

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

# **ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

**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](http://www.dppps.sc.gov)

**Office of Executive Programs**

**Arnise Moultrie, Program Administrator**

**Research and Evaluation**

**Marchar Stagg, Senior Statistical and Research Analyst**

**Saskia Santos, Statistical and Research Analyst**

## TO THE READER

The Annual Statistical Report for Fiscal Year 2014 has been compiled for your review and reference. Fiscal Year 2015 (FY 2015) began July 1, 2014 and ended June 30, 2015. This report provides a statistical representation of the work of 632 employees of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS) including 402 caseload carrying Agents. During the fiscal year, 77% of our probationers and 94% of our parolees successfully completed supervision.

The Department operates its offender programs within a clear framework of public safety in supervising the 48,885 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, 30,929 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, 2015. Our responses to offender risks and needs in the community are focused to address present or potential problems that may interfere with the successful completion of supervision without compromising public safety. We maintain a fundamental belief that given support, resources, and service interventions, the offender has the ability to make positive changes in his or her life.

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

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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SECTION A---TOTAL POPULATION

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

## SECTION B---PROBATION

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

## SECTION C---PAROLE

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

## SECTION D---YOA

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

**SECTION E---SEX OFFENDERS**

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

**SECTION F---VIOLATIONS**

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

**SECTION G---ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE**

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

**SECTION H---SUMMARY**

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

**SECTION A**

**TOTAL  
POPULATION**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## TOTAL POPULATION

Tables 1-A through 6-A and Figures 1 and 2, represent admissions to the SCDPPPS during FY 2015. 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 2015, there were 17,124 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 34.5% of all admissions.

## EXPLANATION OF PROGRAM TYPES

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

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

**YOA:** Includes offenders sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act.

Table 2-A presents information on total admissions by type of offense. Violent refers to those offenses as defined by the Omnibus Crime Act, Section 16-1-60. Total admissions during the fiscal year were predominately non-violent with only 9% admissions for violent offenses. This figure increased one percentage point from the previous year.

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

Table 4-A and Figure 2 describe all active offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2015. This total does not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences. The level of supervision determines how often the Agent has contact with the offender. Among all offenders, standard supervision represented 61%, medium, 14%, and high level supervision represented 20%. 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 2015 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 2015 was 79%, an increase of 1% from last fiscal year. The unsuccessful rate, 21%, 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	123	92%	11	8%	0	0%	134
AIKEN	321	84%	63	16%	0	0%	384
ALLENDALE	44	90%	5	10%	0	0%	49
ANDERSON	531	88%	71	12%	0	0%	602
BAMBERG	33	80%	7	17%	1	2%	41
BARNWELL	79	78%	22	22%	0	0%	101
BEAUFORT	244	87%	34	12%	2	1%	280
BERKELEY	479	88%	65	12%	1	0%	545
CALHOUN	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	33
CHARLESTON	1151	87%	178	13%	1	0%	1,330
CHEROKEE	402	89%	44	10%	7	2%	453
CHESTER	87	81%	20	19%	0	0%	107
CHESTERFIELD	61	72%	24	28%	0	0%	85
CLARENDON	99	79%	26	21%	0	0%	125
COLLETON	147	86%	24	14%	0	0%	171
DARLINGTON	177	80%	44	20%	0	0%	221
DILLON	117	82%	25	18%	0	0%	142
DORCHESTER	279	85%	50	15%	0	0%	329
EDGEFIELD	117	85%	21	15%	0	0%	138
FAIRFIELD	58	85%	10	15%	0	0%	68
FLORENCE	487	79%	130	21%	0	0%	617
GEORGETOWN	131	69%	58	31%	0	0%	189
GREENVILLE	1625	88%	230	12%	0	0%	1,855
GREENWOOD	322	89%	41	11%	0	0%	363
HAMPTON	31	69%	14	31%	0	0%	45
HORRY	649	80%	164	20%	1	0%	814
JASPER	76	83%	16	17%	0	0%	92
KERSHAW	192	87%	28	13%	0	0%	220
LANCASTER	219	87%	34	13%	0	0%	253
LAURENS	337	88%	46	12%	0	0%	383
LEE	61	80%	15	20%	0	0%	76
LEXINGTON	641	82%	145	18%	0	0%	786
McCORMICK	21	81%	5	19%	0	0%	26
MARION	95	74%	33	26%	0	0%	128
MARLBORO	77	75%	25	25%	0	0%	102
NEWBERRY	113	88%	16	12%	0	0%	129
OCONEE	242	90%	26	10%	0	0%	268
ORANGEBURG	350	85%	61	15%	0	0%	411
PICKENS	456	93%	33	7%	0	0%	489
RICHLAND	957	77%	278	23%	0	0%	1,235
SALUDA	55	79%	15	21%	0	0%	70
SPARTANBURG	1284	86%	212	14%	0	0%	1,496
SUMTER	329	80%	80	20%	1	0%	410
UNION	110	79%	29	21%	0	0%	139
WILLIAMSBURG	176	84%	34	16%	0	0%	210
YORK	724	83%	145	17%	2	0%	871
TRANSITIONAL	15	14%	73	67%	21	19%	109
STATE TOTAL	14,352	84%	2,735	16%	37	0%	17,124

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


COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	5	4%	129	96%	134
AIKEN	35	9%	349	91%	384
ALLENDALE	8	16%	41	84%	49
ANDERSON	48	8%	554	92%	602
BAMBERG	3	7%	38	93%	41
BARNWELL	6	6%	95	94%	101
BEAUFORT	18	6%	262	94%	280
BERKELEY	58	11%	487	89%	545
CALHOUN	4	12%	29	88%	33
CHARLESTON	97	7%	1233	93%	1330
CHEROKEE	23	5%	430	95%	453
CHESTER	11	10%	96	90%	107
CHESTERFIELD	11	13%	74	87%	85
CLARENDON	11	9%	114	91%	125
COLLETON	12	7%	159	93%	171
DARLINGTON	24	11%	197	89%	221
DILLON	10	7%	132	93%	142
DORCHESTER	30	9%	299	91%	329
EDGEFIELD	11	8%	127	92%	138
FAIRFIELD	5	7%	63	93%	68
FLORENCE	48	8%	569	92%	617
GEORGETOWN	18	10%	171	90%	189
GREENVILLE	174	9%	1681	91%	1855
GREENWOOD	18	5%	345	95%	363
HAMPTON	8	18%	37	82%	45
HORRY	82	10%	732	90%	814
JASPER	5	5%	87	95%	92
KERSHAW	20	9%	200	91%	220
LANCASTER	20	8%	233	92%	253
LAURENS	20	5%	363	95%	383
LEE	3	4%	73	96%	76
LEXINGTON	80	10%	706	90%	786
McCORMICK	1	4%	25	96%	26
MARION	9	7%	119	93%	128
MARLBORO	11	11%	91	89%	102
NEWBERRY	4	3%	125	97%	129
OCONEE	20	7%	248	93%	268
ORANGEBURG	32	8%	379	92%	411
PICKENS	33	7%	456	93%	489
RICHLAND	170	14%	1065	86%	1235
SALUDA	9	13%	61	87%	70
SPARTANBURG	142	9%	1354	91%	1496
SUMTER	34	8%	376	92%	410
UNION	10	7%	129	93%	139
WILLIAMSBURG	8	4%	202	96%	210
YORK	71	8%	800	92%	871
TRANSITIONAL	45	41%	64	59%	109
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>1,525</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>15,599</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>17,124</b>

