

MF-1

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
BOARD OF CORRECTIONS
AND THE
COMMISSIONER
OF THE
SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FOR THE
DD JULY 1, 1977 TO JUNE 30, 1978



PRINTED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD

81760

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
BOARD OF CORRECTIONS
AND THE
COMMISSIONER
OF THE
SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FOR THE
PERIOD JULY 1, 1977 TO JUNE 30, 1978



PRINTED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

South Carolina Department
of Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
South Carolina State Board of Corrections	4
Directory of Key Administrators	5
Organization of the South Carolina Department of Corrections	9
Facilities of the South Carolina Department of Corrections	10
Historical Perspective	15
Significant Developments of FY 1978	19
Federal Assistance Being Received by or Approved for the South Carolina Department of Corrections During FY 1978..	34
Publications/Documents of the South Carolina Department of Corrections During FY 1978	37
Statistical Section	39
Appendix	63
A. Statutory Authority of the South Carolina Department of Corrections	64
B. Youthful Offender Act	65
C. Programs and Services Administered by the South Carolina Department of Corrections	66
D. Counties Comprising South Carolina Planning Districts and Correctional Regions	67

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Institutions and Centers of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, As of June 30, 1978	12
2.	SCDC Average Inmate Population, 1960-1978 (Calendar Years)	40
3.	SCDC Average Inmate Population, 1967-1978 (Fiscal Years)	40
4.	Per Inmate Costs of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, Fiscal Years 1973-1977	41
5.	Expenditures of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, FY 1978	41
6.	Flow of Offenders Through the South Carolina Depart- ment of Corrections, Fiscal Years 1977 and 1978	42
7.	Distribution by Committing County and Correctional Region of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1978 (July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)	44
8.	Offense Distribution of SCDC Inmate Admitted During FY 1978 (July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)	46
9.	Sentence Length Distribution of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1978 (July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)	48
10.	Age Distribution of SCDC Inmates Admitted During FY 1978 (July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)	49
11.	Distribution by Committing County and Correctional Region of SCDC Inmate Population, As of June 30, 1978	50
12.	Type of Offense Distribution, As of June 30, 1978	52
13.	Sentence Length Distribution of SCDC Inmate Population, As of June 30, 1978	54
14.	Age Distribution of SCDC Inmate Population, As of June 30, 1978	55
15.	Custody Grade Distribution by Committing Correctional Region, Race and Sex of SCDC Inmates, As of June 30, 1978	56
16.	Youthful Offender Division Statistics, FY 1978 (July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)	58
17.	Parole Board Action During FY 1978 (July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)	59
18.	Distribution of SCDC Personnel by Race and Sex, As of the End of FY 1978	59
19.	Distribution of SCDC Security Strength by Facility, As of June 26, 1978	60
FIGURE 1.	Organizational Structure, South Carolina Depart- ment of Corrections	8
FIGURE 2.	Locations of SCDC Institutions and Centers, As of June 30, 1978	14

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF CORRECTIONS

Governor James B. Edwards, *Ex Officio*
Chairman, Mr. Charles C. Moore Spartanburg
Vice-Chairman, Mr. Clarence E. Watkins Camden
Secretary, Mr. Eugene N. Zeigler Florence
Member, Mr. Norman Kirkland Bamberg
Member, Mrs. Betty M. Condon Mount Pleasant
Member, Mr. W. M. Cromley, Jr. Saluda

DIRECTORY OF KEY ADMINISTRATORS *

Headquarters

Commissioner William D. Leeke
Executive Assistant Sterling W. Beckman
Administrative Assistant Sandra Jeffcoat
Assistant for Special Projects Joann B. Morton
Director, Division of Inspections G. S. Friday
Public Information Director Sam E. McCuen
Director, Division of Internal Affairs John W. Liddle
Legal Advisor Larry C. Batson
Director, Division of Inmate Relations Janice M. Foy

Deputy Commissioner for Administration Hubert M. Clements
Director, Division of Planning and Research ... Hugh H. Riddle
Acting Director, Division of Management Information
Services John Esposito
Director, Division of Correctional Industries John A. Carullo
Director, Division of Finance and Budget Charles M. Case
Acting Director, Division of Personnel Administration—
Elsie A. Harrington
Director, Division of Staff Development W. T. Cave

Deputy Commissioner for Operations Charles A. Leath
Director, Division of Classification David L. Bartles
Director, Division of Regional Operations ... Jesse W. Strickland
Director, Division of Construction and Engineering—
Harry W. Oberlies
Director, Division of Support Services Fred W. Atkinson
Director, Division of Safety and Health Facility
Inspection Services James C. Willis, Jr.
Director, Division of Construction George V. Harris

Deputy Commissioner for Program Services Paul I. Weldon
Director, Division of Educational Services—
J. Harvey DuBose, Sr.
Director, Division of Health Services John P. Solomon
Director, Youthful Offender Division David I. Morgan
Director, Division of Community Services ... Thomas A. Wham
Director, Division of Treatment Services Jerry L. Salisbury

* Although this report provides information pertaining to FY 1978, position titles and incumbents listed for Headquarters and Correctional Facilities are current as of October 27, 1978.

