

The Department is charged with the responsibility of supervising those offenders placed on probation by the Court. Probation is a court-ordered community sanction which suspends the imposition of all or part of the original sentence of incarceration. It requires the offender, under SCDPPPS supervision in the community, to adhere to a set of conditions which limit the offender's freedom, reparation to victims if so ordered, and to provide for judicial revocation for violation of those conditions.

Tables 1-B and 2-B represent all probation admissions during FY 2014. Probation includes Probation, PTUP (Probation Terminated Upon Payment), Split Probation admitted to probation with a split sentence from prison, Monitor for the Court, and NGRI (Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity).

Table 1-B shows probation admissions in terms of offense type, violent or non-violent. For FY 2014, only 5% of all probation admissions were for violent offenses.

Table 2-B provides information on probation admissions by gender and race. Probation admissions were predominately male, at 77%, with a racial composition of 47% black, 2% other, and 51% white.

Table 3-B and Figure 3 describe the active probation offender population in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2014. These figures do not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences, Absconders, offenders transferred out of state and others who are not under the day-to-day supervision of the Department. Among probationers, those on standard supervision represented 55%, the medium supervision level represented 16%, the high supervision level represented 26% of the population, intensive supervision was 1% followed by sex offender supervision representing 2%.

Table 4-B provides data for probation closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for probationers was 77%, slightly lower than the total offender population success rate of 78%.

Table 5-B reflects probation admissions by age category.

**TABLE 1-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE**

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	10	9%	97	91%	107
AIKEN	18	5%	320	95%	338
ALLENDALE	0	0%	25	100%	25
ANDERSON	43	8%	510	92%	553
BAMBERG	3	8%	36	92%	39
BARNWELL	1	2%	59	98%	60
BEAUFORT	8	3%	246	97%	254
BERKELEY	22	5%	410	95%	432
CALHOUN	2	5%	39	95%	41
CHARLESTON	23	2%	1,007	98%	1,030
CHEROKEE	33	9%	329	91%	362
CHESTER	0	0%	101	100%	101
CHESTERFIELD	4	6%	68	94%	72
CLARENDON	2	2%	88	98%	90
COLLETON	8	5%	164	95%	172
DARLINGTON	9	5%	163	95%	172
DILLON	1	1%	94	99%	95
DORCHESTER	20	6%	309	94%	329
EDGEFIELD	3	3%	100	97%	103
FAIRFIELD	2	4%	50	96%	52
FLORENCE	14	3%	485	97%	499
GEORGETOWN	5	5%	97	95%	102
GREENVILLE	115	6%	1,700	94%	1,815
GREENWOOD	16	5%	292	95%	308
HAMPTON	1	2%	53	98%	54
HORRY	19	3%	667	97%	686
JASPER	2	3%	61	97%	63
KERSHAW	11	7%	145	93%	156
LANCASTER	2	1%	161	99%	163
LAURENS	14	6%	219	94%	233
LEE	0	0%	54	100%	54
LEXINGTON	39	6%	604	94%	643
McCORMICK	1	3%	28	97%	29
MARION	0	0%	138	100%	138
MARLBORO	3	3%	85	97%	88
NEWBERRY	4	4%	103	96%	107
OCONEE	24	12%	178	88%	202
ORANGEBURG	3	1%	408	99%	411
PICKENS	37	8%	434	92%	471
RICHLAND	36	4%	965	96%	1,001
SALUDA	3	4%	68	96%	71
SPARTANBURG	84	7%	1,181	93%	1,265
SUMTER	6	2%	340	98%	346
UNION	4	2%	157	98%	161
WILLIAMSBURG	2	2%	118	98%	120
YORK	30	4%	674	96%	704
TRANSITIONAL	1	14%	6	86%	7
STATE TOTAL	688	5%	13,636	95%	14,324


**TABLE 2-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	79%	21%	47%	1%	52%
AIKEN	76%	24%	39%	1%	60%
ALLENDALE	88%	12%	76%	0%	24%
ANDERSON	75%	25%	30%	0%	69%
BAMBERG	82%	18%	51%	0%	49%
BARNWELL	73%	27%	53%	0%	47%
BEAUFORT	79%	21%	55%	7%	38%
BERKELEY	80%	20%	42%	1%	56%
CALHOUN	85%	15%	51%	0%	49%
CHARLESTON	85%	15%	61%	0%	38%
CHEROKEE	75%	25%	31%	1%	67%
CHESTER	80%	20%	50%	1%	49%
CHESTERFIELD	69%	31%	39%	1%	60%
CLARENDON	79%	21%	66%	2%	32%
COLLETON	78%	22%	58%	2%	41%
DARLINGTON	75%	25%	58%	1%	41%
DILLON	72%	28%	54%	7%	39%
DORCHESTER	79%	21%	43%	2%	55%
EDGEFIELD	80%	20%	53%	1%	46%
FAIRFIELD	87%	13%	73%	2%	25%
FLORENCE	78%	22%	66%	2%	33%
GEORGETOWN	80%	20%	51%	1%	48%
GREENVILLE	71%	29%	37%	5%	58%
GREENWOOD	76%	24%	45%	2%	54%
HAMPTON	91%	9%	85%	0%	15%
HORRY	77%	23%	30%	3%	68%
JASPER	81%	19%	60%	2%	38%
KERSHAW	83%	17%	56%	0%	44%
LANCASTER	74%	26%	40%	2%	58%
LAURENS	70%	30%	34%	1%	64%
LEE	89%	11%	76%	0%	24%
LEXINGTON	75%	25%	33%	2%	65%
McCORMICK	76%	24%	59%	3%	38%
MARION	80%	20%	75%	0%	25%
MARLBORO	85%	15%	61%	2%	36%
NEWBERRY	83%	17%	53%	1%	46%
OCONEE	77%	23%	15%	2%	83%
ORANGEBURG	79%	21%	81%	0%	19%
PICKENS	70%	30%	13%	1%	86%
RICHLAND	80%	20%	78%	1%	20%
SALUDA	80%	20%	44%	0%	56%
SPARTANBURG	74%	26%	39%	2%	59%
SUMTER	80%	20%	73%	0%	27%
UNION	71%	29%	37%	1%	61%
WILLIAMSBURG	78%	23%	79%	0%	21%
YORK	74%	26%	36%	2%	62%
TRANSITIONAL	86%	14%	57%	0%	43%
STATE TOTAL	77%	23%	47%	2%	51%