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	84%	16%	46%	1%	53%
AIKEN	79%	21%	42%	2%	56%
ALLENDALE	94%	6%	88%	0%	12%
ANDERSON	80%	20%	31%	1%	68%
BAMBERG	78%	22%	61%	0%	39%
BARNWELL	80%	20%	64%	3%	33%
BEAUFORT	83%	18%	56%	5%	40%
BERKELEY	80%	20%	39%	2%	59%
CALHOUN	91%	9%	64%	0%	36%
CHARLESTON	84%	16%	66%	1%	34%
CHEROKEE	73%	27%	29%	2%	69%
CHESTER	83%	17%	60%	2%	38%
CHESTERFIELD	87%	13%	52%	2%	46%
CLARENDON	89%	11%	82%	2%	16%
COLLETON	82%	18%	58%	2%	40%
DARLINGTON	70%	30%	56%	1%	43%
DILLON	76%	24%	52%	8%	39%
DORCHESTER	79%	21%	43%	2%	55%
EDGEFIELD	80%	20%	52%	1%	46%
FAIRFIELD	82%	18%	68%	0%	32%
FLORENCE	80%	20%	69%	1%	30%
GEORGETOWN	87%	13%	61%	0%	39%
GREENVILLE	76%	24%	39%	4%	57%
GREENWOOD	75%	25%	54%	1%	44%
HAMPTON	93%	7%	78%	0%	22%
HORRY	78%	22%	34%	2%	64%
JASPER	77%	23%	62%	2%	36%
KERSHAW	79%	21%	45%	1%	53%
LANCASTER	80%	20%	39%	2%	59%
LAURENS	74%	26%	33%	1%	66%
LEE	87%	13%	79%	0%	21%
LEXINGTON	78%	22%	35%	1%	64%
McCORMICK	77%	23%	38%	0%	62%
MARION	86%	14%	66%	2%	32%
MARLBORO	79%	21%	62%	5%	33%
NEWBERRY	82%	18%	68%	2%	29%
OCONEE	77%	23%	15%	1%	84%
ORANGEBURG	79%	21%	73%	0%	27%
PICKENS	72%	28%	14%	2%	84%
RICHLAND	82%	18%	76%	2%	22%
SALUDA	84%	16%	54%	4%	41%
SPARTANBURG	76%	24%	37%	2%	61%
SUMTER	84%	16%	80%	0%	19%
UNION	79%	21%	47%	0%	53%
WILLIAMSBURG	83%	17%	70%	0%	30%
YORK	80%	20%	41%	3%	56%
TRANSITIONAL	90%	10%	55%	4%	41%
STATE TOTAL	79%	21%	49%	2%	49%


**FIGURE 1**  
**TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2015**



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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	66%	16%	17%	0%	1%	183
AIKEN	56%	13%	27%	1%	4%	936
ALLENDALE	84%	8%	5%	0%	3%	98
ANDERSON	59%	12%	24%	1%	3%	1661
BAMBERG	80%	7%	6%	0%	6%	95
BARNWELL	76%	14%	7%	1%	2%	180
BEAUFORT	82%	9%	7%	0%	3%	341
BERKELEY	69%	9%	15%	3%	4%	916
CALHOUN	81%	8%	8%	3%	1%	80
CHARLESTON	51%	17%	29%	2%	2%	2337
CHEROKEE	60%	17%	19%	2%	1%	754
CHESTER	61%	17%	21%	1%	2%	199
CHESTERFIELD	73%	14%	8%	2%	4%	132
CLARENDON	66%	14%	15%	0%	5%	205
COLLETON	59%	14%	23%	1%	3%	333
DARLINGTON	69%	10%	18%	0%	2%	362
DILLON	84%	7%	5%	1%	2%	134
DORCHESTER	59%	17%	21%	1%	3%	746
EDGEFIELD	66%	13%	17%	2%	3%	224
FAIRFIELD	63%	13%	21%	0%	3%	144
FLORENCE	66%	16%	14%	1%	3%	993
GEORGETOWN	67%	9%	20%	2%	2%	254
GREENVILLE	56%	16%	25%	1%	2%	3663
GREENWOOD	65%	15%	18%	1%	1%	610
HAMPTON	76%	10%	9%	0%	4%	138
HORRY	65%	13%	15%	2%	5%	1271
JASPER	66%	11%	19%	1%	3%	209
KERSHAW	54%	14%	27%	1%	4%	379
LANCASTER	70%	11%	16%	1%	2%	406
LAURENS	50%	19%	27%	2%	2%	573
LEE	74%	15%	8%	0%	3%	133
LEXINGTON	68%	14%	14%	2%	2%	1219
McCORMICK	74%	9%	10%	4%	3%	77
MARION	76%	16%	6%	1%	1%	185
MARLBORO	71%	15%	9%	1%	4%	127
NEWBERRY	57%	19%	19%	3%	3%	228
OCONEE	68%	14%	12%	1%	4%	508
ORANGEBURG	69%	11%	18%	1%	1%	1045
PICKENS	55%	23%	19%	0%	2%	934
RICHLAND	61%	13%	22%	2%	2%	2524
SALUDA	71%	15%	7%	2%	6%	121
SPARTANBURG	59%	16%	21%	1%	3%	2712
SUMTER	66%	15%	15%	0%	3%	747
UNION	49%	14%	35%	0%	2%	290
WILLIAMSBURG	52%	11%	31%	2%	4%	327
YORK	66%	14%	16%	1%	2%	1191
TRANSITIONAL	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	5
STATE TOTAL	61%	14%	20%	1%	3%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	18,986	4,472	6,274	371	826	30,929

**FIGURE 2**  
**ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2015**



**CONTACT STANDARDS**

**STANDARD**

- 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

**MEDIUM**

- One Progress report every other month
- One additional progress report must be conducted every six months as a Field Visit or Home Visit

**HIGH**

- One Progress Report Every Other Month
- An additional progress report must be conducted as a Field Visit or Home Visit every quarter

**INTENSIVE**

- Two Progress Reports per Month
- One of the two progress reports must be conducted as a Field Visit or Home Visit

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

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	63	81%	15	19%
AIKEN	331	82%	75	18%
ALLENDALE	19	83%	4	17%
ANDERSON	492	82%	107	18%
BAMBERG	49	78%	14	22%
BARNWELL	45	76%	14	24%
BEAUFORT	260	87%	39	13%
BERKELEY	292	74%	101	26%
CALHOUN	33	77%	10	23%
CHARLESTON	1001	80%	248	20%
CHEROKEE	241	67%	117	33%
CHESTER	87	83%	18	17%
CHESTERFIELD	61	87%	9	13%
CLARENDON	85	75%	28	25%
COLLETON	131	72%	50	28%
DARLINGTON	167	83%	35	17%
DILLON	114	86%	18	14%
DORCHESTER	260	75%	88	25%
EDGEFIELD	70	76%	22	24%
FAIRFIELD	82	82%	18	18%
FLORENCE	378	74%	131	26%
GEORGETOWN	128	79%	35	21%
GREENVILLE	1585	75%	523	25%
GREENWOOD	244	78%	68	22%
HAMPTON	44	90%	5	10%
HORRY	502	73%	181	27%
JASPER	67	75%	22	25%
KERSHAW	102	72%	40	28%
LANCASTER	191	77%	57	23%
LAURENS	188	79%	49	21%
LEE	46	79%	12	21%
LEXINGTON	385	71%	157	29%
MCCORMICK	25	93%	2	7%
MARION	96	78%	27	22%
MARLBORO	68	74%	24	26%
NEWBERRY	91	76%	28	24%
OCONEE	150	85%	27	15%
ORANGEBURG	264	85%	48	15%
PICKENS	300	79%	78	21%
RICHLAND	864	72%	341	28%
SALUDA	45	85%	8	15%
SPARTANBURG	939	72%	370	28%
SUMTER	304	78%	88	22%
UNION	132	80%	32	20%
WILLIAMSBURG	116	85%	21	15%
YORK	546	82%	121	18%
TRANSITIONAL	1524	99%	8	1%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>13,207</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>3,533</b>	<b>21%</b>

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

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	26	19%	108	81%
AIKEN	97	25%	287	75%
ALLENDALE	10	20%	39	80%
ANDERSON	113	19%	489	81%
BAMBERG	8	20%	33	80%
BARNWELL	27	27%	74	73%
BEAUFORT	84	30%	196	70%
BERKELEY	145	27%	400	73%
CALHOUN	7	21%	26	79%
CHARLESTON	355	27%	975	73%
CHEROKEE	80	18%	373	82%
CHESTER	32	30%	75	70%
CHESTERFIELD	19	22%	66	78%
CLARENDON	20	16%	105	84%
COLLETON	51	30%	120	70%
DARLINGTON	55	25%	166	75%
DILLON	38	27%	104	73%
DORCHESTER	89	27%	240	73%
EDGEFIELD	38	28%	100	72%
FAIRFIELD	15	22%	53	78%
FLORENCE	154	25%	463	75%
GEORGETOWN	42	22%	147	78%
GREENVILLE	360	19%	1495	81%
GREENWOOD	91	25%	272	75%
HAMPTON	13	29%	32	71%
HORRY	218	27%	596	73%
JASPER	21	23%	71	77%
KERSHAW	56	25%	164	75%
LANCASTER	43	17%	210	83%
LAURENS	74	19%	309	81%
LEE	28	37%	48	63%
LEXINGTON	166	21%	620	79%
McCORMICK	6	23%	20	77%
MARION	32	25%	96	75%
MARLBORO	20	20%	82	80%
NEWBERRY	31	24%	98	76%
OCONEE	42	16%	226	84%
ORANGEBURG	93	23%	318	77%
PICKENS	114	23%	375	77%
RICHLAND	308	25%	927	75%
SALUDA	16	23%	54	77%
SPARTANBURG	299	20%	1197	80%
SUMTER	102	25%	308	75%
UNION	41	29%	98	71%
WILLIAMSBURG	49	23%	161	77%
YORK	241	28%	630	72%
TRANSITIONAL	33	30%	76	70%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>4,002</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>13,122</b>	<b>77%</b>

**SECTION B**

**PROBATION**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## 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 2015. Probation includes Probation, PTUP (Probation Terminated Upon Payment), Split Probation admitted to probation with a split sentence from prison, Monitor for the Court, and NGRI (Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity).

