South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services

ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 2011

This document is the property of the
South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services

Kela E. Thomas, Director

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

All data in this document was generated by the
South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services

Office of Executive Programs and Public Policy
Arnise Moultrie, Program Administrator

Division of Field Operations
Marchar Stagg, Statistical & Research Analyst

Message from the Director

As an agency, we continue to strive for excellence. To meet this objective, we have implemented a philosophy and organizational culture that promotes strategic planning, mission-driven prioritization, accountability, cost effectiveness and transparency. .

The Annual Statistical Report for Fiscal Year 2011 has been complied for your review and reference. This report provides a statistical representation of the work of 586 employees of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS) including 385 Class One Agents. While there have been many challenges over the course of the year, I am pleased to report that 66% of our probationers and 91% of our parolees successfully completed supervision. The Bureau of Justice Statistics of the United States Department of Justice (2009) reported nationally that approximately 65% of probationers and 51% 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 44,782 offenders under our jurisdiction. We maintain a fundamental belief that given support, resources, and service interventions can promote the offender's ability to make positive changes in his or her life.

In addition, our interventions are responses focused to address present or potential problems that may interfere with the successful completion of supervision through offender compliance and 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, 2011.

Fiscal year 2011 (FY 2011) began on July 1, 2010 and ended on June 30, 2011. At the end of FY 2011, there were 44,782 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, 30,977 offenders were under active supervision of the Department.

In addition, due to rounding, some of the totals will not equal 100%. Where possible, missing data or rounding has been indicated.

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	15
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

SECTION G---MONITORING

FIGURE 7	Offenders on Electronic Monitoring	53
FIGURE 8	Offenders on GPS	54

SECTION H---SUMMARY

TABLE 1-H	Offender Referrals	60
TABLE 2-H	DNA Collections by County	61
FIGURE 9	Monthly DNA Collections	62
TABLE 3-H	Offender Drug Testing	63
TABLE 4-H	Population Characteristics	64
FIGURE 10	Admissions: A 20-Year Comparison	65
FIGURE 11	Violent Admissions by Program	66

SECTION A

TOTAL POPULATION

FISCAL YEAR 2011

TOTAL POPULATION

Tables 1-A through 6-A and Figures 1 and 2, represent admissions to the SCDPPPS during FY 2011. 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 2011, there were 16,870 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 34% 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 sentences under the Youth 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[1]. Total admissions during the fiscal year were predominately non-violent with only 8% 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 82%, with a racial composition of 53% black, 45% white, and 2% of other races.

[1]Abuse or Neglect of a Vulnerable Adult, Arson, 1st & 2nd degree, Assault and Battery of a High & Aggravated Nature (offense on or after 06/02/2010), Assault and Battery with Intent to Kill, Assault with Intent to Commit Criminal Sexual Conduct 1st or 2nd degree, Attempted Murder, Burglary 1st and 2nd degree, Carjacking, Child Abuse, Criminal Domestic Violence of a High and Aggravated Nature, Criminal Sexual Conduct 1st or 2nd degree, Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor (or Attempted) 1st or 2nd degree, Drugs - Manufacture, Distribution or Etc. of Methamphetamine 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or Subsequent Offenses, Drug Trafficking (44-53-0370, 44-53-0375), Engaging a Child for Sexual Performance, Homicide by Child Abuse (or Aiding or Abetting), Kidnapping, Murder, Robbery (Armed, Attempted Armed), Taking of Hostages by an Inmate, Voluntary Manslaughter, or Accessory Before the Fact to any of the above crimes.

Table 4-A and Figure 2 describe all active offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2011. 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. Among all offenders, high level supervision represented 18% and standard supervision represented 75%. Sex offender supervision and intensive supervision each represented 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 2011 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 2011 was 67%. The unsuccessful rate, 33%, 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	58	75%	17	22%	2	3%	77
AIKEN	366	77%	65	14%	43	9%	474
ALLENDALE	34	65%	5	10%	13	25%	52
ANDERSON	553	84%	61	9%	47	7%	661
BAMBERG	43	69%	9	15%	10	16%	62
BARNWELL	73	72%	10	10%	19	19%	102
BEAUFORT	220	77%	35	12%	32	11%	287
BERKELEY	347	78%	40	9%	58	13%	445
CALHOUN	47	82%	5	9%	5	9%	57
CHARLESTON	1,096	81%	126	9%	132	10%	1,354
CHEROKEE	192	83%	24	10%	14	6%	230
CHESTER	133	84%	17	11%	8	5%	158
CHESTERFIELD	130	83%	19	12%	7	4%	156
CLARENDON	111	78%	19	13%	12	8%	142
COLLETON	198	92%	4	2%	13	6%	215
DARLINGTON	231	80%	36	12%	23	8%	290
DILLON	53	65%	14	17%	14	17%	81
DORCHESTER	305	79%	30	8%	52	13%	387
EDGEFIELD	119	83%	14	10%	10	7%	143
FAIRFIELD	89	88%	10	10%	2	2%	101
FLORENCE	491	77%	78	12%	67	11%	636
GEORGETOWN	133	69%	44	23%	16	8%	193
GREENVILLE	1,775	87%	177	9%	87	4%	2,039
GREENWOOD	284	81%	49	14%	16	5%	349
HAMPTON	44	67%	8	12%	14	21%	66
HORRY	685	79%	123	14%	61	7%	869
JASPER	81	69%	17	14%	20	17%	118
KERSHAW	107	80%	17	13%	10	7%	134
LANCASTER	248	86%	26	9%	14	5%	288
LAURENS	331	88%	31	8%	13	3%	375
LEE	53	78%	10	15%	5	7%	68
LEXINGTON	604	83%	73	10%	54	7%	731
McCORMICK	37	82%	2	4%	6	13%	45
MARION	122	76%	27	17%	12	7%	161
MARLBORO	65	71%	14	15%	12	13%	91
NEWBERRY	162	86%	15	8%	12	6%	189
OCONEE	150	82%	17	9%	17	9%	184
ORANGEBURG	357	80%	45	10%	44	10%	446
PICKENS	355	87%	37	9%	16	4%	408
RICHLAND	717	71%	209	21%	91	9%	1,017
SALUDA	63	82%	10	13%	4	5%	77
SPARTANBURG	1,076	84%	125	10%	84	7%	1,285
SUMTER	285	70%	65	16%	58	14%	408
UNION	189	89%	14	7%	9	4%	212
WILLIAMSBURG	110	76%	25	17%	10	7%	145
YORK	646	77%	118	14%	72	9%	836
TRANSITIONAL	2	8%	19	73%	5	19%	26
STATE TOTAL	**13,570**	**80%**	**1,955**	**12%**	**1,345**	**8%**	**16,870**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 2-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	7	9%	70	91%	77
AIKEN	38	8%	436	92%	474
ALLENDALE	12	23%	40	77%	52
ANDERSON	94	14%	567	86%	661
BAMBERG	2	3%	60	97%	62
BARNWELL	4	4%	98	96%	102
BEAUFORT	17	6%	270	94%	287
BERKELEY	28	6%	417	94%	445
CALHOUN	6	11%	51	89%	57
CHARLESTON	92	7%	1,262	93%	1,354
CHEROKEE	23	10%	207	90%	230
CHESTER	8	5%	150	95%	158
CHESTERFIELD	12	8%	144	92%	156
CLARENDON	7	5%	135	95%	142
COLLETON	7	3%	208	97%	215
DARLINGTON	25	9%	265	91%	290
DILLON	4	5%	77	95%	81
DORCHESTER	27	7%	360	93%	387
EDGEFIELD	7	5%	136	95%	143
FAIRFIELD	6	6%	95	94%	101
FLORENCE	50	8%	586	92%	636
GEORGETOWN	17	9%	176	91%	193
GREENVILLE	141	7%	1,898	93%	2,039
GREENWOOD	32	9%	317	91%	349
HAMPTON	5	8%	61	92%	66
HORRY	64	7%	805	93%	869
JASPER	8	7%	110	93%	118
KERSHAW	14	10%	120	90%	134
LANCASTER	19	7%	269	93%	288
LAURENS	34	9%	341	91%	375
LEE	7	10%	61	90%	68
LEXINGTON	78	11%	653	89%	731
McCORMICK	-	0%	45	100%	45
MARION	8	5%	153	95%	161
MARLBORO	3	3%	88	97%	91
NEWBERRY	7	4%	182	96%	189
OCONEE	19	10%	165	90%	184
ORANGEBURG	18	4%	428	96%	446
PICKENS	45	11%	363	89%	408
RICHLAND	139	14%	878	86%	1,017
SALUDA	2	3%	75	97%	77
SPARTANBURG	114	9%	1,171	91%	1,285
SUMTER	37	9%	371	91%	408
UNION	7	3%	205	97%	212
WILLIAMSBURG	19	13%	126	87%	145
YORK	68	8%	768	92%	836
TRANSITIONAL	11	42%	15	58%	26
STATE TOTAL	**1,392**	**8%**	**15,478**	**92%**	**16,870**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.					

