



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

# **ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT**

**FISCAL YEAR  
2013**

**KELA E. THOMAS  
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.

***Kela E. Thomas, Director***

Post Office Box 50666  
Columbia, South Carolina 29250  
803-734-9220  
[www.dppps.sc.gov](http://www.dppps.sc.gov)

**Office of Executive Programs and Grants Management**

Arnise Moultrie, Program Administrator

**Division of Field Operations**

Marchar Stagg, Senior Statistical & Research Analyst

## Message from the Director

I am pleased to present this year's Annual Statistical Report. As an agency, we accomplished benchmarked results, utilizing Evidence-Based Practices supervision strategies and focusing on mission-driven priorities. This report depicts the Department's successes and areas of greater opportunity.

The Annual Statistical Report for Fiscal Year 2013 has been compiled for your review and reference. This report provides a statistical representation of the work of 590 employees of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS) including 342 caseload carrying Agents. While there have been many challenges over the course of the year, I am pleased to report that 75% of our probationers and 93% of our parolees successfully completed supervision. The Bureau of Justice Statistics of the United States Department of Justice (2012) reported nationally that approximately 68% of probationers and 58% of parolees successfully met the conditions of their supervision.


This Department operates its offender programs within a clear framework of public safety in supervising the 47,529 offenders under our jurisdiction. 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.

In addition, 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.

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.

For additional information or clarification, please contact Arnise Moultrie in the Office of Executive Programs and Public Policy at 803-734-9220.

Sincerely,

  
Kela E. Thomas  
Director

---

## To the Reader

---

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. The description of Actives represents only those offenders who had at least one active case on June 30, 2013.

Fiscal Year 2013 (FY 2013) began on July 1, 2012 and ended on June 30, 2013. At the end of FY 2013, there were 47,529 offenders under the legal jurisdiction of the Department. 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, 33,842 offenders were under active supervision of the Department.

In addition, due to rounding, some of the totals will not equal 100%.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

### SECTION A---TOTAL POPULATION

TABLE 1-A	Total Admissions by Program Type .....	10
TABLE 2-A	Total Admissions by Type of Offense .....	11
TABLE 3-A	Total Admissions by Gender & Race .....	12
FIGURE 1	Total Admissions by Gender & Race .....	13
TABLE 4-A	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	14
FIGURE 2	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	15
TABLE 5-A	Total Closures by Type .....	16
TABLE 6-A	Total Admissions by Age .....	17

### SECTION B---PROBATION

TABLE 1-B	Probation Admissions by Type of Offense .....	21
TABLE 2-B	Probation Admissions by Gender & Race .....	22
TABLE 3-B	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	23
FIGURE 3	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	24
TABLE 4-B	Probation Closures by Type .....	25
TABLE 5-B	Probation Admissions by Age .....	26

### SECTION C---PAROLE

TABLE 1-C	Parole Admissions by Type of Offense .....	29
TABLE 2-C	Parole Admissions by Gender & Race .....	30
TABLE 3-C	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	31
FIGURE 4	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	32
TABLE 4-C	Parole Closures by Type .....	33
TABLE 5-C	Parole Admissions by Age .....	34

### SECTION D---YOA

TABLE 1-D	YOA Admissions by Type of Offense .....	37
TABLE 2-D	YOA Admissions by Gender & Race .....	38
TABLE 3-D	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	39
FIGURE 5	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision .....	40
TABLE 4-D	YOA Closures by Type .....	41
TABLE 5-D	YOA Admissions by Age .....	42

## SECTION E---SEX OFFENDERS

TABLE 1-E	Active Sex Offenders .....	45
FIGURE 6	Active Sex Offenders .....	46

## SECTION F---VIOLATIONS

TABLE 1-F	Violations by County .....	49
TABLE 2-F	Closures by Type .....	50
TABLE 3-F	Administrative Hearing Collections .....	51

## SECTION G---ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

FIGURE 7	Offenders on Electronic Monitoring.....	54
FIGURE 8	Offenders on GPS .....	55

## SECTION H---SUMMARY

TABLE 1-H	Offender Referrals .....	59
TABLE 2-H	DNA Collections by County.....	60
FIGURE 9	Monthly DNA Collections .....	61
TABLE 3-H	Offender Drug Testing .....	62
TABLE 4-H	Population Characteristics .....	63
FIGURE 10	Admissions: A 20-Year Comparison .....	64
FIGURE 11	Violent Admissions by Program Status .....	65

**SECTION A**

**TOTAL  
POPULATION**

**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## TOTAL POPULATION

Tables 1-A through 6-A and Figures 1 and 2, represent admissions to the SCDPPPS during FY 2013. 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 2013, there were 17,218 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. The counties of Charleston, Greenville, Richland and Spartanburg contributed the largest number of total admissions, together accounting for 35.2% of all admissions.

### **Explanation of Program Types**

**Probation:** Includes Probation, Probation Termination 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 versus non-violent. 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. This figure is up one percentage point from last year.

Table 3-A and Figure 1 illustrate total admissions by gender and race. Admissions overall continue to be predominately male at 80%, with a racial composition of 51% black, 47% white, and 2% of other races.

Table 4-A and Figure 2 describe all active offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2013. This total does not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences. The level of supervision determines how often the offender is seen by the Agent. During the fiscal year, the levels of supervision were reconfigured to include standard, medium, high, intensive, and sex offender. A Medium supervision level was added in 2013 to differentiate risk to maximize the use of resources, match the intensity and duration of supervision to the level of risk while utilizing a differential supervision strategy in which high risk offender populations are supervised at a more intense level than medium and low risk individuals. Among all offenders, and standard supervision represented 62%, medium, 10%, and high level supervision



represented 24%. 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 2013 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 2013 was 76%, an increase of 5% from last fiscal year. The unsuccessful rate, 24%, 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	99	93%	7	7%	1	1%	107
AIKEN	349	81%	71	16%	12	3%	432
ALLENDALE	13	81%	1	6%	2	13%	16
ANDERSON	613	88%	68	10%	17	2%	698
BAMBERG	49	91%	5	9%	0	0%	54
BARNWELL	69	86%	6	8%	5	6%	80
BEAUFORT	206	86%	20	8%	14	6%	240
BERKELEY	425	89%	35	7%	19	4%	479
CALHOUN	38	86%	4	9%	2	5%	44
CHARLESTON	1,142	86%	140	10%	53	4%	1,335
CHEROKEE	312	89%	26	7%	12	3%	350
CHESTER	132	86%	19	12%	3	2%	154
CHESTERFIELD	49	72%	15	22%	4	6%	68
CLARENDON	120	87%	13	9%	5	4%	138
COLLETON	147	88%	10	6%	11	7%	168
DARLINGTON	166	80%	29	14%	12	6%	207
DILLON	112	83%	11	8%	12	9%	135
DORCHESTER	287	87%	25	8%	17	5%	329
EDGEFIELD	151	91%	12	7%	3	2%	166
FAIRFIELD	84	84%	10	10%	6	6%	100
FLORENCE	582	86%	72	11%	23	3%	677
GEORGETOWN	126	70%	36	20%	18	10%	180
GREENVILLE	1,836	91%	141	7%	36	2%	2,013
GREENWOOD	172	80%	33	15%	9	4%	214
HAMPTON	36	72%	9	18%	5	10%	50
HORRY	685	82%	114	14%	34	4%	833
JASPER	74	80%	16	17%	3	3%	93
KERSHAW	120	85%	18	13%	3	2%	141
LANCASTER	212	86%	28	11%	7	3%	247
LAURENS	238	84%	27	9%	20	7%	285
LEE	84	88%	7	7%	5	5%	96
LEXINGTON	590	84%	88	13%	24	3%	702
McCORMICK	35	90%	3	8%	1	3%	39
MARION	140	84%	20	12%	7	4%	167
MARLBORO	56	73%	15	19%	6	8%	77
NEWBERRY	148	87%	13	8%	10	6%	171
OCONEE	200	88%	21	9%	5	2%	226
ORANGEBURG	410	85%	51	11%	20	4%	481
PICKENS	516	94%	26	5%	7	1%	549
RICHLAND	872	80%	172	16%	45	4%	1,089
SALUDA	77	87%	10	11%	2	2%	89
SPARTANBURG	1,460	89%	142	9%	31	2%	1,633
SUMTER	363	80%	72	16%	20	4%	455
UNION	169	85%	22	11%	7	4%	198
WILLIAMSBURG	149	82%	22	12%	10	6%	181
YORK	812	85%	114	12%	34	4%	960
TRANSITIONAL	3	4%	42	58%	27	38%	72
STATE TOTAL	14,728	86%	1,861	11%	629	4%	17,218


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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	6	6%	101	94%	107
AIKEN	61	14%	371	86%	432
ALLENDALE	1	6%	15	94%	16
ANDERSON	91	13%	607	87%	698
BAMBERG	2	4%	52	96%	54
BARNWELL	4	5%	76	95%	80
BEAUFORT	16	7%	224	93%	240
BERKELEY	33	7%	446	93%	479
CALHOUN	3	7%	41	93%	44
CHARLESTON	95	7%	1,240	93%	1,335
CHEROKEE	40	11%	310	89%	350
CHESTER	16	10%	138	90%	154
CHESTERFIELD	13	19%	55	81%	68
CLARENDON	6	4%	132	96%	138
COLLETON	13	8%	155	92%	168
DARLINGTON	20	10%	187	90%	207
DILLON	3	2%	132	98%	135
DORCHESTER	24	7%	305	93%	329
EDGEFIELD	14	8%	152	92%	166
FAIRFIELD	6	6%	94	94%	100
FLORENCE	48	7%	629	93%	677
GEORGETOWN	23	13%	157	87%	180
GREENVILLE	183	9%	1,830	91%	2,013
GREENWOOD	21	10%	193	90%	214
HAMPTON	7	14%	43	86%	50
HORRY	60	7%	773	93%	833
JASPER	9	10%	84	90%	93
KERSHAW	15	11%	126	89%	141
LANCASTER	23	9%	224	91%	247
LAURENS	30	11%	255	89%	285
LEE	5	5%	91	95%	96
LEXINGTON	76	11%	626	89%	702
McCORMICK	4	10%	35	90%	39
MARION	6	4%	161	96%	167
MARLBORO	7	9%	70	91%	77
NEWBERRY	14	8%	157	92%	171
OCONEE	17	8%	209	92%	226
ORANGEBURG	35	7%	446	93%	481
PICKENS	41	7%	508	93%	549
RICHLAND	127	12%	962	88%	1,089
SALUDA	7	8%	82	92%	89
SPARTANBURG	181	11%	1,452	89%	1,633
SUMTER	39	9%	416	91%	455
UNION	15	8%	183	92%	198
WILLIAMSBURG	18	10%	163	90%	181
YORK	76	8%	884	92%	960
TRANSITIONAL	23	32%	49	68%	72
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>1,577</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>15,641</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>17,218</b>