**TABLE 3-B
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	62%	19%	17%	0%	2%	133
AIKEN	43%	6%	46%	1%	4%	912
ALLENDALE	70%	16%	11%	0%	3%	63
ANDERSON	55%	19%	24%	0%	2%	1,599
BAMBERG	51%	8%	35%	3%	3%	113
BARNWELL	69%	16%	14%	0%	1%	140
BEAUFORT	62%	20%	15%	0%	3%	350
BERKELEY	57%	13%	26%	1%	3%	775
CALHOUN	66%	18%	12%	3%	0%	89
CHARLESTON	48%	11%	39%	1%	2%	2,187
CHEROKEE	61%	14%	22%	1%	1%	676
CHESTER	46%	15%	37%	0%	1%	155
CHESTERFIELD	63%	17%	18%	0%	2%	104
CLARENDON	64%	18%	14%	1%	3%	166
COLLETON	49%	23%	25%	1%	2%	313
DARLINGTON	66%	14%	18%	1%	2%	278
DILLON	87%	7%	4%	1%	1%	112
DORCHESTER	57%	14%	26%	1%	2%	764
EDGEFIELD	60%	13%	24%	0%	2%	231
FAIRFIELD	70%	14%	12%	0%	4%	146
FLORENCE	57%	18%	22%	0%	3%	830
GEORGETOWN	70%	14%	14%	0%	2%	180
GREENVILLE	52%	15%	30%	1%	2%	4,002
GREENWOOD	44%	11%	43%	1%	1%	486
HAMPTON	68%	16%	15%	0%	2%	115
HORRY	63%	14%	19%	0%	4%	1,082
JASPER	56%	19%	20%	1%	4%	172
KERSHAW	48%	21%	28%	0%	3%	267
LANCASTER	56%	18%	24%	1%	2%	412
LAURENS	52%	20%	24%	1%	2%	394
LEE	63%	18%	18%	0%	2%	102
LEXINGTON	64%	15%	17%	1%	2%	984
McCORMICK	63%	18%	15%	0%	4%	68
MARION	81%	13%	6%	0%	1%	168
MARLBORO	71%	17%	7%	0%	4%	98
NEWBERRY	43%	22%	32%	1%	3%	212
OCONEE	60%	18%	15%	1%	6%	402
ORANGEBURG	57%	13%	28%	0%	1%	894
PICKENS	47%	19%	30%	0%	3%	842
RICHLAND	59%	14%	25%	1%	2%	2,122
SALUDA	71%	10%	10%	3%	7%	112
SPARTANBURG	52%	19%	25%	1%	3%	2,481
SUMTER	63%	18%	17%	0%	2%	702
UNION	41%	10%	48%	0%	1%	296
WILLIAMSBURG	50%	15%	28%	0%	5%	246
YORK	53%	22%	23%	0%	2%	1,042
TRANSITIONAL	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	4
STATE TOTAL	55%	16%	26%	1%	2%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS						

FIGURE 3
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2014



**TABLE 4-B
PROBATION CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	88	88%	12	12%
AIKEN	231	73%	87	27%
ALLENDALE	20	80%	5	20%
ANDERSON	425	90%	49	10%
BAMBERG	29	63%	17	37%
BARNWELL	39	71%	16	29%
BEAUFORT	177	85%	31	15%
BERKELEY	329	84%	61	16%
CALHOUN	24	89%	3	11%
CHARLESTON	924	82%	203	18%
CHEROKEE	158	61%	102	39%
CHESTER	100	75%	33	25%
CHESTERFIELD	50	79%	13	21%
CLARENDON	75	77%	22	23%
COLLETON	132	79%	36	21%
DARLINGTON	119	77%	35	23%
DILLON	82	78%	23	22%
DORCHESTER	214	85%	37	15%
EDGEFIELD	80	89%	10	11%
FAIRFIELD	61	74%	21	26%
FLORENCE	375	73%	136	27%
GEORGETOWN	108	76%	35	24%
GREENVILLE	1150	74%	411	26%
GREENWOOD	142	67%	70	33%
HAMPTON	36	82%	8	18%
HORRY	415	74%	147	26%
JASPER	52	91%	5	9%
KERSHAW	77	69%	34	31%
LANCASTER	129	69%	58	31%
LAURENS	164	69%	73	31%
LEE	53	82%	12	18%
LEXINGTON	383	67%	187	33%
MCCORMICK	21	88%	3	13%
MARION	94	75%	32	25%
MARLBORO	36	62%	22	38%
NEWBERRY	83	81%	20	19%
OCONEE	126	76%	39	24%
ORANGEBURG	220	83%	45	17%
PICKENS	341	87%	50	13%
RICHLAND	625	63%	363	37%
SALUDA	46	85%	8	15%
SPARTANBURG	754	68%	349	32%
SUMTER	245	74%	86	26%
UNION	101	68%	47	32%
WILLIAMSBURG	119	84%	23	16%
YORK	415	76%	132	24%
TRANSITIONAL	868	99.5%	4	0.5%
STATE TOTAL	10,535	77%	3,215	23%

**TABLE 5-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	24	22%	83	78%
AIKEN	77	23%	261	77%
ALLENDALE	4	16%	21	84%
ANDERSON	119	22%	434	78%
BAMBERG	4	10%	35	90%
BARNWELL	18	30%	42	70%
BEAUFORT	92	36%	162	64%
BERKELEY	128	30%	304	70%
CALHOUN	10	24%	31	76%
CHARLESTON	269	26%	761	74%
CHEROKEE	85	23%	277	77%
CHESTER	24	24%	77	76%
CHESTERFIELD	15	21%	57	79%
CLARENDON	23	26%	67	74%
COLLETON	67	39%	105	61%
DARLINGTON	60	35%	112	65%
DILLON	30	32%	65	68%
DORCHESTER	93	28%	236	72%
EDGEFIELD	23	22%	80	78%
FAIRFIELD	16	31%	36	69%
FLORENCE	146	29%	353	71%
GEORGETOWN	19	19%	83	81%
GREENVILLE	361	20%	1454	80%
GREENWOOD	85	28%	223	72%
HAMPTON	16	30%	38	70%
HORRY	203	30%	483	70%
JASPER	20	32%	43	68%
KERSHAW	43	28%	113	72%
LANCASTER	41	25%	122	75%
LAURENS	50	21%	183	79%
LEE	20	37%	34	63%
LEXINGTON	155	24%	488	76%
McCORMICK	8	28%	21	72%
MARION	48	35%	90	65%
MARLBORO	28	32%	60	68%
NEWBERRY	23	21%	84	79%
OCONEE	35	17%	167	83%
ORANGEBURG	104	25%	307	75%
PICKENS	125	27%	346	73%
RICHLAND	306	31%	695	69%
SALUDA	12	17%	59	83%
SPARTANBURG	276	22%	989	78%
SUMTER	107	31%	239	69%
UNION	53	33%	108	67%
WILLIAMSBURG	23	19%	97	81%
YORK	228	32%	476	68%
TRANSITIONAL	2	29%	5	71%
STATE TOTAL	3,718	26%	10,606	74%

SECTION C

PAROLE

FISCAL YEAR 2014

PAROLE

The Department is charged with the responsibility of supervising those offenders paroled by the South Carolina Board of Pardons and Paroles. Parole is the conditional release of an individual from imprisonment, but not from the legal custody of the state, to complete his or her sentence outside a correctional institution under conditions and provisions of supervision determined by the Board. Should an individual be granted parole, he or she must agree to abide by certain conditions of community supervision. The violation of any of these conditions is sufficient grounds for revocation of parole by the Board, and the imposition of the remainder of the original sentence of incarceration. The parole category also includes early release from the South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and Community Supervision Program offenders.

Table 1-C shows parole admissions by type of offense. A larger percent of parole admissions, 44%, fall into the violent category, as compared to 5% for probation admissions (see Table 1-B) and 2% for YOA admissions (see Table 1-D).