TABLE 3-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
N=16,870

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	78%	22%	48%	0%	52%
AIKEN	77%	23%	47%	0%	53%
ALLENDALE	92%	8%	96%	0%	4%
ANDERSON	83%	17%	34%	1%	65%
BAMBERG	89%	11%	74%	0%	26%
BARNWELL	89%	11%	71%	1%	28%
BEAUFORT	82%	18%	56%	5%	39%
BERKELEY	82%	18%	50%	2%	48%
CALHOUN	88%	12%	65%	2%	33%
CHARLESTON	85%	15%	69%	1%	30%
CHEROKEE	84%	16%	35%	3%	61%
CHESTER	84%	16%	59%	1%	41%
CHESTERFIELD	79%	21%	62%	1%	37%
CLARENDON	85%	15%	74%	1%	25%
COLLETON	85%	15%	61%	3%	36%
DARLINGTON	81%	19%	56%	1%	43%
DILLON	83%	17%	60%	2%	37%
DORCHESTER	83%	17%	44%	2%	54%
EDGEFIELD	77%	23%	57%	0%	43%
FAIRFIELD	83%	17%	73%	0%	27%
FLORENCE	85%	15%	70%	1%	30%
GEORGETOWN	80%	20%	53%	1%	46%
GREENVILLE	77%	23%	45%	3%	52%
GREENWOOD	83%	17%	55%	1%	44%
HAMPTON	94%	6%	74%	0%	26%
HORRY	82%	18%	38%	3%	59%
JASPER	85%	15%	66%	5%	29%
KERSHAW	87%	13%	43%	0%	57%
LANCASTER	81%	19%	55%	1%	44%
LAURENS	80%	20%	35%	2%	63%
LEE	84%	16%	82%	0%	18%
LEXINGTON	82%	18%	38%	2%	60%
McCORMICK	78%	22%	71%	4%	24%
MARION	81%	19%	79%	1%	20%
MARLBORO	81%	19%	57%	7%	36%
NEWBERRY	86%	14%	64%	4%	32%
OCONEE	82%	18%	28%	1%	71%
ORANGEBURG	83%	17%	79%	0%	21%
PICKENS	76%	24%	15%	1%	84%
RICHLAND	84%	16%	81%	1%	18%
SALUDA	82%	18%	64%	8%	29%
SPARTANBURG	80%	20%	45%	2%	53%
SUMTER	85%	15%	75%	1%	24%
UNION	80%	20%	47%	1%	52%
WILLIAMSBURG	83%	17%	78%	1%	21%
YORK	81%	19%	37%	1%	62%
TRANSITIONAL	92%	8%	38%	4%	58%
STATE TOTAL	**82%**	**18%**	**53%**	**2%**	**45%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 1
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
FY 2011



TABLE 4-A
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION AS OF JUNE 30, 2011

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	77%	17%	2%	4%	166
AIKEN	77%	15%	3%	5%	1,112
ALLENDALE	66%	26%	6%	2%	93
ANDERSON	73%	22%	1%	3%	1,602
BAMBERG	85%	11%	4%	1%	132
BARNWELL	85%	8%	4%	2%	190
BEAUFORT	70%	24%	3%	3%	473
BERKELEY	75%	19%	3%	4%	906
CALHOUN	66%	30%	2%	2%	98
CHARLESTON	73%	21%	3%	2%	2,956
CHEROKEE	67%	27%	3%	3%	505
CHESTER	73%	22%	4%	0%	237
CHESTERFIELD	72%	22%	4%	3%	180
CLARENDON	78%	16%	3%	3%	236
COLLETON	75%	19%	3%	3%	464
DARLINGTON	77%	17%	4%	2%	340
DILLON	77%	13%	6%	4%	125
DORCHESTER	74%	19%	4%	3%	792
EDGEFIELD	73%	20%	3%	4%	256
FAIRFIELD	74%	23%	2%	1%	175
FLORENCE	74%	18%	5%	3%	954
GEORGETOWN	81%	12%	4%	4%	391
GREENVILLE	73%	21%	4%	2%	3,408
GREENWOOD	69%	25%	4%	2%	546
HAMPTON	87%	9%	3%	1%	150
HORRY	79%	12%	5%	4%	1,444
JASPER	76%	17%	4%	3%	178
KERSHAW	76%	18%	2%	4%	280
LANCASTER	70%	25%	3%	3%	586
LAURENS	75%	21%	2%	2%	624
LEE	74%	22%	2%	2%	116
LEXINGTON	75%	17%	5%	3%	1,288
McCORMICK	66%	27%	3%	3%	92
MARION	70%	21%	6%	3%	185
MARLBORO	73%	20%	5%	2%	104
NEWBERRY	78%	17%	2%	3%	308
OCONEE	79%	12%	3%	7%	425
ORANGEBURG	78%	17%	4%	1%	862
PICKENS	73%	21%	3%	3%	844
RICHLAND	83%	12%	3%	2%	2,499
SALUDA	60%	30%	5%	5%	106
SPARTANBURG	72%	20%	4%	3%	2,022
SUMTER	82%	11%	4%	3%	779
UNION	74%	19%	5%	2%	348
WILLIAMSBURG	74%	15%	6%	5%	298
YORK	74%	18%	4%	4%	1,095
TRANSITIONAL	100%	0%	0%	0%	7
STATE TOTAL	**75%**	**18%**	**3%**	**3%**	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	**23,263**	**5,711**	**1,081**	**922**	**30,977**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 2
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2011



CONTACT STANDARDS

STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE
1 Face-to-Face/Quarter	1 Progress Report Every Other Month Following the initial Home Visit, additional Home Visits will be conducted in the event of community complaints and violation investigation	2 Progress Reports/Month 1 Home Visit Every Other Month

TABLE 5-A
TOTAL CLOSURES BY TYPE

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	59	61%	37	39%
AIKEN	344	70%	149	30%
ALLENDALE	21	44%	27	56%
ANDERSON	426	74%	149	26%
BAMBERG	33	56%	26	44%
BARNWELL	44	75%	15	25%
BEAUFORT	246	75%	81	25%
BERKELEY	395	76%	124	24%
CALHOUN	30	77%	9	23%
CHARLESTON	876	80%	225	20%
CHEROKEE	158	72%	62	28%
CHESTER	77	59%	53	41%
CHESTERFIELD	72	58%	53	42%
CLARENDON	93	72%	37	28%
COLLETON	125	70%	53	30%
DARLINGTON	155	68%	73	32%
DILLON	58	72%	23	28%
DORCHESTER	243	67%	118	33%
EDGEFIELD	66	77%	20	23%
FAIRFIELD	72	61%	46	39%
FLORENCE	376	58%	267	42%
GEORGETOWN	137	62%	83	38%
GREENVILLE	885	63%	525	37%
GREENWOOD	204	66%	104	34%
HAMPTON	59	79%	16	21%
HORRY	483	65%	261	35%
JASPER	57	53%	51	47%
KERSHAW	71	64%	40	36%
LANCASTER	170	61%	108	39%
LAURENS	250	59%	172	41%
LEE	53	65%	29	35%
LEXINGTON	389	67%	192	33%
MCCORMICK	30	61%	19	39%
MARION	79	77%	23	23%
MARLBORO	73	61%	46	39%
NEWBERRY	131	68%	61	32%
OCONEE	164	74%	58	26%
ORANGEBURG	345	78%	99	22%
PICKENS	178	60%	121	40%
RICHLAND	687	63%	412	37%
SALUDA	52	73%	19	27%
SPARTANBURG	609	53%	534	47%
SUMTER	271	67%	133	33%
UNION	142	72%	54	28%
WILLIAMSBURG	83	70%	35	30%
YORK	518	66%	264	34%
TRANSITIONAL	353	100%	1	0%
STATE TOTAL	**10,442**	**67%**	**5,107**	**33%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 6-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY AGE

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	18	23%	59	77%
AIKEN	137	29%	337	71%
ALLENDALE	25	48%	27	52%
ANDERSON	172	26%	489	74%
BAMBERG	25	40%	37	60%
BARNWELL	42	41%	60	59%
BEAUFORT	104	36%	183	64%
BERKELEY	171	38%	274	62%
CALHOUN	19	33%	38	67%
CHARLESTON	429	32%	925	68%
CHEROKEE	62	27%	168	73%
CHESTER	37	23%	121	77%
CHESTERFIELD	53	34%	103	66%
CLARENDON	46	32%	96	68%
COLLETON	76	35%	139	65%
DARLINGTON	93	32%	197	68%
DILLON	32	40%	49	60%
DORCHESTER	145	37%	242	63%
EDGEFIELD	46	32%	97	68%
FAIRFIELD	31	31%	70	69%
FLORENCE	221	35%	415	65%
GEORGETOWN	67	35%	126	65%
GREENVILLE	468	23%	1,571	77%
GREENWOOD	93	27%	256	73%
HAMPTON	29	44%	37	56%
HORRY	260	30%	609	70%
JASPER	45	38%	73	62%
KERSHAW	49	37%	85	63%
LANCASTER	98	34%	190	66%
LAURENS	92	25%	283	75%
LEE	21	31%	47	69%
LEXINGTON	238	33%	493	67%
McCORMICK	18	40%	27	60%
MARION	62	39%	99	61%
MARLBORO	32	35%	59	65%
NEWBERRY	73	39%	116	61%
OCONEE	49	27%	135	73%
ORANGEBURG	159	36%	287	64%
PICKENS	129	32%	279	68%
RICHLAND	311	31%	706	69%
SALUDA	23	30%	54	70%
SPARTANBURG	358	28%	927	72%
SUMTER	133	33%	275	67%
UNION	64	30%	148	70%
WILLIAMSBURG	47	32%	98	68%
YORK	272	33%	564	67%
TRANSITIONAL	7	27%	19	73%
STATE TOTAL	**5,181**	**31%**	**11,689**	**69%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION B

PROBATION

FISCAL YEAR 2011

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 2011. 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 2011, 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 79%, with a racial composition of 50% black, 2% other, and 48% white.