Table 1-B shows probation admissions in terms of offense type, violent or non-violent. For FY 2015, only 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, at 77%, with a racial composition of 46% black, 2% other, and 52% white.

Table 3-B and Figure 3 describe the active probation offender population in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2015. 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 62%, the medium supervision level represented 14%, the high supervision level represented 20% of the population, intensive supervision was 1% followed by sex offender supervision representing 2%.

Table 4-B provides data for probation closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for probationers was 77%, slightly lower than the total offender population success rate of 79%.

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	3	2%	120	98%	123
AIKEN	17	5%	304	95%	321
ALLENDALE	5	11%	39	89%	44
ANDERSON	18	3%	513	97%	531
BAMBERG	0	0%	33	100%	33
BARNWELL	1	1%	78	99%	79
BEAUFORT	5	2%	239	98%	244
BERKELEY	31	6%	448	94%	479
CALHOUN	1	4%	27	96%	28
CHARLESTON	29	3%	1122	97%	1151
CHEROKEE	9	2%	393	98%	402
CHESTER	3	3%	84	97%	87
CHESTERFIELD	4	7%	57	93%	61
CLARENDON	2	2%	97	98%	99
COLLETON	6	4%	141	96%	147
DARLINGTON	4	2%	173	98%	177
DILLON	3	3%	114	97%	117
DORCHESTER	15	5%	264	95%	279
EDGEFIELD	2	2%	115	98%	117
FAIRFIELD	0	0%	58	100%	58
FLORENCE	18	4%	469	96%	487
GEORGETOWN	2	2%	129	98%	131
GREENVILLE	76	5%	1549	95%	1625
GREENWOOD	10	3%	312	97%	322
HAMPTON	2	6%	29	94%	31
HORRY	25	4%	624	96%	649
JASPER	0	0%	76	100%	76
KERSHAW	9	5%	183	95%	192
LANCASTER	5	2%	214	98%	219
LAURENS	7	2%	330	98%	337
LEE	1	2%	60	98%	61
LEXINGTON	29	5%	612	95%	641
McCORMICK	1	5%	20	95%	21
MARION	3	3%	92	97%	95
MARLBORO	2	3%	75	97%	77
NEWBERRY	2	2%	111	98%	113
OCONEE	12	5%	230	95%	242
ORANGEBURG	7	2%	343	98%	350
PICKENS	18	4%	438	96%	456
RICHLAND	33	3%	924	97%	957
SALUDA	3	5%	52	95%	55
SPARTANBURG	62	5%	1222	95%	1284
SUMTER	5	2%	324	98%	329
UNION	2	2%	108	98%	110
WILLIAMSBURG	1	1%	175	99%	176
YORK	25	3%	699	97%	724
TRANSITIONAL	1	7%	14	93%	15
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>13,833</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>14,352</b>


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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	83%	17%	46%	1%	54%
AIKEN	76%	24%	41%	2%	57%
ALLENDALE	93%	7%	91%	0%	9%
ANDERSON	79%	21%	31%	1%	68%
BAMBERG	73%	27%	61%	0%	39%
BARNWELL	78%	22%	65%	3%	33%
BEAUFORT	81%	19%	56%	4%	40%
BERKELEY	79%	21%	38%	2%	61%
CALHOUN	89%	11%	64%	0%	36%
CHARLESTON	83%	17%	63%	1%	36%
CHEROKEE	71%	29%	27%	3%	70%
CHESTER	79%	21%	60%	2%	38%
CHESTERFIELD	84%	16%	44%	3%	52%
CLARENDON	86%	14%	81%	2%	17%
COLLETON	80%	20%	57%	2%	41%
DARLINGTON	66%	34%	51%	1%	48%
DILLON	73%	27%	47%	9%	44%
DORCHESTER	77%	23%	41%	1%	58%
EDGEFIELD	78%	22%	52%	1%	47%
FAIRFIELD	81%	19%	67%	0%	33%
FLORENCE	75%	25%	67%	1%	32%
GEORGETOWN	82%	18%	57%	0%	43%
GREENVILLE	74%	26%	37%	4%	59%
GREENWOOD	73%	27%	53%	2%	45%
HAMPTON	90%	10%	71%	0%	29%
HORRY	73%	27%	30%	1%	69%
JASPER	76%	24%	64%	1%	34%
KERSHAW	77%	23%	44%	2%	55%
LANCASTER	78%	22%	37%	2%	61%
LAURENS	72%	28%	31%	1%	68%
LEE	84%	16%	75%	0%	25%
LEXINGTON	76%	24%	31%	1%	68%
McCORMICK	71%	29%	38%	0%	62%
MARION	81%	19%	60%	1%	39%
MARLBORO	73%	27%	55%	6%	39%
NEWBERRY	80%	20%	66%	3%	31%
OCONEE	76%	24%	15%	1%	84%
ORANGEBURG	76%	24%	71%	0%	29%
PICKENS	71%	29%	14%	2%	85%
RICHLAND	80%	20%	74%	2%	24%
SALUDA	80%	20%	55%	2%	44%
SPARTANBURG	73%	27%	34%	3%	63%
SUMTER	81%	19%	79%	1%	20%
UNION	75%	25%	40%	0%	60%
WILLIAMSBURG	81%	19%	68%	0%	32%
YORK	77%	23%	39%	3%	58%
TRANSITIONAL	80%	20%	27%	0%	73%
STATE TOTAL	77%	23%	46%	2%	52%

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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	67%	17%	17%	0%	0%	168
AIKEN	56%	12%	28%	0%	4%	811
ALLENDALE	89%	8%	2%	0%	1%	87
ANDERSON	59%	12%	25%	1%	2%	1,527
BAMBERG	83%	9%	5%	0%	4%	82
BARNWELL	76%	13%	7%	1%	2%	150
BEAUFORT	84%	7%	6%	0%	3%	294
BERKELEY	71%	9%	14%	3%	3%	813
CALHOUN	81%	8%	7%	3%	1%	72
CHARLESTON	52%	17%	28%	2%	2%	2,020
CHEROKEE	62%	17%	19%	1%	1%	670
CHESTER	57%	17%	25%	1%	1%	163
CHESTERFIELD	80%	9%	9%	0%	2%	110
CLARENDON	66%	15%	15%	0%	4%	167
COLLETON	61%	13%	24%	0%	2%	297
DARLINGTON	71%	9%	18%	0%	2%	303
DILLON	84%	8%	6%	0%	2%	102
DORCHESTER	61%	15%	21%	0%	2%	646
EDGEFIELD	68%	11%	17%	2%	2%	194
FAIRFIELD	62%	13%	21%	0%	3%	126
FLORENCE	67%	16%	14%	0%	3%	819
GEORGETOWN	70%	7%	21%	0%	2%	183
GREENVILLE	56%	16%	26%	0%	2%	3,295
GREENWOOD	66%	16%	17%	1%	1%	532
HAMPTON	79%	9%	10%	0%	2%	112
HORRY	68%	12%	14%	1%	4%	1,038
JASPER	66%	10%	21%	1%	3%	175
KERSHAW	54%	14%	27%	1%	3%	333
LANCASTER	71%	11%	17%	0%	1%	362
LAURENS	51%	19%	28%	1%	1%	490
LEE	77%	14%	7%	0%	2%	107
LEXINGTON	69%	14%	14%	2%	2%	1,050
McCORMICK	73%	9%	12%	5%	2%	66
MARION	79%	15%	5%	0%	1%	148
MARLBORO	69%	16%	11%	0%	4%	99
NEWBERRY	56%	20%	19%	3%	2%	209
OCONEE	69%	14%	12%	1%	5%	463
ORANGEBURG	70%	11%	18%	0%	1%	907
PICKENS	56%	24%	19%	0%	2%	872
RICHLAND	62%	13%	22%	2%	2%	2,056
SALUDA	71%	14%	7%	2%	7%	107
SPARTANBURG	60%	16%	21%	1%	2%	2,400
SUMTER	68%	15%	15%	0%	2%	626
UNION	50%	14%	35%	0%	0%	257
WILLIAMSBURG	52%	10%	34%	0%	4%	258
YORK	67%	14%	16%	0%	2%	1,035
TRANSITIONAL	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	5
STATE TOTAL	62%	14%	20%	1%	2%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	16,694	3,849	5,463	222	578	26,809