Table 2-C describes all parole admissions by gender and race. Parole admissions consisted primarily of males, 92%, with a racial composition of 64% black, 2% other, and 34% white.

Table 3-C and Figure 4 describe active parolees by level of supervision on June 30, 2014. These figures do not include indirect supervision offenders, such as absconders, offenders transferred out of state and others who are not under the day-to-day supervision of the Department. Among parolees, standard supervision offenders represented 53% of the population, medium level accounted for 15% of the population, high level was 22%, intensive supervision, 3%, and sex offender supervision was 7%.

Table 4-C presents parole case closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for parolees (94%) was higher than that of probationers (77%, see Table 4-B).

Table 5-C describes the parole population by age category.

**TABLE 1-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE**

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	4	50%	4	50%	8
AIKEN	28	42%	39	58%	67
ALLENDALE	3	75%	1	25%	4
ANDERSON	39	57%	30	43%	69
BAMBERG	4	44%	5	56%	9
BARNWELL	3	43%	4	57%	7
BEAUFORT	10	29%	24	71%	34
BERKELEY	26	57%	20	43%	46
CALHOUN	3	43%	4	57%	7
CHARLESTON	77	48%	85	52%	162
CHEROKEE	13	35%	24	65%	37
CHESTER	10	38%	16	62%	26
CHESTERFIELD	5	50%	5	50%	10
CLARENDON	6	30%	14	70%	20
COLLETON	10	50%	10	50%	20
DARLINGTON	15	42%	21	58%	36
DILLON	2	10%	19	90%	21
DORCHESTER	20	39%	31	61%	51
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	10	100%	10
FAIRFIELD	5	38%	8	62%	13
FLORENCE	35	33%	70	67%	105
GEORGETOWN	13	33%	27	68%	40
GREENVILLE	86	51%	81	49%	167
GREENWOOD	19	48%	21	53%	40
HAMPTON	2	67%	1	33%	3
HORRY	44	31%	96	69%	140
JASPER	7	58%	5	42%	12
KERSHAW	6	29%	15	71%	21
LANCASTER	14	47%	16	53%	30
LAURENS	14	40%	21	60%	35
LEE	8	53%	7	47%	15
LEXINGTON	40	38%	66	62%	106
McCORMICK	1	50%	1	50%	2
MARION	5	26%	14	74%	19
MARLBORO	5	23%	17	77%	22
NEWBERRY	8	42%	11	58%	19
OCONEE	5	33%	10	67%	15
ORANGEBURG	16	35%	30	65%	46
PICKENS	8	40%	12	60%	20
RICHLAND	130	58%	96	42%	226
SALUDA	2	33%	4	67%	6
SPARTANBURG	88	50%	88	50%	176
SUMTER	30	40%	45	60%	75
UNION	3	16%	16	84%	19
WILLIAMSBURG	12	44%	15	56%	27
YORK	55	43%	73	57%	128
TRANSITIONAL	31	61%	20	39%	51
STATE TOTAL	970	44%	1,252	56%	2,222


**TABLE 2-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	75%	0%	25%
AIKEN	91%	9%	54%	3%	43%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	97%	3%	45%	1%	54%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	89%	0%	11%
BARNWELL	71%	29%	100%	0%	0%
BEAUFORT	94%	6%	53%	6%	41%
BERKELEY	96%	4%	63%	0%	37%
CALHOUN	86%	14%	43%	0%	57%
CHARLESTON	96%	4%	79%	2%	19%
CHEROKEE	89%	11%	35%	0%	65%
CHESTER	96%	4%	65%	4%	31%
CHESTERFIELD	70%	30%	40%	0%	60%
CLARENDON	95%	5%	90%	0%	10%
COLLETON	90%	10%	80%	0%	20%
DARLINGTON	89%	11%	69%	0%	31%
DILLON	95%	5%	67%	5%	29%
DORCHESTER	96%	4%	59%	0%	41%
EDGEFIELD	90%	10%	50%	0%	50%
FAIRFIELD	100%	0%	62%	0%	38%
FLORENCE	97%	3%	86%	0%	14%
GEORGETOWN	100%	0%	80%	3%	18%
GREENVILLE	86%	14%	53%	2%	44%
GREENWOOD	93%	8%	78%	3%	20%
HAMPTON	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
HORRY	89%	11%	51%	5%	44%
JASPER	100%	0%	50%	17%	33%
KERSHAW	90%	10%	62%	0%	38%
LANCASTER	100%	0%	70%	0%	30%
LAURENS	94%	6%	54%	3%	43%
LEE	100%	0%	93%	0%	7%
LEXINGTON	90%	10%	39%	1%	60%
McCORMICK	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
MARION	89%	11%	84%	0%	16%
MARLBORO	91%	9%	77%	0%	23%
NEWBERRY	95%	5%	84%	0%	16%
OCONEE	73%	27%	27%	0%	73%
ORANGEBURG	93%	7%	85%	4%	11%
PICKENS	70%	30%	35%	0%	65%
RICHLAND	92%	8%	83%	2%	15%
SALUDA	83%	17%	50%	0%	50%
SPARTANBURG	93%	7%	49%	2%	49%
SUMTER	97%	3%	87%	1%	12%
UNION	84%	16%	74%	0%	26%
WILLIAMSBURG	89%	11%	78%	0%	22%
YORK	95%	5%	55%	5%	40%
TRANSITIONAL	88%	12%	63%	2%	35%
STATE TOTAL	92%	8%	64%	2%	34%

**TABLE 3-C
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	71%	14%	0%	0%	14%	7
AIKEN	46%	6%	37%	4%	8%	105
ALLENDALE	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%	4
ANDERSON	54%	15%	15%	3%	12%	123
BAMBERG	40%	0%	20%	10%	30%	10
BARNWELL	71%	7%	7%	14%	0%	14
BEAUFORT	72%	7%	16%	2%	2%	43
BERKELEY	48%	12%	28%	3%	8%	60
CALHOUN	29%	43%	0%	0%	29%	7
CHARLESTON	47%	15%	30%	2%	6%	218
CHEROKEE	37%	15%	26%	9%	13%	54
CHESTER	51%	17%	23%	6%	3%	35
CHESTERFIELD	57%	14%	7%	7%	14%	14
CLARENDON	73%	4%	8%	0%	15%	26
COLLETON	46%	23%	23%	0%	8%	26
DARLINGTON	57%	12%	20%	2%	8%	49
DILLON	73%	15%	4%	4%	4%	26
DORCHESTER	47%	17%	25%	2%	8%	59
EDGEFIELD	57%	7%	36%	0%	0%	14
FAIRFIELD	48%	19%	14%	5%	14%	21
FLORENCE	56%	17%	20%	2%	5%	132
GEORGETOWN	65%	8%	18%	6%	4%	51
GREENVILLE	51%	19%	21%	2%	6%	283
GREENWOOD	36%	12%	33%	5%	14%	58
HAMPTON	54%	0%	15%	0%	31%	13
HORRY	61%	13%	18%	1%	8%	180
JASPER	63%	13%	19%	6%	0%	16
KERSHAW	55%	19%	12%	0%	14%	42
LANCASTER	36%	17%	33%	2%	12%	42
LAURENS	65%	12%	13%	2%	8%	52
LEE	64%	9%	9%	5%	14%	22
LEXINGTON	58%	14%	18%	6%	4%	138
McCORMICK	75%	13%	0%	0%	13%	8
MARION	73%	9%	0%	9%	9%	22
MARLBORO	64%	20%	12%	4%	0%	25
NEWBERRY	38%	14%	24%	10%	14%	21
OCONEE	55%	10%	10%	10%	14%	29
ORANGEBURG	51%	13%	26%	3%	7%	76
PICKENS	47%	14%	31%	4%	4%	49
RICHLAND	59%	15%	16%	4%	6%	358
SALUDA	63%	0%	38%	0%	0%	8
SPARTANBURG	55%	11%	20%	4%	9%	250
SUMTER	36%	28%	30%	2%	5%	101
UNION	32%	13%	52%	0%	3%	31
WILLIAMSBURG	53%	8%	31%	2%	6%	49
YORK	49%	20%	24%	2%	4%	164
TRANSITIONAL	----	----	----	----	----	0
STATE TOTAL	53%	15%	22%	3%	7%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	1,666	457	680	102	230	3,135