Table 3-B and Figure 3 describe the active probation offender population in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2011. 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 high level supervision represented 19% of the population, standard supervision represented 77%, intensive supervision at 1% followed by sex offender supervision representing 3% of probationers.

Table 4-B provides data for probation closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for probationers was 66%, slightly lower than the total offender population success rate of 67%.

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	0	0%	58	100%	58
AIKEN	17	5%	349	95%	366
ALLENDALE	5	15%	29	85%	34
ANDERSON	61	11%	492	89%	553
BAMBERG	1	2%	42	98%	43
BARNWELL	1	1%	72	99%	73
BEAUFORT	6	3%	214	97%	220
BERKELEY	9	3%	338	97%	347
CALHOUN	4	9%	43	91%	47
CHARLESTON	24	2%	1,072	98%	1,096
CHEROKEE	12	6%	180	94%	192
CHESTER	1	1%	132	99%	133
CHESTERFIELD	3	2%	127	98%	130
CLARENDON	2	2%	109	98%	111
COLLETON	7	4%	191	96%	198
DARLINGTON	9	4%	222	96%	231
DILLON	0	0%	53	100%	53
DORCHESTER	11	4%	294	96%	305
EDGEFIELD	3	3%	116	97%	119
FAIRFIELD	1	1%	88	99%	89
FLORENCE	10	2%	481	98%	491
GEORGETOWN	3	2%	130	98%	133
GREENVILLE	66	4%	1,709	96%	1,775
GREENWOOD	11	4%	273	96%	284
HAMPTON	1	2%	43	98%	44
HORRY	21	3%	664	97%	685
JASPER	0	0%	81	100%	81
KERSHAW	4	4%	103	96%	107
LANCASTER	4	2%	244	98%	248
LAURENS	20	6%	311	94%	331
LEE	1	2%	52	98%	53
LEXINGTON	40	7%	564	93%	604
McCORMICK	0	0%	37	100%	37
MARION	1	1%	121	99%	122
MARLBORO	0	0%	65	100%	65
NEWBERRY	2	1%	160	99%	162
OCONEE	10	7%	140	93%	150
ORANGEBURG	6	2%	351	98%	357
PICKENS	23	6%	332	94%	355
RICHLAND	29	4%	688	96%	717
SALUDA	0	0%	63	100%	63
SPARTANBURG	49	5%	1,027	95%	1,076
SUMTER	9	3%	276	97%	285
UNION	3	2%	186	98%	189
WILLIAMSBURG	4	4%	106	96%	110
YORK	23	4%	623	96%	646
TRANSITIONAL	1	50%	1	50%	2
STATE TOTAL	**518**	**4%**	**13,052**	**96%**	**13,570**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 2-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	81%	19%	45%	0%	55%
AIKEN	71%	29%	42%	0%	58%
ALLENDALE	88%	12%	94%	0%	6%
ANDERSON	81%	19%	33%	1%	66%
BAMBERG	84%	16%	72%	0%	28%
BARNWELL	85%	15%	73%	0%	27%
BEAUFORT	80%	20%	55%	4%	41%
BERKELEY	79%	21%	47%	3%	50%
CALHOUN	87%	13%	62%	2%	36%
CHARLESTON	82%	18%	66%	1%	34%
CHEROKEE	81%	19%	34%	4%	63%
CHESTER	82%	18%	57%	1%	42%
CHESTERFIELD	75%	25%	62%	2%	36%
CLARENDON	81%	19%	70%	0%	30%
COLLETON	84%	16%	60%	3%	37%
DARLINGTON	77%	23%	51%	1%	48%
DILLON	74%	26%	53%	4%	43%
DORCHESTER	79%	21%	42%	2%	55%
EDGEFIELD	73%	27%	55%	0%	45%
FAIRFIELD	82%	18%	72%	0%	28%
FLORENCE	82%	18%	68%	0%	31%
GEORGETOWN	74%	26%	44%	1%	55%
GREENVILLE	75%	25%	43%	3%	53%
GREENWOOD	81%	19%	54%	1%	45%
HAMPTON	93%	7%	70%	0%	30%
HORRY	79%	21%	33%	3%	64%
JASPER	79%	21%	65%	6%	28%
KERSHAW	84%	16%	39%	0%	61%
LANCASTER	79%	21%	54%	1%	46%
LAURENS	78%	22%	33%	2%	65%
LEE	79%	21%	83%	0%	17%
LEXINGTON	80%	20%	38%	2%	60%
McCORMICK	76%	24%	65%	5%	30%
MARION	77%	23%	75%	1%	24%
MARLBORO	78%	22%	57%	6%	37%
NEWBERRY	85%	15%	62%	4%	35%
OCONEE	81%	19%	27%	1%	73%
ORANGEBURG	81%	19%	78%	1%	22%
PICKENS	75%	25%	13%	1%	86%
RICHLAND	83%	17%	79%	1%	19%
SALUDA	78%	22%	57%	10%	33%
SPARTANBURG	78%	22%	44%	1%	55%
SUMTER	79%	21%	73%	0%	27%
UNION	79%	21%	45%	1%	54%
WILLIAMSBURG	79%	21%	75%	1%	25%
YORK	78%	22%	33%	1%	66%
TRANSITIONAL	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
STATE TOTAL	**79%**	**21%**	**50%**	**2%**	**48%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 3-B
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION AS OF JUNE 30, 2011

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	79%	18%	0%	3%	135
AIKEN	79%	16%	1%	5%	917
ALLENDALE	71%	24%	1%	3%	70
ANDERSON	74%	23%	0%	3%	1,419
BAMBERG	89%	11%	0%	0%	111
BARNWELL	87%	10%	1%	2%	153
BEAUFORT	73%	24%	1%	3%	386
BERKELEY	76%	19%	1%	3%	742
CALHOUN	66%	30%	2%	2%	90
CHARLESTON	75%	22%	1%	2%	2,444
CHEROKEE	67%	29%	2%	3%	439
CHESTER	76%	24%	0%	1%	189
CHESTERFIELD	76%	22%	0%	2%	144
CLARENDON	83%	15%	1%	1%	202
COLLETON	78%	19%	1%	2%	410
DARLINGTON	82%	15%	1%	2%	270
DILLON	79%	17%	0%	4%	75
DORCHESTER	76%	20%	2%	2%	658
EDGEFIELD	75%	20%	1%	4%	234
FAIRFIELD	75%	25%	1%	0%	155
FLORENCE	78%	19%	1%	2%	756
GEORGETOWN	85%	11%	0%	3%	301
GREENVILLE	75%	22%	2%	2%	3,021
GREENWOOD	71%	27%	0%	2%	464
HAMPTON	90%	9%	1%	1%	115
HORRY	83%	12%	1%	4%	1,169
JASPER	81%	16%	0%	3%	134
KERSHAW	79%	19%	0%	3%	228
LANCASTER	71%	26%	1%	2%	517
LAURENS	77%	21%	0%	2%	531
LEE	77%	23%	0%	0%	92
LEXINGTON	77%	17%	3%	3%	1,096
McCORMICK	64%	32%	1%	3%	78
MARION	78%	21%	0%	1%	143
MARLBORO	74%	23%	0%	3%	78
NEWBERRY	78%	18%	1%	3%	266
OCONEE	82%	11%	0%	6%	372
ORANGEBURG	80%	18%	1%	1%	685
PICKENS	73%	22%	2%	3%	776
RICHLAND	85%	12%	1%	2%	1,987
SALUDA	60%	33%	2%	5%	86
SPARTANBURG	74%	22%	2%	3%	1,727
SUMTER	87%	11%	0%	2%	610
UNION	76%	20%	2%	2%	309
WILLIAMSBURG	79%	15%	1%	5%	225
YORK	77%	18%	1%	4%	887
TRANSITIONAL	100%	0%	0%	0%	6
STATE TOTAL	**77%**	**19%**	**1%**	**3%**	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	**20,006**	**4,969**	**251**	**676**	**25,902**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.					

