



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

**ANNUAL
STATISTICAL
REPORT**

FISCAL YEAR 2016

**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**

Research and Evaluation/Office of Rehabilitative Services

**LaQuenta Weldon, Statistical and Research Analyst
Marchar Stagg, Senior Statistical and Research Analyst
Saskia Santos, Director of Program Planning & Development**

TO THE READER

Fiscal Year 2016 (FY 2016) began July 1, 2015 and ended June 30, 2016. This report provides a statistical representation of the work of 609 employees of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS). During the fiscal year, 74% of our probationers and 84% of our parolees successfully completed supervision.

The Department operates its offender programs within a clear framework of public safety in supervising the 48,835 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, 28,743 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, 2016. 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 LaQuenta Weldon in Research and Evaluation at 803-734-4057.

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. The numbers for YOA offenders may be skewed because this program is being taken over by the South Carolina Department of Correction (SCDC). SCDPPPS will no longer receive admissions to this program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A---TOTAL POPULATION

TABLE 1-A	Total Admissions by Program Type.....	8
TABLE 2-A	Total Admissions by Type of Offense	9
TABLE 3-A	Total Admissions by Age	10
TABLE 4-A	Total Admissions by Gender & Race.....	11
FIGURE 1	Total Admissions by Gender & Race.....	12
TABLE 5-A	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision	13
FIGURE 2	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision	14
TABLE 6-A	Total Closures by Type.....	15

SECTION B---PROBATION

TABLE 1-B	Probation Admissions by Type of Offense	18
TABLE 2-B	Probation Admissions by Gender & Race	19
TABLE 3-B	Probation Admissions by Age	20
TABLE 4-B	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision.....	21
FIGURE 3	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision.....	22
TABLE 5-B	Probation Closures by Type.....	23

SECTION C---PAROLE

TABLE 1-C	Parole Admissions by Type of Offense.....	26
TABLE 2-C	Parole Admissions by Gender & Race	27
TABLE 3-C	Parole Admissions by Age	28
TABLE 4-C	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision.....	29
FIGURE 4	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision.....	30
TABLE 5-C	Parole Closures by Type.....	31

SECTION D---YOA

TABLE 1-D	YOA Admissions by Type of Offense.....	34
TABLE 2-D	YOA Admissions by Gender & Race.....	35
TABLE 3-D	YOA Admissions by Age.....	36
TABLE 4-D	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision	37
FIGURE 5	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision	38
TABLE 5-D	YOA Closures by Type	39

SECTION E---SEX OFFENDERS

TABLE 1-E	Active Sex Offenders	42
FUGURE 6	Sex Offenders by Supervision Status	43

SECTION F---VIOLATIONS

TABLE 1-F	Violations by County	46
TABLE 2-F	Closures by Type	47
TABLE 3-F	Administrative Hearing Collections	48

SECTION G---ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

FIGURE 7	Offenders on Active GPS	51
----------	-------------------------------	----

SECTION H---SUMMARY

FIGURE 8	Monthly DNA Collections	54
TABLE 1-H	Offender Drug Testing	55
TABLE 2-H	Population Characteristics	56
FIGURE 9	Admissions: A 20-Year Comparison	57
FIGURE 10	Violent Admissions by Program Status	58

SECTION A

**TOTAL
POPULATION**

FISCAL YEAR 2016

TOTAL POPULATION

Tables 1-A through 4-A and Figure 1 represent the total admissions to the SCDPPPS during FY 2016. 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 2016, there were 17,032 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 35.6% of all admissions.
- 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 9% admissions for violent offenses.
- Table 3-A describes offender admissions by age category. Majority of those admitted during FY 2017 (78%) were 25 years or older at time of admission.
- Table 4-A and Figure 1 illustrate total admissions by gender and race. Admissions overall continue to be predominately male at 78%, with a racial composition of 49% black, 49% white, and 2% of other races.

Table 5-A and Figure 2 describe all active offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2016. 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. Standard risk supervision accounted for 64% of the active population, 13% were medium risk, and 19% were high risk offenders. Intensive supervision represented only 1% and sex offender supervision accounted for 3% of all active offenders.

Table 6-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 2016 and within that order only the main case, even though an offender may have had more than one case, was included. The overall success rate for all offenders closing during FY 2016 was 76%. The unsuccessful rate, 24%, is defined as those offenders whose supervision was revoked due to a technical violation or new offense.

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	92	84%	16	15%	1	1%	109
AIKEN	377	82%	81	18%	0	0%	458
ALLENDALE	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	21
ANDERSON	456	84%	85	16%	0	0%	541
BAMBERG	39	89%	5	11%	0	0%	44
BARNWELL	62	78%	18	23%	0	0%	80
BEAUFORT	255	89%	31	11%	0	0%	286
BERKELEY	468	88%	65	12%	1	0%	534
CALHOUN	47	82%	10	18%	0	0%	57
CHARLESTON	1334	87%	203	13%	1	0%	1,538
CHEROKEE	422	90%	48	10%	1	0%	471
CHESTER	110	88%	15	12%	0	0%	125
CHESTERFIELD	59	73%	22	27%	0	0%	81
CLARENDON	102	82%	22	18%	1	1%	125
COLLETON	115	85%	21	15%	0	0%	136
DARLINGTON	240	88%	34	12%	0	0%	274
DILLON	131	83%	26	17%	0	0%	157
DORCHESTER	278	87%	42	13%	0	0%	320
EDGEFIELD	103	83%	21	17%	0	0%	124
FAIRFIELD	95	88%	13	12%	0	0%	108
FLORENCE	360	83%	76	17%	0	0%	436
GEORGETOWN	109	64%	61	36%	0	0%	170
GREENVILLE	1545	87%	229	13%	0	0%	1,774
GREENWOOD	321	87%	50	13%	0	0%	371
HAMPTON	49	82%	11	18%	0	0%	60
HORRY	578	78%	160	22%	0	0%	738
JASPER	62	78%	18	23%	0	0%	80
KERSHAW	223	91%	22	9%	0	0%	245
LANCASTER	199	90%	22	10%	0	0%	221
LAURENS	238	84%	44	16%	0	0%	282
LEE	39	74%	14	26%	0	0%	53
LEXINGTON	582	81%	134	19%	0	0%	716
McCORMICK	26	81%	6	19%	0	0%	32
MARION	133	78%	38	22%	0	0%	171
MARLBORO	63	67%	31	33%	0	0%	94
NEWBERRY	101	90%	11	10%	0	0%	112
OCONEE	300	92%	26	8%	0	0%	326
ORANGEBURG	417	87%	60	13%	0	0%	477
PICKENS	517	91%	49	9%	0	0%	566
RICHLAND	941	79%	247	21%	0	0%	1,188
SALUDA	51	82%	11	18%	0	0%	62
SPARTANBURG	1353	86%	215	14%	0	0%	1,568
SUMTER	365	82%	82	18%	0	0%	447
UNION	120	80%	30	20%	0	0%	150
WILLIAMSBURG	126	77%	36	22%	2	1%	164
YORK	679	81%	159	19%	0	0%	838
TRANSITIONAL	18	18%	70	69%	14	14%	102
STATE TOTAL	14,318	84%	2,693	16%	21	0%	17,032

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	8	7%	101	93%	109
AIKEN	53	12%	405	88%	458
ALLENDALE	5	24%	16	76%	21
ANDERSON	52	10%	489	90%	541
BAMBERG	6	14%	38	86%	44
BARNWELL	11	14%	69	86%	80
BEAUFORT	20	7%	266	93%	286
BERKELEY	51	10%	483	90%	534
CALHOUN	6	11%	51	89%	57
CHARLESTON	122	8%	1,416	92%	1,538
CHEROKEE	25	5%	446	95%	471
CHESTER	12	10%	113	90%	125
CHESTERFIELD	11	14%	70	86%	81
CLARENDON	7	6%	118	94%	125
COLLETON	11	8%	125	92%	136
DARLINGTON	12	4%	262	96%	274
DILLON	8	5%	149	95%	157
DORCHESTER	46	14%	274	86%	320
EDGEFIELD	6	5%	118	95%	124
FAIRFIELD	4	4%	104	96%	108
FLORENCE	36	8%	400	92%	436
GEORGETOWN	19	11%	151	89%	170
GREENVILLE	179	10%	1,595	90%	1,774
GREENWOOD	31	8%	340	92%	371
HAMPTON	4	7%	56	93%	60
HORRY	78	11%	660	89%	738
JASPER	12	15%	68	85%	80
KERSHAW	16	7%	229	93%	245
LANCASTER	13	6%	208	94%	221
LAURENS	26	9%	256	91%	282
LEE	2	4%	51	96%	53
LEXINGTON	81	11%	635	89%	716
McCORMICK	4	13%	28	88%	32
MARION	11	6%	160	94%	171
MARLBORO	3	3%	91	97%	94
NEWBERRY	5	4%	107	96%	112
OCONEE	20	6%	306	94%	326
ORANGEBURG	39	8%	438	92%	477
PICKENS	30	5%	536	95%	566
RICHLAND	160	13%	1,028	87%	1,188
SALUDA	3	5%	59	95%	62
SPARTANBURG	150	10%	1,418	90%	1,568
SUMTER	31	7%	416	93%	447
UNION	6	4%	144	96%	150
WILLIAMSBURG	19	12%	145	88%	164
YORK	84	10%	754	90%	838
TRANSITIONAL	41	40%	61	60%	102
STATE TOTAL	1,579	9%	15,453	91%	17,032