FIGURE 4
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2014



**TABLE 4-C
PAROLE CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	6	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	40	95%	2	5%
ALLENDALE	4	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	37	93%	3	8%
BAMBERG	4	100%	0	0%
BARNWELL	6	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	14	100%	0	0%
BERKELEY	27	96%	1	4%
CALHOUN	3	100%	0	0%
CHARLESTON	119	96%	5	4%
CHEROKEE	20	100%	0	0%
CHESTER	17	89%	2	11%
CHESTERFIELD	11	100%	0	0%
CLARENDON	10	91%	1	9%
COLLETON	14	88%	2	13%
DARLINGTON	25	96%	1	4%
DILLON	14	88%	2	13%
DORCHESTER	20	100%	0	0%
EDGEFIELD	9	90%	1	10%
FAIRFIELD	14	100%	0	0%
FLORENCE	76	93%	6	7%
GEORGETOWN	24	86%	4	14%
GREENVILLE	100	93%	8	7%
GREENWOOD	30	100%	0	0%
HAMPTON	2	100%	0	0%
HORRY	99	90%	11	10%
JASPER	11	100%	0	0%
KERSHAW	15	100%	0	0%
LANCASTER	18	95%	1	5%
LAURENS	30	100%	0	0%
LEE	9	100%	0	0%
LEXINGTON	62	95%	3	5%
MCCORMICK	6	86%	1	14%
MARION	19	90%	2	10%
MARLBORO	13	93%	1	7%
NEWBERRY	15	94%	1	6%
OCONEE	10	83%	2	17%
ORANGEBURG	36	95%	2	5%
PICKENS	22	96%	1	4%
RICHLAND	143	92%	13	8%
SALUDA	8	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	113	94%	7	6%
SUMTER	57	93%	4	7%
UNION	15	100%	0	0%
WILLIAMSBURG	14	100%	0	0%
YORK	89	97%	3	3%
TRANSITIONAL	93	99%	1	1%
STATE TOTAL	1,543	94%	91	6%

**TABLE 5-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	1	13%	7	88%
AIKEN	6	9%	61	91%
ALLENDALE	0	0%	4	100%
ANDERSON	6	9%	63	91%
BAMBERG	0	0%	9	100%
BARNWELL	1	14%	6	86%
BEAUFORT	3	9%	31	91%
BERKELEY	7	15%	39	85%
CALHOUN	3	43%	4	57%
CHARLESTON	27	17%	135	83%
CHEROKEE	4	11%	33	89%
CHESTER	1	4%	25	96%
CHESTERFIELD	1	10%	9	90%
CLARENDON	3	15%	17	85%
COLLETON	1	5%	19	95%
DARLINGTON	8	22%	28	78%
DILLON	5	24%	16	76%
DORCHESTER	11	22%	40	78%
EDGEFIELD	3	30%	7	70%
FAIRFIELD	0	0%	13	100%
FLORENCE	17	16%	88	84%
GEORGETOWN	7	18%	33	83%
GREENVILLE	11	7%	156	93%
GREENWOOD	4	10%	36	90%
HAMPTON	0	0%	3	100%
HORRY	18	13%	122	87%
JASPER	1	8%	11	92%
KERSHAW	4	19%	17	81%
LANCASTER	0	0%	30	100%
LAURENS	3	9%	32	91%
LEE	1	7%	14	93%
LEXINGTON	20	19%	86	81%
McCORMICK	0	0%	2	100%
MARION	1	5%	18	95%
MARLBORO	5	23%	17	77%
NEWBERRY	4	21%	15	79%
OCONEE	2	13%	13	87%
ORANGEBURG	3	7%	43	93%
PICKENS	3	15%	17	85%
RICHLAND	31	14%	195	86%
SALUDA	1	17%	5	83%
SPARTANBURG	22	13%	154	88%
SUMTER	6	8%	69	92%
UNION	3	16%	16	84%
WILLIAMSBURG	4	15%	23	85%
YORK	13	10%	115	90%
TRANSITIONAL	7	14%	44	86%
STATE TOTAL	282	13%	1,940	87%

SECTION D

**YOUTHFUL
OFFENDERS**

FISCAL YEAR 2014

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER RELEASE

Inmates ages 17 through 24, sentenced under the South Carolina Youthful Offender Act (YOA) to an indeterminate period of incarceration, not to exceed six years, within the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), may be conditionally released prior to that time, based on offense category, adjustment, and evaluation while incarcerated.

Table 1-D displays YOA admissions by type of offense. YOA violent admissions of 2% is less than for those admitted to probation at 5% (See Table 1-B).

Table 2-D illustrates YOA admissions by gender and race. Admissions were predominately male (95%) and black (53%).

Table 3-D and Figure 5 describe the active population for YOA conditional release offenders in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2014. Of the total active YOA population, 43% were supervised at standard level, 23% at medium, 31% at high, 2% at intensive, and 1% at the sex offender supervision level.

Table 4-D shows YOA offenders are more inclined to close unsuccessfully (40%) than the parole population (6%, see Table 4-C) or the probation population (23%, See Table 4-B).

Table 5-D describes YOA admissions by age category.