Correctional Facilities

Appalachian Correctional Region:

Regional Administrator Charles A. Livesay
Blue Ridge Community Pre-Release Center,
Superintendent R. H. Mauney
Cherokee Correctional Center, Supervisor . Willie J. Bratton, Jr.
Duncan Correctional Center, Supervisor . William C. Henderson
Givens Youth Correction Center, Superintendent—
John H. Carmichael, Jr.
Greenwood Correctional Center, Superintendent—
Glenn T. Davis
Hillcrest Correctional Center, Superintendent—
Frank H. Horton, Jr.
Intake Service Center, Superintendent ... Frank H. Horton, Jr.
Laurens Correctional Center, Superintendent .. Glenn T. Davis
Northside Correctional Center, Supervisor .. William C. Bryant
Oaklawn Correctional Center, Warden Ronald L. Hamby
Piedmont Community Pre-Release Center,
Superintendent John R. Lark
Travelers Rest Correctional Center, Supervisor .. Fred J. Smith

Midlands Correctional Region:

Regional Administrator Blake E. Taylor, Jr.
Aiken Youth Correction Center, Superintendent—
Louis M. Mims, Jr.
Campbell Pre-Release Center, Superintendent. . Olin L. Turner
Catawba Community Pre-Release Center,
Superintendent R. Brien Ward
Employment Program Dorm, Chief Correctional Officer—
Ronald G. Dabney
Goodman Correctional Institution, Superintendent—
W. Robert Holley
Lexington Correctional Center, Supervisor .. Mitchell R. Helton
Lower Savannah Community Pre-Release Center,
Superintendent George A. Roof
North Sumter Correctional Center, Supervisor ... J. C. Halley
Palmer Pre-Release Center, Superintendent—
William T. Wade
Reception and Evaluation Center, Superintendent—
Kenneth D. McKellar
Walden Correctional Institution, Warden Willie R. Portee

Watkins Pre-Release Center, Superintendent . Jerry D. Spigner
Women's Work Release Dorm, Superintendent—
Judy O. Anderson

Coastal Correctional Region:

Regional Administrator L. J. Allen
Coastal Community Pre-Release Center, Superintendent—
Frank A. Smith
MacDougall Youth Correction Center, Superintendent—
Edsel T. Taylor

Non-Regionalized Institutions and Centers:

Central Correctional Institution, Warden Joe R. Martin
Kirkland Correctional Institution, Warden James L. Harvey
Manning Correctional Intitution, Warden . . George N. Martin, III
Maximum Security Center, Warden Laurie F. Bessinger
Wateree River Correctional Institution, Warden—
Jerald J. Thames
Women's Correctional Center, Warden Louisa D. Brown

tions and providing support for treatment/rehabilitative programs and services. Under the supervision of this Office are the Divisions of Classification, Regional Operations, Support Services, Engineering and Maintenance, Construction, and Safety and Health Facility Inspection Services. All SCDC institutions/centers are under the Division of Regional Operations. Regionalized facilities operate under the supervision of Regional Administrators, while non-regionalized facilities operate under the direct supervision of the Director, Division of Regional Operations.

The Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Program Services² is administratively responsible for developing program and treatment policy, monitoring performance of the delivery system, and providing technical expertise for planning and design of new programs. Delivering a broad spectrum of services under the supervision of this Office are the Divisions of Health, Educational, Community, and Treatment Services. The Youthful Offender Division is also supervised by this Office. This Division was created in 1968 to execute provisions of the Youthful Offender Act. The program essentially operates as a micro-correctional system within the Department, providing all Youthful Offenders a complete range of administrative, evaluative, parole and aftercare services.

The organizational structure of SCDC is illustrated in the chart on page 8.

FACILITIES OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

While the Department has a central administrative structure, as described in the previous section, its facilities, widespread throughout the state, are aligned into Correctional Regions for management and operational efficiency. The three Correctional Regions in operation are Appalachian, Midlands and Coastal. The geographical configuration of these regions is shown in Figure 2, page 14. Each of the Correctional Regions is administered by a Regional Administrator through a Regional Corrections Coordinating Office. The Regional Administrators are responsible to the Director, Division of Regional Operations. Since the regionalization process has not been completed, some facilities remain independent, operating under the direct supervision of the Director,

² For a list of programs and services administered by SCDC, see Appendix C, page 66.

Division of Regional Operations. Table 1, page 12 presents the facilities by region as well as the non-regionalized facilities.

At the end of FY 1978, the Department of Corrections operated a total of 33 facilities, which are individually listed in Table 1, page 12. Figure 2, page 14 shows their location. Of these, ten are pre-release or work release centers. Twenty-two of the Department's facilities house minimum security inmates, while the remainder house medium or maximum security inmates. Four SCDC facilities are primarily for younger offenders, three of which predominantly house inmates sentenced under the Youthful Offender Act. One SCDC institution is for female inmates.