FIGURE 3
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2011



TABLE 4-B
PROBATION CLOSURES BY TYPE

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	47	56%	37	44%
AIKEN	295	69%	132	31%
ALLENDALE	18	50%	18	50%
ANDERSON	359	73%	135	27%
BAMBERG	28	56%	22	44%
BARNWELL	28	68%	13	32%
BEAUFORT	210	76%	67	24%
BERKELEY	347	78%	98	22%
CALHOUN	24	75%	8	25%
CHARLESTON	719	80%	185	20%
CHEROKEE	131	70%	55	30%
CHESTER	60	56%	47	44%
CHESTERFIELD	51	53%	45	47%
CLARENDON	76	73%	28	27%
COLLETON	103	67%	51	33%
DARLINGTON	119	68%	57	32%
DILLON	44	71%	18	29%
DORCHESTER	198	68%	93	32%
EDGEFIELD	51	73%	19	27%
FAIRFIELD	66	60%	44	40%
FLORENCE	287	56%	229	44%
GEORGETOWN	102	58%	73	42%
GREENVILLE	727	60%	490	40%
GREENWOOD	166	64%	94	36%
HAMPTON	48	79%	13	21%
HORRY	393	66%	205	34%
JASPER	50	55%	41	45%
KERSHAW	56	64%	32	36%
LANCASTER	148	60%	97	40%
LAURENS	221	57%	164	43%
LEE	42	66%	22	34%
LEXINGTON	320	66%	168	34%
MCCORMICK	24	59%	17	41%
MARION	55	79%	15	21%
MARLBORO	51	58%	37	42%
NEWBERRY	107	66%	54	34%
OCONEE	146	75%	48	25%
ORANGEBURG	288	77%	84	23%
PICKENS	154	59%	107	41%
RICHLAND	496	58%	358	42%
SALUDA	39	76%	12	24%
SPARTANBURG	516	51%	487	49%
SUMTER	180	63%	104	37%
UNION	121	72%	46	28%
WILLIAMSBUR	64	67%	32	33%
YORK	426	64%	235	36%
TRANSITIONAL	230	100%	1	0%
STATE TOTAL	**8,431**	**66%**	**4,437**	**34%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 5-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY AGE

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	14	24%	44	76%
AIKEN	91	25%	275	75%
ALLENDALE	15	44%	19	56%
ANDERSON	125	23%	428	77%
BAMBERG	16	37%	27	63%
BARNWELL	20	27%	53	73%
BEAUFORT	77	35%	143	65%
BERKELEY	119	34%	228	66%
CALHOUN	15	32%	32	68%
CHARLESTON	306	28%	790	72%
CHEROKEE	47	24%	145	76%
CHESTER	31	23%	102	77%
CHESTERFIELD	46	35%	84	65%
CLARENDON	34	31%	77	69%
COLLETON	65	33%	133	67%
DARLINGTON	69	30%	162	70%
DILLON	19	36%	34	64%
DORCHESTER	101	33%	204	67%
EDGEFIELD	34	29%	85	71%
FAIRFIELD	30	34%	59	66%
FLORENCE	148	30%	343	70%
GEORGETOWN	50	38%	83	62%
GREENVILLE	388	22%	1,387	78%
GREENWOOD	76	27%	208	73%
HAMPTON	18	41%	26	59%
HORRY	182	27%	503	73%
JASPER	27	33%	54	67%
KERSHAW	37	35%	70	65%
LANCASTER	84	34%	164	66%
LAURENS	79	24%	252	76%
LEE	17	32%	36	68%
LEXINGTON	181	30%	423	70%
McCORMICK	11	30%	26	70%
MARION	45	37%	77	63%
MARLBORO	22	34%	43	66%
NEWBERRY	61	38%	101	62%
OCONEE	31	21%	119	79%
ORANGEBURG	118	33%	239	67%
PICKENS	111	31%	244	69%
RICHLAND	198	28%	519	72%
SALUDA	19	30%	44	70%
SPARTANBURG	272	25%	804	75%
SUMTER	80	28%	205	72%
UNION	55	29%	134	71%
WILLIAMSBURG	33	30%	77	70%
YORK	186	29%	460	71%
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	2	100%
STATE TOTAL	**3,803**	**28%**	**9,767**	**72%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION C

PAROLE

FISCAL YEAR 2011

PAROLE

The Department is charged with the responsibility of supervising those offenders paroled by the South Carolina Board of Paroles and Pardons. 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, 43%, 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, 89%, with a racial composition of 64% black, 3% other, and 34% white.

Table 3-C and Figure 4 describe active parolees by level of supervision on June 30, 2011. These figures do not include indirect supervision offenders, such 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 64% of the parolee population, followed by high level at 14%. Intensive supervision accounted for 15% of the parolee population and sex offender supervision was 7%.

Table 4-C presents parole case closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for parolees (91%) was higher than that of probationers (66%, 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	7	41%	10	59%	17
AIKEN	20	31%	45	69%	65
ALLENDALE	3	60%	2	40%	5
ANDERSON	32	52%	29	48%	61
BAMBERG	1	11%	8	89%	9
BARNWELL	3	30%	7	70%	10
BEAUFORT	11	31%	24	69%	35
BERKELEY	19	48%	21	53%	40
CALHOUN	2	40%	3	60%	5
CHARLESTON	67	53%	59	47%	126
CHEROKEE	11	46%	13	54%	24
CHESTER	7	41%	10	59%	17
CHESTERFIELD	9	47%	10	53%	19
CLARENDON	4	21%	15	79%	19
COLLETON	0	0%	4	100%	4
DARLINGTON	16	44%	20	56%	36
DILLON	4	29%	10	71%	14
DORCHESTER	13	43%	17	57%	30
EDGEFIELD	4	29%	10	71%	14
FAIRFIELD	5	50%	5	50%	10
FLORENCE	39	50%	39	50%	78
GEORGETOWN	14	32%	30	68%	44
GREENVILLE	75	42%	102	58%	177
GREENWOOD	21	43%	28	57%	49
HAMPTON	4	50%	4	50%	8
HORRY	42	34%	81	66%	123
JASPER	8	47%	9	53%	17
KERSHAW	10	59%	7	41%	17
LANCASTER	14	54%	12	46%	26
LAURENS	14	45%	17	55%	31
LEE	6	60%	4	40%	10
LEXINGTON	36	49%	37	51%	73
McCORMICK	0	0%	2	100%	2
MARION	7	26%	20	74%	27
MARLBORO	3	21%	11	79%	14
NEWBERRY	5	33%	10	67%	15
OCONEE	9	53%	8	47%	17
ORANGEBURG	12	27%	33	73%	45
PICKENS	21	57%	16	43%	37
RICHLAND	107	51%	102	49%	209
SALUDA	2	20%	8	80%	10
SPARTANBURG	58	46%	67	54%	125
SUMTER	26	40%	39	60%	65
UNION	4	29%	10	71%	14
WILLIAMSBURG	15	60%	10	40%	25
YORK	43	36%	75	64%	118
TRANSITIONAL	10	53%	9	47%	19
STATE TOTAL	**843**	**43%**	**1,112**	**57%**	**1,955**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.					

TABLE 2-C PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE					
COUNTY	**PERCENT MALE**	**PERCENT FEMALE**	**PERCENT BLACK**	**PERCENT OTHER**	**PERCENT WHITE**
ABBEVILLE	65%	35%	59%	0%	41%
AIKEN	94%	6%	58%	0%	42%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	92%	8%	33%	2%	66%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	89%	0%	11%
BARNWELL	100%	0%	40%	0%	60%
BEAUFORT	86%	14%	57%	11%	31%
BERKELEY	85%	15%	70%	0%	30%
CALHOUN	80%	20%	100%	0%	0%
CHARLESTON	93%	7%	79%	2%	20%
CHEROKEE	96%	4%	38%	4%	58%
CHESTER	88%	12%	71%	0%	29%
CHESTERFIELD	100%	0%	53%	0%	47%
CLARENDON	95%	5%	84%	5%	11%
COLLETON	100%	0%	75%	0%	25%
DARLINGTON	97%	3%	81%	3%	17%
DILLON	100%	0%	64%	0%	36%
DORCHESTER	97%	3%	50%	0%	50%
EDGEFIELD	93%	7%	71%	0%	29%
FAIRFIELD	90%	10%	80%	0%	20%
FLORENCE	88%	12%	73%	4%	23%
GEORGETOWN	95%	5%	68%	2%	30%
GREENVILLE	80%	20%	51%	5%	44%
GREENWOOD	92%	8%	61%	2%	37%
HAMPTON	100%	0%	88%	0%	13%
HORRY	89%	11%	58%	6%	37%
JASPER	94%	6%	82%	0%	18%
KERSHAW	100%	0%	47%	0%	53%
LANCASTER	81%	19%	62%	0%	38%
LAURENS	90%	10%	55%	3%	42%
LEE	100%	0%	80%	0%	20%
LEXINGTON	95%	5%	37%	1%	62%
McCORMICK	50%	50%	100%	0%	0%
MARION	93%	7%	93%	0%	7%
MARLBORO	79%	21%	64%	0%	36%
NEWBERRY	87%	13%	73%	7%	20%
OCONEE	76%	24%	47%	0%	53%
ORANGEBURG	89%	11%	82%	0%	18%
PICKENS	76%	24%	24%	3%	73%
RICHLAND	86%	14%	87%	1%	11%
SALUDA	100%	0%	90%	0%	10%
SPARTANBURG	85%	15%	51%	5%	44%
SUMTER	97%	3%	82%	5%	14%
UNION	86%	14%	71%	0%	29%
WILLIAMSBURG	100%	0%	88%	4%	8%
YORK	90%	10%	54%	3%	43%
TRANSITIONAL	95%	5%	47%	5%	47%
STATE TOTAL	**89%**	**11%**	**64%**	**3%**	**34%**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.					