**TABLE 1-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE**

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	0	0%	1	100%	1
AIKEN	0	0%	1	100%	1
ALLENDALE	0	---	0	---	0
ANDERSON	0	0%	2	100%	2
BAMBERG	0	---	0	---	0
BARNWELL	0	0%	2	100%	2
BEAUFORT	1	13%	7	88%	8
BERKELEY	0	0%	7	100%	7
CALHOUN	0	0%	2	100%	2
CHARLESTON	0	0%	14	100%	14
CHEROKEE	0	0%	8	100%	8
CHESTER	0	0%	4	100%	4
CHESTERFIELD	0	0%	5	100%	5
CLARENDON	0	0%	1	100%	1
COLLETON	0	0%	2	100%	2
DARLINGTON	0	0%	2	100%	2
DILLON	0	0%	2	100%	2
DORCHESTER	0	0%	2	100%	2
EDGEFIELD	0	---	0	---	0
FAIRFIELD	0	---	0	---	0
FLORENCE	1	14%	6	86%	7
GEORGETOWN	0	0%	1	100%	1
GREENVILLE	0	0%	10	100%	10
GREENWOOD	1	20%	4	80%	5
HAMPTON	0	0%	3	100%	3
HORRY	0	0%	10	100%	10
JASPER	0	0%	2	100%	2
KERSHAW	0	0%	2	100%	2
LANCASTER	0	0%	2	100%	2
LAURENS	0	0%	1	100%	1
LEE	0	---	0	---	0
LEXINGTON	0	0%	7	100%	7
McCORMICK	0	0%	2	100%	2
MARION	0	0%	3	100%	3
MARLBORO	0	---	0	---	0
NEWBERRY	0	0%	2	100%	2
OCONEE	0	0%	1	100%	1
ORANGEBURG	0	0%	3	100%	3
PICKENS	0	0%	2	100%	2
RICHLAND	1	13%	7	88%	8
SALUDA	0	0%	1	100%	1
SPARTANBURG	0	0%	7	100%	7
SUMTER	0	0%	2	100%	2
UNION	0	0%	1	100%	1
WILLIAMSBURG	0	0%	3	100%	3
YORK	0	0%	3	100%	3
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	17	100%	17
STATE TOTAL	4	2%	164	98%	168


**TABLE 2-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
AIKEN	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
BAMBERG	---	---	---	---	---
BARNWELL	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
BEAUFORT	88%	13%	50%	13%	38%
BERKELEY	86%	14%	57%	0%	43%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
CHARLESTON	93%	7%	64%	7%	29%
CHEROKEE	100%	0%	38%	0%	63%
CHESTER	100%	0%	25%	0%	75%
CHESTERFIELD	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
CLARENDON	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
COLLETON	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
DARLINGTON	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
DILLON	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
DORCHESTER	50%	50%	100%	0%	0%
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	100%	0%	57%	0%	43%
GEORGETOWN	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
GREENVILLE	90%	10%	50%	0%	50%
GREENWOOD	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
HAMPTON	67%	33%	0%	0%	100%
HORRY	90%	10%	50%	0%	50%
JASPER	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
KERSHAW	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
LANCASTER	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
LAURENS	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
LEE	---	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	100%	0%	14%	0%	86%
McCORMICK	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
MARION	67%	33%	67%	0%	33%
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
OCONEE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ORANGEBURG	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
PICKENS	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RICHLAND	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
SALUDA	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
SPARTANBURG	100%	0%	43%	0%	57%
SUMTER	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
UNION	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
WILLIAMSBURG	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
YORK	100%	0%	0%	33%	67%
TRANSITIONAL	94%	6%	18%	0%	82%
STATE TOTAL	95%	5%	53%	2%	45%

**TABLE 3-D
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
AIKEN	67%	7%	19%	4%	4%	54
ALLENDALE	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	9
ANDERSON	38%	31%	31%	0%	0%	29
BAMBERG	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	7
BARNWELL	25%	38%	38%	0%	0%	8
BEAUFORT	30%	55%	15%	0%	0%	20
BERKELEY	42%	25%	29%	4%	0%	24
CALHOUN	43%	43%	14%	0%	0%	7
CHARLESTON	49%	13%	37%	1%	1%	142
CHEROKEE	50%	28%	17%	0%	6%	18
CHESTER	33%	17%	50%	0%	0%	6
CHESTERFIELD	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	4
CLARENDON	14%	29%	57%	0%	0%	7
COLLETON	44%	19%	31%	6%	0%	16
DARLINGTON	57%	7%	36%	0%	0%	14
DILLON	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	9
DORCHESTER	41%	18%	37%	0%	4%	51
EDGEFIELD	60%	30%	10%	0%	0%	10
FAIRFIELD	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	3
FLORENCE	33%	22%	44%	0%	0%	18
GEORGETOWN	54%	8%	38%	0%	0%	13
GREENVILLE	41%	27%	29%	2%	2%	59
GREENWOOD	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	20
HAMPTON	46%	23%	31%	0%	0%	13
HORRY	37%	25%	29%	1%	7%	68
JASPER	38%	25%	38%	0%	0%	16
KERSHAW	14%	29%	57%	0%	0%	7
LANCASTER	29%	14%	57%	0%	0%	7
LAURENS	48%	24%	24%	5%	0%	21
LEE	33%	17%	50%	0%	0%	6
LEXINGTON	42%	25%	31%	0%	3%	36
McCORMICK	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	4
MARION	25%	50%	25%	0%	0%	8
MARLBORO	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	3
NEWBERRY	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	3
OCONEE	83%	8%	8%	0%	0%	12
ORANGEBURG	56%	25%	15%	3%	0%	59
PICKENS	15%	38%	38%	0%	8%	13
RICHLAND	53%	23%	19%	4%	0%	94
SALUDA	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
SPARTANBURG	15%	26%	59%	0%	0%	39
SUMTER	30%	37%	28%	2%	2%	43
UNION	20%	20%	60%	0%	0%	5
WILLIAMSBURG	25%	19%	44%	13%	0%	16
YORK	31%	21%	48%	0%	0%	29
TRANSITIONAL	----	----	----	----	----	0
STATE TOTAL	43%	23%	31%	2%	1%	
ACTIVE	454	240	326	17	15	1,052

FIGURE 5
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2014



**TABLE 4-D
YOA CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	3	75%	1	25%
AIKEN	12	46%	14	54%
ALLENDALE	4	80%	1	20%
ANDERSON	23	82%	5	18%
BAMBERG	0	0%	5	100%
BARNWELL	3	38%	5	63%
BEAUFORT	7	58%	5	42%
BERKELEY	16	62%	10	38%
CALHOUN	0	0%	1	100%
CHARLESTON	47	58%	34	42%
CHEROKEE	10	83%	2	17%
CHESTER	6	60%	4	40%
CHESTERFIELD	5	83%	1	17%
CLARENDON	2	100%	0	0%
COLLETON	3	30%	7	70%
DARLINGTON	7	47%	8	53%
DILLON	6	75%	2	25%
DORCHESTER	16	64%	9	36%
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	2	100%
FAIRFIELD	3	60%	2	40%
FLORENCE	37	71%	15	29%
GEORGETOWN	14	61%	9	39%
GREENVILLE	22	73%	8	27%
GREENWOOD	6	55%	5	45%
HAMPTON	4	57%	3	43%
HORRY	29	66%	15	34%
JASPER	2	67%	1	33%
KERSHAW	5	71%	2	29%
LANCASTER	4	44%	5	56%
LAURENS	10	59%	7	41%
LEE	3	75%	1	25%
LEXINGTON	29	60%	19	40%
MCCORMICK	0	0%	3	100%
MARION	5	71%	2	29%
MARLBORO	6	75%	2	25%
NEWBERRY	5	42%	7	58%
OCONEE	6	67%	3	33%
ORANGEBURG	18	72%	7	28%
PICKENS	6	86%	1	14%
RICHLAND	24	39%	37	61%
SALUDA	1	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	10	34%	19	66%
SUMTER	14	67%	7	33%
UNION	4	50%	4	50%
WILLIAMSBURG	4	80%	1	20%
YORK	20	54%	17	46%
TRANSITIONAL	25	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	486	60%	318	40%