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 3-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	27	25%	82	75%
AIKEN	112	24%	346	76%
ALLENDALE	6	29%	15	71%
ANDERSON	93	17%	448	83%
BAMBERG	8	18%	36	82%
BARNWELL	24	30%	56	70%
BEAUFORT	87	30%	199	70%
BERKELEY	127	24%	407	76%
CALHOUN	10	18%	47	82%
CHARLESTON	351	23%	1187	77%
CHEROKEE	95	20%	376	80%
CHESTER	29	23%	96	77%
CHESTERFIELD	25	31%	56	69%
CLARENDON	26	21%	99	79%
COLLETON	33	24%	103	76%
DARLINGTON	60	22%	214	78%
DILLON	43	27%	114	73%
DORCHESTER	85	27%	235	73%
EDGEFIELD	23	19%	101	81%
FAIRFIELD	27	25%	81	75%
FLORENCE	120	28%	316	72%
GEORGETOWN	40	24%	130	76%
GREENVILLE	298	17%	1476	83%
GREENWOOD	82	22%	289	78%
HAMPTON	9	15%	51	85%
HORRY	162	22%	576	78%
JASPER	20	25%	60	75%
KERSHAW	53	22%	192	78%
LANCASTER	45	20%	176	80%
LAURENS	61	22%	221	78%
LEE	12	23%	41	77%
LEXINGTON	162	23%	554	77%
McCORMICK	9	28%	23	72%
MARION	62	36%	109	64%
MARLBORO	25	27%	69	73%
NEWBERRY	25	22%	87	78%
OCONEE	61	19%	265	81%
ORANGEBURG	130	27%	347	73%
PICKENS	123	22%	443	78%
RICHLAND	279	23%	909	77%
SALUDA	14	23%	48	77%
SPARTANBURG	301	19%	1267	81%
SUMTER	116	26%	331	74%
UNION	23	15%	127	85%
WILLIAMSBURG	53	32%	111	68%
YORK	215	26%	623	74%
TRANSITIONAL	18	18%	84	82%
STATE TOTAL	3,809	22%	13,223	78%


Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 4-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
N=17,032

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	75%	25%	41%	0%	59%
AIKEN	79%	21%	43%	0%	57%
ALLENDALE	95%	5%	90%	0%	10%
ANDERSON	75%	25%	24%	2%	74%
BAMBERG	80%	20%	73%	0%	27%
BARNWELL	76%	24%	46%	0%	54%
BEAUFORT	84%	16%	59%	4%	37%
BERKELEY	79%	21%	41%	1%	58%
CALHOUN	84%	16%	56%	2%	42%
CHARLESTON	84%	16%	65%	2%	33%
CHEROKEE	73%	27%	24%	1%	75%
CHESTER	80%	20%	58%	2%	41%
CHESTERFIELD	83%	17%	47%	0%	53%
CLARENDON	82%	18%	70%	2%	29%
COLLETON	76%	24%	64%	1%	35%
DARLINGTON	61%	39%	63%	0%	37%
DILLON	87%	13%	62%	5%	33%
DORCHESTER	79%	21%	44%	3%	53%
EDGEFIELD	81%	19%	47%	0%	53%
FAIRFIELD	88%	12%	70%	1%	29%
FLORENCE	78%	22%	69%	1%	30%
GEORGETOWN	80%	20%	49%	1%	49%
GREENVILLE	75%	25%	39%	5%	56%
GREENWOOD	77%	23%	56%	2%	43%
HAMPTON	82%	18%	72%	3%	25%
HORRY	77%	23%	35%	4%	62%
JASPER	88%	13%	60%	5%	35%
KERSHAW	81%	19%	52%	2%	47%
LANCASTER	80%	20%	38%	1%	61%
LAURENS	78%	22%	36%	2%	62%
LEE	77%	23%	81%	0%	19%
LEXINGTON	79%	21%	33%	2%	65%
McCORMICK	91%	9%	69%	3%	28%
MARION	81%	19%	78%	0%	22%
MARLBORO	88%	12%	64%	9%	28%
NEWBERRY	83%	17%	63%	2%	35%
OCONEE	73%	27%	18%	1%	81%
ORANGEBURG	84%	16%	77%	0%	23%
PICKENS	70%	30%	15%	2%	83%
RICHLAND	82%	18%	77%	1%	22%
SALUDA	89%	11%	55%	6%	39%
SPARTANBURG	72%	28%	40%	3%	58%
SUMTER	83%	17%	74%	1%	25%
UNION	77%	23%	36%	1%	63%
WILLIAMSBURG	85%	15%	77%	0%	23%
YORK	81%	19%	42%	4%	54%
TRANSITIONAL	84%	16%	53%	7%	40%
STATE TOTAL	78%	22%	49%	2%	49%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.


FIGURE 1
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
FISCAL YEAR 2016



**TABLE 5-A
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	76%	12%	11%	0%	1%	0%	152
AIKEN	59%	15%	22%	1%	4%	0%	913
ALLENDALE	86%	7%	1%	0%	6%	0%	71
ANDERSON	60%	8%	28%	1%	4%	0%	1355
BAMBERG	68%	5%	21%	0%	5%	0%	92
BARNWELL	76%	8%	9%	0%	7%	0%	168
BEAUFORT	83%	9%	5%	1%	2%	0%	320
BERKELEY	64%	6%	25%	1%	4%	0%	917
CALHOUN	79%	9%	6%	2%	4%	0%	101
CHARLESTON	52%	17%	28%	1%	2%	0%	2417
CHEROKEE	64%	17%	15%	3%	1%	0%	761
CHESTER	62%	16%	20%	0%	2%	0%	208
CHESTERFIELD	66%	13%	16%	0%	5%	0%	134
CLARENDON	66%	9%	21%	0%	4%	0%	200
COLLETON	63%	10%	20%	3%	4%	0%	274
DARLINGTON	77%	10%	11%	0%	2%	0%	410
DILLON	87%	7%	4%	0%	2%	0%	174
DORCHESTER	67%	12%	18%	1%	3%	0%	685
EDGEFIELD	74%	9%	13%	2%	3%	0%	200
FAIRFIELD	58%	17%	19%	1%	4%	0%	163
FLORENCE	74%	12%	10%	0%	4%	0%	818
GEORGETOWN	69%	7%	18%	1%	4%	0%	223
GREENVILLE	59%	15%	22%	1%	3%	0%	3376
GREENWOOD	70%	13%	14%	1%	1%	0%	610
HAMPTON	72%	6%	18%	1%	3%	0%	131
HORRY	70%	12%	12%	1%	5%	0%	1119
JASPER	66%	13%	16%	1%	5%	0%	183
KERSHAW	62%	9%	21%	2%	5%	0%	366
LANCASTER	77%	12%	8%	2%	1%	0%	345
LAURENS	64%	16%	18%	1%	2%	0%	470
LEE	74%	10%	11%	0%	4%	0%	105
LEXINGTON	68%	11%	14%	4%	3%	0%	1155
McCORMICK	78%	7%	12%	0%	3%	0%	68
MARION	79%	14%	3%	1%	2%	0%	207
MARLBORO	80%	8%	7%	1%	4%	0%	106
NEWBERRY	67%	14%	18%	1%	1%	0%	192
OCONEE	71%	10%	14%	2%	3%	0%	514
ORANGEBURG	65%	5%	29%	0%	1%	0%	1010
PICKENS	62%	18%	18%	0%	2%	0%	911
RICHLAND	64%	15%	18%	2%	2%	0%	2146
SALUDA	71%	6%	18%	2%	3%	0%	103
SPARTANBURG	60%	15%	21%	1%	3%	0%	2578
SUMTER	71%	11%	15%	0%	2%	0%	687
UNION	63%	13%	20%	1%	3%	0%	260
WILLIAMSBURG	59%	8%	29%	1%	3%	0%	262
YORK	70%	11%	15%	1%	2%	0%	1083
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
STATE TOTAL	64%	13%	19%	1%	3%	0%	---
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	18,488	3,671	5,481	331	769	3	28,743
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.							