**TABLE 3-A**  
**TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**  
**N=17,218**

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	70%	30%	43%	1%	56%
AIKEN	81%	19%	47%	1%	51%
ALLENDALE	88%	13%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	78%	22%	34%	1%	65%
BAMBERG	85%	15%	63%	0%	37%
BARNWELL	81%	19%	60%	0%	40%
BEAUFORT	80%	20%	53%	4%	43%
BERKELEY	81%	19%	43%	2%	55%
CALHOUN	84%	16%	66%	0%	34%
CHARLESTON	83%	17%	67%	1%	31%
CHEROKEE	74%	26%	29%	0%	71%
CHESTER	82%	18%	58%	0%	42%
CHESTERFIELD	87%	13%	51%	1%	47%
CLARENDON	84%	16%	78%	0%	22%
COLLETON	81%	19%	52%	2%	46%
DARLINGTON	79%	21%	65%	0%	35%
DILLON	81%	19%	49%	6%	45%
DORCHESTER	78%	22%	51%	2%	47%
EDGEFIELD	77%	23%	57%	1%	43%
FAIRFIELD	83%	17%	76%	0%	24%
FLORENCE	83%	17%	65%	2%	34%
GEORGETOWN	83%	17%	52%	0%	48%
GREENVILLE	77%	23%	43%	4%	54%
GREENWOOD	78%	22%	53%	2%	45%
HAMPTON	92%	8%	70%	0%	30%
HORRY	80%	20%	33%	3%	64%
JASPER	80%	20%	72%	1%	27%
KERSHAW	87%	13%	43%	1%	56%
LANCASTER	86%	14%	50%	2%	49%
LAURENS	75%	25%	38%	0%	61%
LEE	86%	14%	90%	0%	10%
LEXINGTON	81%	19%	33%	3%	64%
McCORMICK	72%	28%	69%	0%	31%
MARION	86%	14%	75%	2%	23%
MARLBORO	82%	18%	60%	9%	31%
NEWBERRY	83%	17%	60%	1%	40%
OCONEE	79%	21%	21%	2%	77%
ORANGEBURG	83%	17%	79%	1%	21%
PICKENS	77%	23%	14%	2%	84%
RICHLAND	84%	16%	78%	1%	21%
SALUDA	87%	13%	62%	1%	37%
SPARTANBURG	76%	24%	42%	2%	56%
SUMTER	79%	21%	78%	1%	22%
UNION	80%	20%	46%	0%	54%
WILLIAMSBURG	90%	10%	86%	1%	13%
YORK	78%	22%	45%	2%	53%
TRANSITIONAL	86%	14%	44%	7%	49%
STATE TOTAL	80%	20%	51%	2%	47%


**FIGURE 1**  
**TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**  
**FY 2013**



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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	67%	11%	18%	1%	3%	174
AIKEN	62%	7%	25%	1%	5%	1,119
ALLENDALE	49%	21%	28%	0%	3%	78
ANDERSON	64%	11%	20%	1%	4%	1,723
BAMBERG	73%	8%	17%	0%	2%	147
BARNWELL	70%	13%	14%	1%	2%	182
BEAUFORT	68%	13%	15%	0%	3%	418
BERKELEY	66%	11%	19%	1%	3%	945
CALHOUN	68%	15%	10%	4%	2%	97
CHARLESTON	59%	7%	31%	1%	2%	2,899
CHEROKEE	62%	11%	22%	2%	2%	698
CHESTER	54%	12%	31%	1%	2%	251
CHESTERFIELD	67%	16%	13%	1%	3%	128
CLARENDON	66%	10%	21%	0%	3%	263
COLLETON	57%	16%	22%	1%	4%	359
DARLINGTON	63%	11%	23%	1%	2%	341
DILLON	73%	5%	17%	1%	3%	156
DORCHESTER	63%	7%	27%	1%	3%	883
EDGEFIELD	65%	7%	26%	0%	1%	299
FAIRFIELD	72%	13%	12%	2%	0%	210
FLORENCE	64%	11%	21%	1%	3%	1,063
GEORGETOWN	69%	11%	16%	1%	2%	322
GREENVILLE	61%	10%	26%	1%	2%	4,417
GREENWOOD	53%	2%	41%	1%	2%	524
HAMPTON	78%	8%	13%	0%	1%	139
HORRY	66%	10%	19%	1%	4%	1,375
JASPER	65%	16%	16%	1%	4%	199
KERSHAW	59%	8%	27%	2%	4%	295
LANCASTER	60%	14%	23%	1%	2%	564
LAURENS	60%	18%	18%	1%	3%	544
LEE	64%	15%	20%	0%	1%	148
LEXINGTON	64%	10%	21%	1%	3%	1,317
McCORMICK	65%	9%	20%	1%	4%	89
MARION	68%	14%	16%	0%	1%	211
MARLBORO	55%	22%	19%	1%	3%	104
NEWBERRY	47%	9%	37%	4%	4%	268
OCONEE	63%	13%	17%	1%	6%	437
ORANGEBURG	74%	13%	11%	1%	1%	959
PICKENS	54%	10%	32%	1%	3%	991
RICHLAND	65%	6%	26%	2%	2%	2,695
SALUDA	60%	6%	26%	3%	5%	117
SPARTANBURG	58%	13%	25%	1%	3%	2,782
SUMTER	62%	10%	24%	1%	2%	911
UNION	57%	8%	32%	1%	1%	338
WILLIAMSBURG	57%	9%	28%	2%	4%	331
YORK	57%	13%	27%	1%	3%	1,327
TRANSITIONAL	20%	20%	60%	0%	0%	5
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>	
<b>ACTIVE OFFENDERS</b>	<b>20,963</b>	<b>3,439</b>	<b>8,152</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>913</b>	<b>33,842</b>

**FIGURE 2  
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION  
JUNE 30, 2013**



**CONTACT STANDARDS**

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

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

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	80	82%	17	18%
AIKEN	319	77%	95	23%
ALLENDALE	28	74%	10	26%
ANDERSON	458	83%	92	17%
BAMBERG	28	62%	17	38%
BARNWELL	57	69%	26	31%
BEAUFORT	187	80%	46	20%
BERKELEY	351	82%	77	18%
CALHOUN	37	80%	9	20%
CHARLESTON	1,047	80%	257	20%
CHEROKEE	171	66%	88	34%
CHESTER	126	79%	33	21%
CHESTERFIELD	80	86%	13	14%
CLARENDON	92	77%	27	23%
COLLETON	150	78%	42	22%
DARLINGTON	154	75%	52	25%
DILLON	112	84%	22	16%
DORCHESTER	238	84%	46	16%
EDGEFIELD	71	78%	20	22%
FAIRFIELD	63	72%	25	28%
FLORENCE	489	79%	129	21%
GEORGETOWN	153	71%	62	29%
GREENVILLE	1,070	71%	444	29%
GREENWOOD	181	68%	85	32%
HAMPTON	51	89%	6	11%
HORRY	643	76%	203	24%
JASPER	80	77%	24	23%
KERSHAW	103	78%	29	22%
LANCASTER	162	69%	74	31%
LAURENS	223	70%	96	30%
LEE	43	70%	18	30%
LEXINGTON	432	74%	155	26%
MCCORMICK	24	73%	9	27%
MARION	121	84%	23	16%
MARLBORO	73	74%	25	26%
NEWBERRY	131	74%	46	26%
OCONEE	133	74%	47	26%
ORANGEBURG	276	80%	70	20%
PICKENS	324	78%	92	22%
RICHLAND	635	67%	307	33%
SALUDA	40	87%	6	13%
SPARTANBURG	771	61%	490	39%
SUMTER	250	71%	100	29%
UNION	138	74%	48	26%
WILLIAMSBURG	114	78%	33	22%
YORK	615	86%	96	14%
TRANSITIONAL	432	100%	0	0%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>11,556</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>3,731</b>	<b>24%</b>



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

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	22	21%	85	79%
AIKEN	94	22%	338	78%
ALLENDALE	8	50%	8	50%
ANDERSON	138	20%	560	80%
BAMBERG	15	28%	39	72%
BARNWELL	25	31%	55	69%
BEAUFORT	86	36%	154	64%
BERKELEY	132	28%	347	72%
CALHOUN	14	32%	30	68%
CHARLESTON	388	29%	947	71%
CHEROKEE	76	22%	274	78%
CHESTER	47	31%	107	69%
CHESTERFIELD	22	32%	46	68%
CLARENDON	43	31%	95	69%
COLLETON	62	37%	106	63%
DARLINGTON	75	36%	132	64%
DILLON	57	42%	78	58%
DORCHESTER	108	33%	221	67%
EDGEFIELD	45	27%	121	73%
FAIRFIELD	29	29%	71	71%
FLORENCE	191	28%	486	72%
GEORGETOWN	78	43%	102	57%
GREENVILLE	461	23%	1552	77%
GREENWOOD	47	22%	167	78%
HAMPTON	16	32%	34	68%
HORRY	265	32%	568	68%
JASPER	25	27%	68	73%
KERSHAW	46	33%	95	67%
LANCASTER	69	28%	178	72%
LAURENS	72	25%	213	75%
LEE	28	29%	68	71%
LEXINGTON	194	28%	508	72%
McCORMICK	8	21%	31	79%
MARION	45	27%	122	73%
MARLBORO	27	35%	50	65%
NEWBERRY	57	33%	114	67%
OCONEE	49	22%	177	78%
ORANGEBURG	141	29%	340	71%
PICKENS	125	23%	424	77%
RICHLAND	360	33%	729	67%
SALUDA	18	20%	71	80%
SPARTANBURG	362	22%	1271	78%
SUMTER	129	28%	326	72%
UNION	54	27%	144	73%
WILLIAMSBURG	64	35%	117	65%
YORK	303	32%	657	68%
TRANSITIONAL	29	40%	43	60%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>4,749</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>12,469</b>	<b>72%</b>



**SECTION B**

**PROBATION**

**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## 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 2013. 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 Guilt by Reason of Insanity).