TABLE 3-C
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION AS OF JUNE 30, 2011

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	61%	13%	17%	9%	23
AIKEN	71%	12%	11%	7%	113
ALLENDALE	29%	43%	29%	0%	7
ANDERSON	70%	14%	5%	11%	116
BAMBERG	67%	11%	11%	11%	9
BARNWELL	80%	0%	20%	0%	15
BEAUFORT	68%	22%	7%	2%	41
BERKELEY	68%	16%	6%	10%	69
CALHOUN	71%	29%	0%	0%	7
CHARLESTON	55%	21%	16%	8%	198
CHEROKEE	60%	20%	17%	3%	30
CHESTER	65%	16%	19%	0%	31
CHESTERFIELD	50%	23%	19%	8%	26
CLARENDON	45%	25%	10%	20%	20
COLLETON	44%	19%	25%	13%	16
DARLINGTON	68%	20%	10%	3%	40
DILLON	75%	7%	11%	7%	28
DORCHESTER	56%	19%	13%	13%	48
EDGEFIELD	69%	23%	8%	0%	13
FAIRFIELD	67%	8%	17%	8%	12
FLORENCE	53%	14%	20%	13%	99
GEORGETOWN	67%	15%	13%	6%	54
GREENVILLE	59%	17%	18%	5%	259
GREENWOOD	54%	21%	18%	7%	56
HAMPTON	80%	10%	0%	10%	10
HORRY	62%	8%	21%	9%	163
JASPER	61%	30%	4%	4%	23
KERSHAW	67%	14%	6%	14%	36
LANCASTER	65%	13%	17%	6%	48
LAURENS	62%	23%	10%	6%	52
LEE	75%	6%	6%	13%	16
LEXINGTON	68%	13%	11%	9%	117
McCORMICK	75%	0%	13%	13%	8
MARION	50%	18%	21%	11%	28
MARLBORO	65%	12%	24%	0%	17
NEWBERRY	86%	7%	0%	7%	28
OCONEE	71%	4%	8%	17%	24
ORANGEBURG	65%	11%	21%	3%	72
PICKENS	69%	13%	13%	4%	52
RICHLAND	75%	7%	14%	4%	317
SALUDA	50%	25%	19%	6%	16
SPARTANBURG	67%	10%	15%	8%	203
SUMTER	62%	9%	20%	9%	93
UNION	40%	10%	40%	10%	20
WILLIAMSBURG	57%	15%	23%	4%	47
YORK	63%	17%	16%	5%	132
TRANSITIONAL	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
STATE TOTAL	**64%**	**14%**	**15%**	**7%**	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	**1,828**	**397**	**424**	**204**	**2,853**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.					

FIGURE 4
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2011



TABLE 4-C
PAROLE CLOSURES BY TYPE

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	12	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	34	100%	0	0%
ALLENDALE	1	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	62	95%	3	5%
BAMBERG	5	100%	0	0%
BARNWELL	11	92%	1	8%
BEAUFORT	19	95%	1	5%
BERKELEY	24	92%	2	8%
CALHOUN	2	100%	0	0%
CHARLESTON	91	97%	3	3%
CHEROKEE	25	93%	2	7%
CHESTER	13	93%	1	7%
CHESTERFIELD	14	93%	1	7%
CLARENDON	13	93%	1	7%
COLLETON	15	100%	0	0%
DARLINGTON	27	87%	4	13%
DILLON	8	100%	0	0%
DORCHESTER	30	100%	0	0%
EDGEFIELD	13	100%	0	0%
FAIRFIELD	5	83%	1	17%
FLORENCE	58	85%	10	15%
GEORGETOWN	26	90%	3	10%
GREENVILLE	118	91%	12	9%
GREENWOOD	24	96%	1	4%
HAMPTON	8	100%	0	0%
HORRY	63	64%	36	36%
JASPER	3	100%	0	0%
KERSHAW	12	86%	2	14%
LANCASTER	17	89%	2	11%
LAURENS	22	92%	2	8%
LEE	6	100%	0	0%
LEXINGTON	59	92%	5	8%
MCCORMICK	6	100%	0	0%
MARION	20	91%	2	9%
MARLBORO	16	94%	1	6%
NEWBERRY	19	90%	2	10%
OCONEE	13	68%	6	32%
ORANGEBURG	46	96%	2	4%
PICKENS	19	90%	2	10%
RICHLAND	153	91%	16	9%
SALUDA	9	90%	1	10%
SPARTANBURG	74	87%	11	13%
SUMTER	68	94%	4	6%
UNION	12	92%	1	8%
WILLIAMSBURG	12	86%	2	14%
YORK	59	87%	9	13%
TRANSITIONAL	106	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	**1,472**	**91%**	**152**	**9%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 5-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY AGE

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	3	18%	14	82%
AIKEN	8	12%	57	88%
ALLENDALE	0	0%	5	100%
ANDERSON	11	18%	50	82%
BAMBERG	0	0%	9	100%
BARNWELL	3	30%	7	70%
BEAUFORT	2	6%	33	94%
BERKELEY	5	13%	35	88%
CALHOUN	0	0%	5	100%
CHARLESTON	14	11%	112	89%
CHEROKEE	3	13%	21	88%
CHESTER	1	6%	16	94%
CHESTERFIELD	2	11%	17	89%
CLARENDON	2	11%	17	89%
COLLETON	1	25%	3	75%
DARLINGTON	7	19%	29	81%
DILLON	1	7%	13	93%
DORCHESTER	5	17%	25	83%
EDGEFIELD	4	29%	10	71%
FAIRFIELD	0	0%	10	100%
FLORENCE	12	15%	66	85%
GEORGETOWN	2	5%	42	95%
GREENVILLE	15	8%	162	92%
GREENWOOD	4	8%	45	92%
HAMPTON	0	0%	8	100%
HORRY	20	16%	103	84%
JASPER	3	18%	14	82%
KERSHAW	2	12%	15	88%
LANCASTER	4	15%	22	85%
LAURENS	3	10%	28	90%
LEE	0	0%	10	100%
LEXINGTON	11	15%	62	85%
McCORMICK	1	50%	1	50%
MARION	5	19%	22	81%
MARLBORO	1	7%	13	93%
NEWBERRY	2	13%	13	87%
OCONEE	2	12%	15	88%
ORANGEBURG	3	7%	42	93%
PICKENS	3	8%	34	92%
RICHLAND	32	15%	177	85%
SALUDA	1	10%	9	90%
SPARTANBURG	10	8%	115	92%
SUMTER	10	15%	55	85%
UNION	1	7%	13	93%
WILLIAMSBURG	5	20%	20	80%
YORK	18	15%	100	85%
TRANSITIONAL	2	11%	17	89%
STATE TOTAL	**244**	**12%**	**1,711**	**88%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION D

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS

FISCAL YEAR 2011

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 4% (See Table 1-B).

Table 2-D illustrates YOA admissions by gender and race. Admissions were predominately male (97%) and black (67%).

Table 3-D and Figure 5 describe the active population for YOA conditional release offenders in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2011. Sixteen percent (16%) were supervised at a high level. Intensive level supervision accounted for 18%, while 64% were supervised at standard level and 2% at the sex offender level.