FIGURE 2
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2016



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 6-A
TOTAL CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	81	70%	34	30%
AIKEN	333	74%	114	26%
ALLENDALE	41	91%	4	9%
ANDERSON	496	71%	206	29%
BAMBERG	43	74%	15	26%
BARNWELL	60	69%	27	31%
BEAUFORT	208	82%	45	18%
BERKELEY	388	77%	116	23%
CALHOUN	27	75%	9	25%
CHARLESTON	1054	81%	250	19%
CHEROKEE	294	71%	122	29%
CHESTER	83	71%	34	29%
CHESTERFIELD	68	83%	14	17%
CLARENDON	97	82%	22	18%
COLLETON	130	72%	51	28%
DARLINGTON	160	77%	47	23%
DILLON	98	84%	19	16%
DORCHESTER	256	75%	85	25%
EDGEFIELD	84	82%	18	18%
FAIRFIELD	64	82%	14	18%
FLORENCE	432	79%	118	21%
GEORGETOWN	130	77%	38	23%
GREENVILLE	1604	74%	575	26%
GREENWOOD	313	85%	55	15%
HAMPTON	42	74%	15	26%
HORRY	592	72%	230	28%
JASPER	79	71%	33	29%
KERSHAW	171	73%	64	27%
LANCASTER	244	87%	36	13%
LAURENS	264	75%	88	25%
LEE	77	82%	17	18%
LEXINGTON	500	74%	180	26%
MCCORMICK	34	92%	3	8%
MARION	96	79%	26	21%
MARLBORO	74	76%	23	24%
NEWBERRY	111	79%	30	21%
OCONEE	242	82%	52	18%
ORANGEBURG	332	82%	73	18%
PICKENS	389	83%	79	17%
RICHLAND	1017	74%	355	26%
SALUDA	45	73%	17	27%
SPARTANBURG	1030	66%	533	34%
SUMTER	368	78%	104	22%
UNION	139	78%	40	22%
WILLIAMSBURG	168	84%	33	16%
YORK	670	82%	143	18%
TRANSITIONAL	387	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	13,615	76%	4,206	24%
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.				

SECTION B

PROBATION

FISCAL YEAR

2016

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, to make reparation to victims if so ordered, and to provide for judicial revocation for violation of those conditions.

Tables 1-B through 3-B represents all probation admissions during FY 2016. 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. Violent refers to those offenses as defined by the Omnibus Crime Act, Section 16-1-60. For FY 2016, 4% 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 (76%) with a racial composition of 51% white, 47% black, and 2% other.
- Table 3-B reflects probation admissions by age category. Majority (76%) of offenders were 25 years or older at time of admission.

Table 4-B and Figure 3 describe active probation offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2016. This total does not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences. Standard risk supervision accounted for 65% of the active population, 13% were medium risk, and 19% were high risk offenders. Intensive supervision represented only 1% and sex offender supervision accounted for 3% of all active probation offenders.

Table 5-B provides data for probation 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 2016 and within that order only the main case, even though an offender may have had more than one case, was included. The overall success rate for probationers was 74%, slightly lower than the total offender population success rate of 76%.

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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	2	2%	90	98%	92
AIKEN	24	6%	353	94%	377
ALLENDALE	2	11%	16	89%	18
ANDERSON	16	4%	440	96%	456
BAMBERG	5	13%	34	87%	39
BARNWELL	5	8%	57	92%	62
BEAUFORT	5	2%	250	98%	255
BERKELEY	26	6%	442	94%	468
CALHOUN	2	4%	45	96%	47
CHARLESTON	28	2%	1,306	98%	1,334
CHEROKEE	12	3%	410	97%	422
CHESTER	3	3%	107	97%	110
CHESTERFIELD	1	2%	58	98%	59
CLARENDON	3	3%	99	97%	102
COLLETON	3	3%	112	97%	115
DARLINGTON	4	2%	236	98%	240
DILLON	2	2%	129	98%	131
DORCHESTER	23	8%	255	92%	278
EDGEFIELD	3	3%	100	97%	103
FAIRFIELD	2	2%	93	98%	95
FLORENCE	13	4%	347	96%	360
GEORGETOWN	1	1%	108	99%	109
GREENVILLE	73	5%	1,472	95%	1,545
GREENWOOD	13	4%	308	96%	321
HAMPTON	3	6%	46	94%	49
HORRY	27	5%	551	95%	578
JASPER	2	3%	60	97%	62
KERSHAW	7	3%	216	97%	223
LANCASTER	2	1%	197	99%	199
LAURENS	9	4%	229	96%	238
LEE	1	3%	38	97%	39
LEXINGTON	35	6%	547	94%	582
McCORMICK	1	4%	25	96%	26
MARION	1	1%	132	99%	133
MARLBORO	1	2%	62	98%	63
NEWBERRY	4	4%	97	96%	101
OCONEE	11	4%	289	96%	300
ORANGEBURG	12	3%	405	97%	417
PICKENS	17	3%	500	97%	517
RICHLAND	49	5%	892	95%	941
SALUDA	0	0%	51	100%	51
SPARTANBURG	68	5%	1,285	95%	1,353
SUMTER	7	2%	358	98%	365
UNION	3	3%	117	98%	120
WILLIAMSBURG	3	2%	123	98%	126
YORK	28	4%	651	96%	679
TRANSITIONAL	1	6%	17	94%	18
STATE TOTAL	563	4%	13,755	96%	14,318

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	72%	28%	36%	0%	64%
AIKEN	77%	23%	44%	0%	56%
ALLENDALE	94%	6%	94%	0%	6%
ANDERSON	74%	26%	22%	2%	77%
BAMBERG	77%	23%	69%	0%	31%
BARNWELL	73%	27%	44%	0%	56%
BEAUFORT	83%	17%	58%	4%	38%
BERKELEY	77%	23%	40%	1%	59%
CALHOUN	81%	19%	51%	0%	49%
CHARLESTON	82%	18%	64%	2%	34%
CHEROKEE	71%	29%	21%	2%	77%
CHESTER	77%	23%	54%	2%	45%
CHESTERFIELD	81%	19%	41%	0%	59%
CLARENDON	78%	22%	65%	2%	33%
COLLETON	76%	24%	63%	1%	37%
DARLINGTON	58%	43%	64%	0%	36%
DILLON	85%	15%	60%	5%	35%
DORCHESTER	77%	23%	41%	3%	56%
EDGEFIELD	79%	21%	45%	0%	55%
FAIRFIELD	86%	14%	69%	1%	29%
FLORENCE	76%	24%	68%	1%	31%
GEORGETOWN	74%	26%	42%	1%	57%
GREENVILLE	72%	28%	37%	5%	58%
GREENWOOD	75%	25%	53%	1%	45%
HAMPTON	84%	16%	73%	4%	22%
HORRY	73%	27%	32%	3%	65%
JASPER	85%	15%	55%	5%	40%
KERSHAW	81%	19%	51%	2%	48%
LANCASTER	78%	22%	36%	1%	63%
LAURENS	76%	24%	34%	2%	64%
LEE	74%	26%	82%	0%	18%
LEXINGTON	75%	25%	29%	2%	68%
McCORMICK	92%	8%	69%	0%	31%
MARION	77%	23%	77%	0%	23%
MARLBORO	89%	11%	65%	8%	27%
NEWBERRY	82%	18%	62%	2%	36%
OCONEE	71%	29%	17%	1%	82%
ORANGEBURG	82%	18%	76%	0%	23%
PICKENS	68%	32%	14%	2%	85%
RICHLAND	80%	20%	76%	1%	23%
SALUDA	88%	12%	53%	6%	41%
SPARTANBURG	70%	30%	39%	2%	59%
SUMTER	81%	19%	72%	1%	27%
UNION	72%	28%	33%	1%	67%
WILLIAMSBURG	84%	16%	75%	0%	25%
YORK	78%	22%	39%	4%	57%
TRANSITIONAL	67%	33%	50%	0%	50%
STATE TOTAL	76%	24%	47%	2%	51%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 3-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY AGE**


COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	22	24%	70	76%
AIKEN	104	28%	273	72%
ALLEDALE	5	28%	13	72%
ANDERSON	81	18%	375	82%
BAMBERG	8	21%	31	79%
BARNWELL	21	34%	41	66%
BEAUFORT	82	32%	173	68%
BERKELEY	108	23%	360	77%
CALHOUN	7	15%	40	85%
CHARLESTON	323	24%	1011	76%
CHEROKEE	91	22%	331	78%
CHESTER	29	26%	81	74%
CHESTERFIELD	20	34%	39	66%
CLARENDON	24	24%	78	76%
COLLETON	31	27%	84	73%
DARLINGTON	53	22%	187	78%
DILLON	39	30%	92	70%
DORCHESTER	80	29%	198	71%
EDGEFIELD	21	20%	82	80%
FAIRFIELD	26	27%	69	73%
FLORENCE	112	31%	248	69%
GEORGETOWN	27	25%	82	75%
GREENVILLE	281	18%	1264	82%
GREENWOOD	72	22%	249	78%
HAMPTON	6	12%	43	88%
HORRY	140	24%	438	76%
JASPER	18	29%	44	71%
KERSHAW	52	23%	171	77%
LANCASTER	43	22%	156	78%
LAURENS	56	24%	182	76%
LEE	10	26%	29	74%
LEXINGTON	138	24%	444	76%
McCORMICK	7	27%	19	73%
MARION	55	41%	78	59%
MARLBORO	20	32%	43	68%
NEWBERRY	23	23%	78	77%
OCONEE	60	20%	240	80%
ORANGEBURG	117	28%	300	72%
PICKENS	117	23%	400	77%
RICHLAND	241	26%	700	74%
SALUDA	14	27%	37	73%
SPARTANBURG	284	21%	1069	79%
SUMTER	106	29%	259	71%
UNION	18	15%	102	85%
WILLIAMSBURG	43	34%	83	66%
YORK	193	28%	486	72%
TRANSITIONAL	2	11%	16	89%
STATE TOTAL	3,430	24%	10,888	76%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 4-B
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	76%	11%	12%	0%	1%	0%	135
AIKEN	60%	14%	23%	0%	3%	0%	788
ALLENDALE	94%	5%	2%	0%	0%	0%	63
ANDERSON	60%	8%	28%	1%	3%	0%	1,230
BAMBERG	72%	4%	21%	0%	4%	0%	81
BARNWELL	78%	9%	9%	0%	4%	0%	141
BEAUFORT	82%	10%	5%	0%	2%	0%	279
BERKELEY	65%	5%	26%	0%	3%	0%	811
CALHOUN	82%	9%	4%	2%	3%	0%	92
CHARLESTON	52%	17%	29%	1%	1%	0%	2,133
CHEROKEE	65%	17%	15%	2%	1%	0%	678
CHESTER	62%	16%	20%	0%	2%	0%	176
CHESTERFIELD	71%	8%	17%	0%	4%	0%	103
CLARENDON	67%	10%	20%	0%	3%	0%	172
COLLETON	64%	10%	21%	2%	3%	0%	238
DARLINGTON	78%	10%	10%	0%	1%	0%	357
DILLON	87%	7%	4%	0%	1%	0%	141
DORCHESTER	68%	11%	18%	0%	3%	0%	609
EDGEFIELD	75%	9%	13%	1%	2%	0%	173
FAIRFIELD	58%	18%	18%	1%	5%	0%	146
FLORENCE	75%	13%	10%	0%	3%	0%	701
GEORGETOWN	68%	7%	20%	1%	3%	0%	161
GREENVILLE	59%	15%	23%	1%	2%	0%	3,052
GREENWOOD	71%	14%	13%	1%	0%	0%	547
HAMPTON	76%	6%	16%	0%	2%	0%	108
HORRY	72%	11%	12%	0%	4%	0%	897
JASPER	65%	14%	17%	0%	5%	0%	155
KERSHAW	61%	9%	24%	2%	4%	0%	325
LANCASTER	79%	11%	7%	1%	1%	0%	310
LAURENS	63%	17%	18%	1%	1%	0%	406
LEE	76%	8%	12%	0%	4%	0%	92
LEXINGTON	70%	11%	14%	4%	2%	0%	991
McCORMICK	78%	7%	14%	0%	2%	0%	58
MARION	81%	15%	3%	0%	1%	0%	171
MARLBORO	81%	11%	4%	0%	4%	0%	79
NEWBERRY	66%	14%	19%	1%	1%	0%	177
OCONEE	72%	10%	14%	1%	3%	0%	472
ORANGEBURG	65%	5%	29%	0%	1%	0%	911
PICKENS	63%	18%	18%	0%	1%	0%	848
RICHLAND	64%	15%	18%	2%	1%	0%	1,779
SALUDA	72%	5%	20%	1%	2%	0%	92
SPARTANBURG	61%	15%	21%	1%	2%	0%	2,306
SUMTER	72%	11%	16%	0%	2%	0%	581
UNION	64%	14%	20%	1%	2%	0%	225
WILLIAMSBURG	59%	8%	30%	0%	2%	0%	217
YORK	72%	11%	14%	1%	2%	0%	925
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
STATE TOTAL	65%	13%	19%	1%	2%	0%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	16,330	3,187	4,878	221	513	3	25,132
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.							

FIGURE 3
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2016



PROBATION CLOSURES BY TYPE

TABLE 5-B

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	73	68%	34	32%
AIKEN	255	70%	108	30%
ALLENDALE	30	91%	3	9%
ANDERSON	436	69%	200	31%
BAMBERG	34	69%	15	31%
BARNWELL	42	62%	26	38%
BEAUFORT	175	81%	42	19%
BERKELEY	333	76%	107	24%
CALHOUN	21	75%	7	25%
CHARLESTON	864	80%	220	20%
CHEROKEE	251	68%	116	32%
CHESTER	67	68%	31	32%
CHESTERFIELD	54	86%	9	14%
CLARENDON	69	78%	19	22%
COLLETON	107	70%	45	30%
DARLINGTON	126	77%	38	23%
DILLON	83	82%	18	18%
DORCHESTER	214	75%	72	25%
EDGEFIELD	68	82%	15	18%
FAIRFIELD	52	79%	14	21%
FLORENCE	318	75%	106	25%
GEORGETOWN	86	74%	30	26%
GREENVILLE	1401	72%	543	28%
GREENWOOD	259	83%	54	17%
HAMPTON	32	70%	14	30%
HORRY	448	69%	201	31%
JASPER	61	67%	30	33%
KERSHAW	153	72%	60	28%
LANCASTER	211	86%	34	14%
LAURENS	220	73%	83	27%
LEE	56	78%	16	22%
LEXINGTON	404	71%	168	29%
MCCORMICK	31	91%	3	9%
MARION	65	72%	25	28%
MARLBORO	50	75%	17	25%
NEWBERRY	98	77%	30	23%
OCONEE	220	81%	50	19%
ORANGEBURG	253	80%	64	20%
PICKENS	357	82%	76	18%
RICHLAND	745	69%	336	31%
SALUDA	35	69%	16	31%
SPARTANBURG	875	63%	504	37%
SUMTER	301	78%	85	22%
UNION	116	77%	35	23%
WILLIAMSBURG	116	79%	30	21%
YORK	544	80%	132	20%
TRANSITIONAL	242	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	11,051	74%	3,881	26%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION C

PAROLE

**FISCAL YEAR
2016**

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.

Tables 1-C through 3-C represents all parole admissions during FY 2016.

- Table 1-C shows parole admissions by type of offense. Violent refers to those offenses as defined by the Omnibus Crime Act, Section 16-1-60. A larger percent of parole admissions, 38%, fall into the violent category, as compared to 4% for probation admissions (see Table 1-B) and 0% for YOA admissions (see Table 1-D).
- Table 2-C describes all parole admissions by gender and race. Parole admissions consisted primarily of males (91%) with a racial composition of 60% black, 38% white, and 3% other.
- Table 3-C reflects parole admissions by age category. Majority (87%) of offenders were 25 years or older at time of admission.

Table 4-C and Figure 4 describe active parolees by level of supervision on June 30, 2016. This total does not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences. Standard risk supervision accounted for 60% of the active population, 13% were medium risk, and 16% were high risk offenders. Intensive supervision represented only 3% and sex offender supervision accounted for 8% of all active parole offenders.

Table 5-C provides data for parole 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 2016 and within that order only the main case, even though an offender may have had more than one case, was included. The overall success rate for parolees (90%) was higher than that of probationers (74%, see Table 4-B).