**FIGURE 3**  
**ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2015**



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

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	58	79%	15	21%
AIKEN	255	79%	68	21%
ALLENDALE	14	82%	3	18%
ANDERSON	432	81%	102	19%
BAMBERG	39	78%	11	22%
BARNWELL	34	74%	12	26%
BEAUFORT	224	88%	32	13%
BERKELEY	257	74%	91	26%
CALHOUN	27	75%	9	25%
CHARLESTON	834	79%	216	21%
CHEROKEE	212	66%	111	34%
CHESTER	63	79%	17	21%
CHESTERFIELD	52	87%	8	13%
CLARENDON	70	72%	27	28%
COLLETON	113	75%	37	25%
DARLINGTON	128	83%	27	17%
DILLON	93	85%	17	15%
DORCHESTER	210	72%	80	28%
EDGEFIELD	62	75%	21	25%
FAIRFIELD	70	80%	17	20%
FLORENCE	290	72%	113	28%
GEORGETOWN	89	78%	25	22%
GREENVILLE	1421	73%	516	27%
GREENWOOD	206	77%	61	23%
HAMPTON	37	90%	4	10%
HORRY	374	70%	163	30%
JASPER	56	74%	20	26%
KERSHAW	79	71%	32	29%
LANCASTER	165	76%	51	24%
LAURENS	153	78%	44	22%
LEE	30	75%	10	25%
LEXINGTON	282	66%	144	34%
MCCORMICK	20	91%	2	9%
MARION	73	74%	26	26%
MARLBORO	49	72%	19	28%
NEWBERRY	75	74%	26	26%
OCONEE	134	84%	26	16%
ORANGEBURG	213	86%	35	14%
PICKENS	265	77%	77	23%
RICHLAND	653	68%	301	32%
SALUDA	39	85%	7	15%
SPARTANBURG	806	70%	351	30%
SUMTER	234	76%	73	24%
UNION	105	78%	29	22%
WILLIAMSBURG	87	82%	19	18%
YORK	411	80%	102	20%
TRANSITIONAL	1394	99%	8	1%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>10,987</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>3,205</b>	<b>23%</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	24	20%	99	80%
AIKEN	86	27%	235	73%
ALLENDALE	10	23%	34	77%
ANDERSON	108	20%	423	80%
BAMBERG	8	24%	25	76%
BARNWELL	24	30%	55	70%
BEAUFORT	74	30%	170	70%
BERKELEY	130	27%	349	73%
CALHOUN	7	25%	21	75%
CHARLESTON	317	28%	834	72%
CHEROKEE	70	17%	332	83%
CHESTER	27	31%	60	69%
CHESTERFIELD	16	26%	45	74%
CLARENDON	20	20%	79	80%
COLLETON	43	29%	104	71%
DARLINGTON	49	28%	128	72%
DILLON	30	26%	87	74%
DORCHESTER	77	28%	202	72%
EDGEFIELD	38	32%	79	68%
FAIRFIELD	14	24%	44	76%
FLORENCE	129	26%	358	74%
GEORGETOWN	39	30%	92	70%
GREENVILLE	338	21%	1287	79%
GREENWOOD	82	25%	240	75%
HAMPTON	11	35%	20	65%
HORRY	189	29%	460	71%
JASPER	18	24%	58	76%
KERSHAW	52	27%	140	73%
LANCASTER	41	19%	178	81%
LAURENS	69	20%	268	80%
LEE	25	41%	36	59%
LEXINGTON	145	23%	496	77%
MCCORMICK	6	29%	15	71%
MARION	25	26%	70	74%
MARLBORO	15	19%	62	81%
NEWBERRY	28	25%	85	75%
OCONEE	39	16%	203	84%
ORANGEBURG	84	24%	266	76%
PICKENS	112	25%	344	75%
RICHLAND	271	28%	686	72%
SALUDA	14	25%	41	75%
SPARTANBURG	274	21%	1010	79%
SUMTER	93	28%	236	72%
UNION	36	33%	74	67%
WILLIAMSBURG	47	27%	129	73%
YORK	214	30%	510	70%
TRANSITIONAL	4	27%	11	73%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>3,572</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>10,780</b>	<b>75%</b>

**SECTION C**

**PAROLE**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## PAROLE

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

Table 1-C shows parole admissions by type of offense. A larger percent of parole admissions, 37%, fall into the violent category, as compared to 4% for probation admissions (see Table 1-B) and 3% for YOA admissions (see Table 1-D).

Table 2-C describes all parole admissions by gender and race. Parole admissions consisted primarily of males, 92%, with a racial composition of 63% black, 2% other, and 36% white.

Table 3-C and Figure 4 describe active parolees by level of supervision on June 30, 2015. 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 57% of the population, medium level accounted for 14% of the population, high level was 18%, intensive supervision, 4%, and sex offender supervision was 7%.

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

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

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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	2	18%	9	82%	11
AIKEN	18	29%	45	71%	63
ALLENDALE	3	60%	2	40%	5
ANDERSON	30	42%	41	58%	71
BAMBERG	3	43%	4	57%	7
BARNWELL	5	23%	17	77%	22
BEAUFORT	13	38%	21	62%	34
BERKELEY	27	42%	38	58%	65
CALHOUN	3	60%	2	40%	5
CHARLESTON	68	38%	110	62%	178
CHEROKEE	14	32%	30	68%	44
CHESTER	8	40%	12	60%	20
CHESTERFIELD	7	29%	17	71%	24
CLARENDON	9	35%	17	65%	26
COLLETON	6	25%	18	75%	24
DARLINGTON	20	45%	24	55%	44
DILLON	7	28%	18	72%	25
DORCHESTER	15	30%	35	70%	50
EDGEFIELD	9	43%	12	57%	21
FAIRFIELD	5	50%	5	50%	10
FLORENCE	30	23%	100	77%	130
GEORGETOWN	16	28%	42	72%	58
GREENVILLE	98	43%	132	57%	230
GREENWOOD	8	20%	33	80%	41
HAMPTON	6	43%	8	57%	14
HORRY	57	35%	107	65%	164
JASPER	5	31%	11	69%	16
KERSHAW	11	39%	17	61%	28
LANCASTER	15	44%	19	56%	34
LAURENS	13	28%	33	72%	46
LEE	2	13%	13	87%	15
LEXINGTON	51	35%	94	65%	145
McCORMICK	0	0%	5	100%	5
MARION	6	18%	27	82%	33
MARLBORO	9	36%	16	64%	25
NEWBERRY	2	13%	14	88%	16
OCONEE	8	31%	18	69%	26
ORANGEBURG	25	41%	36	59%	61
PICKENS	15	45%	18	55%	33
RICHLAND	137	49%	141	51%	278
SALUDA	6	40%	9	60%	15
SPARTANBURG	80	38%	132	62%	212
SUMTER	29	36%	51	64%	80
UNION	8	28%	21	72%	29
WILLIAMSBURG	7	21%	27	79%	34
YORK	46	32%	99	68%	145
TRANSITIONAL	43	59%	30	41%	73
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>1,005</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>1,730</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>2,735</b>