Table 4-D shows YOA offenders are more inclined to close unsuccessfully (49%) than the parole population (9%, see Table 4-C) or the probation population (34%, 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%	2	100%	2
AIKEN	1	2%	42	98%	43
ALLENDALE	4	31%	9	69%	13
ANDERSON	1	2%	46	98%	47
BAMBERG	0	0%	10	100%	10
BARNWELL	0	0%	19	100%	19
BEAUFORT	0	0%	32	100%	32
BERKELEY	0	0%	58	100%	58
CALHOUN	0	0%	5	100%	5
CHARLESTON	1	1%	131	99%	132
CHEROKEE	0	0%	14	100%	14
CHESTER	0	0%	8	100%	8
CHESTERFIELD	0	0%	7	100%	7
CLARENDON	1	8%	11	92%	12
COLLETON	0	0%	13	100%	13
DARLINGTON	0	0%	23	100%	23
DILLON	0	0%	14	100%	14
DORCHESTER	3	6%	49	94%	52
EDGEFIELD	0	0%	10	100%	10
FAIRFIELD	0	0%	2	100%	2
FLORENCE	1	1%	66	99%	67
GEORGETOWN	0	0%	16	100%	16
GREENVILLE	0	0%	87	100%	87
GREENWOOD	0	0%	16	100%	16
HAMPTON	0	0%	14	100%	14
HORRY	1	2%	60	98%	61
JASPER	0	0%	20	100%	20
KERSHAW	0	0%	10	100%	10
LANCASTER	1	7%	13	93%	14
LAURENS	0	0%	13	100%	13
LEE	0	0%	5	100%	5
LEXINGTON	2	4%	52	96%	54
McCORMICK	0	0%	6	100%	6
MARION	0	0%	12	100%	12
MARLBORO	0	0%	12	100%	12
NEWBERRY	0	0%	12	100%	12
OCONEE	0	0%	17	100%	17
ORANGEBURG	0	0%	44	100%	44
PICKENS	1	6%	15	94%	16
RICHLAND	3	3%	88	97%	91
SALUDA	0	0%	4	100%	4
SPARTANBURG	7	8%	77	92%	84
SUMTER	2	3%	56	97%	58
UNION	0	0%	9	100%	9
WILLIAMSBURG	0	0%	10	100%	10
YORK	2	3%	70	97%	72
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	5	100%	5
STATE TOTAL	**31**	**2%**	**1,314**	**98%**	**1,345**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 2-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
AIKEN	98%	2%	67%	0%	33%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	94%	6%	51%	0%	49%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	70%	0%	30%
BARNWELL	100%	0%	79%	5%	16%
BEAUFORT	97%	3%	63%	3%	34%
BERKELEY	98%	2%	55%	0%	45%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
CHARLESTON	97%	3%	92%	2%	7%
CHEROKEE	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
CHESTER	100%	0%	63%	0%	38%
CHESTERFIELD	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
CLARENDON	100%	0%	92%	0%	8%
COLLETON	100%	0%	85%	0%	15%
DARLINGTON	96%	4%	65%	0%	35%
DILLON	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
DORCHESTER	98%	2%	52%	0%	48%
EDGEFIELD	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
FAIRFIELD	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
FLORENCE	99%	1%	76%	0%	24%
GEORGETOWN	94%	6%	81%	0%	19%
GREENVILLE	94%	6%	63%	0%	37%
GREENWOOD	100%	0%	63%	0%	38%
HAMPTON	93%	7%	79%	0%	21%
HORRY	95%	5%	54%	3%	43%
JASPER	100%	0%	55%	5%	40%
KERSHAW	100%	0%	70%	0%	30%
LANCASTER	100%	0%	71%	0%	29%
LAURENS	100%	0%	46%	0%	54%
LEE	100%	0%	80%	0%	20%
LEXINGTON	93%	7%	43%	0%	57%
McCORMICK	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
MARION	100%	0%	83%	0%	17%
MARLBORO	100%	0%	50%	17%	33%
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	83%	0%	17%
OCONEE	100%	0%	24%	0%	76%
ORANGEBURG	98%	2%	84%	0%	16%
PICKENS	100%	0%	38%	0%	63%
RICHLAND	90%	10%	82%	1%	16%
SALUDA	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
SPARTANBURG	96%	4%	61%	1%	38%
SUMTER	98%	2%	76%	2%	22%
UNION	100%	0%	44%	0%	56%
WILLIAMSBURG	90%	10%	90%	0%	10%
YORK	96%	4%	40%	1%	58%
TRANSITIONAL	100%	0%	20%	0%	80%
STATE TOTAL	**97%**	**3%**	**67%**	**1%**	**32%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 3-D
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION AS OF JUNE 30, 2011

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	88%	13%	0%	0%	8
AIKEN	71%	12%	13%	4%	82
ALLENDALE	56%	25%	19%	0%	16
ANDERSON	60%	22%	16%	1%	67
BAMBERG	58%	8%	33%	0%	12
BARNWELL	77%	0%	18%	5%	22
BEAUFORT	46%	30%	20%	4%	46
BERKELEY	67%	16%	15%	2%	95
CALHOUN	100%	0%	0%	0%	1
CHARLESTON	67%	19%	12%	2%	314
CHEROKEE	72%	8%	8%	11%	36
CHESTER	65%	12%	24%	0%	17
CHESTERFIELD	60%	20%	20%	0%	10
CLARENDON	57%	21%	21%	0%	14
COLLETON	53%	26%	18%	3%	38
DARLINGTON	47%	27%	27%	0%	30
DILLON	73%	5%	23%	0%	22
DORCHESTER	69%	13%	16%	2%	86
EDGEFIELD	44%	11%	44%	0%	9
FAIRFIELD	75%	25%	0%	0%	8
FLORENCE	68%	7%	24%	1%	99
GEORGETOWN	69%	11%	17%	3%	36
GREENVILLE	59%	16%	23%	2%	128
GREENWOOD	58%	8%	31%	4%	26
HAMPTON	80%	8%	12%	0%	25
HORRY	65%	12%	19%	4%	112
JASPER	62%	10%	29%	0%	21
KERSHAW	69%	13%	19%	0%	16
LANCASTER	67%	14%	14%	5%	21
LAURENS	73%	17%	7%	2%	41
LEE	38%	50%	13%	0%	8
LEXINGTON	55%	15%	27%	4%	75
McCORMICK	83%	0%	17%	0%	6
MARION	36%	21%	43%	0%	14
MARLBORO	78%	11%	11%	0%	9
NEWBERRY	71%	7%	21%	0%	14
OCONEE	45%	28%	28%	0%	29
ORANGEBURG	71%	12%	16%	0%	105
PICKENS	50%	19%	25%	6%	16
RICHLAND	74%	12%	13%	0%	195
SALUDA	100%	0%	0%	0%	4
SPARTANBURG	42%	21%	35%	2%	92
SUMTER	66%	16%	14%	4%	76
UNION	74%	11%	16%	0%	19
WILLIAMSBURG	65%	12%	23%	0%	26
YORK	58%	20%	22%	0%	76
STATE TOTAL	**64%**	**16%**	**18%**	**2%**	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	**1,429**	**345**	**406**	**42**	**2,222**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 5
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2011



TABLE 4-D
YOA CLOSURES BY TYPE

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	0	---	0	---
AIKEN	15	47%	17	53%
ALLENDALE	2	18%	9	82%
ANDERSON	5	31%	11	69%
BAMBERG	0	0%	4	100%
BARNWELL	5	83%	1	17%
BEAUFORT	17	57%	13	43%
BERKELEY	24	50%	24	50%
CALHOUN	4	80%	1	20%
CHARLESTON	66	64%	37	36%
CHEROKEE	2	29%	5	71%
CHESTER	4	44%	5	56%
CHESTERFIELD	7	50%	7	50%
CLARENDON	4	33%	8	67%
COLLETON	7	78%	2	22%
DARLINGTON	9	43%	12	57%
DILLON	6	55%	5	45%
DORCHESTER	15	38%	25	63%
EDGEFIELD	2	67%	1	33%
FAIRFIELD	1	50%	1	50%
FLORENCE	31	53%	28	47%
GEORGETOWN	9	56%	7	44%
GREENVILLE	40	63%	23	37%
GREENWOOD	14	61%	9	39%
HAMPTON	3	50%	3	50%
HORRY	27	57%	20	43%
JASPER	4	29%	10	71%
KERSHAW	3	33%	6	67%
LANCASTER	5	36%	9	64%
LAURENS	7	54%	6	46%
LEE	5	42%	7	58%
LEXINGTON	10	34%	19	66%
MCCORMICK	0	0%	2	100%
MARION	4	40%	6	60%
MARLBORO	6	43%	8	57%
NEWBERRY	5	50%	5	50%
OCONEE	5	56%	4	44%
ORANGEBURG	11	46%	13	54%
PICKENS	5	29%	12	71%
RICHLAND	38	50%	38	50%
SALUDA	4	40%	6	60%
SPARTANBURG	19	35%	36	65%
SUMTER	23	48%	25	52%
UNION	9	56%	7	44%
WILLIAMSBURG	7	88%	1	13%
YORK	33	62%	20	38%
TRANSITIONAL	17	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	**539**	**51%**	**518**	**49%**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 5-D YOA ADMISSIONS BY AGE				
COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	1	50%	1	50%
AIKEN	38	88%	5	12%
ALLENDALE	10	77%	3	23%
ANDERSON	36	77%	11	23%
BAMBERG	9	90%	1	10%
BARNWELL	19	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	25	78%	7	22%
BERKELEY	47	81%	11	19%
CALHOUN	4	80%	1	20%
CHARLESTON	109	83%	23	17%
CHEROKEE	12	86%	2	14%
CHESTER	5	63%	3	38%
CHESTERFIELD	5	71%	2	29%
CLARENDON	10	83%	2	17%
COLLETON	10	77%	3	23%
DARLINGTON	17	74%	6	26%
DILLON	12	86%	2	14%
DORCHESTER	39	75%	13	25%
EDGEFIELD	8	80%	2	20%
FAIRFIELD	1	50%	1	50%
FLORENCE	61	91%	6	9%
GEORGETOWN	15	94%	1	6%
GREENVILLE	65	75%	22	25%
GREENWOOD	13	81%	3	19%
HAMPTON	11	79%	3	21%
HORRY	58	95%	3	5%
JASPER	15	75%	5	25%
KERSHAW	10	100%	0	0%
LANCASTER	10	71%	4	29%
LAURENS	10	77%	3	23%
LEE	4	80%	1	20%
LEXINGTON	46	85%	8	15%
McCORMICK	6	100%	0	0%
MARION	12	100%	0	0%
MARLBORO	9	75%	3	25%
NEWBERRY	10	83%	2	17%
OCONEE	16	94%	1	6%
ORANGEBURG	38	86%	6	14%
PICKENS	15	94%	1	6%
RICHLAND	81	89%	10	11%
SALUDA	3	75%	1	25%
SPARTANBURG	76	90%	8	10%
SUMTER	43	74%	15	26%
UNION	8	89%	1	11%
WILLIAMSBURG	9	90%	1	10%
YORK	68	94%	4	6%
TRANSITIONAL	5	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	**1,134**	**84%**	**211**	**16%**
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.				