**TABLE 5-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	1	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	1	100%	0	0%
ALLENDALE	0	---	0	---
ANDERSON	2	100%	0	0%
BAMBERG	0	---	0	---
BARNWELL	1	50%	1	50%
BEAUFORT	8	100%	0	0%
BERKELEY	7	100%	0	0%
CALHOUN	1	50%	1	50%
CHARLESTON	12	86%	2	14%
CHEROKEE	8	100%	0	0%
CHESTER	4	100%	0	0%
CHESTERFIELD	4	80%	1	20%
CLARENDON	1	100%	0	0%
COLLETON	2	100%	0	0%
DARLINGTON	2	100%	0	0%
DILLON	2	100%	0	0%
DORCHESTER	1	50%	1	50%
EDGEFIELD	0	---	0	---
FAIRFIELD	0	---	0	---
FLORENCE	7	100%	0	0%
GEORGETOWN	1	100%	0	0%
GREENVILLE	9	90%	1	10%
GREENWOOD	5	100%	0	0%
HAMPTON	3	100%	0	0%
HORRY	10	100%	0	0%
JASPER	2	100%	0	0%
KERSHAW	2	100%	0	0%
LANCASTER	2	100%	0	0%
LAURENS	1	100%	0	0%
LEE	0	---	0	---
LEXINGTON	7	100%	0	0%
McCORMICK	1	50%	1	50%
MARION	2	67%	1	33%
MARLBORO	0	---	0	---
NEWBERRY	2	100%	0	0%
OCONEE	1	100%	0	0%
ORANGEBURG	3	100%	0	0%
PICKENS	2	100%	0	0%
RICHLAND	7	88%	1	13%
SALUDA	1	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	5	71%	2	29%
SUMTER	2	100%	0	0%
UNION	1	100%	0	0%
WILLIAMSBURG	3	100%	0	0%
YORK	3	100%	0	0%
TRANSITIONAL	16	94%	1	6%
STATE TOTAL	155	92%	13	8%

SECTION E

**SEX
OFFENDERS**

FISCAL YEAR 2014

SEX OFFENDERS

The Department is responsible for supervising those offenders sentenced to community supervision by the Court of General Sessions or released from incarceration on other supervision programs who have been convicted of sex offenses.

In Table 1-E those offenders who have been convicted of a sex offense are shown. SCDPPPS utilizes the Sex Offender Management Program to supervise those sex offenders who are currently serving an active sentence for a sex offense. For those offenders currently under supervision for an offense that is not a sex offense but who are required to register as a sex offender for a previous offense, SCDPPPS provides general supervision according to the offender's risk assessment score. Figure 6 compares the number of sex offenders supervised under general supervision and the Sex Offender Management Program.


There are three levels of sex offender supervision: SO-Containment, SO-Intensive, and SO-High. A male sex offender's level of supervision is determined by his score on the Static-99 risk assessment. Female sex offenders are supervised at the SO-High level of supervision for the entirety of their supervision period.

SEX OFFENDER CONTACT STANDARDS		
SO-HIGH	SO-INTENSIVE	SO-CONTAINMENT
1 Home Visit per Month	2 Home Visits per Month	3 Home Visits per Month
1 Employment Verification per Month	1 Employment Verification per Month	1 Employment Verification per Month
1 Field, Home, or Office Visit per Month	1 Field, Home, or Office Visit per Month	1 Field, Home or Office Visit per Month
1 Treatment Provider Contact/Month	1 Treatment Provider Contact/Month	1 Treatment Provider Contact per Month
1 Computer Search Every Six Months, if Applicable	1 Computer Search Every Other Month, if Applicable	1 Computer Search per Month, if Applicable

**TABLE 1-E
ACTIVE SEX OFFENDERS UNDER SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION		GENERAL SUPERVISION		TOTAL SEX OFFENDERS
ABBEVILLE	4	57%	3	43%	7
AIKEN	51	85%	9	15%	60
ALLENDALE	3	75%	1	25%	4
ANDERSON	51	65%	27	35%	78
BAMBERG	6	86%	1	14%	7
BARNWELL	2	33%	4	67%	6
BEAUFORT	11	100%	0	0%	11
BERKELEY	30	88%	4	12%	34
CALHOUN	2	50%	2	50%	4
CHARLESTON	51	70%	22	30%	73
CHEROKEE	15	88%	2	12%	17
CHESTER	3	75%	1	25%	4
CHESTERFIELD	4	100%	0	0%	4
CLARENDON	9	75%	3	25%	12
COLLETON	7	58%	5	42%	12
DARLINGTON	9	82%	2	18%	11
DILLON	2	67%	1	33%	3
DORCHESTER	23	77%	7	23%	30
EDGEFIELD	5	42%	7	58%	12
FAIRFIELD	9	100%	0	0%	9
FLORENCE	28	78%	8	22%	36
GEORGETOWN	5	71%	2	29%	7
GREENVILLE	88	82%	19	18%	107
GREENWOOD	14	82%	3	18%	17
HAMPTON	6	86%	1	14%	7
HORRY	61	100%	0	0%	61
JASPER	7	88%	1	13%	8
KERSHAW	14	93%	1	7%	15
LANCASTER	13	81%	3	19%	16
LAURENS	13	81%	3	19%	16
LEE	5	71%	2	29%	7
LEXINGTON	30	77%	9	23%	39
McCORMICK	3	100%	0	0%	3
MARION	3	60%	2	40%	5
MARLBORO	4	44%	5	56%	9
NEWBERRY	9	60%	6	40%	15
OCONEE	28	85%	5	15%	33
ORANGEBURG	13	76%	4	24%	17
PICKENS	26	67%	13	33%	39
RICHLAND	56	67%	27	33%	83
SALUDA	8	89%	1	11%	9
SPARTANBURG	87	79%	23	21%	110
SUMTER	20	74%	7	26%	27
UNION	4	50%	4	50%	8
WILLIAMSBURG	16	94%	1	6%	17
YORK	30	75%	10	25%	40
STATE TOTAL	888	77%	261	23%	1,149

FIGURE 6
ACTIVE SEX OFFENDER UNDER SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2014



SECTION F

VIOLATIONS

FISCAL YEAR 2014

VIOLATIONS

Offenders charged by their supervising Agents with violations of the conditions of supervision are reviewed through an administrative hearing process to determine if probable cause of a violation exists. If a violation is found, a determination is made as to which community sanctions should be imposed, or whether the case should be referred to the Board or the Court for revocation action.

Table 1-F provides data by county on the violation process. Statewide, a total of 3,390 violation hearings were held during the fiscal year. At those hearings, 2,346 cases were continued or recommended for continuation, while 1,574 cases were revoked or recommended for revocation.

Table 2-F provides a comparison of changes in active population and the types of closure for FY 2010 to FY 2014.