Table 1-B shows probation admissions in terms of offense type, violent or non-violent. For FY 2013, 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 78%, with a racial composition of 48% black, 2% other, and 50% white.

Table 3-B and Figure 3 describe the active probation offender population in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2013. 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 63%, the medium supervision level represented 10%, high level represented 24% of the population, intensive supervision at 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 75%, slightly lower than the total offender population success rate of 76%.

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	6	6%	93	94%	99
AIKEN	37	11%	312	89%	349
ALLENDALE	0	0%	13	100%	13
ANDERSON	46	8%	567	92%	613
BAMBERG	1	2%	48	98%	49
BARNWELL	3	4%	66	96%	69
BEAUFORT	8	4%	198	96%	206
BERKELEY	17	4%	408	96%	425
CALHOUN	0	0%	38	100%	38
CHARLESTON	19	2%	1,123	98%	1,142
CHEROKEE	28	9%	284	91%	312
CHESTER	9	7%	123	93%	132
CHESTERFIELD	4	8%	45	92%	49
CLARENDON	1	1%	119	99%	120
COLLETON	6	4%	141	96%	147
DARLINGTON	8	5%	158	95%	166
DILLON	0	0%	112	100%	112
DORCHESTER	10	3%	277	97%	287
EDGEFIELD	12	8%	139	92%	151
FAIRFIELD	2	2%	82	98%	84
FLORENCE	21	4%	561	96%	582
GEORGETOWN	3	2%	123	98%	126
GREENVILLE	113	6%	1,723	94%	1,836
GREENWOOD	4	2%	168	98%	172
HAMPTON	0	0%	36	100%	36
HORRY	16	2%	669	98%	685
JASPER	2	3%	72	97%	74
KERSHAW	7	6%	113	94%	120
LANCASTER	9	4%	203	96%	212
LAURENS	16	7%	222	93%	238
LEE	3	4%	81	96%	84
LEXINGTON	29	5%	561	95%	590
McCORMICK	2	6%	33	94%	35
MARION	2	1%	138	99%	140
MARLBORO	2	4%	54	96%	56
NEWBERRY	5	3%	143	97%	148
OCONEE	9	5%	191	96%	200
ORANGEBURG	6	1%	404	99%	410
PICKENS	31	6%	485	94%	516
RICHLAND	37	4%	835	96%	872
SALUDA	5	6%	72	94%	77
SPARTANBURG	103	7%	1,357	93%	1,460
SUMTER	11	3%	352	97%	363
UNION	9	5%	160	95%	169
WILLIAMSBURG	7	5%	142	95%	149
YORK	23	3%	789	97%	812
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	3	100%	3
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>14,036</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>14,728</b>

**PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**


**TABLE 2-B**

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	68%	32%	44%	0%	56%
AIKEN	80%	20%	44%	1%	54%
ALLEDALE	85%	15%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	76%	24%	33%	1%	66%
BAMBERG	84%	16%	61%	0%	39%
BARNWELL	78%	22%	55%	0%	45%
BEAUFORT	79%	21%	50%	4%	46%
BERKELEY	79%	21%	42%	1%	57%
CALHOUN	82%	18%	63%	0%	37%
CHARLESTON	81%	19%	64%	1%	35%
CHEROKEE	72%	28%	26%	0%	74%
CHESTER	80%	20%	56%	0%	44%
CHESTERFIELD	86%	14%	47%	0%	53%
CLARENDON	83%	18%	77%	0%	23%
COLLETON	78%	22%	55%	1%	44%
DARLINGTON	76%	24%	65%	0%	35%
DILLON	77%	23%	46%	6%	48%
DORCHESTER	76%	24%	50%	2%	48%
EDGEFIELD	75%	25%	56%	1%	44%
FAIRFIELD	80%	20%	74%	0%	26%
FLORENCE	81%	19%	64%	1%	35%
GEORGETOWN	78%	22%	50%	0%	50%
GREENVILLE	76%	24%	41%	4%	56%
GREENWOOD	74%	26%	48%	2%	50%
HAMPTON	92%	8%	67%	0%	33%
HORRY	78%	22%	29%	2%	68%
JASPER	76%	24%	73%	1%	26%
KERSHAW	86%	14%	41%	2%	58%
LANCASTER	85%	15%	47%	2%	51%
LAURENS	73%	27%	33%	0%	67%
LEE	86%	14%	89%	0%	11%
LEXINGTON	80%	20%	30%	3%	67%
McCORMICK	69%	31%	66%	0%	34%
MARION	84%	16%	73%	2%	25%
MARLBORO	77%	23%	57%	13%	30%
NEWBERRY	82%	18%	57%	1%	42%
OCONEE	79%	21%	19%	2%	80%
ORANGEBURG	81%	19%	77%	1%	22%
PICKENS	75%	25%	13%	2%	85%
RICHLAND	82%	18%	76%	1%	22%
SALUDA	87%	13%	60%	0%	40%
SPARTANBURG	74%	26%	40%	2%	58%
SUMTER	76%	24%	75%	1%	24%
UNION	77%	23%	44%	0%	56%
WILLIAMSBURG	87%	13%	85%	1%	14%
YORK	75%	25%	41%	1%	58%
TRANSITIONAL	67%	33%	67%	0%	33%
STATE TOTAL	78%	22%	48%	2%	50%

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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	66%	11%	20%	1%	3%	163
AIKEN	62%	7%	26%	0%	4%	937
ALLENDALE	56%	23%	18%	0%	3%	61
ANDERSON	65%	11%	20%	1%	3%	1,548
BAMBERG	73%	8%	17%	0%	2%	126
BARNWELL	73%	12%	14%	1%	1%	146
BEAUFORT	69%	13%	14%	0%	4%	366
BERKELEY	67%	11%	19%	1%	3%	841
CALHOUN	72%	15%	9%	2%	1%	86
CHARLESTON	60%	7%	31%	1%	1%	2,471
CHEROKEE	63%	11%	23%	1%	2%	629
CHESTER	53%	12%	32%	1%	1%	206
CHESTERFIELD	75%	13%	10%	0%	3%	103
CLARENDON	68%	9%	21%	0%	2%	233
COLLETON	59%	16%	21%	0%	3%	309
DARLINGTON	68%	12%	19%	0%	1%	269
DILLON	72%	5%	20%	0%	3%	117
DORCHESTER	64%	6%	27%	1%	2%	755
EDGEFIELD	66%	7%	26%	0%	1%	272
FAIRFIELD	74%	13%	11%	1%	0%	180
FLORENCE	68%	10%	20%	0%	2%	885
GEORGETOWN	72%	10%	16%	0%	2%	241
GREENVILLE	61%	10%	26%	1%	2%	4,073
GREENWOOD	54%	2%	42%	1%	1%	438
HAMPTON	80%	6%	13%	0%	1%	110
HORRY	68%	10%	18%	1%	4%	1,093
JASPER	65%	15%	16%	0%	4%	164
KERSHAW	60%	7%	30%	0%	3%	238
LANCASTER	61%	13%	23%	1%	2%	509
LAURENS	61%	18%	18%	0%	2%	446
LEE	66%	15%	18%	0%	1%	125
LEXINGTON	64%	10%	21%	1%	2%	1,125
McCORMICK	68%	6%	21%	1%	4%	71
MARION	68%	16%	15%	0%	1%	174
MARLBORO	59%	23%	14%	0%	4%	78
NEWBERRY	48%	9%	37%	3%	3%	225
OCONEE	64%	12%	17%	1%	6%	395
ORANGEBURG	76%	12%	11%	0%	1%	802
PICKENS	54%	9%	33%	0%	3%	920
RICHLAND	65%	6%	27%	1%	1%	2,203
SALUDA	61%	5%	26%	3%	6%	104
SPARTANBURG	59%	13%	25%	1%	3%	2,494
SUMTER	67%	11%	20%	0%	2%	759
UNION	60%	8%	31%	0%	1%	299
WILLIAMSBURG	58%	9%	28%	0%	5%	275
YORK	58%	13%	27%	0%	2%	1,104
TRANSITIONAL	20%	20%	60%	0%	0%	5
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	
<b>ACTIVE OFFENDERS</b>	<b>18,388</b>	<b>2,935</b>	<b>7,014</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>29,173</b>