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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	55%	0%	45%
AIKEN	94%	6%	48%	0%	52%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
ANDERSON	92%	8%	28%	4%	68%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	71%	0%	29%
BARNWELL	86%	14%	64%	5%	32%
BEAUFORT	94%	6%	50%	12%	38%
BERKELEY	89%	11%	52%	0%	48%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
CHARLESTON	95%	5%	84%	1%	16%
CHEROKEE	84%	16%	43%	0%	57%
CHESTER	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
CHESTERFIELD	96%	4%	71%	0%	29%
CLARENDON	100%	0%	85%	4%	12%
COLLETON	96%	4%	63%	4%	33%
DARLINGTON	84%	16%	75%	0%	25%
DILLON	92%	8%	76%	4%	20%
DORCHESTER	86%	14%	58%	2%	40%
EDGEFIELD	95%	5%	52%	5%	43%
FAIRFIELD	90%	10%	70%	0%	30%
FLORENCE	95%	5%	75%	1%	24%
GEORGETOWN	97%	3%	69%	0%	31%
GREENVILLE	88%	12%	55%	1%	44%
GREENWOOD	93%	7%	61%	0%	39%
HAMPTON	100%	0%	93%	0%	7%
HORRY	94%	6%	52%	4%	44%
JASPER	81%	19%	50%	6%	44%
KERSHAW	93%	7%	57%	0%	43%
LANCASTER	94%	6%	47%	3%	50%
LAURENS	89%	11%	46%	0%	54%
LEE	100%	0%	93%	0%	7%
LEXINGTON	88%	12%	49%	1%	50%
McCORMICK	100%	0%	40%	0%	60%
MARION	100%	0%	85%	3%	12%
MARLBORO	100%	0%	84%	0%	16%
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	81%	0%	19%
OCONEE	85%	15%	15%	0%	85%
ORANGEBURG	93%	7%	85%	0%	15%
PICKENS	91%	9%	21%	6%	73%
RICHLAND	91%	9%	84%	2%	14%
SALUDA	100%	0%	53%	13%	33%
SPARTANBURG	92%	8%	52%	1%	47%
SUMTER	98%	3%	86%	0%	14%
UNION	97%	3%	76%	0%	24%
WILLIAMSBURG	94%	6%	76%	0%	24%
YORK	92%	8%	52%	2%	46%
TRANSITIONAL	92%	8%	58%	5%	37%
STATE TOTAL	92%	8%	63%	2%	36%

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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	57%	14%	21%	0%	7%	14
AIKEN	57%	17%	16%	1%	9%	95
ALLENDALE	25%	25%	0%	0%	50%	4
ANDERSON	62%	13%	10%	6%	9%	111
BAMBERG	55%	0%	18%	0%	27%	11
BARNWELL	76%	12%	8%	0%	4%	25
BEAUFORT	69%	17%	11%	0%	3%	36
BERKELEY	59%	7%	20%	4%	11%	82
CALHOUN	80%	0%	20%	0%	0%	5
CHARLESTON	50%	14%	29%	2%	5%	236
CHEROKEE	43%	19%	20%	13%	4%	69
CHESTER	77%	17%	3%	0%	3%	35
CHESTERFIELD	35%	35%	5%	10%	15%	20
CLARENDON	66%	11%	9%	0%	14%	35
COLLETON	47%	13%	23%	7%	10%	30
DARLINGTON	61%	17%	17%	0%	6%	54
DILLON	81%	7%	4%	4%	4%	27
DORCHESTER	48%	28%	19%	0%	5%	79
EDGEFIELD	52%	17%	17%	4%	9%	23
FAIRFIELD	69%	6%	19%	0%	6%	16
FLORENCE	62%	17%	14%	1%	5%	167
GEORGETOWN	58%	16%	17%	6%	3%	64
GREENVILLE	54%	14%	22%	4%	7%	334
GREENWOOD	54%	9%	25%	5%	8%	65
HAMPTON	58%	11%	11%	0%	21%	19
HORRY	54%	13%	19%	5%	9%	197
JASPER	79%	8%	4%	0%	8%	24
KERSHAW	55%	9%	25%	2%	9%	44
LANCASTER	67%	10%	7%	5%	12%	42
LAURENS	44%	17%	21%	10%	8%	71
LEE	70%	13%	9%	0%	9%	23
LEXINGTON	56%	15%	17%	7%	5%	150
McCORMICK	71%	14%	0%	0%	14%	7
MARION	67%	18%	6%	6%	3%	33
MARLBORO	78%	11%	4%	4%	4%	27
NEWBERRY	65%	6%	24%	0%	6%	17
OCONEE	63%	20%	13%	5%	0%	40
ORANGEBURG	64%	7%	19%	3%	7%	96
PICKENS	43%	22%	28%	6%	2%	54
RICHLAND	60%	12%	19%	5%	4%	418
SALUDA	71%	21%	7%	0%	0%	14
SPARTANBURG	47%	16%	21%	4%	11%	289
SUMTER	63%	13%	15%	1%	7%	98
UNION	35%	19%	32%	0%	13%	31
WILLIAMSBURG	58%	15%	18%	4%	5%	55
YORK	62%	15%	18%	1%	3%	146
TRANSITIONAL	---	---	---	---	---	---
STATE TOTAL	57%	14%	18%	4%	7%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	2,004	506	651	130	241	3,532

**FIGURE 4**  
**ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2015**



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

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	5	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	52	96%	2	4%
ALLENDALE	3	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	56	100%	0	0%
BAMBERG	6	86%	1	14%
BARNWELL	7	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	27	87%	4	13%
BERKELEY	29	94%	2	6%
CALHOUN	4	100%	0	0%
CHARLESTON	119	95%	6	5%
CHEROKEE	22	88%	3	12%
CHESTER	20	100%	0	0%
CHESTERFIELD	8	100%	0	0%
CLARENDON	12	100%	0	0%
COLLETON	13	87%	2	13%
DARLINGTON	33	97%	1	3%
DILLON	16	94%	1	6%
DORCHESTER	29	97%	1	3%
EDGEFIELD	8	100%	0	0%
FAIRFIELD	10	91%	1	9%
FLORENCE	81	92%	7	8%
GEORGETOWN	34	89%	4	11%
GREENVILLE	147	98%	3	2%
GREENWOOD	34	97%	1	3%
HAMPTON	3	75%	1	25%
HORRY	109	95%	6	5%
JASPER	6	100%	0	0%
KERSHAW	21	88%	3	13%
LANCASTER	24	100%	0	0%
LAURENS	26	96%	1	4%
LEE	12	86%	2	14%
LEXINGTON	88	95%	5	5%
MCCORMICK	4	100%	0	0%
MARION	18	100%	0	0%
MARLBORO	18	90%	2	10%
NEWBERRY	16	94%	1	6%
OCONEE	11	100%	0	0%
ORANGEBURG	41	87%	6	13%
PICKENS	30	100%	0	0%
RICHLAND	168	90%	18	10%
SALUDA	6	86%	1	14%
SPARTANBURG	122	92%	10	8%
SUMTER	56	92%	5	8%
UNION	25	96%	1	4%
WILLIAMSBURG	26	100%	0	0%
YORK	117	94%	7	6%
TRANSITIONAL	101	100%	0	0%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>1,823</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>6%</b>

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

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	2	18%	9	82%
AIKEN	11	17%	52	83%
ALLENDALE	0	0%	5	100%
ANDERSON	5	7%	66	93%
BAMBERG	0	0%	7	100%
BARNWELL	3	14%	19	86%
BEAUFORT	8	24%	26	76%
BERKELEY	14	22%	51	78%
CALHOUN	0	0%	5	100%
CHARLESTON	37	21%	141	79%
CHEROKEE	3	7%	41	93%
CHESTER	5	25%	15	75%
CHESTERFIELD	3	13%	21	88%
CLARENDON	0	0%	26	100%
COLLETON	8	33%	16	67%
DARLINGTON	6	14%	38	86%
DILLON	8	32%	17	68%
DORCHESTER	12	24%	38	76%
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	21	100%
FAIRFIELD	1	10%	9	90%
FLORENCE	25	19%	105	81%
GEORGETOWN	3	5%	55	95%
GREENVILLE	22	10%	208	90%
GREENWOOD	9	22%	32	78%
HAMPTON	2	14%	12	86%
HORRY	28	17%	136	83%
JASPER	3	19%	13	81%
KERSHAW	4	14%	24	86%
LANCASTER	2	6%	32	94%
LAURENS	5	11%	41	89%
LEE	3	20%	12	80%
LEXINGTON	21	14%	124	86%
McCORMICK	0	0%	5	100%
MARION	7	21%	26	79%
MARLBORO	5	20%	20	80%
NEWBERRY	3	19%	13	81%
OCONEE	3	12%	23	88%
ORANGEBURG	9	15%	52	85%
PICKENS	2	6%	31	94%
RICHLAND	37	13%	241	87%
SALUDA	2	13%	13	87%
SPARTANBURG	25	12%	187	88%
SUMTER	9	11%	71	89%
UNION	5	17%	24	83%
WILLIAMSBURG	2	6%	32	94%
YORK	25	17%	120	83%
TRANSITIONAL	12	16%	61	84%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2,336</b>	<b>85%</b>

**SECTION D**

**YOUTHFUL  
OFFENDERS**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## **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 3% is slightly less than for those admitted to probation of 4% (See Table 1-B).