The total design capacity of these facilities at the end of FY 1978 was 4,530. Design capacity for individual facilities is shown in Table 1 page 12. The regional distributions of the design capacity are as follows: Appalachian Correctional Region—707; Midlands Correctional Region—1,185; Coastal Correctional Region—302; and non-regionalized facilities—2,336. The total average incarcerated inmate population under SCDC jurisdiction during FY 1978 was 7,448. Of these, 6,709 inmates were housed in SCDC facilities, which were thus operating at 48.1 percent above design capacity.

Because of overcrowded conditions in SCDC institutions/centers, the Department has been housing State inmates in designated local facilities³ since FY 1975, as provided for by legislation. At the end of FY 1978, 714 state inmates were held in 59 designated local facilities in 40 counties. The average number of SCDC inmates held in designated county facilities during FY 1978 was 738 or about 9.9 percent of the total average inmate population under SCDC custody.

Besides housing inmates in designated facilities because of overcrowded conditions, SCDC also placed certain inmates in other special locations because of their unique assignments or needs. A 31-bed unit of the State Park Health Center administered and operated by the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), was renovated and designated to hold SCDC inmates undergoing and recuperating from general surgery. Whereas DHEC provides the professional services, SCDC is responsible for the security staffing and procedures. Other locations, where a small number of inmates are housed for special assignments, are the State Law Enforcement Division, the Governor's Mansion and the Criminal Justice Academy.

³ See FY 1975 and FY 1976 SCDC Annual Reports for details of the origin of designated facilities.

TABLE 1
INSTITUTIONS AND CENTERS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
AS OF JUNE 30, 1978

Institutions and Centers	Key to Location Map (Figure 2)	Degree of Security	Description of Resident Population	Design Capacity	Average Daily Population FY 1978	Avg. Daily Popul. as Percentage of Design Capacity
APPALACHIAN CORRECTIONAL REGION						
Blue Ridge Community Pre-Release Center	2	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	115	176	153.0
Cherokee Correctional Center	7	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	56	71	126.8
Duncan Correctional Center	5	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	40	53	132.5
Givens Youth Correction Center	3	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily Youthful Offenders 17-25	76	98	128.9
Greenwood Correctional Center	9	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—includes some inmates undergoing intake processing	48	98	204.2
Hillcrest Correctional Center	2	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	60	109	181.7
Intake Service Center (Greenville)	2	Maximum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates undergoing intake processing	42	75	178.6
Laurens Correctional Center	8	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—includes some inmates undergoing intake processing	40	66	165.0
Northside Correctional Center	6	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	30	48	160.0
Oaklawn Correctional Center	4	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	60	110	183.3
Piedmont Community Pre-Release Center	6	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	90	81	90.0
Travelers Rest Correctional Center	1	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	50	90	180.0
MIDLANDS CORRECTIONAL REGION						
Aiken Youth Correction Center	16	Minimum	Male, ages 17-21—primarily Youthful Offenders	240	200	83.3
Campbell Pre-Release Center	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	100	118	118.0
Catawba Community Pre-Release Center	10	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	70	58	82.8
Employment Program Dorm	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—participants in the Economic Development Pilot Program	50	62	124.0
Goodman Correctional Institution	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily geriatric and handicapped inmates	84	89	106.0

12


13

Institutions and Centers	Key to Location Map (Figure 2)	Degree of Security	Description of Resident Population	Design Capacity	Average Daily Population FY 1978	Avg. Daily Popul. as Percentage of Design Capacity
Lexington Correctional Center	15	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmate staff working in the Columbia area	40	66	165.0
Lower Savannah Community Pre-Release Center	16	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	45	44	97.8
North Sumter Correctional Center	18	Medium	Male, ages 17 and up—holding status before institutional assignment	50	92	184.0
Palmer Pre-Release Center	19	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	50	76	152.0
Reception and Evaluation Center 1	14	Maximum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates undergoing intake processing	180	200	111.1
Walden Correctional Institution	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily trustee grade inmates	98	118	120.4
Watkins Pre-Release Center	12	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	129	154	119.4
Women's Work Release Dorm	12	Minimum	Female, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release and employment programs	49	49	100.0
COASTAL CORRECTIONAL REGION						
Coastal Community Pre-Release Center	22	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up—inmates on work release or accelerated pre-release programs	62	71	114.5
MacDougall Youth Correction Center	20	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	240	346	144.2
NON-REGIONALIZED INSTITUTIONS/CENTERS 2						
Central Correctional Institution	14	Maximum/ Medium	Male, ages 17 and up	1,100	1,702	154.7
Kirkland Correctional Institution	12	Maximum/ Medium	Male, ages 17 and up	448	938	209.4
Manning Correctional Institution	13	Medium	Male, ages 17 and up—primarily Youthful Offenders 17-25	300	418	139.3
Maximum Security Center	14	Maximum	Male, ages 17 and up	80	103	128.8
Waterloo River Correctional Institution	17	Minimum	Male, ages 17 and up	240	417	173.8
Women's Correctional Center	12	Minimum	Female, ages 17 and up	168	276	164.3

1 Although the R & E Center was assigned to the Midlands Correctional Region, it is serving as a regional intake service center for both the Midlands and Coastal Regions. The design capacity and FY 1978 average population shown for the R & E Center include both the R & E Center proper (capacity 100) and the leased portion of the Columbia City Jail (capacity 80).