Table 3-F shows fees collected in FY2014 as a result of the Administrative Hearing Process. Offenders pay restitution, supervision fees and fines just prior to their Administrative Hearing to avoid incarceration. During the year, \$255,073.25 was collected in delinquent restitution payments, \$116,854.65 for supervision fees and \$51,771.78 in court ordered fines and fees. The total to \$423,699.68 collected demonstrates the effectiveness of the Administrative Hearing Process in bringing offenders who have the means to become compliant with their monetary obligations.

**TABLE 1-F
VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY**

COUNTY	Cases Heard	Cases Revoked or Recommended for Revocation	Cases Continued or Recommended for Continuation
ABBEVILLE	4	1	3
AIKEN	121	37	84
ALLENDALE	19	12	7
ANDERSON	287	127	160
BAMBERG	33	12	21
BARNWELL	33	12	21
BEAUFORT	13	9	4
BERKELEY	78	29	49
CALHOUN	10	1	9
CHARLESTON	627	284	343
CHEROKEE	111	27	84
CHESTER	9	9	0
CHESTERFIELD	10	5	5
CLARENDON	7	1	6
COLLETON	60	40	20
DARLINGTON	22	12	10
DILLON	13	8	5
DORCHESTER	216	98	118
EDGEFIELD	22	9	13
FAIRFIELD	2	2	0
FLORENCE	64	24	40
GEORGETOWN	50	22	28
GREENVILLE	853	288	565
GREENWOOD	49	23	26
HAMPTON	15	11	4
HORRY	64	32	32
JASPER	24	14	10
KERSHAW	19	3	16
LANCASTER	33	17	16
LAURENS	18	10	8
LEE	5	1	4
LEXINGTON	114	27	87
MARION	7	3	4
MARLBORO	11	4	7
MCCORMICK	7	4	3
NEWBERRY	43	21	22
OCONEE	47	19	28
ORANGEBURG	166	64	102
PICKENS	51	31	20
RICHLAND	238	98	140
SALUDA	17	6	11
SPARTANBURG	109	49	60
SUMTER	116	27	89
UNION	22	7	15
WILLIAMSBURG	9	2	7
YORK	72	32	40
STATE TOTAL	3920	1574	2346

**TABLE 2-F
CLOSURES BY TYPE**

FY 2014	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Ret-CD⁶	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	28,021	10,535	16	2	624	2,356	217	3,215
Parole	1,618	405	1	0	11	31	0	43
YOA	1,052	486	7	0	97	214	0	318
Other Releases	1,517	1,138	43	0	1	4	0	48
Total	32,208	12,564	67	2	733	2,605	217	3,624
% Unsuccessful			1.8%	0.1%	22.2%	71.9%	6.0%	

FY 2013	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Ret-CD⁶	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	29,173	9,557	7	5	700	2,323	211	3,246
Parole	1,622	472	5	0	22	34	0	61
YOA	1,636	615	8	0	101	268	0	377
Other Releases	1,411	912	46	0	0	1	0	47
Total	33,842	11,556	66	5	823	2,626	211	3,731
% Unsuccessful			1.8%	0.1%	22.1%	70.4%	5.7%	

FY 2012	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	27,824	8,614	16	12	703	2,888	0	3,619
Parole	1,626	516	10	0	11	60	0	81
YOA	2,001	666	12	0	136	373	0	521
Other Releases	1,220	853	46	0	0	1	0	47
Total	32,671	10,649	84	12	850	3,322	0	4,268
% Unsuccessful⁶			1.6%	0.2%	16.6%	65.0%	0.0%	

FY 2011	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	25,902	8,431	27	6	446	3,719	239	4,437
Parole	1,728	409	6	0	8	37	8	59
YOA	2,222	539	9	0	54	385	70	518
Other Releases	1,125	1,063	93	0	0	0	0	93
Total	30,977	10,442	135	6	508	4,141	317	5,107
% Unsuccessful⁶			2.6%	0.1%	9.9%	81.1%	6.2%	

FY 2010	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,157	9,109	28	6	485	4,142	255	4,916
Parole	1,587	435	9	0	9	70	14	102
YOA	2,096	542	14	0	62	570	55	701
Other Releases	1,422	648	110	0	0	1	0	111
Total	31,262	10,734	161	6	556	4,783	324	5,830
% Unsuccessful⁶			2.8%	0.1%	9.5%	82.0%	5.6%	

Footnotes:

1 Exp-I - Expired Offender in Institution
 2 JC-I - Judicial Closure in Institution
 3 Rev-C - Revoke, New Conviction

4 Rev-T - Revoke, Technical Charges
 5 Rev TC - Revoke, Technical Charges & New Charges Pending
 6 Ret-CD Returned - Conditional Discharge.

**TABLE 3-F
FEES COLLECTED THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS PROCESS**

	SUPERVISION FEES	FINES/COURT COSTS	RESTITUTION	TOTAL
JULY 2013	\$9,548.00	\$4,043.53	\$18,539.01	\$32,130.54
AUGUST	\$13,370.00	\$5,637.35	\$13,802.00	\$32,809.35
SEPTEMBER	\$8,873.60	\$2,212.81	\$16,406.48	\$27,492.89
OCTOBER	\$10,087.00	\$4,217.34	\$40,929.98	\$55,234.32
NOVEMBER	\$4,829.00	\$3,370.89	\$7,284.30	\$15,484.19
DECEMBER	\$6,246.20	\$2,118.61	\$6,415.80	\$14,780.61
JANUARY 2014	\$9,659.00	\$8,189.27	\$9,429.10	\$27,277.37
FEBRUARY	\$9,265.50	\$4,501.93	\$26,404.74	\$40,172.17
MARCH	\$15,977.50	\$5,146.25	\$27,948.01	\$49,071.76
APRIL	\$13,609.50	\$6,035.68	\$34,916.99	\$54,562.17
MAY	\$8,932.35	\$2,266.32	\$34,077.86	\$45,276.53
JUNE 2014	\$6,457.00	\$4,031.80	\$18,918.98	\$29,407.78
TOTAL	\$116,854.65	\$51,771.78	\$255,073.25	\$423,699.68

SECTION G

**ELECTRONIC
SURVEILLANCE**

FISCAL YEAR 2014


ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

The Department utilizes electronic surveillance to monitor certain offenders. On June 8, 2006, Jessie's Law, a bill aimed at protecting our state's children through tougher penalties for sexual predators was signed into law with an effective date of July 1, 2006. Named after Jessica Marie Lunsford -- who was murdered in 2005 by a registered sex offender in Florida -- the law imposes a mandatory minimum of 25 years in prison for sexual predators and mandates active Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) monitoring for sex offenders convicted of certain offenses. GPS can pinpoint within 15 meters a person's position on Earth using 24 satellites in orbit at 11,000 nautical miles above the Earth. The satellites are owned and operated by the U. S. Department of Defense and continuously transmit signals which can be detected by anyone possessing a GPS receiver. Of the 706 offenders on Active GPS on June 30, 2014, 512 offenders were placed on GPS under Jessie's Law.