Table 2-D illustrates YOA admissions by gender and race. Admissions were predominately male (89%) and black (59%).

Table 3-D and Figure 5 describe the active population for YOA conditional release offenders in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2015. Of the total active YOA population, 49% were supervised at standard level, 20% at medium, 27% at high, 3% at intensive, and 1% at the sex offender supervision level.

Table 4-D shows YOA offenders are more inclined to close unsuccessfully (36%) than the parole population (6%, see Table 4-C) or the probation population (23%, See Table 4-B).

Table 5-D describes YOA admissions by age category.

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

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	---	---	---	---	---
AIKEN	---	---	---	---	---
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	---	---	---	---	---
BAMBERG	0	0%	1	100%	1
BARNWELL	---	---	---	---	---
BEAUFORT	0	0%	2	100%	2
BERKELEY	0	0%	1	100%	1
CALHOUN	---	---	---	---	---
CHARLESTON	0	0%	1	100%	1
CHEROKEE	0	0%	7	100%	7
CHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	---	---	---	---	---
COLLETON	---	---	---	---	---
DARLINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
DILLON	---	---	---	---	---
DORCHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	---	---	---	---	---
GEORGETOWN	---	---	---	---	---
GREENVILLE	---	---	---	---	---
GREENWOOD	---	---	---	---	---
HAMPTON	---	---	---	---	---
HORRY	0	0%	1	100%	1
JASPER	---	---	---	---	---
KERSHAW	---	---	---	---	---
LANCASTER	---	---	---	---	---
LAURENS	---	---	---	---	---
LEE	---	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
McCORMICK	---	---	---	---	---
MARION	---	---	---	---	---
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	---	---	---	---	---
OCONEE	---	---	---	---	---
ORANGEBURG	---	---	---	---	---
PICKENS	---	---	---	---	---
RICHLAND	---	---	---	---	---
SALUDA	---	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	---	---	---	---	---
SUMTER	0	0%	1	100%	1
UNION	---	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMSBURG	---	---	---	---	---
YORK	0	0%	2	100%	2
TRANSITIONAL	1	5%	20	95%	21
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>37</b>


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

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	---	---	---	---	---
AIKEN	---	---	---	---	---
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	---	---	---	---	---
BAMBERG	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
BARNWELL	---	---	---	---	---
BEAUFORT	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
BERKELEY	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
CALHOUN	---	---	---	---	---
CHARLESTON	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
CHEROKEE	86%	14%	43%	0%	57%
CHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	---	---	---	---	---
COLLETON	---	---	---	---	---
DARLINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
DILLON	---	---	---	---	---
DORCHESTER	---	---	---	---	---
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	---	---	---	---	---
GEORGETOWN	---	---	---	---	---
GREENVILLE	---	---	---	---	---
GREENWOOD	---	---	---	---	---
HAMPTON	---	---	---	---	---
HORRY	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
JASPER	---	---	---	---	---
KERSHAW	---	---	---	---	---
LANCASTER	---	---	---	---	---
LAURENS	---	---	---	---	---
LEE	---	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	---	---	---	---	---
McCORMICK	---	---	---	---	---
MARION	---	---	---	---	---
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	---	---	---	---	---
OCONEE	---	---	---	---	---
ORANGEBURG	---	---	---	---	---
PICKENS	---	---	---	---	---
RICHLAND	---	---	---	---	---
SALUDA	---	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	---	---	---	---	---
SUMTER	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
UNION	---	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMSBURG	---	---	---	---	---
YORK	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
TRANSITIONAL	90%	10%	67%	0%	33%
STATE TOTAL	89%	11%	59%	0%	41%

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

COUNTY	STANDARD	MEDIUM	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
AIKEN	57%	10%	27%	3%	3%	30
ALLENDALE	57%	0%	43%	0%	0%	7
ANDERSON	43%	26%	30%	0%	0%	23
BAMBERG	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2
BARNWELL	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	5
BEAUFORT	82%	9%	9%	0%	0%	11
BERKELEY	52%	19%	24%	5%	0%	21
CALHOUN	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3
CHARLESTON	38%	22%	40%	0%	0%	81
CHEROKEE	67%	0%	27%	0%	7%	15
CHESTER	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
CHESTERFIELD	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	2
CLARENDON	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	3
COLLETON	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	6
DARLINGTON	40%	0%	60%	0%	0%	5
DILLON	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5
DORCHESTER	48%	19%	29%	5%	0%	21
EDGEFIELD	57%	29%	14%	0%	0%	7
FAIRFIELD	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	2
FLORENCE	71%	0%	29%	0%	0%	7
GEORGETOWN	71%	0%	29%	0%	0%	7
GREENVILLE	50%	18%	29%	3%	0%	34
GREENWOOD	54%	31%	15%	0%	0%	13
HAMPTON	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%	7
HORRY	36%	31%	22%	6%	6%	36
JASPER	40%	30%	30%	0%	0%	10
KERSHAW	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2
LANCASTER	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	2
LAURENS	42%	25%	33%	0%	0%	12
LEE	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	3
LEXINGTON	63%	11%	21%	0%	5%	19
McCORMICK	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4
MARION	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%	4
MARLBORO	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
NEWBERRY	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	2
OCONEE	80%	0%	0%	20%	0%	5
ORANGEBURG	57%	24%	19%	0%	0%	42
PICKENS	50%	0%	38%	0%	13%	8
RICHLAND	42%	20%	24%	14%	0%	50
SALUDA	---	---	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	26%	30%	43%	0%	0%	23
SUMTER	39%	35%	17%	4%	4%	23
UNION	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	2
WILLIAMSBURG	21%	14%	43%	21%	0%	14
YORK	40%	10%	40%	10%	0%	10
TRANSITIONAL						
STATE TOTAL	49%	20%	27%	3%	1%	
ACTIVE	288	117	160	19	7	591

**FIGURE 5**  
**ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2015**



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

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	---	---	---	---
AIKEN	24	83%	5	17%
ALLENDALE	2	67%	1	33%
ANDERSON	4	44%	5	56%
BAMBERG	4	67%	2	33%
BARNWELL	4	67%	2	33%
BEAUFORT	9	75%	3	25%
BERKELEY	6	43%	8	57%
CALHOUN	2	67%	1	33%
CHARLESTON	48	65%	26	35%
CHEROKEE	7	70%	3	30%
CHESTER	4	80%	1	20%
CHESTERFIELD	1	50%	1	50%
CLARENDON	3	75%	1	25%
COLLETON	5	31%	11	69%
DARLINGTON	6	46%	7	54%
DILLON	5	100%	0	0%
DORCHESTER	21	75%	7	25%
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	1	100%
FAIRFIELD	2	100%	0	0%
FLORENCE	7	39%	11	61%
GEORGETOWN	5	45%	6	55%
GREENVILLE	17	81%	4	19%
GREENWOOD	4	40%	6	60%
HAMPTON	4	100%	0	0%
HORRY	19	61%	12	39%
JASPER	5	71%	2	29%
KERSHAW	2	29%	5	71%
LANCASTER	2	25%	6	75%
LAURENS	9	69%	4	31%
LEE	4	100%	0	0%
LEXINGTON	15	65%	8	35%
MCCORMICK	1	100%	0	0%
MARION	5	83%	1	17%
MARLBORO	1	25%	3	75%
NEWBERRY	0	0%	1	100%
OCONEE	5	83%	1	17%
ORANGEBURG	10	59%	7	41%
PICKENS	5	83%	1	17%
RICHLAND	43	66%	22	34%
SALUDA	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	11	55%	9	45%
SUMTER	14	58%	10	42%
UNION	2	50%	2	50%
WILLIAMSBURG	3	60%	2	40%
YORK	18	60%	12	40%
TRANSITIONAL	29	100%	0	0%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>36%</b>