2 The non-regionalized institutions/centers of the Department remains directly under the Division of Regional Operations at the present time. Some of these facilities may be incorporated into correctional regions as regionalization of SCDC continues.

FIGURE 2
LOCATIONS OF SCDC INSTITUTIONS AND CENTERS
AS OF JULY 1, 1977



HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Corrections in South Carolina has evolved, over the years, from county-operated prison systems to State administered institutions; from a single State penitentiary to a network of penal facilities throughout the State; from a punishment-oriented philosophy to a philosophy emphasizing humane treatment, rehabilitative services and community-based correctional programs. The following summary of significant developments and events in this evolution during the last several decades provides a perspective for the current efforts of the South Carolina Department of Corrections.⁴

Dual Prison System and Creation of SCDC

As a humane alternative to cruelties which had prevailed under county supervision of convicts, in 1866 the General Assembly passed an act which transferred the control of convicted and sentenced felons from the counties to the State and established the State Penitentiary. Although the Act stripped the counties of their responsibility for handling felons, shortly thereafter the counties' demands for labor for building and maintaining roads prompted the reversal of this provision, and by 1930, county supervisors assumed full authority to choose to retain convicts for road construction or to transfer them to the State. This dual prison system of State administered facilities and local prison and jail operations resulted in inequitable treatment of prisoners, and criticism of the system was widespread.

In the midst of the political and legal developments concerning State and county jurisdiction over convicts, the State Penitentiary expanded to a network of penal facilities throughout the State and experienced changes reflecting the evolution of correctional philosophy from retribution and punishment to humane treatment and rehabilitation. Despite notable improvements, overcrowding and mismanagement prevailed; as a result, the state correctional system was reorganized, and the Department of Corrections was created through legislative action in 1960. But the autonomy of the State and local systems remained intact, and the dual prison system continued.

Problems inherent in the dual prison system became increasingly evident as crime soared in the 1960's. The most critical problems concerned the absence of adequate planning and programming,

⁴ For greater details of these developments and events, see previous SCDC Annual Reports.

inefficiency of resource utilization and inequitable distribution of rehabilitative services. Therefore, system reform of the total adult corrections system in South Carolina was necessary.

Consolidation of the South Carolina Adult Corrections System

While the problems of the dual prison system and the need for system reform had long been recognized, the major impetus for reform of the South Carolina adult corrections system was the 1973 Adult Corrections Study conducted by the Office of Criminal Justice Programs (OCJP). The major recommendations of this study were the elimination of the dual prison system in favor of a consolidated state system and regionalization of SCDC operations. Under the proposed consolidated system, the State would be responsible for all long-term adult offenders, insuring their humane treatment, providing confinement, programs and services close to their home communities. Under the proposed regionalization, the State would be divided into ten Correctional Regions, and a Regional Corrections Coordinating Office, headed by a Regional Administrator, would be established in each region. The Regional Corrections Coordinating Office would be responsible for administration of all SCDC facilities in the area, including the development, coordination and support of regional correctional programs in their respective regions, and for coordination with the Department's central headquarters. Such regionalization was designed to provide for improved planning, coordination and administration of SCDC operations and to facilitate effective and efficient utilization of local community resources.

While some recommendations in the Adult Corrections Study were modified in the course of implementation, the overall concept was adopted as policy by the State Board of Corrections, and steps were immediately taken to consolidate and regionalize the adult corrections system in South Carolina. The major step toward consolidation was the closure of county prison operations. Legislation passed in June, 1974 gave the State jurisdiction over all adult offenders with sentences exceeding three months, and counties were required to transfer any such prisoners in their facilities to the Department. Either voluntarily or through negotiations with SCDC officials, counties began transferring their long-term prisoners to the State and closing their prison operations in May 1973. Since May 1, 1973, 27 counties have closed their prisons or converted them to other use. As of June 30, 1978, only 12 counties operate

prisons as a separate facility. Other counties operate combined facilities for detainees and sentenced inmates, county jails, correctional centers, detention centers and/or law enforcement centers.

The assumption of county prisoners and closing of local prison systems enabled the Department to take steps toward the ultimate regionalization of SCDC operations. One of the major steps toward implementation of regionalization was the alignment of contiguous planning districts into Correctional Regions. Continual in-house study of the geographic distribution of offenders and cost-benefit analysis of resource utilization resulted in the Department's decision in FY 1975 to reduce the proposed number of Correctional Regions from the ten originally recommended by the Adult Corrections Study to four. Further in-depth examination of regionalization was undertaken as an integral part of the ten-year Comprehensive Growth and Capital Improvements Plan developed in FY 1977 by the contract consultant, Stephen Carter and Associates. After studying the distribution of SCDC facilities throughout the State, the commitment trends of the inmate population, the Department's manpower and financial resources and the capital improvement requirements, the consultant recommended that the Department further reduce the number of Correctional Regions from four to three. This recommendation was implemented and by the end of FY 1978, three Correctional Regions—Appalachian, Midlands and Coastal—were established and became fully operational through the Regional Corrections Coordinating Office. Twenty-seven of the Department's facilities were assigned under the administration of Regional Administrators through the Regional Corrections Coordination Office in each of the Correctional Regions, and only six SCDC facilities remain unassigned to regions.