Home detention (HD) is a special condition of intensive supervision. Offenders are confined to their residences except for those times authorized by the Court, Parole Board or supervising probation/parole Agent. Electronic Monitoring (EM) was the enhanced surveillance technique used in conjunction with HD to ensure heightened supervision and accountability for those offenders on intensive supervision status. It was used to verify the degree of the offender's compliance with the conditions of HD.

The Department's EMHD contract expired in November 2012. EM units were phased out and replaced with Passive GPS beginning January 2013. By July 2013 all EM units were removed from the field. Effective June 2014, a decision was made to monitor all GPS cases actively (in real time). The change from EM to Passive-GPS and then to Active-GPS was made to enhance public safety and provide a more modern and efficient way to enforce home detention and curfews. Figure 7 shows the number of offenders on Passive-GPS and Figure 8 shows the Active-GPS population each month of the fiscal year.

FIGURE 7
ACTIVE OFFENDERS ON PASSIVE GPS
FISCAL YEAR 2014



**FIGURE 8
OFFENDERS ON ACTIVE GPS
FISCAL YEAR 2014**



SECTION H

SUMMARY

FISCAL YEAR 2014

SUMMARY

Figure 9 compares monthly DNA collections during FY 2014.

Table 1-H shows drug testing activity during FY 2014. This table represents the number of individual offenders tested, the number of individuals testing positive, the total number of positive tests and the number of times offenders were tested.

Table 2-H summarizes the population characteristics of SCDPPPS offenders by supervision programs as well as offender involvement in drug testing.

The proportion of violent offenses among YOA admissions (2%) remained the same when comparing FY 2013 and FY 2014, as did the percentage of violent offenses among probationers (5%). Parole admissions for violent offenses decreased by 3% from the previous fiscal year.

Overall, the most utilized level of supervision was standard (55%), followed by high (26%), medium (16%), sex offender (3%), and intensive (1%) for all cases.


The overall success rate for closures was 78% during the fiscal year. The overall success rate for parolees was 94%. Both probationers (77%) and YOA offenders (60%) had less successful closures rates than parolees, but probationers showed a 2% increase from the previous fiscal year.

Of the 18,661 offenders tested for drug use while under supervision, 8,646 or 46.3% tested positive for drugs.

Figure 10 compares the number of admissions for each fiscal year from 1995 to 2014. Admissions decreased for FY 2014 by 2.9% from the previous fiscal year.

Figure 11 shows the percentage of violent admissions by program type for fiscal years 2005 to 2014.

**FIGURE 9
MONTHLY DNA COLLECTIONS
FISCAL YEAR 2014**



**TABLE 1-H
OFFENDER DRUG TESTING**

COUNTY	INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED	INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE	PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	TOTAL NO. POSITIVE TESTS	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS WERE TESTED
ABBEVILLE	80	35	43.75%	57	87
AIKEN	475	210	44.21%	381	544
ALLENDALE	73	45	61.64%	94	109
ANDERSON	764	413	54.06%	878	884
BAMBERG	75	40	53.33%	97	142
BARNWELL	179	83	46.37%	145	214
BEAUFORT	444	237	53.38%	374	587
BERKELEY	528	186	35.23%	314	611
CALHOUN	93	38	40.86%	68	136
CHARLESTON	957	487	50.89%	736	1,086
CHEROKEE	466	257	55.15%	638	574
CHESTER	185	93	50.27%	159	258
CHESTERFIELD	126	59	46.83%	147	215
CLARENDON	76	30	39.47%	63	108
COLLETON	259	142	54.83%	262	317
DARLINGTON	267	145	54.31%	278	310
DILLON	52	4	7.69%	4	53
DORCHESTER	344	179	52.03%	277	370
EDGEFIELD	114	63	55.26%	115	133
FAIRFIELD	73	39	53.42%	53	76
FLORENCE	805	352	43.73%	699	1,234
GEORGETOWN	229	93	40.61%	168	312
GREENVILLE	2,066	759	36.74%	1,395	2,516
GREENWOOD	368	213	57.88%	375	493
HAMPTON	96	46	47.92%	70	116
HORRY	818	310	37.90%	547	1,038
JASPER	92	37	40.22%	63	131
KERSHAW	151	86	56.95%	163	226
LANCASTER	311	146	46.95%	263	366
LAURENS	321	155	48.29%	346	431
LEE	63	28	44.44%	47	83
LEXINGTON	854	307	35.95%	649	1,075
MCCORMICK	16	10	62.50%	14	20
MARION	190	98	51.58%	146	232
MARLBORO	94	54	57.45%	91	112
NEWBERRY	200	124	62.00%	220	260
OCONEE	166	93	56.02%	232	188
ORANGEBURG	374	190	50.80%	268	415
PICKENS	498	269	54.02%	572	592
RICHLAND	1,699	860	50.62%	1,427	2,321
SALUDA	81	29	35.80%	55	97
SPARTANBURG	1,877	789	42.04%	1,405	2,314
SUMTER	505	259	51.29%	408	681
UNION	149	62	41.61%	98	157
WILLIAMSBURG	132	74	56.06%	108	151
YORK	873	416	47.65%	680	1,104
CENTRAL	3	2	66.67%	3	3
STATE TOTAL	18,661	8,646	46.33%	15,652	23,482

**TABLE 2-H
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**

ADMISSIONS								
CATEGORY	Probation		Parole		YOA		Total	
	FY 13	FY 14	FY 13	FY 14	FY 13	FY 14	FY 13	FY 14
<u>RACE:</u>								
BLACK	48%	47%	66%	64%	67%	53%	51%	49%
WHITE	50%	51%	31%	34%	32%	45%	47%	49%
OTHER	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%
<u>GENDER:</u>								
MALE	78%	77%	91%	92%	96%	95%	80%	79%
FEMALE	22%	23%	9%	8%	4%	5%	20%	21%
<u>OFFENSE TYPE:</u>								
VIOLENT	5%	5%	47%	44%	2%	2%	9%	10%
NON-VIOLENT	95%	95%	53%	56%	98%	98%	91%	90%

ACTIVES								
<u>LEVEL OF SUPERVISION:</u>								
STANDARD	63%	55%	58%	53%	49%	43%	62%	55%
MEDIUM	10%	16%	9%	15%	14%	23%	10%	16%
HIGH RISK	24%	26%	21%	22%	31%	31%	24%	26%
INTENSIVE	1%	1%	4%	3%	4%	2%	1%	1%
SEX OFFENDER	2%	2%	8%	7%	2%	1%	3%	3%

CLOSURES								
<u>CASE OUTCOME:</u>								
SUCCESSFUL	75%	77%	93%	94%	62%	60%	76%	78%
UNSUCCESSFUL	25%	23%	7%	6%	38%	40%	24%	22%

DRUG TESTING		
	<u>FY 13</u>	<u>FY 14</u>
INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED	19,933	18,661
OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	8,872	8,646
% OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	44.51%	46.33%
TOTAL POSITIVE TESTS	15,652	15,652
NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS TESTED	24,808	23,482

FIGURE 10
ADMISSIONS: A 20-YEAR COMPARISON




FIGURE 11
PERCENTAGE OF VIOLENT ADMISSIONS BY PROGRAM TYPE