SECTION E

SEX OFFENDERS

FISCAL YEAR 2011

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.

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

TABLE 1-E
ACTIVE SEX OFFENDERS UNDER SUPERVISION AS OF JUNE 30, 2011

COUNTY	SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION		GENERAL SUPERVISION		TOTAL SEX OFFENDERS
ABBEVILLE	6	67%	3	33%	9
AIKEN	53	78%	15	22%	68
ALLENDALE	2	67%	1	33%	3
ANDERSON	55	73%	20	27%	75
BAMBERG	1	100%	0	0%	1
BARNWELL	4	57%	3	43%	7
BEAUFORT	14	78%	4	22%	18
BERKELEY	34	72%	13	28%	47
CALHOUN	2	33%	4	67%	6
CHARLESTON	73	68%	35	32%	108
CHEROKEE	16	67%	8	33%	24
CHESTER	1	25%	3	75%	4
CHESTERFIELD	5	63%	3	38%	8
CLARENDON	6	43%	8	57%	14
COLLETON	13	72%	5	28%	18
DARLINGTON	7	88%	1	13%	8
DILLON	5	63%	3	38%	8
DORCHESTER	22	73%	8	27%	30
EDGEFIELD	10	71%	4	29%	14
FAIRFIELD	1	100%	0	0%	1
FLORENCE	30	88%	4	12%	34
GEORGETOWN	14	82%	3	18%	17
GREENVILLE	76	68%	35	32%	111
GREENWOOD	13	68%	6	32%	19
HAMPTON	2	67%	1	33%	3
HORRY	64	89%	8	11%	72
JASPER	5	71%	2	29%	7
KERSHAW	11	85%	2	15%	13
LANCASTER	15	68%	7	32%	22
LAURENS	15	65%	8	35%	23
LEE	2	67%	1	33%	3
LEXINGTON	44	85%	8	15%	52
McCORMICK	3	50%	3	50%	6
MARION	5	63%	3	38%	8
MARLBORO	2	67%	1	33%	3
NEWBERRY	9	53%	8	47%	17
OCONEE	28	88%	4	13%	32
ORANGEBURG	10	50%	10	50%	20
PICKENS	28	68%	13	32%	41
RICHLAND	52	63%	31	37%	83
SALUDA	5	71%	2	29%	7
SPARTANBURG	69	86%	11	14%	80
SUMTER	26	79%	7	21%	33
UNION	8	73%	3	27%	11
WILLIAMSBURG	14	78%	4	22%	18
YORK	42	88%	6	13%	48
STATE TOTAL	**922**	**74%**	**332**	**26%**	**1,254**

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.


100%
90%
80%
70%
60%
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%
0%
GENERAL SUPERVISION
(ACTIVE SENTENCE IS
NOT A SEX OFFENSE)
26%
SEX OFFENDER
MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION
74%

SECTION F

VIOLATIONS

FISCAL YEAR 2011

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 4,496 violation hearings were held. At those hearings, 2,260 cases were continued or recommended for continuation, while 1,536 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 2006 to FY 2011.

TABLE 1-F
VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY

COUNTY	CASES HEARD	CASES CONTINUED OR RECOMMENDED FOR CONTINUATION	CASES REVOKED OR RECOMMENDED FOR REVOCATION
Abbeville	2	1	1
Aiken	215	134	81
Allendale	44	22	22
Anderson	367	303	64
Bamberg	33	18	15
Barnwell	36	29	7
Beaufort	24	5	19
Berkeley	179	116	63
Calhoun	27	20	7
Charleston	434	227	207
Cherokee	45	30	15
Chester	8	3	5
Chesterfield	22	15	7
Clarendon	56	46	10
Colleton	18	10	8
Darlington	33	20	13
Dillon	12	5	7
Dorchester	142	81	61
Edgefield	65	56	9
Fairfield	4	3	1
Florence	113	76	37
Georgetown	24	15	9
Greenville	610	448	162
Greenwood	32	22	10
Hampton	20	8	12
Horry	72	43	29
Jasper	59	32	27
Kershaw	25	16	9
Lancaster	71	43	28
Laurens	70	56	14
Lee	11	3	8
Lexington	102	63	39
Marion	21	13	8
Marlboro	12	5	7
McCormick	53	43	10
Newberry	49	22	27
Oconee	181	130	51
Orangeburg	160	82	78
Pickens	111	73	38
Richland	233	131	102
Saluda	44	19	25
Spartanburg	291	207	84
Sumter	155	100	55
Union	117	100	17
Williamsburg	10	8	2
York	84	58	26
STATEWIDE	**4,496**	**2,260**	**1,536**

TABLE 2-F
CLOSURES BY TYPE

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

FY 2010	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I[1]	JC-I[2]	Rev-C[3]	Rev-T[4]	Rev-TC[5]	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,157	9,109	28	6	485	4,142	255	4,916
Parole	1,587	435	9	0	9	70	14	102
YOA	2,096	542	14	0	62	570	55	701
Other Releases	1,422	648	110	0	0	1	0	111
Total	**31,262**	**10,734**	**161**	**6**	**556**	**4,783**	**324**	**5,830**
% Unsuccessful[6]			2.8%	0.1%	9.5%	82.0%	5.6%	

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

FY 2008	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I[1]	JC-I[2]	Rev-C[3]	Rev-T[4]	Rev-TC[5]	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,990	9,547	44	19	404	4,313	213	4,993
Parole	1,911	657	13	0	14	147	10	184
YOA	1,921	539	13	0	52	583	27	675
Other Releases	1,372	552	23	0	0	6	0	29
Total	**32,194**	**11,295**	**93**	**19**	**470**	**5,049**	**250**	**5,881**
% Unsuccessful[6]			1.6%	0.3%	8.0%	85.9%	4.3%	

FY 2007	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I[1]	JC-I[2]	Rev-C[3]	Rev-T[4]	Rev-TC[5]	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,578	9,061	24	35	603	4,122	115	4,899
Parole	3,634	737	17	0	20	184	9	230
YOA	2,064	538	14	0	81	534	38	667
Other Releases	1,373	387	19	0	0	5	0	24
Total	**33,649**	**10,723**	**74**	**35**	**704**	**4,845**	**162**	**5,820**
% Unsuccessful[6]			1.3%	0.6%	12.1%	83.2%	2.8%	

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.

SECTION G

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

FISCAL YEAR 2011

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 2011, 171 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. 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 2011



FIGURE 8
ACTIVE OFFENDERS ON GPS
FISCAL YEAR 2011



SECTION H

SUMMARY

FISCAL YEAR 2011

SUMMARY

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

Abbreviations:

AA/NA	ALCOHOLICS ANONOMOUS/NARCOTICS ANONOMOUS
DNA	DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID BLOOD TESTING
DRGTST	DRUG TESTING
DSS	SC DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
DVC	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUSELING
ED	HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAMS
ESC	EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION (WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT)
MH	METAL HEALTH COUNSELING/TREATMENT
PEP	PAROLE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
PSE	PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT
RE EN	RENTRY INITIATIVES
SAC	SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNSELING
SOC	SEX OFFENDER COUNSELING/TREATMENT
SPICE	SELF-PACED IN CLASS EDUCATION
VR	SC DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

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

Table 3-H shows drug testing activity during FY 2011. 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%) and probationers (4%) remained the same when comparing FY 2010 and FY 2011. The percentage of violent offenses among parole admissions decreased by 4% over the previous year.

Overall, the most utilized level of supervision was standard (77%), followed by high (19%), intensive (1%) and sex offender (3%) for all cases.

The overall success rate for closures was 65% during the fiscal year. The overall success rate for parolees was 91%. Both probationers (66%) and YOA offenders (51%) had less successful closures rates than parolees.

Of the 18,291 offenders tested for drug use while under supervision, 6,472 or 35.4%, tested positive for drugs.

Figure 10 compares the number of admissions for each fiscal year from 1992 to 2011. Admissions decreased for FY 2011 by 3.6% from the previous fiscal year.

Figure 11 displays the percentage of violent admissions by program for fiscal years 2002 to 2011.