**FIGURE 3**  
**ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2013**





**PROBATION CLOSURES BY TYPE**

**TABLE 4-B**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	67	81%	16	19%
AIKEN	256	75%	84	25%
ALLENDALE	18	67%	9	33%
ANDERSON	408	83%	85	17%
BAMBERG	20	56%	16	44%
BARNWELL	42	66%	22	34%
BEAUFORT	156	85%	28	15%
BERKELEY	299	85%	53	15%
CALHOUN	34	85%	6	15%
CHARLESTON	876	80%	225	20%
CHEROKEE	148	65%	81	35%
CHESTER	101	76%	32	24%
CHESTERFIELD	63	90%	7	10%
CLARENDON	70	78%	20	22%
COLLETON	132	78%	38	22%
DARLINGTON	126	77%	38	23%
DILLON	86	85%	15	15%
DORCHESTER	201	84%	38	16%
EDGEFIELD	64	78%	18	22%
FAIRFIELD	59	73%	22	27%
FLORENCE	394	78%	111	22%
GEORGETOWN	117	70%	50	30%
GREENVILLE	923	69%	413	31%
GREENWOOD	140	63%	81	37%
HAMPTON	38	88%	5	12%
HORRY	537	76%	172	24%
JASPER	60	77%	18	23%
KERSHAW	87	76%	27	24%
LANCASTER	141	67%	69	33%
LAURENS	204	70%	88	30%
LEE	31	69%	14	31%
LEXINGTON	352	72%	135	28%
MCCORMICK	23	77%	7	23%
MARION	94	83%	19	17%
MARLBORO	58	74%	20	26%
NEWBERRY	112	74%	40	26%
OCONEE	123	76%	39	24%
ORANGEBURG	223	82%	48	18%
PICKENS	294	77%	89	23%
RICHLAND	458	63%	272	37%
SALUDA	32	86%	5	14%
SPARTANBURG	659	60%	444	40%
SUMTER	184	69%	81	31%
UNION	114	72%	45	28%
WILLIAMSBURG	92	77%	27	23%
YORK	516	87%	74	13%
TRANSITIONAL	325	100%	0	0%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>9,557</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>3,246</b>	<b>25%</b>

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

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>Age 24 &amp; Under</b>	<b>Percent 24 &amp; Under</b>	<b>Age 25 &amp; Over</b>	<b>Percent 25 &amp; Over</b>
ABBEVILLE	21	21%	78	79%
AIKEN	79	23%	270	77%
ALLENDALE	6	46%	7	54%
ANDERSON	118	19%	495	81%
BAMBERG	13	27%	36	73%
BARNWELL	20	29%	49	71%
BEAUFORT	70	34%	136	66%
BERKELEY	116	27%	309	73%
CALHOUN	11	29%	27	71%
CHARLESTON	329	29%	813	71%
CHEROKEE	64	21%	248	79%
CHESTER	43	33%	89	67%
CHESTERFIELD	16	33%	33	67%
CLARENDON	38	32%	82	68%
COLLETON	50	34%	97	66%
DARLINGTON	57	34%	109	66%
DILLON	42	38%	70	63%
DORCHESTER	92	32%	195	68%
EDGEFIELD	42	28%	109	72%
FAIRFIELD	25	30%	59	70%
FLORENCE	158	27%	424	73%
GEORGETOWN	56	44%	70	56%
GREENVILLE	419	23%	1417	77%
GREENWOOD	36	21%	136	79%
HAMPTON	13	36%	23	64%
HORRY	222	32%	463	68%
JASPER	20	27%	54	73%
KERSHAW	42	35%	78	65%
LANCASTER	63	30%	149	70%
LAURENS	53	22%	185	78%
LEE	23	27%	61	73%
LEXINGTON	155	26%	435	74%
McCORMICK	7	20%	28	80%
MARION	38	27%	102	73%
MARLBORO	21	38%	35	63%
NEWBERRY	47	32%	101	68%
OCONEE	43	22%	157	79%
ORANGEBURG	118	29%	292	71%
PICKENS	115	22%	401	78%
RICHLAND	295	34%	577	66%
SALUDA	16	21%	61	79%
SPARTANBURG	319	22%	1141	78%
SUMTER	98	27%	265	73%
UNION	44	26%	125	74%
WILLIAMSBURG	51	34%	98	66%
YORK	258	32%	554	68%
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	3	100%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>3,982</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>10,746</b>	<b>73%</b>

**SECTION C**

**PAROLE**

**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## 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/her sentence outside a correctional institution under conditions and provisions of supervision determined by the Board. Should an individual be granted parole, he/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 DJJ early release and Community Supervision Program offenders

Table 1-C shows parole admissions by type of offense. A larger percent of parole admissions, 47%, fall into the violent category, as compared to 4% for probation admissions (see Table 1-B) and 2% for YOA (see Table 1-D) admissions.

Table 2-C describes all parole admissions by gender and race. Parole admissions consisted primarily of males, 91%, with a racial composition of 66% black, 3% other, and 31% white.

Table 3-C and Figure 4 describe active parolees by level of supervision on June 30, 2013. 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 58% of the population, medium level accounted for 9% of the population, high level at 21%, intensive supervision at 4% and sex offender supervision was 8%.

Table 4-C presents parole case closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for parolees (93%) was higher than that of probationers (75%, 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	0	0%	7	100%	7
AIKEN	24	34%	47	66%	71
ALLENDALE	1	100%	0	0%	1
ANDERSON	45	66%	23	34%	68
BAMBERG	1	20%	4	80%	5
BARNWELL	1	17%	5	83%	6
BEAUFORT	8	40%	12	60%	20
BERKELEY	15	43%	20	57%	35
CALHOUN	3	75%	1	25%	4
CHARLESTON	76	54%	64	46%	140
CHEROKEE	12	46%	14	54%	26
CHESTER	7	37%	12	63%	19
CHESTERFIELD	7	47%	8	53%	15
CLARENDON	5	38%	8	62%	13
COLLETON	7	70%	3	30%	10
DARLINGTON	12	41%	17	59%	29
DILLON	3	27%	8	73%	11
DORCHESTER	14	56%	11	44%	25
EDGEFIELD	2	17%	10	83%	12
FAIRFIELD	3	30%	7	70%	10
FLORENCE	26	36%	46	64%	72
GEORGETOWN	19	53%	17	47%	36
GREENVILLE	70	50%	71	50%	141
GREENWOOD	17	52%	16	48%	33
HAMPTON	6	67%	3	33%	9
HORRY	44	39%	70	61%	114
JASPER	7	44%	9	56%	16
KERSHAW	8	44%	10	56%	18
LANCASTER	13	46%	15	54%	28
LAURENS	14	52%	13	48%	27
LEE	2	29%	5	71%	7
LEXINGTON	47	53%	41	47%	88
McCORMICK	2	67%	1	33%	3
MARION	4	20%	16	80%	20
MARLBORO	5	33%	10	67%	15
NEWBERRY	9	69%	4	31%	13
OCONEE	8	38%	13	62%	21
ORANGEBURG	29	57%	22	43%	51
PICKENS	10	38%	16	62%	26
RICHLAND	90	52%	82	48%	172
SALUDA	2	20%	8	80%	10
SPARTANBURG	78	55%	64	45%	142
SUMTER	28	39%	44	61%	72
UNION	6	27%	16	73%	22
WILLIAMSBURG	10	45%	12	55%	22
YORK	52	46%	62	54%	114
TRANSITIONAL	23	55%	19	45%	42
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>986</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>1,861</b>


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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	29%	14%	57%
AIKEN	83%	17%	58%	3%	39%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	93%	7%	41%	0%	59%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	80%	0%	20%
BARNWELL	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
BEAUFORT	85%	15%	75%	10%	15%
BERKELEY	91%	9%	60%	9%	31%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
CHARLESTON	92%	8%	84%	5%	11%
CHEROKEE	92%	8%	54%	0%	46%
CHESTER	95%	5%	68%	0%	32%
CHESTERFIELD	87%	13%	60%	7%	33%
CLARENDON	92%	8%	85%	0%	15%
COLLETON	100%	0%	10%	20%	70%
DARLINGTON	90%	10%	59%	0%	41%
DILLON	100%	0%	73%	9%	18%
DORCHESTER	92%	8%	52%	0%	48%
EDGEFIELD	92%	8%	58%	0%	42%
FAIRFIELD	100%	0%	80%	0%	20%
FLORENCE	97%	3%	75%	4%	21%
GEORGETOWN	97%	3%	61%	0%	39%
GREENVILLE	89%	11%	65%	6%	28%
GREENWOOD	91%	9%	73%	3%	24%
HAMPTON	100%	0%	78%	0%	22%
HORRY	89%	11%	50%	4%	46%
JASPER	94%	6%	69%	0%	31%
KERSHAW	94%	6%	56%	0%	44%
LANCASTER	93%	7%	68%	0%	32%
LAURENS	85%	15%	70%	0%	30%
LEE	86%	14%	86%	0%	14%
LEXINGTON	89%	11%	51%	2%	47%
McCORMICK	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
MARION	90%	10%	85%	0%	15%
MARLBORO	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
NEWBERRY	85%	15%	62%	0%	38%
OCONEE	81%	19%	33%	5%	62%
ORANGEBURG	98%	2%	86%	0%	14%
PICKENS	92%	8%	38%	0%	62%
RICHLAND	89%	11%	84%	1%	15%
SALUDA	80%	20%	80%	10%	10%
SPARTANBURG	87%	13%	56%	5%	39%
SUMTER	90%	10%	86%	0%	14%
UNION	95%	5%	55%	0%	45%
WILLIAMSBURG	100%	0%	91%	0%	9%
YORK	96%	4%	69%	4%	27%
TRANSITIONAL	88%	12%	45%	7%	48%
STATE TOTAL	91%	9%	66%	3%	31%