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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	6	38%	10	63%	16
AIKEN	29	36%	52	64%	81
ALLENDALE	3	100%	0	0%	3
ANDERSON	36	42%	49	58%	85
BAMBERG	1	20%	4	80%	5
BARNWELL	6	33%	12	67%	18
BEAUFORT	15	48%	16	52%	31
BERKELEY	25	38%	40	62%	65
CALHOUN	4	40%	6	60%	10
CHARLESTON	94	46%	109	54%	203
CHEROKEE	13	27%	35	73%	48
CHESTER	9	60%	6	40%	15
CHESTERFIELD	10	45%	12	55%	22
CLARENDON	4	18%	18	82%	22
COLLETON	8	38%	13	62%	21
DARLINGTON	8	24%	26	76%	34
DILLON	6	23%	20	77%	26
DORCHESTER	23	55%	19	45%	42
EDGEFIELD	3	14%	18	86%	21
FAIRFIELD	2	15%	11	85%	13
FLORENCE	23	30%	53	70%	76
GEORGETOWN	18	30%	43	70%	61
GREENVILLE	106	46%	123	54%	229
GREENWOOD	18	36%	32	64%	50
HAMPTON	1	9%	10	91%	11
HORRY	51	32%	109	68%	160
JASPER	10	56%	8	44%	18
KERSHAW	9	41%	13	59%	22
LANCASTER	11	50%	11	50%	22
LAURENS	17	39%	27	61%	44
LEE	1	7%	13	93%	14
LEXINGTON	46	34%	88	66%	134
McCORMICK	3	50%	3	50%	6
MARION	10	26%	28	74%	38
MARLBORO	2	6%	29	94%	31
NEWBERRY	1	9%	10	91%	11
OCONEE	9	35%	17	65%	26
ORANGEBURG	27	45%	33	55%	60
PICKENS	13	27%	36	73%	49
RICHLAND	111	45%	136	55%	247
SALUDA	3	27%	8	73%	11
SPARTANBURG	82	38%	133	62%	215
SUMTER	24	29%	58	71%	82
UNION	3	10%	27	90%	30
WILLIAMSBURG	16	44%	20	56%	36
YORK	56	35%	103	65%	159
TRANSITIONAL	40	57%	30	43%	70
STATE TOTAL	1,016	38%	1,677	62%	2,693

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	94%	6%	69%	0%	31%
AIKEN	88%	12%	42%	0%	58%
ALLEDALE	100%	0%	67%	0%	33%
ANDERSON	81%	19%	35%	2%	62%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
BARNWELL	89%	11%	56%	0%	44%
BEAUFORT	94%	6%	65%	10%	26%
BERKELEY	92%	8%	48%	3%	49%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	80%	10%	10%
CHARLESTON	99%	1%	73%	1%	25%
CHEROKEE	85%	15%	46%	0%	54%
CHESTER	100%	0%	87%	0%	13%
CHESTERFIELD	86%	14%	64%	0%	36%
CLARENDON	100%	0%	91%	0%	9%
COLLETON	81%	19%	71%	0%	29%
DARLINGTON	88%	12%	59%	0%	41%
DILLON	92%	8%	69%	8%	23%
DORCHESTER	90%	10%	60%	5%	36%
EDGEFIELD	95%	5%	57%	0%	43%
FAIRFIELD	100%	0%	77%	0%	23%
FLORENCE	88%	12%	78%	0%	22%
GEORGETOWN	90%	10%	62%	2%	36%
GREENVILLE	90%	10%	53%	3%	45%
GREENWOOD	92%	8%	70%	4%	26%
HAMPTON	73%	27%	64%	0%	36%
HORRY	94%	6%	46%	6%	48%
JASPER	94%	6%	78%	6%	17%
KERSHAW	86%	14%	64%	0%	36%
LANCASTER	95%	5%	50%	5%	45%
LAURENS	89%	11%	50%	0%	50%
LEE	86%	14%	79%	0%	21%
LEXINGTON	94%	6%	48%	1%	51%
McCORMICK	83%	17%	67%	17%	17%
MARION	95%	5%	79%	0%	21%
MARLBORO	87%	13%	61%	10%	29%
NEWBERRY	91%	9%	73%	0%	27%
OCONEE	92%	8%	31%	4%	65%
ORANGEBURG	97%	3%	82%	0%	18%
PICKENS	90%	10%	31%	2%	67%
RICHLAND	89%	11%	82%	1%	17%
SALUDA	91%	9%	64%	9%	27%
SPARTANBURG	87%	13%	44%	4%	52%
SUMTER	94%	6%	83%	1%	16%
UNION	100%	0%	50%	3%	47%
WILLIAMSBURG	86%	14%	81%	0%	19%
YORK	92%	8%	54%	3%	43%
TRANSITIONAL	87%	13%	53%	10%	37%
STATE TOTAL	91%	9%	60%	3%	38%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 3-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 Under	& Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	4	25%	12	75%
AIKEN	8	10%	73	90%
ALLENDALE	1	33%	2	67%
ANDERSON	12	14%	73	86%
BAMBERG	0	0%	5	100%
BARNWELL	3	17%	15	83%
BEAUFORT	5	16%	26	84%
BERKELEY	18	28%	47	72%
CALHOUN	3	30%	7	70%
CHARLESTON	27	13%	176	87%
CHEROKEE	3	6%	45	94%
CHESTER	0	0%	15	100%
CHESTERFIELD	5	23%	17	77%
CLARENDON	1	5%	21	95%
COLLETON	2	10%	19	90%
DARLINGTON	7	21%	27	79%
DILLON	4	15%	22	85%
DORCHESTER	5	12%	37	88%
EDGEFIELD	2	10%	19	90%
FAIRFIELD	1	8%	12	92%
FLORENCE	8	11%	68	89%
GEORGETOWN	13	21%	48	79%
GREENVILLE	17	7%	212	93%
GREENWOOD	10	20%	40	80%
HAMPTON	3	27%	8	73%
HORRY	22	14%	138	86%
JASPER	2	11%	16	89%
KERSHAW	1	5%	21	95%
LANCASTER	2	9%	20	91%
LAURENS	5	11%	39	89%
LEE	2	14%	12	86%
LEXINGTON	24	18%	110	82%
McCORMICK	2	33%	4	67%
MARION	7	18%	31	82%
MARLBORO	5	16%	26	84%
NEWBERRY	2	18%	9	82%
OCONEE	1	4%	25	96%
ORANGEBURG	13	22%	47	78%
PICKENS	6	12%	43	88%
RICHLAND	38	15%	209	85%
SALUDA	0	0%	11	100%
SPARTANBURG	17	8%	198	92%
SUMTER	10	12%	72	88%
UNION	5	17%	25	83%
WILLIAMSBURG	8	22%	28	78%
YORK	22	14%	137	86%
TRANSITIONAL	6	9%	64	91%
STATE TOTAL	362	13%	2,331	87%


Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 4-C
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%	16
AIKEN	50%	20%	14%	3%	13%	111
ALLENDALE	14%	29%	0%	0%	57%	7
ANDERSON	53%	10%	22%	2%	13%	112
BAMBERG	45%	18%	18%	0%	18%	11
BARNWELL	69%	8%	4%	0%	19%	26
BEAUFORT	85%	5%	3%	5%	3%	39
BERKELEY	59%	10%	18%	2%	11%	92
CALHOUN	50%	13%	25%	0%	13%	8
CHARLESTON	51%	15%	24%	4%	5%	256
CHEROKEE	54%	17%	15%	10%	4%	71
CHESTER	59%	16%	22%	0%	3%	32
CHESTERFIELD	52%	29%	10%	0%	10%	31
CLARENDON	59%	4%	26%	0%	11%	27
COLLETON	58%	10%	13%	10%	10%	31
DARLINGTON	63%	12%	18%	2%	4%	49
DILLON	84%	10%	3%	0%	3%	31
DORCHESTER	61%	14%	17%	1%	6%	69
EDGEFIELD	64%	8%	16%	4%	8%	25
FAIRFIELD	67%	0%	27%	7%	0%	15
FLORENCE	72%	11%	8%	2%	8%	114
GEORGETOWN	72%	7%	13%	2%	7%	60
GREENVILLE	59%	14%	18%	2%	7%	311
GREENWOOD	58%	13%	24%	2%	4%	55
HAMPTON	48%	5%	33%	5%	10%	21
HORRY	63%	16%	11%	2%	8%	206
JASPER	67%	8%	13%	4%	8%	24
KERSHAW	73%	8%	3%	0%	18%	40
LANCASTER	58%	21%	9%	6%	6%	33
LAURENS	67%	14%	16%	0%	3%	58
LEE	62%	31%	8%	0%	0%	13
LEXINGTON	58%	12%	17%	8%	5%	156
McCORMICK	75%	13%	0%	0%	13%	8
MARION	68%	15%	3%	9%	6%	34
MARLBORO	78%	0%	15%	4%	4%	27
NEWBERRY	69%	15%	15%	0%	0%	13
OCONEE	58%	16%	8%	8%	11%	38
ORANGEBURG	57%	8%	24%	3%	7%	86
PICKENS	45%	28%	13%	3%	10%	60
RICHLAND	63%	12%	16%	5%	4%	353
SALUDA	64%	9%	9%	9%	9%	11
SPARTANBURG	52%	14%	17%	5%	13%	266
SUMTER	67%	14%	10%	1%	8%	100
UNION	59%	13%	22%	0%	6%	32
WILLIAMSBURG	62%	10%	21%	3%	5%	39
YORK	63%	12%	19%	1%	5%	154
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	---	---	---	---
STATE TOTAL	60%	13%	16%	3%	8%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	2,015	448	547	107	254	3,371

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 4
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2016