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

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	---	---	---	---
AIKEN	---	---	---	---
ALLENDALE	---	---	---	---
ANDERSON	---	---	---	---
BAMBERG	0	0%	1	100%
BARNWELL	---	---	---	---
BEAUFORT	2	100%	0	0%
BERKELEY	1	100%	0	0%
CALHOUN	---	---	---	---
CHARLESTON	1	100%	0	0%
CHEROKEE	7	100%	0	0%
CHESTER	---	---	---	---
CHESTERFIELD	---	---	---	---
CLARENDON	---	---	---	---
COLLETON	---	---	---	---
DARLINGTON	---	---	---	---
DILLON	---	---	---	---
DORCHESTER	---	---	---	---
EDGEFIELD	---	---	---	---
FAIRFIELD	---	---	---	---
FLORENCE	---	---	---	---
GEORGETOWN	---	---	---	---
GREENVILLE	---	---	---	---
GREENWOOD	---	---	---	---
HAMPTON	---	---	---	---
HORRY	1	100%	0	0%
JASPER	---	---	---	---
KERSHAW	---	---	---	---
LANCASTER	---	---	---	---
LAURENS	---	---	---	---
LEE	---	---	---	---
LEXINGTON	---	---	---	---
McCORMICK	---	---	---	---
MARION	---	---	---	---
MARLBORO	---	---	---	---
NEWBERRY	---	---	---	---
OCONEE	---	---	---	---
ORANGEBURG	---	---	---	---
PICKENS	---	---	---	---
RICHLAND	---	---	---	---
SALUDA	---	---	---	---
SPARTANBURG	---	---	---	---
SUMTER	0	0%	1	100%
UNION	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMSBURG	---	---	---	---
YORK	2	100%	0	0%
TRANSITIONAL	17	81%	4	19%
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16%</b>

**SECTION E**

**SEX  
OFFENDERS**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## SEX OFFENDERS

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

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

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


## SEX OFFENDER CONTACT STANDARDS

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

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

COUNTY	SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION		GENERAL SUPERVISION		TOTAL SEX OFFENDERS
ABBEVILLE	1	100%	0	0%	1
AIKEN	41	93%	3	7%	44
ALLENDALE	3	100%	0	0%	3
ANDERSON	47	70%	20	30%	67
BAMBERG	6	100%	0	0%	6
BARNWELL	4	67%	2	33%	6
BEAUFORT	9	100%	0	0%	9
BERKELEY	31	100%	0	0%	31
CALHOUN	1	25%	3	75%	4
CHARLESTON	45	64%	25	36%	70
CHEROKEE	10	59%	7	41%	17
CHESTER	3	50%	3	50%	6
CHESTERFIELD	5	100%	0	0%	5
CLARENDON	11	92%	1	8%	12
COLLETON	9	69%	4	31%	13
DARLINGTON	8	100%	0	0%	8
DILLON	3	100%	0	0%	3
DORCHESTER	20	80%	5	20%	25
EDGEFIELD	6	46%	7	54%	13
FAIRFIELD	5	83%	1	17%	6
FLORENCE	32	84%	6	16%	38
GEORGETOWN	6	55%	5	45%	11
GREENVILLE	80	77%	24	23%	104
GREENWOOD	8	73%	3	27%	11
HAMPTON	6	100%	0	0%	6
HORRY	62	100%	0	0%	62
JASPER	7	100%	0	0%	7
KERSHAW	15	94%	1	6%	16
LANCASTER	10	71%	4	29%	14
LAURENS	13	57%	10	43%	23
LEE	4	57%	3	43%	7
LEXINGTON	28	80%	7	20%	35
McCORMICK	2	100%	0	0%	2
MARION	2	67%	1	33%	3
MARLBORO	5	71%	2	29%	7
NEWBERRY	6	67%	3	33%	9
OCONEE	22	79%	6	21%	28
ORANGEBURG	12	80%	3	20%	15
PICKENS	19	95%	1	5%	20
RICHLAND	51	56%	40	44%	91
SALUDA	7	88%	1	13%	8
SPARTANBURG	88	82%	19	18%	107
SUMTER	21	84%	4	16%	25
UNION	5	56%	4	44%	9
WILLIAMSBURG	13	87%	2	13%	15
YORK	28	70%	12	30%	40
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>1,062</b>

**FIGURE 6**  
**ACTIVE SEX OFFENDER UNDER SUPERVISION**  
**JUNE 30, 2015**



**SECTION F**

**VIOLATIONS**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## VIOLATIONS

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

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

Table 2-F provides a comparison of changes in active population and the types of closure for FY 2011 to FY 2015.

Table 3-F shows fees collected in FY2015 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, \$176,529.26 was collected in delinquent restitution payments, \$163,553.09 in supervision fees and \$73,818.40 in court ordered fines and fees. The total to \$413,900.75 collected demonstrates the effectiveness of the Administrative Hearing Process in bringing offenders who have the means to become compliant with their monetary obligations.

**TABLE 1-F  
VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY**

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>Cases Heard</b>	<b>Cases Revoked or Recommended for Revocation</b>	<b>Cases Continued or Recommended for Continuation</b>
ABBEVILLE	4	1	3
AIKEN	151	25	126
ALLENDALE	20	14	6
ANDERSON	582	234	348
BAMBERG	21	9	12
BARNWELL	44	8	36
BEAUFORT	14	9	5
BERKELEY	120	44	76
CALHOUN	5	3	2
CHARLESTON	517	291	226
CHEROKEE	192	49	143
CHESTER	18	10	8
CHESTERFIELD	6	2	4
CLARENDON	11	1	10
COLLETON	59	39	20
DARLINGTON	18	9	9
DILLON	7	4	3
DORCHESTER	310	166	144
EDGEFIELD	23	12	11
FAIRFIELD	3	0	3
FLORENCE	95	26	69
GEORGETOWN	30	21	9
GREENVILLE	499	131	368
GREENWOOD	36	18	18
HAMPTON	16	12	4
HORRY	58	20	38
JASPER	45	36	9
KERSHAW	39	15	24
LANCASTER	30	17	13
LAURENS	25	15	10
LEE	3	0	3
LEXINGTON	276	76	200
MARION	10	1	9
MARLBORO	11	5	6
MCCORMICK	12	5	7
NEWBERRY	93	54	39
OCONEE	88	22	66
ORANGEBURG	156	48	108
PICKENS	153	68	85
RICHLAND	245	78	167
SALUDA	60	25	35
SPARTANBURG	203	90	113
SUMTER	110	23	87
UNION	22	8	14
WILLIAMSBURG	10	3	7
YORK	103	40	63
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>4,553</b>	<b>1,787</b>	<b>2,766</b>

**TABLE 2-F  
CLOSURES BY TYPE**

<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>Active</b>							<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
	<b>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>	
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	1,525	1,414	32	0	2	11	0	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,929</b>	<b>13,207</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>2,598</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>3,533</b>
<b>%</b>			1.7%	0.1%	15.9%	73.5%	8.8%	

<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>Active</b>							<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
	<b>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>	
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	1,517	1,138	43	0	1	4	0	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,208</b>	<b>12,564</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>2,605</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>3,624</b>
<b>%</b>			1.8%	0.1%	20.2%	71.9%	6.0%	

<b>FY 2013</b>	<b>Active</b>							<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
	<b>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>	
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	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>%</b>			1.8%	0.1%	22.1%	70.4%	5.7%	

<b>FY 2012</b>	<b>Active</b>							<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
	<b>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>	
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	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>%</b>			2.0%	0.3%	19.9%	77.8%	0.0%	

<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>Active</b>							<b>Total Unsuccessful</b>
	<b>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>	
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	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>%</b>			2.6%	0.1%	9.9%	81.1%	6.2%	