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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%	7
AIKEN	58%	7%	18%	10%	6%	109
ALLENDALE	75%	0%	25%	0%	0%	4
ANDERSON	65%	6%	13%	2%	14%	115
BAMBERG	50%	10%	30%	0%	10%	10
BARNWELL	89%	0%	5%	0%	5%	19
BEAUFORT	75%	9%	16%	0%	0%	32
BERKELEY	64%	5%	16%	3%	13%	64
CALHOUN	40%	20%	0%	20%	20%	5
CHARLESTON	51%	10%	27%	5%	7%	219
CHEROKEE	46%	17%	21%	13%	4%	48
CHESTER	58%	15%	18%	0%	9%	33
CHESTERFIELD	44%	28%	17%	6%	6%	18
CLARENDON	61%	4%	17%	0%	17%	23
COLLETON	52%	13%	13%	9%	13%	23
DARLINGTON	53%	4%	27%	9%	7%	45
DILLON	83%	4%	4%	4%	4%	23
DORCHESTER	52%	4%	30%	2%	12%	50
EDGEFIELD	53%	20%	27%	0%	0%	15
FAIRFIELD	57%	14%	19%	5%	5%	21
FLORENCE	53%	15%	19%	4%	9%	124
GEORGETOWN	65%	6%	19%	2%	8%	48
GREENVILLE	55%	8%	26%	4%	7%	260
GREENWOOD	49%	5%	32%	2%	12%	59
HAMPTON	82%	0%	9%	0%	9%	11
HORRY	63%	5%	20%	3%	8%	191
JASPER	64%	18%	14%	0%	5%	22
KERSHAW	59%	7%	11%	9%	14%	44
LANCASTER	50%	27%	14%	5%	5%	44
LAURENS	56%	20%	14%	2%	8%	59
LEE	71%	14%	7%	0%	7%	14
LEXINGTON	64%	8%	18%	2%	8%	131
McCORMICK	54%	23%	15%	0%	8%	13
MARION	75%	7%	11%	0%	7%	28
MARLBORO	61%	6%	28%	6%	0%	18
NEWBERRY	59%	0%	22%	4%	15%	27
OCONEE	46%	19%	15%	0%	19%	26
ORANGEBURG	74%	9%	8%	4%	5%	77
PICKENS	56%	15%	19%	4%	7%	54
RICHLAND	63%	4%	22%	5%	6%	347
SALUDA	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	10
SPARTANBURG	56%	11%	20%	4%	10%	225
SUMTER	37%	8%	47%	2%	7%	92
UNION	46%	7%	32%	14%	0%	28
WILLIAMSBURG	66%	8%	21%	3%	3%	38
YORK	58%	12%	21%	4%	5%	160
TRANSITIONAL	----	----	----	----	----	0
STATE TOTAL	58%	9%	21%	4%	8%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	1,770	274	636	118	235	3,033

**FIGURE 4**  
**ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2013**





**PAROLE CLOSURES BY TYPE**

**TABLE 4-C**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	8	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	50	94%	3	6%
ALLENDALE	4	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	37	95%	2	5%
BAMBERG	5	100%	0	0%
BARNWELL	9	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	17	94%	1	6%
BERKELEY	23	85%	4	15%
CALHOUN	1	50%	1	50%
CHARLESTON	90	97%	3	3%
CHEROKEE	19	90%	2	10%
CHESTER	16	94%	1	6%
CHESTERFIELD	11	79%	3	21%
CLARENDON	20	95%	1	5%
COLLETON	7	88%	1	13%
DARLINGTON	21	91%	2	9%
DILLON	11	100%	0	0%
DORCHESTER	21	95%	1	5%
EDGEFIELD	6	100%	0	0%
FAIRFIELD	3	75%	1	25%
FLORENCE	64	97%	2	3%
GEORGETOWN	26	84%	5	16%
GREENVILLE	115	94%	7	6%
GREENWOOD	29	100%	0	0%
HAMPTON	5	100%	0	0%
HORRY	73	84%	14	16%
JASPER	13	93%	1	7%
KERSHAW	12	92%	1	8%
LANCASTER	14	100%	0	0%
LAURENS	12	92%	1	8%
LEE	8	89%	1	11%
LEXINGTON	62	89%	8	11%
MCCORMICK	1	100%	0	0%
MARION	19	100%	0	0%
MARLBORO	11	79%	3	21%
NEWBERRY	15	94%	1	6%
OCONEE	4	44%	5	56%
ORANGEBURG	40	93%	3	7%
PICKENS	18	95%	1	5%
RICHLAND	144	95%	8	5%
SALUDA	3	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	84	91%	8	9%
SUMTER	40	85%	7	15%
UNION	15	100%	0	0%
WILLIAMSBURG	18	95%	1	5%
YORK	74	94%	5	6%
TRANSITIONAL	86	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	1,384	93%	108	7%

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

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	0	0%	7	100%
AIKEN	4	6%	67	94%
ALLENDALE	0	0%	1	100%
ANDERSON	5	7%	63	93%
BAMBERG	2	40%	3	60%
BARNWELL	0	0%	6	100%
BEAUFORT	3	15%	17	85%
BERKELEY	5	14%	30	86%
CALHOUN	1	25%	3	75%
CHARLESTON	13	9%	127	91%
CHEROKEE	2	8%	24	92%
CHESTER	2	11%	17	89%
CHESTERFIELD	3	20%	12	80%
CLARENDON	0	0%	13	100%
COLLETON	1	10%	9	90%
DARLINGTON	6	21%	23	79%
DILLON	4	36%	7	64%
DORCHESTER	2	8%	23	92%
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	12	100%
FAIRFIELD	0	0%	10	100%
FLORENCE	13	18%	59	82%
GEORGETOWN	6	17%	30	83%
GREENVILLE	11	8%	130	92%
GREENWOOD	3	9%	30	91%
HAMPTON	0	0%	9	100%
HORRY	14	12%	100	88%
JASPER	2	13%	14	88%
KERSHAW	1	6%	17	94%
LANCASTER	0	0%	28	100%
LAURENS	2	7%	25	93%
LEE	1	14%	6	86%
LEXINGTON	19	22%	69	78%
McCORMICK	0	0%	3	100%
MARION	1	5%	19	95%
MARLBORO	0	0%	15	100%
NEWBERRY	0	0%	13	100%
OCONEE	2	10%	19	90%
ORANGEBURG	9	18%	42	82%
PICKENS	3	12%	23	88%
RICHLAND	29	17%	143	83%
SALUDA	0	0%	10	100%
SPARTANBURG	16	11%	126	89%
SUMTER	14	19%	58	81%
UNION	4	18%	18	82%
WILLIAMSBURG	3	14%	19	86%
YORK	13	11%	101	89%
TRANSITIONAL	4	10%	38	90%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>1,638</b>	<b>88%</b>

**SECTION D**

**YOUTHFUL  
OFFENDERS**

**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## 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 (96%) and black (64%).

Table 3-D and Figure 5 describe the active population for YOA conditional release offenders in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2013. Nearly half or 49% were supervised at standard level, 14% at medium, 31% at high, 4% at intensive, and 2% at the sex offender level.

Table 4-D shows YOA offenders are more inclined to close unsuccessfully (38%) than the parole population (7%, see Table 4-C) or the probation population (25%, 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%	12	100%	12
ALLENDALE	0	0%	2	100%	2
ANDERSON	0	0%	17	100%	17
BAMBERG	0	0%	0	0%	0
BARNWELL	0	0%	5	100%	5
BEAUFORT	0	0%	14	100%	14
BERKELEY	1	5%	18	95%	19
CALHOUN	0	0%	2	100%	2
CHARLESTON	0	0%	53	100%	53
CHEROKEE	0	0%	12	100%	12
CHESTER	0	0%	3	100%	3
CHESTERFIELD	2	50%	2	50%	4
CLARENDON	0	0%	5	100%	5
COLLETON	0	0%	11	100%	11
DARLINGTON	0	0%	12	100%	12
DILLON	0	0%	12	100%	12
DORCHESTER	0	0%	17	100%	17
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	3	100%	3
FAIRFIELD	1	17%	5	83%	6
FLORENCE	1	4%	22	96%	23
GEORGETOWN	1	6%	17	94%	18
GREENVILLE	0	0%	36	100%	36
GREENWOOD	0	0%	9	100%	9
HAMPTON	1	20%	4	80%	5
HORRY	0	0%	34	100%	34
JASPER	0	0%	3	100%	3
KERSHAW	0	0%	3	100%	3
LANCASTER	1	14%	6	86%	7
LAURENS	0	0%	20	100%	20
LEE	0	0%	5	100%	5
LEXINGTON	0	0%	24	100%	24
McCORMICK	0	0%	1	100%	1
MARION	0	0%	7	100%	7
MARLBORO	0	0%	6	100%	6
NEWBERRY	0	0%	10	100%	10
OCONEE	0	0%	5	100%	5
ORANGEBURG	0	0%	20	100%	20
PICKENS	0	0%	7	100%	7
RICHLAND	0	0%	45	100%	45
SALUDA	0	0%	2	100%	2
SPARTANBURG	0	0%	31	100%	31
SUMTER	0	0%	20	100%	20
UNION	0	0%	7	100%	7
WILLIAMSBURG	1	10%	9	90%	10
YORK	1	3%	33	97%	34
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	27	100%	27
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>629</b>