TABLE 1-H

OFFENDER REFERRALS AS OF JUNE 30, 2011

COUNTY	AA/ NA	DNA	DSS	DVC	ED*	ESC	MH	PEP	PSE	RE EN	SAC	SOC	SPICE	VR	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	9	0	11	1	0	1	52
AIKEN	4	127	1	8	16	0	19	1	107	0	203	20	1	5	722
ALLENDALE	1	8	0	4	25	0	2	0	17	0	30	1	0	37	141
ANDERSON	31	98	3	33	39	0	24	2	60	0	266	23	2	51	986
BAMBERG	0	5	0	1	1	0	2	0	20	0	23	0	0	0	65
BARNWELL	0	8	0	0	4	0	0	0	23	0	38	1	0	1	113
BEAUFORT	2	26	2	6	7	0	2	0	20	0	57	5	0	4	166
BERKELEY	3	2	0	5	13	0	11	0	48	0	65	6	0	4	230
CALHOUN	1	7	0	6	6	0	2	0	9	0	13	1	0	26	87
CHARLESTON	2	3	3	21	79	0	30	2	181	8	292	23	1	13	944
CHEROKEE	0	2	2	4	23	0	17	1	44	0	94	2	0	6	313
CHESTER	1	35	0	1	3	0	1	2	39	0	82	0	1	4	319
CHESTERFIELD	0	34	0	3	2	0	0	0	6	0	18	6	0	12	136
CLARENDON	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	1	4	0	20	1	0	4	66
COLLETON	1	1	0	3	6	0	2	0	2	0	27	2	1	0	53
DARLINGTON	1	41	3	3	9	0	5	1	29	0	39	4	0	5	177
DILLON	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	0	1	12
DORCHESTER	9	4	0	3	13	0	6	1	35	0	53	11	1	10	176
EDGEFIELD	1	6	0	3	14	0	8	2	30	0	60	1	0	10	230
FAIRFIELD	0	29	2	5	4	0	3	0	17	0	23	0	0	5	107
FLORENCE	3	39	1	29	13	4	14	0	164	0	180	7	0	48	553
GEORGETOWN	5	36	1	1	9	68	12	3	26	0	53	6	2	25	276
GREENVILLE	5	53	6	33	123	0	63	4	328	0	909	27	0	52	2534
GREENWOOD	0	7	0	16	17	2	4	0	36	0	84	4	0	18	240
HAMPTON	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	2	24
HORRY	10	34	0	19	12	0	20	3	62	1	143	8	0	58	415
JASPER	0	3	0	2	5	0	1	0	8	0	12	4	0	0	42
KERSHAW	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	1	0	2	30
LANCASTER	1	124	1	13	4	0	12	0	37	0	101	3	0	8	417
LAURENS	5	18	1	13	16	1	9	2	48	0	105	5	0	28	387
LEE	0	8	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	11	1	0	26	71
LEXINGTON	8	243	1	16	39	0	15	0	70	1	200	24	0	30	1229
McCORMICK	0	7	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	7	0	1	5	43
MARION	0	49	1	3	3	0	4	0	16	0	41	5	0	3	157
MARLBORO	0	14	0	0	6	0	4	2	11	0	12	0	0	10	99
NEWBERRY	0	9	0	8	2	0	1	1	15	0	18	4	0	35	105
OCONEE	3	21	0	2	17	0	1	0	20	0	89	7	0	15	231
ORANGEBURG	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	9	1	12	1	0	0	36
PICKENS	4	7	2	12	55	0	11	1	64	0	222	7	0	7	636
RICHLAND	9	244	0	25	21	0	38	10	389	0	276	21	0	45	1207
SALUDA	1	6	0	3	3	0	3	0	11	0	33	3	0	19	111
SPARTANBURG	11	16	2	16	157	0	47	9	255	0	443	12	3	52	1472
SUMTER	0	17	0	1	10	0	3	4	12	0	48	1	2	29	157
UNION	0	52	1	5	6	0	6	1	25	0	57	1	0	2	324
WILLIAMSBURG	0	2	1	2	2	0	2	0	3	0	16	5	0	8	50
YORK	15	244	1	4	37	0	37	6	72	0	331	8	2	18	1409
TRANSITIONAL	0	55	0	2	13	0	7	0	31	0	76	6	0	4	290
STATE TOTAL	**138**	**1751**	**35**	**343**	**851**	**75**	**460**	**59**	**2427**	**11**	**4921**	**282**	**17**	**748**	**17640**

***ED is comprised of referrals to Adult Education, GED, and Learn & earn high school equivalency programs.**

TABLE 2-H DNA COLLECTIONS AS OF JUNE 30, 2011	
COUNTY	**TOTAL COLLECTIONS**
Abbeville	42
Aiken	218
Allendale	17
Anderson	316
Bamberg	35
Barnwell	44
Beaufort	151
Berkeley	223
Calhoun	9
Charleston	439
Cherokee	84
Chester	38
Chesterfield	54
Clarendon	78
Colleton	88
Darlington	103
Dillon	56
Dorchester	156
Edgefield	40
Fairfield	27
Florence	247
Georgetown	98
Greenville	477
Greenwood	101
Hampton	19
Horry	399
Jasper	52
Kershaw	41
Lancaster	117
Laurens	101
Lee	25
Lexington	259
McCormick	20
Marion	49
Marlboro	58
Newberry	30
Oconee	136
Orangeburg	175
Pickens	162
Richland	510
Saluda	23
Spartanburg	503
Sumter	157
Union	48
Williamsburg	40
York	325
Central Office	3
STATE TOTAL	**6,393**

FIGURE 9
MONTHLY DNA COLLECTIONS



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	59	14	23.73%	18	68
AIKEN	746	144	19.30%	213	1,019
ALLENDALE	107	68	63.55%	120	136
ANDERSON	797	300	37.64%	411	919
BAMBERG	79	33	41.77%	51	95
BARNWELL	104	40	38.46%	47	131
BEAUFORT*	373	126	33.78%	168	485
BERKELEY*	695	192	27.63%	290	846
CALHOUN	116	53	45.69%	99	253
CHARLESTON	1,229	435	35.39%	536	1,298
CHEROKEE	283	122	43.11%	205	321
CHESTER	227	79	34.80%	115	310
CHESTERFIELD	193	70	36.27%	114	306
CLARENDON	99	29	29.29%	32	107
COLLETON	249	111	44.58%	156	313
DARLINGTON	340	150	44.12%	231	452
DILLON	32	7	21.88%	8	37
DORCHESTER*	354	126	35.59%	195	445
EDGEFIELD	184	58	31.52%	83	212
FAIRFIELD	112	44	39.29%	52	116
FLORENCE*	604	184	30.46%	263	725
GEORGETOWN	256	77	30.08%	118	319
GREENVILLE*	1,647	576	34.97%	975	2,072
GREENWOOD	163	92	56.44%	124	178
HAMPTON	44	10	22.73%	11	49
HORRY	737	241	32.70%	409	936
JASPER	135	39	28.89%	55	183
KERSHAW	128	56	43.75%	92	198
LANCASTER	398	178	44.72%	240	447
LAURENS	324	133	41.05%	234	402
LEE	108	26	24.07%	37	126
LEXINGTON	767	236	30.77%	381	985
MCCORMICK	13	4	30.77%	5	16
MARION	162	51	31.48%	64	206
MARLBORO	112	55	49.11%	78	140
NEWBERRY	196	85	43.37%	118	251
OCONEE	185	84	45.41%	169	214
ORANGEBURG	759	326	42.95%	508	1,022
PICKENS	338	137	40.53%	202	365
RICHLAND	1,245	451	36.22%	595	1,430
SALUDA	108	34	31.48%	52	132
SPARTANBURG	1,533	542	35.36%	783	1,879
SUMTER	374	105	28.07%	146	438
UNION	231	79	34.20%	121	271
WILLIAMSBURG	191	70	36.65%	108	251
YORK*	1,150	398	34.61%	570	1,525
CENTRAL	5	2	40.00%	2	5
STATE TOTAL	**18,291**	**6,472**	**35.38%**	**9,604**	**22,634**

*** Includes Satellite Office**

TABLE 4-H
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

ADMISSIONS

CATEGORY	Probation		Parole		YOA		Total	
	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11
RACE:								
BLACK	51%	50%	66%	64%	68%	67%	53%	53%
WHITE	47%	48%	32%	34%	31%	32%	45%	45%
OTHER	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	2%
GENDER:								
MALE	79%	79%	91%	89%	97%	97%	82%	82%
FEMALE	21%	21%	9%	11%	3%	3%	18%	18%
OFFENSE TYPE:								
VIOLENT	3%	4%	47%	43%	2%	2%	7%	8%
NON-VIOLENT	97%	96%	53%	57%	98%	98%	93%	92%

ACTIVES

LEVEL OF SUPERVISION:	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11
STANDARD	76%	77%	68%	64%	62%	64%	74%	75%
HIGH RISK	20%	19%	13%	14%	15%	16%	19%	18%
INTENSIVE	1%	1%	12%	15%	21%	18%	3%	3%
SEX OFFENDER	3%	3%	7%	7%	2%	2%	3%	3%

CLOSURES

CASE OUTCOME:	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11	FY 10	FY 11
SUCCESSFUL	65%	66%	84%	91%	44%	51%	65%	65%
UNSUCCESSFUL	35%	34%	16%	9%	56%	49%	35%	33%

DRUG TESTING

	FY 10	FY 11
INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED	14,548	18,291
INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE	5,288	6,472
% OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	36.35%	35.38%
TOTAL POSITIVE TESTS	7,841	9,604
NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS TESTED	17,769	22,634

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 10
ADMISSIONS: A 20-YEAR COMPARISON



FIGURE 11
PERCENTAGE OF VIOLENT ADMISSIONS BY STATUS