**PAROLE CLOSURES BY TYPE
TABLE 5-C**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	6	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	54	93%	4	7%
ALLENDALE	3	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	47	89%	6	11%
BAMBERG	6	100%	0	0%
BARNWELL	12	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	20	87%	3	13%
BERKELEY	44	86%	7	14%
CALHOUN	3	75%	1	25%
CHARLESTON	135	87%	20	13%
CHEROKEE	38	90%	4	10%
CHESTER	14	82%	3	18%
CHESTERFIELD	13	76%	4	24%
CLARENDON	21	91%	2	9%
COLLETON	18	86%	3	14%
DARLINGTON	31	79%	8	21%
DILLON	13	93%	1	7%
DORCHESTER	24	80%	6	20%
EDGEFIELD	11	79%	3	21%
FAIRFIELD	11	100%	0	0%
FLORENCE	100	91%	10	9%
GEORGETOWN	38	88%	5	12%
GREENVILLE	176	87%	26	13%
GREENWOOD	48	98%	1	2%
HAMPTON	5	100%	0	0%
HORRY	116	85%	20	15%
JASPER	13	100%	0	0%
KERSHAW	17	81%	4	19%
LANCASTER	33	100%	0	0%
LAURENS	39	93%	3	7%
LEE	18	95%	1	5%
LEXINGTON	83	88%	11	12%
MCCORMICK	1	100%	0	0%
MARION	30	97%	1	3%
MARLBORO	23	79%	6	21%
NEWBERRY	12	100%	0	0%
OCONEE	21	95%	1	5%
ORANGEBURG	45	92%	4	8%
PICKENS	26	93%	2	7%
RICHLAND	225	95%	13	5%
SALUDA	10	91%	1	9%
SPARTANBURG	136	87%	20	13%
SUMTER	53	83%	11	17%
UNION	22	81%	5	19%
WILLIAMSBURG	42	100%	0	0%
YORK	109	94%	7	6%
TRANSITIONAL	100	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	2,065	90%	227	10%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION D

**YOUTHFUL
OFFENDERS**

**FISCAL YEAR
2016**

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.

Tables 1-D through 3-D represents all YOA admissions during FY 2016.

- Table 1-D displays YOA admissions by type of offense. Violent refers to those offenses as defined by the Omnibus Crime Act, Section 16-1-60. All YOA admissions were nonviolent.
- Table 2-D describes YOA admissions by gender and race. Admissions were predominately male (95%) and black (62%).
- Table 3-D describes YOA admissions by age category. Majority (81%) of offenders were 24 years or younger at time of admission.

Table 4-D and Figure 5 describe the active population for YOA conditional release offenders in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2016. Of the total active YOA population, 60% were supervised at standard level, 15% at medium, 23% at high, 1% at intensive, and 1% at the sex offender supervision level.

Table 5-D shows 84% of YOA offenders closing successfully compared to 90% of the parole population (See Table 4-C) and 74% of the probation population (See Table 4-B).

NOTE: This program is being taken over by the South Carolina Department of Corrections. SCDPPPS will no longer receive admissions to this program.

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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	---	---	1	100%	1
AIKEN	---	---	---	---	---
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	---	---	---	---	---
BAMBERG	---	---	---	---	---
BARNWELL	---	---	---	---	---
BEAUFORT	---	---	---	---	---
BERKELEY	---	---	1	100%	1
CALHOUN	---	---	---	---	---
CHARLESTON	---	---	1	100%	1
CHEROKEE	---	---	1	100%	1
CHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	---	---	1	100%	1
COLLETON	---	---	---	---	---
DARLINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
DILLON	---	---	---	---	---
DORCHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	---	---	---	---	---
GEORGETOWN	---	---	---	---	---
GREENVILLE	---	---	---	---	---
GREENWOOD	---	---	---	---	---
HAMPTON	---	---	---	---	---
HORRY	---	---	---	---	---
JASPER	---	---	---	---	---
KERSHAW	---	---	---	---	---
LANCASTER	---	---	---	---	---
LAURENS	---	---	---	---	---
LEE	---	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
McCORMICK	---	---	---	---	---
MARION	---	---	---	---	---
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	---	---	---	---	---
OCONEE	---	---	---	---	---
ORANGEBURG	---	---	---	---	---
PICKENS	---	---	---	---	---
RICHLAND	---	---	---	---	---
SALUDA	---	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	---	---	---	---	---
SUMTER	---	---	---	---	---
UNION	---	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMSBURG	---	---	2	100%	2
YORK	---	---	---	---	---
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	14	100%	14
STATE TOTAL	---	---	21	100%	21

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**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%
AIKEN	---	---	---	---	---
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	---	---	---	---	---
BAMBERG	---	---	---	---	---
BARNWELL	---	---	---	---	---
BEAUFORT	---	---	---	---	---
BERKELEY	100%	0%	100%	---	0%
CALHOUN	---	---	---	---	---
CHARLESTON	100%	0%	0%	---	100%
CHEROKEE	100%	0%	0%	---	100%
CHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	100%	0%	100%	---	0%
COLLETON	---	---	---	---	---
DARLINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
DILLON	---	---	---	---	---
DORCHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	---	---	---	---	---
GEORGETOWN	---	---	---	---	---
GREENVILLE	---	---	---	---	---
GREENWOOD	---	---	---	---	---
HAMPTON	---	---	---	---	---
HORRY	---	---	---	---	---
JASPER	---	---	---	---	---
KERSHAW	---	---	---	---	---
LANCASTER	---	---	---	---	---
LAURENS	---	---	---	---	---
LEE	---	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
McCORMICK	---	---	---	---	---
MARION	---	---	---	---	---
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	---	---	---	---	---
OCONEE	---	---	---	---	---
ORANGEBURG	---	---	---	---	---
PICKENS	---	---	---	---	---
RICHLAND	---	---	---	---	---
SALUDA	---	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	---	---	---	---	---
SUMTER	---	---	---	---	---
UNION	---	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMSBURG	100%	0%	100%	---	0%
YORK	---	---	---	---	---
TRANSITIONAL	93%	7%	57%	---	43%
STATE TOTAL	95%	5%	62%	---	38%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 3-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY AGE**


COUNTY	Age 24 Under	& Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	1	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	---	---	---	---
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	---	---	---	---
BAMBERG	---	---	---	---
BARNWELL	---	---	---	---
BEAUFORT	---	---	---	---
BERKELEY	1	100%	0	0%
CALHOUN	---	---	---	---
CHARLESTON	1	100%	0	0%
CHEROKEE	1	100%	0	0%
CHESTER	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	1	100%	0	0%
COLLETON	---	---	---	---
DARLINGTON	---	---	---	---
DILLON	---	---	---	---
DORCHESTER	---	---	---	---
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	---	---	---	---
GEORGETOWN	---	---	---	---
GREENVILLE	---	---	---	---
GREENWOOD	---	---	---	---
HAMPTON	---	---	---	---
HORRY	---	---	---	---
JASPER	---	---	---	---
KERSHAW	---	---	---	---
LANCASTER	---	---	---	---
LAURENS	---	---	---	---
LEE	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	---	---	---	---
McCORMICK	---	---	---	---
MARION	---	---	---	---
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	---	---	---	---
OCONEE	---	---	---	---
ORANGEBURG	---	---	---	---
PICKENS	---	---	---	---
RICHLAND	---	---	---	---
SALUDA	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	---	---	---	---
SUMTER	---	---	---	---
UNION	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMSBURG	2	100%	0	0%
YORK	---	---	---	---
TRANSITIONAL	10	71%	4	29%
STATE TOTAL	17	81%	4	19%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

**TABLE 4-D
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
AIKEN	50%	21%	21%	0%	7%	14
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
ANDERSON	54%	15%	31%	0%	0%	13
BAMBERG	---	---	---	---	---	---
BARNWELL	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
BEAUFORT	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
BERKELEY	64%	14%	21%	0%	0%	14
CALHOUN	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
CHARLESTON	50%	14%	36%	0%	0%	28
CHEROKEE	58%	8%	17%	17%	0%	12
CHESTER	---	---	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1
COLLETON	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	5
DARLINGTON	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	4
DILLON	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
DORCHESTER	29%	29%	29%	14%	0%	7
EDGEFIELD	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
FAIRFIELD	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2
FLORENCE	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	3
GEORGETOWN	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	2
GREENVILLE	69%	15%	15%	0%	0%	13
GREENWOOD	75%	13%	13%	0%	0%	8
HAMPTON	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
HORRY	44%	50%	6%	0%	0%	16
JASPER	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	4
KERSHAW	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
LANCASTER	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	2
LAURENS	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%	6
LEE	---	---	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	8
McCORMICK	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
MARION	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
OCONEE	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4
ORANGEBURG	62%	8%	31%	0%	0%	13
PICKENS	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	3
RICHLAND	36%	21%	43%	0%	0%	14
SALUDA	---	---	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	6
SUMTER	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%	6
UNION	33%	0%	33%	0%	33%	3
WILLIAMSBURG	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	6
YORK	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	4
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	---	---	---	---
STATE TOTAL	60%	15%	23%	1%	1%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	143	36	56	3	2	240
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.						