Crises Confronting SCDC in Recent Years

SCDC's efforts to regionalize were made more difficult by the fact that this occurred during a time of unprecedented increases in crime in South Carolina as well as throughout the nation. As a result of increasing crime, the counties' transfer of inmates to the State, and the legislative mandate for all long-term prisoners to be under SCDC jurisdiction, the Department experienced an unprecedented influx of offenders through the state corrections system during FY 1975. The number of inmates under state jurisdiction on June 30, 1975 (5,658) was 53 percent higher than on the same date the previous year (3,693). There was also a more than 30 percent

increase in the *average* daily population from FY 1974 to FY 1975 (from 3,542 to 4,618), the largest known yearly increase in average daily population in SCDC history. However, this percentage increase was surpassed during FY 1976 when the average daily population under SCDC jurisdiction (6,264) increased by 35.6 percent over the FY 1975 figure. Such increases in the number of inmates under state jurisdiction have been among the severest in the nation, as indicated by a nationwide survey of the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture. The state offender commitment rate was also ranked third highest in the nation in 1975. Another survey showed that South Carolina experienced the nation's second highest percentage increase in state inmate population between January 1, 1975, and January 1, 1976. Between those two dates, SCDC population jumped by 38 percent as compared with an 11 percent increase in the total U. S. incarcerated population in state and federal prisons. Inmate population continued to increase in FY 1977, but at a slower pace. On June 30, 1977, incarcerated inmates under SCDC custody reached 7,632, which is 10.4 percent more than on the same date a year before. Average daily inmate population in FY 1977 was 14.4 percent higher than FY 1976.

The dramatic increases in inmate population in recent years have resulted in continued and intensified overcrowding in SCDC facilities as well as constant strain on the Department's financial resources. Therefore, while efforts toward system consolidation and regionalization have continued, the Department has been forced to focus primary attention on solving the problems of overcrowding and limited financial resources. Short-term and long-range strategies directed toward overcoming either or both problems have involved renovation of existing facilities; realignment of existing space use; acquisition of additional facilities; expanded use of designated facilities; revision of youthful offender institutional release policies; revision of fiscal policies and procedures; implementation of economizing measures; revision of capital improvement plans; and implementation of the Extended Work Release Program as an alternative to continued incarceration. By the end of FY 1977, these strategies had helped SCDC endure the immediate population and financial crises without any major disturbances, although long-term relief has yet to materialize via additional bedspace and/or stabilization of the inmate population level.

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS OF FY 1978

In FY 1978 a lower inmate population growth rate and the absence of major institutional disturbances enabled SCDC to concentrate its efforts on strategies and programs to cope with immediate and long-range challenges which had stemmed from the population and financial crises of previous years and the increasing demand for efficiency and effective management from government institutions. Although in the past two fiscal years, SCDC's inmate population growth was relatively modest, the dramatic upsurge in fiscal years 1974-76 accompanied by only a meager increase in bedspace resulted in overcrowded conditions in SCDC, which are particularly severe in the larger medium security institutions. As in corrections systems in other states, SCDC was challenged in court because of overcrowding and the deteriorating physical and/or living conditions at CCI. The class action suit, *Mattison, et al. versus South Carolina Board of Corrections, et al.*, involved months of intensive study and negotiations by SCDC management and legal staff. A settlement agreement subject to class and court review was arrived at in March, 1978. Besides the legal challenges, SCDC refined and finalized Phase I of its ten-year Capital Improvements Plan, to meet conditions established by the State Budget and Control Board and commenced constructions to yield 1,200 bedspaces by 1980. In order to stabilize inmate population in the long run and stimulate inmate work incentives, SCDC embarked on two new programs, Extended Work Release and Earned Work Credit, which would reduce the amount of time spent behind bars for selected and/or gainfully employed inmates. For more effective inmate and program management and to facilitate decision-making pertaining to program and work assignments for the ever increasing inmate population, a classification study was initiated. To upgrade medical care standards legally and professionally, a unit of the State Park Health Center of the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) was officially designated to function as a surgical and medical ward for SCDC inmates. Anticipating a continuing trend of court intervention into correctional systems which fail to meet minimum professional standards and to develop strategies for advance voluntary compliance if necessary, SCDC also embarked on a review of accreditation standards established by the American Correctional Association. In response to the emphasis on overall long-range planning in South Carolina state government, SCDC developed its first five-year program budget. For increased

efficiency, its Prison Industries Division was reorganized and expanded, and two in-service training programs provided SCDC staff with management skills and/or ongoing updates of correctional developments. Recognizing the importance of crime prevention, SCDC sponsored two related inmate projects which were favorably received by the criminal justice community and the public. These significant events and developments in FY 1978 are individually presented in the following summaries.