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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
AIKEN	100%	0%	75%	0%	25%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	94%	6%	35%	0%	65%
BAMBERG	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
BARNWELL	100%	0%	80%	0%	20%
BEAUFORT	100%	0%	57%	0%	43%
BERKELEY	100%	0%	42%	0%	58%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
CHARLESTON	92%	8%	91%	0%	9%
CHEROKEE	92%	8%	50%	0%	50%
CHESTER	100%	0%	67%	0%	33%
CHESTERFIELD	100%	0%	75%	0%	25%
CLARENDON	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
COLLETON	100%	0%	45%	9%	45%
DARLINGTON	100%	0%	83%	0%	17%
DILLON	100%	0%	58%	0%	42%
DORCHESTER	100%	0%	71%	0%	29%
EDGEFIELD	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
FAIRFIELD	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
FLORENCE	96%	4%	61%	0%	39%
GEORGETOWN	94%	6%	50%	0%	50%
GREENVILLE	92%	8%	56%	6%	39%
GREENWOOD	100%	0%	78%	0%	22%
HAMPTON	80%	20%	80%	0%	20%
HORRY	97%	3%	62%	0%	38%
JASPER	100%	0%	67%	0%	33%
KERSHAW	100%	0%	33%	0%	67%
LANCASTER	100%	0%	57%	0%	43%
LAURENS	95%	5%	60%	0%	40%
LEE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
LEXINGTON	100%	0%	42%	0%	58%
McCORMICK	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
MARION	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
MARLBORO	83%	17%	83%	0%	17%
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	90%	0%	10%
OCONEE	80%	20%	80%	0%	20%
ORANGEBURG	100%	0%	90%	0%	10%
PICKENS	100%	0%	29%	14%	57%
RICHLAND	98%	2%	78%	0%	22%
SALUDA	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
SPARTANBURG	94%	6%	55%	0%	45%
SUMTER	95%	5%	90%	0%	10%
UNION	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
WILLIAMSBURG	100%	0%	90%	0%	10%
YORK	97%	3%	65%	0%	35%
TRANSITIONAL	85%	15%	41%	7%	52%
STATE TOTAL	96%	4%	67%	1%	32%

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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4
AIKEN	74%	8%	15%	0%	3%	73
ALLENDALE	8%	15%	77%	0%	0%	13
ANDERSON	50%	8%	33%	7%	2%	60
BAMBERG	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%	11
BARNWELL	29%	29%	29%	6%	6%	17
BEAUFORT	50%	15%	25%	10%	0%	20
BERKELEY	48%	20%	33%	0%	0%	40
CALHOUN	33%	17%	33%	17%	0%	6
CHARLESTON	60%	8%	31%	1%	0%	209
CHEROKEE	52%	19%	14%	5%	10%	21
CHESTER	50%	8%	42%	0%	0%	12
CHESTERFIELD	14%	29%	57%	0%	0%	7
CLARENDON	14%	43%	29%	14%	0%	7
COLLETON	41%	19%	41%	0%	0%	27
DARLINGTON	33%	15%	52%	0%	0%	27
DILLON	69%	6%	19%	6%	0%	16
DORCHESTER	60%	9%	19%	6%	5%	78
EDGEFIELD	67%	8%	25%	0%	0%	12
FAIRFIELD	56%	11%	22%	11%	0%	9
FLORENCE	35%	13%	46%	4%	2%	54
GEORGETOWN	55%	21%	18%	6%	0%	33
GREENVILLE	44%	24%	26%	5%	1%	84
GREENWOOD	41%	7%	44%	7%	0%	27
HAMPTON	61%	22%	17%	0%	0%	18
HORRY	43%	14%	30%	7%	7%	91
JASPER	62%	23%	8%	8%	0%	13
KERSHAW	38%	23%	31%	8%	0%	13
LANCASTER	36%	9%	55%	0%	0%	11
LAURENS	46%	18%	33%	3%	0%	39
LEE	33%	11%	56%	0%	0%	9
LEXINGTON	56%	15%	25%	2%	3%	61
McCORMICK	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	5
MARION	33%	0%	56%	11%	0%	9
MARLBORO	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	8
NEWBERRY	13%	19%	56%	13%	0%	16
OCONEE	63%	13%	19%	6%	0%	16
ORANGEBURG	59%	24%	15%	3%	0%	80
PICKENS	47%	18%	18%	0%	18%	17
RICHLAND	63%	8%	20%	8%	0%	145
SALUDA	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	3
SPARTANBURG	14%	16%	63%	5%	2%	63
SUMTER	38%	12%	42%	8%	0%	60
UNION	9%	27%	55%	0%	9%	11
WILLIAMSBURG	28%	11%	39%	22%	0%	18
YORK	38%	17%	38%	6%	0%	63
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	
<b>ACTIVE OFFENDERS</b>	<b>805</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1,636</b>

# ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION JUNE 30, 2013





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

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	5	83%	1	17%
AIKEN	13	62%	8	38%
ALLENDALE	6	86%	1	14%
ANDERSON	13	72%	5	28%
BAMBERG	3	75%	1	25%
BARNWELL	6	60%	4	40%
BEAUFORT	14	45%	17	55%
BERKELEY	29	59%	20	41%
CALHOUN	2	50%	2	50%
CHARLESTON	81	74%	29	26%
CHEROKEE	4	44%	5	56%
CHESTER	9	100%	0	0%
CHESTERFIELD	6	67%	3	33%
CLARENDON	2	25%	6	75%
COLLETON	11	79%	3	21%
DARLINGTON	7	37%	12	63%
DILLON	15	68%	7	32%
DORCHESTER	16	70%	7	30%
EDGEFIELD	1	33%	2	67%
FAIRFIELD	1	33%	2	67%
FLORENCE	31	66%	16	34%
GEORGETOWN	10	59%	7	41%
GREENVILLE	32	57%	24	43%
GREENWOOD	12	75%	4	25%
HAMPTON	8	89%	1	11%
HORRY	33	66%	17	34%
JASPER	7	58%	5	42%
KERSHAW	4	80%	1	20%
LANCASTER	7	58%	5	42%
LAURENS	7	50%	7	50%
LEE	4	57%	3	43%
LEXINGTON	18	60%	12	40%
MCCORMICK	0	0%	2	100%
MARION	8	67%	4	33%
MARLBORO	4	67%	2	33%
NEWBERRY	4	44%	5	56%
OCONEE	6	67%	3	33%
ORANGEBURG	13	41%	19	59%
PICKENS	12	86%	2	14%
RICHLAND	33	55%	27	45%
SALUDA	5	83%	1	17%
SPARTANBURG	28	42%	38	58%
SUMTER	26	68%	12	32%
UNION	9	75%	3	25%
WILLIAMSBURG	4	44%	5	56%
YORK	25	60%	17	40%
TRANSITIONAL	21	100%	0	0%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>38%</b>

**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	11	92%	1	8%
ALLENDALE	2	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	15	88%	2	12%
BAMBERG	0	0%	0	0%
BARNWELL	5	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	13	93%	1	7%
BERKELEY	11	58%	8	42%
CALHOUN	2	100%	0	0%
CHARLESTON	46	87%	7	13%
CHEROKEE	10	83%	2	17%
CHESTER	2	67%	1	33%
CHESTERFIELD	3	75%	1	25%
CLARENDON	5	100%	0	0%
COLLETON	11	100%	0	0%
DARLINGTON	12	100%	0	0%
DILLON	11	92%	1	8%
DORCHESTER	14	82%	3	18%
EDGEFIELD	3	100%	0	0%
FAIRFIELD	4	67%	2	33%
FLORENCE	20	87%	3	13%
GEORGETOWN	16	89%	2	11%
GREENVILLE	31	86%	5	14%
GREENWOOD	8	89%	1	11%
HAMPTON	3	60%	2	40%
HORRY	29	85%	5	15%
JASPER	3	100%	0	0%
KERSHAW	3	100%	0	0%
LANCASTER	6	86%	1	14%
LAURENS	17	85%	3	15%
LEE	4	80%	1	20%
LEXINGTON	20	83%	4	17%
McCORMICK	1	100%	0	0%
MARION	6	86%	1	14%
MARLBORO	6	100%	0	0%
NEWBERRY	10	100%	0	0%
OCONEE	4	80%	1	20%
ORANGEBURG	14	70%	6	30%
PICKENS	7	100%	0	0%
RICHLAND	36	80%	9	20%
SALUDA	2	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	27	87%	4	13%
SUMTER	17	85%	3	15%
UNION	6	86%	1	14%
WILLIAMSBURG	10	100%	0	0%
YORK	32	94%	2	6%
TRANSITIONAL	25	93%	2	7%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>14%</b>

**SECTION E**

**SEX**

**OFFENDERS**

**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## 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 and Figure 6, 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.


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 duration of their supervision period.

<b>SEX OFFENDER CONTACT STANDARDS</b>		
<b>SO-HIGH</b>	<b>SO-INTENSIVE</b>	<b>SO-CONTAINMENT</b>
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	5	45%	6	55%	11
AIKEN	51	88%	7	12%	58
ALLENDALE	2	100%	0	0%	2
ANDERSON	61	70%	26	30%	87
BAMBERG	3	75%	1	25%	4
BARNWELL	3	43%	4	57%	7
BEAUFORT	14	100%	0	0%	14
BERKELEY	31	82%	7	18%	38
CALHOUN	2	67%	1	33%	3
CHARLESTON	47	58%	34	42%	81
CHEROKEE	16	89%	2	11%	18
CHESTER	6	75%	2	25%	8
CHESTERFIELD	4	67%	2	33%	6
CLARENDON	8	62%	5	38%	13
COLLETON	13	68%	6	32%	19
DARLINGTON	7	78%	2	22%	9
DILLON	5	125%	-1	-25%	4
DORCHESTER	24	65%	13	35%	37
EDGEFIELD	3	30%	7	70%	10
FAIRFIELD	1	33%	2	67%	3
FLORENCE	30	83%	6	17%	36
GEORGETOWN	8	89%	1	11%	9
GREENVILLE	89	82%	19	18%	108
GREENWOOD	13	81%	3	19%	16
HAMPTON	2	67%	1	33%	3
HORRY	61	98%	1	2%	62
JASPER	7	88%	1	13%	8
KERSHAW	13	81%	3	19%	16
LANCASTER	10	71%	4	29%	14
LAURENS	16	80%	4	20%	20
LEE	2	40%	3	60%	5
LEXINGTON	41	91%	4	9%	45
McCORMICK	4	80%	1	20%	5
MARION	3	60%	2	40%	5
MARLBORO	3	75%	1	25%	4
NEWBERRY	10	63%	6	38%	16
OCONEE	27	87%	4	13%	31
ORANGEBURG	13	65%	7	35%	20
PICKENS	34	83%	7	17%	41
RICHLAND	54	64%	30	36%	84
SALUDA	6	60%	4	40%	10
SPARTANBURG	88	80%	22	20%	110
SUMTER	20	91%	2	9%	22
UNION	5	50%	5	50%	10
WILLIAMSBURG	14	88%	2	13%	16
YORK	34	87%	5	13%	39
STATE TOTAL	913	77%	274	23%	1,187

**FIGURE 6**  
**ACTIVE SEX OFFENDER UNDER SUPERVISION**



**SECTION F**

**VIOLATIONS**

**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## 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 4,123 violation hearings were held. At those hearings, 2,812 cases were continued or recommended for continuation, while 1,311 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 2008 to FY 2013.