FIGURE 5
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2016



**TABLE 5-D
YOA CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	2	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	24	92%	2	8%
ALLENDALE	8	89%	1	11%
ANDERSON	13	100%	0	0%
BAMBERG	3	100%	0	0%
BARNWELL	6	86%	1	14%
BEAUFORT	13	100%	0	0%
BERKELEY	11	85%	2	15%
CALHOUN	3	75%	1	25%
CHARLESTON	55	85%	10	15%
CHEROKEE	5	71%	2	29%
CHESTER	2	100%	0	0%
CHESTERFIELD	1	50%	1	50%
CLARENDON	7	88%	1	13%
COLLETON	5	63%	3	38%
DARLINGTON	3	75%	1	25%
DILLON	2	100%	0	0%
DORCHESTER	18	72%	7	28%
EDGEFIELD	5	100%	0	0%
FAIRFIELD	1	100%	0	0%
FLORENCE	14	88%	2	13%
GEORGETOWN	6	67%	3	33%
GREENVILLE	27	82%	6	18%
GREENWOOD	6	100%	0	0%
HAMPTON	5	83%	1	17%
HORRY	28	76%	9	24%
JASPER	5	63%	3	38%
KERSHAW	1	100%	0	0%
LANCASTER	0	0%	2	100%
LAURENS	5	71%	2	29%
LEE	3	100%	0	0%
LEXINGTON	13	93%	1	7%
MCCORMICK	2	100%	0	0%
MARION	1	100%	0	0%
MARLBORO	1	100%	0	0%
NEWBERRY	1	100%	0	0%
OCONEE	1	50%	1	50%
ORANGEBURG	34	87%	5	13%
PICKENS	6	86%	1	14%
RICHLAND	47	89%	6	11%
SALUDA	19	68%	9	32%
SPARTANBURG	14	64%	8	36%
SUMTER	1	100%	0	0%
UNION	10	77%	3	23%
WILLIAMSBURG	17	81%	4	19%
YORK	45	100%	0	0%
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	---	---
STATE TOTAL	499	84%	98	16%

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION E

**SEX
OFFENDERS**

FISCAL YEAR 2016

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.

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. Table 1-E and Figure 6 compares the number of sex offenders supervised under general supervision (24%) with those in the Sex Offender Management Program (76%).

A male sex offender's level of supervision is determined by his score on the Static-99 risk assessment. The three levels of male sex offender (SO) supervision are SO-High, SO-Intensive, and SO-Containment. 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	2	50%	2	50%	4
AIKEN	32	100%	0	0%	32
ALLENDALE	4	100%	0	0%	4
ANDERSON	48	80%	12	20%	60
BAMBERG	5	83%	1	17%	6
BARNWELL	11	100%	0	0%	11
BEAUFORT	7	100%	0	0%	7
BERKELEY	36	86%	6	14%	42
CALHOUN	4	67%	2	33%	6
CHARLESTON	40	59%	28	41%	68
CHEROKEE	9	36%	16	64%	25
CHESTER	5	83%	1	17%	6
CHESTERFIELD	7	88%	1	13%	8
CLARENDON	8	80%	2	20%	10
COLLETON	11	79%	3	21%	14
DARLINGTON	7	78%	2	22%	9
DILLON	2	100%	0	0%	2
DORCHESTER	20	77%	6	23%	26
EDGEFIELD	5	63%	3	38%	8
FAIRFIELD	7	100%	0	0%	7
FLORENCE	29	85%	5	15%	34
GEORGETOWN	9	75%	3	25%	12
GREENVILLE	86	77%	26	23%	112
GREENWOOD	4	40%	6	60%	10
HAMPTON	4	80%	1	20%	5
HORRY	56	93%	4	7%	60
JASPER	9	100%	0	0%	9
KERSHAW	20	100%	0	0%	20
LANCASTER	5	71%	2	29%	7
LAURENS	8	67%	4	33%	12
LEE	4	67%	2	33%	6
LEXINGTON	29	78%	8	22%	37
McCORMICK	2	100%	0	0%	2
MARION	4	80%	1	20%	5
MARLBORO	4	57%	3	43%	7
NEWBERRY	1	25%	3	75%	4
OCONEE	16	64%	9	36%	25
ORANGEBURG	12	80%	3	20%	15
PICKENS	18	75%	6	25%	24
RICHLAND	33	54%	28	46%	61
SALUDA	3	60%	2	40%	5
SPARTANBURG	85	80%	21	20%	106
SUMTER	17	94%	1	6%	18
UNION	7	100%	0	0%	7
WILLIAMSBURG	7	78%	2	22%	9
YORK	23	64%	13	36%	36
STATE TOTAL	765	76%	238	24%	1,003

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 6
ACTIVE SEX OFFENDERS UNDER SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2016



SECTION F

VIOLATIONS

FISCAL YEAR 2016

VIOLATIONS & CLOSURES

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 4,700 violation hearings were held during the fiscal year. At those hearings, 3,059 cases were continued or recommended for continuation, while 1,641 cases were revoked or recommended for revocation.

Table 2-F shows fees collected in FY 2016 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, \$182,154.62 was collected in delinquent restitution payments, \$238,288.11 in supervision fees and \$64,250.54 in court ordered fines and fees. The total to \$484,693.27 collected demonstrates the effectiveness of the Administrative Hearing Process in bringing offenders who have the means to become compliant with their monetary obligations.

Table 3-F provides a comparison of changes in active population and the types of closure for FY 2012 to FY 2016. Of the 17,821 closures during FY 2016, 76% closed successfully. Majority (74%) of unsuccessful closures resulted in compliance revocations.

**TABLE 1-F
VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY**

COUNTY	Cases Heard	Cases Revoked or Recommended for Revocation Cases	Continued or Recommended for Continuation
ABBEVILLE	6	1	5
AIKEN	59	6	53
ALLENDALE	17	14	3
ANDERSON	480	147	333
BAMBERG	13	4	9
BARNWELL	32	4	28
BEAUFORT	8	5	3
BERKELEY	105	32	73
CALHOUN	4	1	3
CHARLESTON	423	212	211
CHEROKEE	149	37	112
CHESTER	36	28	8
CHESTERFIELD	6	2	4
CLARENDON	10	4	6
COLLETON	71	40	31
DARLINGTON	12	7	5
DILLON	3	3	0
DORCHESTER	228	101	127
EDGEFIELD	21	8	13
FAIRFIELD	2	0	2
FLORENCE	69	15	54
GEORGETOWN	31	25	6
GREENVILLE	949	192	757
GREENWOOD	32	10	22
HAMPTON	24	13	11
HORRY	51	14	37
JASPER	42	21	21
KERSHAW	47	26	21
LANCASTER	32	17	15
LAURENS	42	20	22
LEE	3	0	3
LEXINGTON	238	32	206
McCORMICK	4	0	4
MARION	4	4	0
MARLBORO	11	3	8
NEWBERRY	76	37	39
OCONEE	81	18	63
ORANGEBURG	196	66	130
PICKENS	114	55	59
RICHLAND	323	100	223
SALUDA	36	18	18
SPARTANBURG	356	205	151
SUMTER	96	24	72
UNION	31	15	16
WILLIAMSBURG	3	3	0
YORK	124	52	72
TRANSITIONAL	0	0	0
STATE TOTAL	4,700	1,641	3,059

TABLE 2-F				
FEES COLLECTED THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS PROCESS				
Month	Supervision Fee	Fine/Court Cost	Restitution	Total
July 2015	\$ 16,535.00	\$ 4,701.80	\$ 10,085.82	\$ 31,322.62
August	\$ 13,498.00	\$ 6,896.49	\$ 12,515.32	\$ 32,909.81
September	\$ 19,269.50	\$ 5,157.93	\$ 17,606.85	\$ 42,034.28
October	\$ 11,976.00	\$ 3,256.60	\$ 10,560.28	\$ 25,792.88
November	\$ 12,764.00	\$ 3,951.12	\$ 8,911.00	\$ 25,626.12
December	\$ 12,926.97	\$ 4,220.64	\$ 10,975.20	\$ 28,122.81
January 2016	\$ 17,724.77	\$ 5,012.14	\$ 17,564.29	\$ 40,301.20
February	\$ 19,571.80	\$ 4,478.60	\$ 11,030.50	\$ 35,080.90
March	\$ 45,491.16	\$ 7,698.05	\$ 23,810.72	\$ 76,999.93
April	\$ 32,141.52	\$ 6,136.63	\$ 19,494.57	\$ 57,772.72
May	\$ 17,558.59	\$ 6,306.70	\$ 16,317.73	\$ 40,183.02
June 2016	\$ 18,830.80	\$ 6,433.84	\$ 23,282.34	\$ 48,546.98
Total	\$ 238,288.11	\$ 64,250.54	\$ 182,154.62	\$484,693.27