SCDC Inmate Population Growth Rate Slows

FY 1978 marked a second year of moderate incarcerated inmate population growth following the dramatic annual increases in Fiscal Years 1974 and 1975. Whereas the average daily inmate population increased by more than 30 percent from FY 1974 to FY 1975, and again from FY 1975 to FY 1976, FY 1977 witnessed only a 14.4 percent increase. During FY 1978, the average incarcerated inmate population was 7,448, which was 3.9 percent higher than that of FY 1977. On June 30, 1978, SCDC's total incarcerated population reached 7,597, which was 2.0 percent higher than 7,450 recorded the same date a year before.

Class Action Suit Challenging Living Conditions at CCI

In 1976, when SCDC's population was increasing at an unprecedented rate, a civil suit was filed in U. S. District Court by several CCI inmates. The complaint, *Mattison, et al. versus South Carolina Board of Corrections, et al.*, alleged that in the operations of CCI, the defendants had violated and were continuing to violate the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments, the Civil Rights Law and the laws of South Carolina in failing to provide the plaintiffs with a safe and healthy environment, reasonable preventive health care and reasonable protection from violence. In essence, the overcrowded living conditions, the inadequate number of security officers and the deteriorating physical conditions at CCI were being challenged. In November, 1977, the Court granted the plaintiffs' motion to maintain the suit on behalf of the class of all persons now incarcerated in CCI, all persons in SCDC custody subject to transfer to CCI and all persons who in the future will either be incarcerated in CCI or in SCDC custody.

After extensive bargaining and negotiations among the attorneys for the plaintiffs and the defendants, a settlement agreement was reached and presented at a status hearing before the United States

District Court in Columbia in March, 1978. This agreement was subsequently presented to and approved by the South Carolina General Assembly. At the end of FY 1978, a Compromise Agreement and Stipulation of Dismissal was being developed to be filed with the Clerk of Court. The agreement subject to review and approval by the Court, incorporated the following terms and conditions to be implemented at CCI:

1. Employment of additional security officers;
2. Reduction of population;
3. Structural modifications;
4. Development and implementation of a classification system;
5. Limitation upon double-celling in certain cases and areas;
6. Limitation of population to an agreed maximum (1,713).

Another significant stipulation in the settlement is that a procedure, involving a hearing panel consisting partially of inmates, will be created for the purpose of hearing and adjudicating inmate complaints arising from the operation of the agreement.

Implementation of the Ten-Year Comprehensive Growth and Capital Improvements Plan

The *Mattison, et al. versus South Carolina Board of Corrections* suit added impetus and urgency to the implementation of SCDC's capital improvements plan. As early as 1973, SCDC had endeavored to phase out CCI, whose physical layout and persistent overcrowded conditions had long been considered unsatisfactory for effective inmate control as well as in violation of modern correctional standards. A proposal to phase out CCI, listing capital improvement projects or replacement facilities and the estimated costs thereof, was submitted to the State Budget and Control Board in November, 1973, and received favorable consideration. Subsequently, in 1974 and 1975, the General Assembly appropriated \$37.5 million in capital improvement bond funds for SCDC. As SCDC's inmate population soared dramatically in 1975, and since continual increase was anticipated, it became apparent that SCDC's capital improvement needs had to be expanded to accommodate future inmate population growth. Long-range planning and development of strategies to deal with the population crisis became mandatory. Accordingly, when the General Assembly released \$20.6 million of the appropriated capital improvements funds to SCDC in 1976, it also directed that a comprehensive ten-year capital improvement plan be developed.

In May, 1976, the firm of Stephen Carter and Associates was retained, and in November, 1976, that firm completed a ten-year capital improvements plan for SCDC. The plan, entitled *Comprehensive Growth and Capital Improvements Plan*, addressed future population projections, facility construction requirements, cost-reducing alternatives to inmate population growth and future directions for further regionalization. The number of inmates in SCDC facilities was forecast to be 8,040 in 1980 and 12,500 by 1986. To accommodate this population level, the consultant recommended a three-phase capital improvements plan which included specifications for construction of 8,160 new bedspaces to replace some existing facilities and to meet additional needs. The total cost was estimated at \$116 million at the 1976 price level.

In February, 1977, the Budget and Control Board authorized the expenditure of \$19.7 million for the implementation of Phase I of the ten-year Capital Improvements Plan, and specified that implementation would include the employment of a construction manager, the selection of an architectural firm to explore prototypical design and if feasible to design the two new facilities planned for the Greenville/Spartanburg area as prototypes for future construction, and the exploration of modular construction techniques and methods for maximizing the use of inmate labor. To meet these requirements, a construction manager was hired; the architectural firm of Wilbur Smith and Associates in association with the firm of Hellmuth, Obatar and Kassabaum was retained to design the two new facilities and develop standardized prototypical facility design for medium, minimum, work release and pre-release facilities; and the contract with Stephen Carter and Associates was expanded to refine the ten-year plan and to include a feasibility study of modular construction program and the development of an inmate construction program.

Phase I projects which the Budget and Control Board authorized for construction included a new 576-bed medium security facility in Greenville, a new 528-bed minimum security facility in Spartanburg; a 96-bed housing unit to be added to Wateree River Correctional Institution; a new abbatoir, and repairs/renovations to Wateree River Correctional Institution, MacDougall Youth Correction Center, State Park Health Center, and KCI Infirmery. As of June 30, 1978, work was underway on the new abbatoir, and the renovation of Wateree, MacDougall, State Park, and the KCI

Infirmery. All of this work was being accomplished with inmate labor.