Table 3-F shows fees collected in FY12-13 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 \$198,081.10 was collected in delinquent restitution payments, \$162,838.99 for supervision fee and \$37,232.80 in court ordered fines and fees. The total collected of \$398,152.89 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**

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>Cases Heard</b>	<b>Cases Revoked or Recommended for Revocation</b>	<b>Cases Continued or Recommended for Continuation</b>
Abbeville	0	0	0
Aiken	168	50	118
Allendale	30	15	15
Anderson	273	47	226
Bamberg	13	1	12
Barnwell	37	7	30
Beaufort	29	23	6
Berkeley	86	40	46
Calhoun	19	7	12
Charleston	733	246	487
Cherokee	73	19	54
Chester	4	0	4
Chesterfield	11	5	6
Clarendon	14	6	8
Colleton	29	10	19
Darlington	24	14	10
Dillon	14	10	4
Dorchester	95	25	70
Edgefield	10	2	8
Fairfield	2	2	0
Florence	43	18	25
Georgetown	15	13	2
Greenville	1027	252	775
Greenwood	90	26	64
Hampton	23	11	12
Horry	56	24	32
Jasper	28	15	13
Kershaw	14	2	12
Lancaster	24	9	15
Laurens	26	11	15
Lee	3	3	0
Lexington	113	30	83
Marion	8	4	4
Marlboro	8	3	5
McCormick	35	8	27
Newberry	54	10	44
Oconee	50	16	34
Orangeburg	244	101	143
Pickens	44	20	24
Richland	184	68	116
Saluda	17	7	10
Spartanburg	140	59	81
Sumter	119	34	85
Union	25	6	19
Williamsburg	11	7	4
York	58	25	33
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>4123</b>	<b>1311</b>	<b>2812</b>

**TABLE 2-F  
CLOSURES BY TYPE**

<b>FY 2013</b>	<b>Active Population</b>	<b>Successful</b>	<b>Exp-I<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>JC-I<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Rev-C<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Rev-T<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Ret-CD<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>33,842</b>	<b>11,556</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>2,626</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>3,731</b>
<b>% Unsuccessful</b>			1.8%	0.1%	22.1%	70.4%	5.7%	

<b>FY 2012</b>	<b>Active Population</b>	<b>Successful</b>	<b>Exp-I<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>JC-I<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Rev-C<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Rev-T<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Rev-TC<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,671</b>	<b>10,649</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>3,322</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,268</b>
<b>% Unsuccessful<sup>6</sup></b>			1.6%	0.2%	16.6%	65.0%	0.0%	

<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>Active Population</b>	<b>Successful</b>	<b>Exp-I<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>JC-I<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Rev-C<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Rev-T<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Rev-TC<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,977</b>	<b>10,442</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>4,141</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>5,107</b>
<b>% Unsuccessful<sup>6</sup></b>			2.6%	0.1%	9.9%	81.1%	6.2%	

<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>Active Population</b>	<b>Successful</b>	<b>Exp-I<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>JC-I<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Rev-C<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Rev-T<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Rev-TC<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,262</b>	<b>10,734</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>4,783</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>5,830</b>
<b>% Unsuccessful<sup>6</sup></b>			2.8%	0.1%	9.5%	82.0%	5.6%	

<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>Active Population</b>	<b>Successful</b>	<b>Exp-I<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>JC-I<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Rev-C<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Rev-T<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Rev-TC<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,697</b>	<b>11,864</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>5,225</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>6,253</b>
<b>% Unsuccessful<sup>6</sup></b>			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 Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

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

	<b>SUPERVISION FEES</b>	<b>FINES/ COURT COSTS</b>	<b>RESTITUTION</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>12-Jul</b>	\$8,889.91	\$1,564.00	\$31,484.19	\$41,938.10
<b>12-Aug</b>	\$13,513.00	\$1,830.15	\$14,726.54	\$30,069.69
<b>12-Sep</b>	\$7,305.00	\$2,846.70	\$4,354.66	\$14,506.36
<b>12-Oct</b>	\$11,125.00	\$2,081.80	\$20,711.80	\$33,918.60
<b>12-Nov</b>	\$20,695.00	\$3,593.53	\$25,062.68	\$49,351.21
<b>12-Dec</b>	\$9,906.00	\$4,018.53	\$6,521.00	\$20,445.53
<b>13-Jan</b>	\$13,986.62	\$1,932.40	\$5,948.33	\$21,867.35
<b>13-Feb</b>	\$12,061.60	\$-	\$17,784.29	\$29,845.89
<b>13-Mar</b>	\$21,395.06	\$3,719.30	\$20,993.96	\$46,108.32
<b>13-Apr</b>	\$19,418.40	\$6,015.95	\$17,930.14	\$43,364.49
<b>13-May</b>	\$13,008.40	\$6,500.14	\$20,769.69	\$40,278.23
<b>13-Jun</b>	\$11,535.00	\$3,130.30	\$11,793.82	\$26,459.12
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$162,838.99</b>	<b>\$37,232.80</b>	<b>\$198,081.10</b>	<b>\$398,152.89</b>

**SECTION G**

**ELECTRONIC  
SURVEILLANCE**


**FISCAL YEAR 2013**

## ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE


The Department utilizes electronic surveillance to monitor certain offenders. Home detention 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) is the enhanced surveillance technique used in conjunction with home detention to ensure heightened supervision and accountability for those offenders on intensive supervision status. It is used to verify the degree of the offender's compliance with the conditions of Home Detention. At the end of FY 2013, 166 offenders were on EM.

On June 8, 2006, Jessie's Law, a bill aimed at protecting our state's children through tougher penalties for sex 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 sex predators and mandates 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 Department of Defense and continuously transmit signals which can be detected by anyone possessing a GPS receiver. Figure 7 shows the number of offenders on EM and Figure 8 shows the GPS population each month of the fiscal year.

**FIGURE 7**  
**ACTIVE OFFENDERS ON ELECTRONIC MONITORING**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2013**



**FIGURE 8**  
**ACTIVE OFFENDERS ON GPS**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2013**



# SECTION H

## SUMMARY

FISCAL YEAR 2013



## SUMMARY

Table 1-H shows offender referrals during the fiscal year.

Abbreviations:

AA/NA	ALCOHOLICS ANONOMOUS/NARCOTICS ANONOMOUS
DNA	DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID BLOOD TESTING
DSS	SC DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
DVC	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUSELING
ED"	HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAMS
DEW	SC DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND WORKFORCE
JDEV	JOB DEVELOPER
JOB R.C.	JOB READINESS CLASS
MH	METAL HEALTH COUNSELING/TREATMENT
PEP	PAROLE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
PPPCS	PPP COUNSELING SERVICES
PSE	PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT
ReEN	REENTRY INITIATIVES
SAC	SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNSELING
SOC	SEX OFFENDER COUNSELING/TREATMENT
SPICE	SELF-PACED IN CLASS EDUCATION
VR	SC DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Note: \* ED includes referrals to all educational programs, including Adult Education, GED, and the Learn & Earn Program.

Table 2-H shows DNA collections by county and Figure 9 illustrates monthly collections.

Table 3-H shows drug testing activity during FY 2013. 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 4-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 2012 and FY 2013. The percentage of violent offenses among probationers (5%) increased by one percent and parole admissions decreased by 5% over the previous year.

Overall, the most utilized level of supervision was standard (62%), followed by high (24%), medium (10%), sex offender (3%), and intensive (1%) for all cases.

The overall success rate for closures was 76% during the fiscal year. The overall success rate for parolees was 93%. Both probationers (75%) and YOA offenders (62%) had less successful closures rates than parolees, but each showed an increase in successful closures over the previous fiscal year.

Of the 19,933 offenders tested for drug use while under supervision, 8,872 or 44.5%, tested positive for drugs.

Figure 10 compares the number of admissions for each fiscal year from 1994 to 2013. Admissions decreased for FY 2013 by 2.5% from the previous fiscal year.

Figure 11 shows the percentage of violent admissions by program for fiscal years 2004 to 2013.