CLOSURES BY TYPE

TABLE 3-F

FY 2016	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Ret-CD ⁶	
Probation	25,132	11,051	20	3	549	2,922	387	3,881
Parole	2,030	490	4	0	20	71	0	95
YOA	240	499	0	0	18	80	0	98
Other Releases	1,341	1,575	108	0	0	24	0	132
Total	28,743	13,615	132	3	587	3,097	387	4,206
% Unsuccessful			3.1%	0.1%	14.0%	73.6%	9.2%	

FY 2015	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Ret-CD ⁶	
Probation	26,806	10,987	13	3	504	2,374	311	3,205
Parole	2,007	409	7	0	11	45	0	63
YOA	591	397	7	0	45	168	0	220
Other Releases	1,525	1,414	32	0	2	11	0	45
Total	30,929	13,207	59	3	562	2,598	311	3,533
% Unsuccessful			1.7%	0.1%	15.9%	73.5%	8.8%	

FY 2014	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Ret-CD ⁶	
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%	20.2%	71.9%	6.0%	

FY 2013	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Ret-CD ⁶	
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							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Rev-TC ⁵	
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
% Unsuccessful			2.0%	0.3%	19.9%	77.8%	0.0%	

FY 2011	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Rev-TC ⁵	
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
% Unsuccessful			2.6%	0.1%	9.9%	81.1%	6.2%	

FY 2010	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Rev-TC ⁵	
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
% Unsuccessful			2.8%	0.1%	9.5%	82.0%	5.6%	

FY 2009	Active							Total
	Population	Successful	Exp-I ¹	JC-I ²	Rev-C ³	Rev-T ⁴	Rev-TC ⁵	
Probation	26,694	10,092	29	6	446	4,494	207	5,182
Parole	1,653	577	7	0	14	117	7	145
YOA	2,053	550	14	0	44	614	34	706
Other Releases	1,297	645	220	0	0	0	0	220
Total	31,697	11,864	270	6	504	5,225	248	6,253
% Unsuccessful			4.3%	0.1%	8.1%	83.6%	4.0%	

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

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION G


**ELECTRONIC
SURVEILLANCE**

FISCAL YEAR 2016

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

The Department utilizes electronic surveillance to monitor certain offenders. On June 8, 2006, Jessie's Law, a bill aimed at protecting the 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. The use of Active-GPS enhances public safety and provides a more modern and efficient way to ensure accountability and enforce home detention and curfews for those offenders requiring a heightened supervision strategy. Of the 880 offenders on Active GPS on June 15, 2016, 590 (67%) offenders were placed on GPS under Jessie's Law.

FIGURE 7
OFFENDERS ON ACTIVE GPS
FISCAL YEAR 2016



SECTION H

SUMMARY

**FISCAL YEAR
2016**

SUMMARY

Figure 8 compares monthly DNA collections during FY 2016.

Table 1-H shows drug testing activity during FY 2016. This table represents the number of individual offenders tested (21,134), the number of individuals testing positive (9,984), the total number of positive tests (19,315) and the number of times offenders were tested (28,500).

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


Population Overview:

- The proportion of violent offenses among YOA admissions (0%) and parole admissions (38%) decreased between FY 2015 and FY 2016 while probationers (4%) remained the same.
- Overall, the most utilized level of supervision was standard (64%), followed by high (19%), medium (13%), sex offender (3%), and intensive (1%) for all active cases.
- The overall success rate for closures was 76%, a nominal decrease from the previous fiscal year. The overall success rate for parolees decreased to 90%. Both probationers (74%) and YOA offenders (84%) had less successful closures rates than parolees, but YOA offenders showed a 20% increase from the previous fiscal year.
- Of the 21,134 offenders tested for drug use while under supervision, 9,984 or 47.2% tested positive for drugs.

Figure 9 compares the number of admissions for each fiscal year from 1997 to 2016. Admissions decreased for FY 2015 by 0.5% from the previous fiscal year.

Figure 10 shows the percentage of violent admissions by program type for FY 2007 to FY 2016.

FIGURE 8
MONTHLY DNA COLLECTIONS
FISCAL YEAR 2016



**TABLE 1-H
OFFENDER DRUG TESTING**

COUNTY	INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED	INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE	PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	TOTAL NUMBER OF POSITIVE TESTS	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS WERE TESTED
ABBEVILLE	76	36	47%	69	78
AIKEN	439	170	39%	325	482
ALLENDALE	50	29	58%	65	62
ANDERSON	1199	612	51%	1421	1789
BAMBERG	45	18	40%	27	56
BARNWELL	147	76	52%	197	231
BEAUFORT	555	240	43%	443	1318
BERKELEY	462	160	35%	290	506
CALHOUN	99	40	40%	74	138
CHARLESTON	1240	671	54%	1223	1629
CHEROKEE	654	336	51%	721	850
CHESTER	136	62	46%	131	177
CHESTERFIELD	146	56	38%	122	253
CLARENDON	53	21	40%	51	66
COLLETON	254	152	60%	307	377
DARLINGTON	272	144	53%	243	302
DILLON	45	3	7%	6	48
DORCHESTER	427	231	54%	503	584
EDGEFIELD	167	90	54%	170	215
FAIRFIELD	152	86	57%	131	189
FLORENCE	637	305	48%	567	935
GEORGETOWN	224	89	40%	155	316
GREENVILLE	2620	1097	42%	2046	3208
GREENWOOD	387	186	48%	325	469
HAMPTON	88	49	56%	76	109
HORRY	729	266	36%	501	939
JASPER	107	41	38%	65	135
KERSHAW	233	129	55%	230	303
LANCASTER	364	192	53%	355	523
LAURENS	466	191	41%	358	665
LEE	71	24	34%	30	88
LEXINGTON	852	412	48%	1002	1188
MCCORMICK	41	13	32%	26	57
MARION	184	90	49%	144	230
MARLBORO	71	36	51%	52	78
NEWBERRY	164	89	54%	159	224
OCONEE	193	91	47%	219	215
ORANGEBURG	559	313	56%	481	622
PICKENS	697	366	53%	857	881
RICHLAND	1724	814	47%	1552	2441
SALUDA	70	26	37%	39	78
SPARTANBURG	2298	1057	46%	2037	3187
SUMTER	561	298	53%	485	761
UNION	166	79	48%	153	203
WILLIAMSBURG	111	56	50%	88	129
YORK	892	439	49%	787	1159
CENTRAL	7	3	43%	7	7
STATE TOTAL	21,134	9,984	47%	19,315	28,500

**TABLE 2-H
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**

ADMISSIONS								
CATEGORY	Probation		Parole		YOA		Total	
	FY 15	FY 16	FY 15	FY 16	FY 15	FY 16	FY 15	FY 16
RACE:								
BLACK	46%	47%	63%	60%	59%	62%	49%	49%
WHITE	52%	51%	36%	38%	41%	38%	49%	49%
OTHER	2%	2%	2%	3%	0%	0%	2%	2%
GENDER:								
MALE	77%	76%	92%	91%	89%	95%	79%	78%
FEMALE	23%	24%	8%	9%	11%	5%	21%	22%
OFFENSE TYPE:								
VIOLENT	4%	4%	37%	38%	3%	0%	9%	9%
NON-VIOLENT	96%	96%	63%	62%	97%	100%	91%	91%

ACTIVES								
LEVEL OF SUPERVISION:								
STANDARD	62%	65%	57%	60%	49%	60%	61%	64%
MEDIUM	14%	13%	14%	13%	20%	15%	14%	13%
HIGH	20%	19%	18%	16%	27%	23%	20%	19%
INTENSIVE	1%	1%	4%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%
SEX OFFENDER	2%	2%	7%	8%	1%	1%	3%	3%
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	---	0%	---	---	---	---	---	0%

CLOSURES								
CASE OUTCOME:								
SUCCESSFUL	77%	74%	94%	90%	64%	84%	79%	76%
UNSUCCESSFUL	23%	26%	6%	10%	36%	16%	21%	24%

DRUG TESTING		
	FY 15	FY 16
INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED	19,571	21,134
INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE	9,381	9,984
PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	47.93%	47.24%
TOTAL POSITIVE TESTS	17,662	19,315
NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS TESTED	25,139	28,500

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 9
ADMISSIONS: A 20-YEAR COMPARISON





FIGURE 10
PERCENTAGE OF VIOLENT ADMISSIONS BY PROGRAM TYPE



1st Printing/SCDPPS
10 copies of this document were published: \$5.07 per copy/\$50.70 total.