Although actual construction of the new medium and minimum security facilities in the Greenville and Spartanburg areas, respectively, did not commence in FY 1978, considerable pre-construction activities were undertaken by the construction manager, the SCDC Building Committee,⁵ and the architectural/engineering firm contracted for the development of prototypical facility designs. These activities included:

1. Evaluation of sites for the two new facilities;
2. Selection and acquisition of 67.4 acres of land adjacent to the existing Oaklawn Correctional Center to be the site of the new 576-bed medium security facility;
3. Selection and acquisition of 391 acres of land near Cross Anchor, south of Spartanburg, to be the site of the new 528-bed minimum security facility, tentatively named Dutchman facility;
4. Topographical survey and soil analysis at both sites;
5. Development of schematic design, evaluation of construction materials, and preparations for bids and contracts.

It was anticipated that actual construction of these two facilities would begin in December, 1978, and the target date of occupancy of these facilities was expected to be August 31, 1980.

Funds for Phase II Construction were pending approval by the General Assembly as Fiscal Year 1978 closed. At that time, SCDC planned the expenditure of \$16,033,936 in Phase II projects which included a new 528-bed minimum security facility in the Appalachian Region, a 96-bed replacement for Piedmont Community Pre-Release Center, a 144-bed addition to Northside Correctional Center, and a 20-bed Infirmery for the New Oaklawn facility. Also included was a second 96-bed minimum addition to Wateree River Correctional Institution, a 96-bed Work Release Center in the Coastal Region, and certain renovations.

Significant to SCDC's capital improvements program is the emphasis on the use of inmate labor. The expanded contract with Stephen Carter and Associates mentioned above addressed this

⁵ The Building Committee consisting of key SCDC personnel in the areas of engineering, planning and institutional management and chaired by the Construction Manager was appointed by the Commissioner in May, 1977, to ensure successful implementation of the ten-year Capital Improvements Plan.

emphasis, and a study was made to assess an Inmate Labor Program for SCDC. The study, completed by the end of FY 1978, also focused on internal management procedures related to developing a comprehensive inmate labor program. It was projected that a savings of almost \$1 million could be realized through the use of inmate labor for construction in implementing Phase I of the ten-year Capital Improvements Plan, and that continued use of inmate labor in Phase II will further save the State approximately \$3.4 million.

Earned Work Credit

Equally important as providing bedspace to relieve overcrowded conditions and to meet court settlement requirements is the strategy to stabilize the adult inmate population, thereby controlling the spiralling long-term capital improvements and operating costs. A major development in FY 1978 which can achieve the population stabilization effect, granting no significant change in crime and sentencing patterns, is the Earned Work Credit Program which was authorized as part of the Litter Control Act signed into law by the Governor on May 5, 1978. Earlier population projections, developed by the Division of Research and Statistics of the State Budget and Control Board and incorporated into the ten-year Capital Improvements Plan in FY 1977, estimated SCDC's population would reach 12,500 in 1986 without any legislative, judicial and sentencing changes. With the implementation of Earned Work Credit provisions in the Litter Control Act, it is projected that SCDC inmate population may stabilize at about 8,000 unless criminal acts increase, parole is delayed and/or stiffer sentences are handed down.

The Earned Work Credit Program is a statutorily authorized program for sentence reduction via productive work. In addition to providing for the use of inmates for litter control and removal, the Litter Control Act of 1978 amended Section 24-13-230 of the 1976 S. C. Code of Laws, and authorized SCDC's Commissioner to allow a reduction of the term of sentence of inmates assigned to productive duty. The allowable credit (Earned Work Credit) authorized by the Act is from zero to one day for every two days so employed, with the maximum annual credit being limited to 180 days. The Act provides that no inmate suffering the penalty of life imprisonment shall be entitled to receive credits under this provision. In addition to reducing the term of sentence, earned

work credits can also be used as a factor in determining the time to be served before an inmate is eligible for parole consideration. However, no inmate convicted of armed robbery shall be entitled to earned work credits against parole eligibility, but credits may be allowed against the full term of sentence for these inmates. Although not specifically referred to in the Act, an inmate serving a sentence under the provisions of the Youthful Offender Act may not be awarded earned work credits, because of the indeterminate length of the sentence. With the introduction of Earned Work Credits, the Litter Control Act discontinued the provision of Seven Day Credits, which were awarded in the past for inmates assigned to jobs requiring them to work seven days a week.

Although inmate assignments to Earned Work Credit jobs were to be effective July 3, 1978, preparations for implementing the program were among the priority activities of SCDC during the latter half of FY 1978. Following the introduction of the Litter Control bill in the state legislature, the Commissioner appointed an internal task force in February to develop detailed policies, procedures, and implementation timetables. An Earned Work Credit Advisory Committee composed of the three deputy commissioners and other key staff was also established to review the implementation plan. Among the tasks completed by the Task Force during FY 1978 were as follows: a thorough study of existing inmate job assignments; development of a job list showing the job classifications and the amount of credits which can be earned; development of program policies and procedures; development of procedures for data entry and inmate record changes; orientation of SCDC administration and institutional staff on the Earned Work Credit program; and establishing staffing requirements for program administration.