**TABLE 1-H  
OFFENDER REFERRALS AS OF JUNE 30, 2013**


COUNTY	AA/NA	DSS	DVC	DEW	ED+	JDEV	JOB R.C.	MH	P.E.P	PPP CS	PSE	ReEn	SAC	SOC	SPICE	V-Reh
ABBEVILLE	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	19	0	18	1	0	2
AIKEN	0	0	5	0	23	0	0	17	1	0	103	0	195	11	0	28
ALLENDALE	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	18	0	29	1	0	19
ANDERSON	89	8	43	1	43	0	0	29	0	0	110	0	323	21	2	67
BAMBERG	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	1	0	34	0	38	0	0	2
BARNWELL	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	30	0	46	1	0	1
BEAUFORT	1	0	3	1	7	0	0	6	0	0	37	0	68	5	0	14
BERKELEY	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	11	0	0	31	0	59	12	0	8
CALHOUN	3	0	3	15	5	0	0	5	0	0	6	0	30	0	0	14
CHARLESTON	3	2	16	0	76	0	0	25	4	0	92	2	276	18	2	11
CHEROKEE	0	2	7	0	25	0	0	8	2	0	34	0	139	6	0	20
CHESTER	5	1	6	18	13	0	0	6	1	81	45	0	72	8	0	18
CHESTERFIELD	2	3	3	5	9	0	2	11	2	0	79	0	40	0	0	23
CLARENDON	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	5	1	0	43	0	12	2	0	4
COLLETON	1	1	6	0	22	0	0	5	0	0	23	0	63	5	0	6
DARLINGTON	3	3	6	24	12	0	1	10	0	0	42	0	82	5	0	18
DILLON	1	0	2	0	8	0	0	2	0	0	14	0	17	2	0	6
DORCHESTER	5	0	1	0	15	0	0	8	0	0	15	0	29	4	0	5
EDGEFIELD	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	12	0	16	0	0	6
FAIRFIELD	1	0	6	34	8	0	0	19	0	0	9	0	47	1	0	14
FLORENCE	7	1	32	90	18	0	2	16	1	1	147	0	176	10	0	45
GEORGETOWN	17	1	4	91	16	0	1	11	1	0	34	0	54	4	1	3
GREENVILLE	16	1	51	1	103	0	12	53	2	4	257	4	869	20	1	54
GREENWOOD	0	1	2	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	19	0	43	2	0	15
HAMPTON	0	0	8	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	11	0	0	0
HORRY	27	3	18	84	30	1	3	23	2	0	43	0	223	7	1	26
JASPER	0	0	8	0	9	0	0	4	0	0	57	0	33	0	0	4
KERSHAW	1	1	3	11	0	0	6	4	0	0	1	0	17	1	0	10
LANCASTER	1	2	12	93	15	0	0	9	4	0	146	1	117	7	2	39
LAURENS	7	3	6	0	20	0	0	14	2	0	64	0	147	4	0	37
LEE	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	2
LEXINGTON	11	2	22	37	41	0	2	36	2	0	110	0	289	25	1	32
McCORMICK	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	3
MARION	1	1	4	95	35	0	0	10	1	0	14	0	47	2	0	9
MARLBORO	1	0	2	2	4	0	0	2	1	0	14	0	11	1	0	13
NEWBERRY	2	0	3	7	10	0	2	8	0	0	11	0	24	2	0	69
OCONEE	0	2	2	0	11	0	0	5	0	0	18	0	72	7	0	8
ORANGEBURG	3	1	2	30	34	0	1	7	0	0	37	0	62	7	0	15
PICKENS	5	0	11	0	33	0	0	17	0	0	69	0	194	3	0	11
RICHLAND	22	1	17	4	33	0	2	26	2	2	186	1	198	12	1	29
SALUDA	4	0	4	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	0	29	3	0	11
SPARTANBURG	10	4	18	1	98	0	89	51	25	27	163	0	422	18	5	82
SUMTER	1	0	7	34	25	0	0	2	2	0	36	0	23	1	0	25
UNION	0	0	4	1	6	0	0	6	2	18	19	0	64	0	3	12
WILLIAMSBURG	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	3	1	0	6	0	9	0	0	7
YORK	27	1	4	76	41	0	1	27	2	2	74	0	289	9	0	21
TRANSITIONAL	1	0	3	9	17	0	2	6	0	1	50	0	84	1	0	6
STATE TOTAL	284	6	359	774	911	1	142	526	62	136	2392	8	5111	251	19	874

**TABLE 2-H  
DNA COLLECTIONS AS OF JUNE 30, 2013**

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL COLLECTIONS</b>
ABBEVILLE	22
AIKEN	180
ALLENDALE	7
ANDERSON	245
BAMBERG	18
BARNWELL	33
BEAUFORT	84
BERKELEY	161
CALHOUN	23
CHARLESTON	325
CHEROKEE	131
CHESTER	52
CHESTERFIELD	38
CLARENDON	68
COLLETON	50
DARLINGTON	97
DILLON	67
DORCHESTER	70
EDGEFIELD	47
FAIRFIELD	34
FLORENCE	221
GEORGETOWN	47
GREENVILLE	384
GREENWOOD	80
HAMPTON	26
HORRY	398
JASPER	27
KERSHAW	49
LANCASTER	132
LAURENS	75
LEE	30
LEXINGTON	237
McCORMICK	18
MARION	56
MARLBORO	45
NEWBERRY	41
OCONEE	69
ORANGEBURG	150
PICKENS	119
RICHLAND	357
SALUDA	25
SPARTANBURG	569
SUMTER	198
UNION	53
WILLIAMSBURG	58
YORK	264
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>5,484</b>

**FIGURE 9**  
**MONTHLY DNA COLLECTIONS – FISCAL YEAR 2013**

**TOTAL = 5,484**



**TABLE 3-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	108	46	42.59%	82	132
AIKEN	568	179	31.51%	341	698
ALLENDALE	76	54	71.05%	120	111
ANDERSON	867	438	50.52%	919	1,027
BAMBERG	89	44	49.44%	78	118
BARNWELL	186	100	53.76%	170	260
BEAUFORT	568	255	44.89%	420	891
BERKELEY	565	182	32.21%	289	648
CALHOUN	107	56	52.34%	116	188
CHARLESTO	1,128	527	46.72%	707	1,239
CHEROKEE	446	240	53.81%	556	549
CHESTER	236	131	55.51%	216	344
CHESTERFIE	144	57	39.58%	134	318
CLARENDON	102	37	36.27%	63	132
COLLETON	201	107	53.23%	141	243
DARLINGTON	271	140	51.66%	240	330
DILLON	72	6	8.33%	17	73
DORCHESTE	232	77	33.19%	104	281
EDGEFIELD	155	78	50.32%	111	180
FAIRFIELD	102	42	41.18%	52	106
FLORENCE	717	279	38.91%	442	859
GEORGETOW	290	111	38.28%	168	364
GREENVILLE	2,992	1,123	37.53%	1,984	3,738
GREENWOOD	80	34	42.50%	43	89
HAMPTON	114	55	48.25%	79	142
HORRY	865	367	42.43%	588	1,029
JASPER	137	56	40.88%	84	186
KERSHAW	179	85	47.49%	135	232
LANCASTER	383	189	49.35%	323	461
LAURENS	362	177	48.90%	440	494
LEE	77	28	36.36%	47	97
LEXINGTON	821	310	37.76%	581	1,032
MCCORMICK	17	7	41.18%	9	18
MARION	170	74	43.53%	116	204
MARLBORO	77	40	51.95%	70	98
NEWBERRY	204	100	49.02%	154	249
OCONEE	186	111	59.68%	278	218
ORANGEBUR	609	292	47.95%	443	704
PICKENS	440	235	53.41%	403	475
RICHLAND	1,309	662	50.57%	1,001	1,713
SALUDA	83	30	36.14%	38	92
SPARTANBU	1,793	845	47.13%	1,556	2,207
SUMTER	532	260	48.87%	408	759
UNION	196	84	42.86%	118	208
WILLIAMSBU	202	100	49.50%	154	245
YORK	873	421	48.22%	643	1,025
CENTRAL	2	1	50.00%	1	2
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>19,933</b>	<b>8,872</b>	<b>44.51%</b>	<b>15,182</b>	<b>24,808</b>

**TABLE 4-H  
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**


<b>ADMISSIONS</b>								
<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>Probation</b>		<b>Parole</b>		<b>YOA</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>FY 12</b>	<b>FY 13</b>	<b>FY 12</b>	<b>FY 13</b>	<b>FY 12</b>	<b>FY 13</b>	<b>FY 12</b>	<b>FY 13</b>
<b><u>RACE:</u></b>								
BLACK	50%	48%	65%	66%	71%	67%	53%	51%
WHITE	48%	50%	33%	31%	28%	32%	46%	47%
OTHER	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	2%
<b><u>GENDER:</u></b>								
MALE	78%	78%	92%	91%	96%	96%	81%	80%
FEMALE	22%	22%	8%	9%	4%	4%	19%	20%
<b><u>OFFENSE TYPE:</u></b>								
VIOLENT	4%	5%	48%	47%	2%	2%	8%	9%
NON-VIOLENT	96%	95%	52%	53%	98%	98%	92%	91%

<b>ACTIVES</b>								
<b><u>LEVEL OF SUPERVISION:</u></b>								
STANDARD	78%	63%	65%	58%	68%	49%	76%	62%
MEDIUM	n/a	10%	n/a	9%	n/a	14%	n/a	10%
HIGH RISK	19%	24%	14%	21%	15%	31%	18%	24%
INTENSIVE	1%	1%	13%	4%	16%	4%	3%	1%
SEX OFFENDER	2%	2%	7%	8%	1%	2%	3%	3%

<b>CLOSURES</b>								
<b><u>CASE OUTCOME:</u></b>								
SUCCESSFUL	70%	75%	91%	93%	56%	62%	71%	76%
UNSUCCESSFUL	30%	25%	9%	7%	44%	38%	29%	24%


<b>DRUG TESTING</b>		
	<b>FY 12</b>	<b>FY 13</b>
<b>INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED</b>	19,052	19,933
<b>INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE</b>	8,293	8,872
<b>% OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE</b>	43.53%	44.51%
<b>TOTAL POSITIVE TESTS</b>	14,081	15,182
<b>NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS TESTED</b>	23,121	24,808

**FIGURE 10**  
**ADMISSIONS: A 20-YEAR COMPARISON**





**FIGURE 11**  
**PERCENTAGE OF VIOLENT ADMISSIONS BY STATUS**



Early Release included in Parole for FY 96-98, FY 00-11