**Footnotes:**

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

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

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

	<b>SUPERVISION FEES</b>	<b>FINES/ COURT COSTS</b>	<b>RESTITUTION</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>JULY 2014</b>	\$10,710.10	\$7,341.73	\$22,145.14	\$40,196.97
<b>AUGUST</b>	\$13,764.26	\$5,273.57	\$15,612.52	\$34,650.35
<b>SEPTEMBER</b>	\$8,303.72	\$1,927.68	\$18,306.50	\$28,537.90
<b>OCTOBER</b>	\$13,435.20	\$3,318.15	\$20,537.69	\$37,291.04
<b>NOVEMBER</b>	\$6,783.60	\$4,028.60	\$9,108.34	\$19,920.54
<b>DECEMBER</b>	\$11,004.00	\$4,737.75	\$9,882.74	\$25,624.49
<b>JANUARY 2015</b>	\$9,280.75	\$4,274.30	\$10,785.80	\$24,340.85
<b>FEBRUARY</b>	\$21,190.65	\$9,331.12	\$16,131.83	\$46,653.60
<b>MARCH</b>	\$20,774.01	\$7,485.60	\$17,750.58	\$46,010.19
<b>APRIL</b>	\$20,403.40	\$12,174.29	\$10,764.40	\$43,342.09
<b>MAY</b>	\$17,329.40	\$9,038.68	\$9,516.08	\$35,884.16
<b>JUNE 2015</b>	\$10,574.00	\$4,886.93	\$15,987.64	\$31,448.57
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$163,553.09	\$73,818.40	\$176,529.26	\$413,900.75

**SECTION G**


**ELECTRONIC  
SURVEILLANCE**

**FISCAL YEAR 2014**

## **ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE**

The Department utilizes electronic surveillance to monitor certain offenders. On June 8, 2006, Jessie's Law, a bill aimed at protecting our state's children through tougher penalties for sexual predators was signed into law with an effective date of July 1, 2006. Named after Jessica Marie Lunsford -- who was murdered in 2005 by a registered sex offender in Florida -- the law imposes a mandatory minimum of 25 years in prison for sexual predators and mandates active Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) monitoring for sex offenders convicted of certain offenses. GPS can pinpoint within 15 meters a person's position on Earth using 24 satellites in orbit at 11,000 nautical miles above the Earth. The satellites are owned and operated by the U. S. Department of Defense and continuously transmit signals which can be detected by anyone possessing a GPS receiver. 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 796 offenders on Active GPS on June 30, 2015, 555 offenders were placed on GPS under Jessie's Law.

FIGURE 7  
OFFENDERS ON ACTIVE GPS  
FISCAL YEAR 2015



**SECTION H**

**SUMMARY**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

## SUMMARY

Figure 9 compares monthly DNA collections during FY 2015.

Table 1-H shows drug testing activity during FY 2015. This table represents the number of individual offenders tested, the number of individuals testing positive, the total number of positive tests and the number of times offenders were tested.

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

The proportion of violent offenses among YOA admissions (3%) increased by 1% comparing FY 2014 and FY 2015. The percentage of violent offenses among probationers (4%) decreased by 1% compared to the previous fiscal year. Parole admissions for violent offenses showed the largest change with a decrease of 7%.

Overall, the most utilized level of supervision was standard (62%), followed by high (20%), medium (14%), sex offender (2%), and intensive (1%) for all active cases.


The overall success rate for closures was 79%, a nominal increase previous fiscal year. Unchanged was the overall success rate for parolees at 94%. Both probationers (77%) and YOA offenders (64%) had less successful closures rates than parolees, but YOA offenders showed a 4% increase from the previous fiscal year.

Of the 19,571 offenders tested for drug use while under supervision, 9,381 or 47.9% tested positive for drugs.

Figure 10 compares the number of admissions for each fiscal year from 1996 to 2015. Admissions decreased for FY 2015 by 2.9% from the previous fiscal year.

Figure 11 shows the percentage of violent admissions by program type for fiscal years 2006 to 2015.

**FIGURE 9**  
**MONTHLY DNA COLLECTIONS**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2015**



**TABLE 1-H  
OFFENDER DRUG TESTING**

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED</b>	<b>INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE</b>	<b>TOTAL NO. POSITIVE TESTS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS WERE TESTED</b>
ABBEVILLE	92	53	58%	102	107
AIKEN	432	170	39%	339	478
ALLENDALE	73	43	59%	61	96
ANDERSON	1039	509	49%	1221	1421
BAMBERG	66	26	39%	52	77
BARNWELL	128	63	49%	109	153
BEAUFORT	499	235	47%	409	802
BERKELEY	497	181	36%	326	568
CALHOUN	77	38	49%	81	109
CHARLESTON	1023	590	58%	944	1210
CHEROKEE	616	347	56%	777	743
CHESTER	167	84	50%	146	224
CHESTERFIELD	124	53	43%	137	215
CLARENDON	55	15	27%	23	62
COLLETON	261	155	59%	294	337
DARLINGTON	242	127	52%	212	280
DILLON	47	6	13%	9	47
DORCHESTER	381	200	52%	351	470
EDGEFIELD	203	127	63%	240	274
FAIRFIELD	86	38	44%	52	103
FLORENCE	717	316	44%	584	1004
GEORGETOWN	271	125	46%	203	399
GREENVILLE	1787	843	47%	1587	2090
GREENWOOD	408	208	51%	416	550
HAMPTON	104	33	32%	46	125
HORRY	874	310	35%	566	1111
JASPER	103	40	39%	73	132
KERSHAW	182	111	61%	203	247
LANCASTER	402	215	53%	494	592
LAURENS	389	185	48%	375	499
LEE	93	30	32%	46	107
LEXINGTON	776	375	48%	826	1034
MCCORMICK	38	21	55%	55	56
MARION	136	66	49%	100	159
MARLBORO	78	46	59%	80	94
NEWBERRY	218	124	57%	250	310
OCONEE	312	122	39%	298	357
ORANGEBURG	309	171	55%	273	357
PICKENS	624	326	52%	743	738
RICHLAND	1658	782	47%	1312	2240
SALUDA	105	28	27%	55	129
SPARTANBURG	2186	977	45%	1880	2901
SUMTER	525	264	50%	415	681
UNION	117	52	44%	80	122
WILLIAMSBURG	146	76	52%	115	182
YORK	898	403	45%	698	1140
CENTRAL	7	3	43%	4	7
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>9,312</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>17,662</b>	<b>25,139</b>

**TABLE 2-H  
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**


<b>ADMISSIONS</b>								
<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>Probation</b>		<b>Parole</b>		<b>YOA</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>FY 14</b>	<b>FY 15</b>	<b>FY 14</b>	<b>FY 15</b>	<b>FY 14</b>	<b>FY 15</b>	<b>FY 14</b>	<b>FY 15</b>
<b><u>RACE:</u></b>								
BLACK	47%	46%	64%	63%	53%	59%	49%	49%
WHITE	51%	52%	34%	36%	45%	41%	49%	49%
OTHER	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	2%
<b><u>GENDER:</u></b>								
MALE	77%	77%	92%	92%	95%	89%	79%	79%
FEMALE	23%	23%	8%	8%	5%	11%	21%	21%
<b><u>OFFENSE TYPE:</u></b>								
VIOLENT	5%	4%	44%	37%	2%	3%	10%	9%
NON-VIOLENT	95%	96%	56%	63%	98%	97%	90%	91%

<b>ACTIVES</b>								
<b><u>LEVEL OF SUPERVISION:</u></b>								
STANDARD	55%	62%	53%	57%	43%	49%	55%	61%
MEDIUM	16%	14%	15%	14%	23%	20%	16%	14%
HIGH RISK	26%	20%	22%	18%	31%	27%	26%	20%
INTENSIVE	1%	1%	3%	4%	2%	3%	1%	1%
SEX OFFENDER	2%	2%	7%	7%	1%	1%	3%	3%


<b>CLOSURES</b>								
<b><u>CASE OUTCOME:</u></b>								
SUCCESSFUL	77%	77%	94%	94%	60%	64%	78%	79%
UNSUCCESSFUL	23%	23%	6%	6%	40%	36%	22%	21%

<b>DRUG TESTING</b>		
	<b>FY 14</b>	<b>FY 15</b>
<b>INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED</b>	18,661	19,571
<b>OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE</b>	8,646	9,381
<b>% OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE</b>	46.33%	47.93%
<b>TOTAL POSITIVE TESTS</b>	15,652	17,662
<b>NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS TESTED</b>	23,482	25,139

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



**FIGURE 11**  
**PERCENTAGE OF VIOLENT ADMISSIONS BY PROGRAM TYPE**



**1<sup>st</sup> Printing/SCDPPPS**  
**10 copies of this document were published: \$5.07 per copy/\$50.70 total.**