At the end of FY 1978, preparations for implementing the Earned Work Credit program were almost complete. The Earned Work Credit Branch was established in the Classification Division. Program implementation policies and procedures were developed and disseminated. For the purpose of determining the number of credits which can be awarded each inmate, every job assignment was placed in one of four job classification levels. Earned Work Credits will be awarded on the basis of performance on the assigned job as well as the classification level. The job levels and the credits

for a full-time job requiring more than four hours work a day are as follows:

Level Two: One Earned Work Credit for each two work days.

Level Three: One Earned Work Credit for each three work days.

Level Five: One Earned Work Credit for each five work days.

Level Seven: One Earned Work Credit for each seven work days.

Those assigned to part-time jobs, requiring up to four hours work each work day, can earn one-half of the amount of credits shown above.

The program policies and procedures also provide that Earned Work Credits apply to SCDC inmates assigned to designated facilities and other agencies on the same basis as those who are housed in SCDC institutions. Work release participants and others who work for pay in the community will be assigned to Level Two and for full-time jobs will be awarded two and one-half credits for each week worked.

Besides the completion of written policies and procedures and staff orientation thereof, inmate job assignment data (job classification code, hours worked per day, and number of work days per week) were updated and entered into SCDC's automated data system. Record and job assignment updating mechanisms were also established. The reporting requirements of Earned Work Credit Program were also specified. It is hoped that through such detailed planning, Earned Work Credits for inmates can be administered effectively and equitably in FY 1979 and in the future. As mandated by the Litter Control Act, a yearly account of this program's progress will be incorporated into the agency's *Annual Report*.

Extended Work Release Program

Another program which can reduce SCDC bedspace requirements in the long run is the Extended Work Release Program. Following legislative authorization on June 13, 1977, the Extended Work Release Program was implemented with federal and state funds for the objectives of facilitating inmate release, increasing bedspace in work release centers and institutions, and reducing construction and operation costs. The program allowed the exceptional work release inmate, convicted of a first and not more than a second offense for non-violent crime, to live with a community sponsor and be gain-

fully employed, thereby removing them from correctional facilities and reducing the number of inmates confined. Extended work release participants must be within six months of their good time release or parole eligibility, have satisfactorily participated in the regular work release program for three months, and maintained a clear disciplinary record since assignment to the work release program. The Extended Work Release participants remain on the job secured for them by SCDC prior to placement on the program. While on Extended Work Release, all participants continue to be responsible to the assigned work release center and are maintained in its count as authorized absentees. They are directly supervised by a Work Release Area Supervisor assigned to that center. While participants need not turn over their payroll checks to SCDC as regular work release participants, they are required to pay SCDC \$21 a week for supervision costs.

Following intensive screening of inmates in July, 1977, the first Extended Work Release client was placed at the beginning of August, 1977. By June 30, 1978, 254 inmates have been approved and/or placed on the program. Out of this number, 103 have successfully completed the program and have been released or paroled, whereas 19 have been terminated from the program for rule violations. As of the end of FY 1978, the program had an active caseload of 120. During the first year of operation, program participants yielded a total of \$266,919 in wages and salaries. From these earnings, \$50,749 were paid for federal, state and social security taxes and \$36,533 were paid to SCDC for supervision costs. Whereas the long-term effects or impacts of the Extended Work Release Program have yet to be measured, the program's first year of progress was encouraging and well received by inmate participants.

Classification Study

Problems and needs stemming from increasing inmate population are not confined to bedspace, physical facilities, future capital improvements, and security. Overcrowded situations, combined with limited medium and minimum security bedspaces resulted in increasing demands on the custody classification system and additional pressure on educational, training and treatment programs. Expanded classification capabilities become mandatory in order to provide accurate and adequate assessment, assignment and tracking of inmates. Upgrading the classification process and integrating it with the development of a comprehensive inmate data base were,

also, particularly crucial in the implementation of new programs such as Earned Work Credits, inmate construction, Extended Work Release, and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) projects.

In view of the pressures on the existing classification system, in April, 1978, SCDC requested and was approved free consultant services from the National Corrections Technical Assistance Project of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to analyze the current classification system, identify needs and develop a system approach to meet future requirements. Specifically, the consultant is to examine and revise, if necessary, existing and proposed classification policies and procedures, to develop an overall agency classification plan, to design an implementation strategy, to determine the new system's implications and/or impacts on organization, staffing needs, bedspace requirements by custody level and the associated costs. The scope of analyses and recommendations encompasses inmate reception, assessment and orientation procedures at the R & E Center and Intake Service Center, the initial classification and subsequent re-classification procedures, the monitoring and tracking mechanisms, as well as pre-release, work release and post-release follow-up.

By the end of FY 1978, the work plan for the Classification Study was finalized, and an advisory committee was appointed to oversee the project. The committee, consisting of SCDC staff in the areas of management, inmate classification, information services, institutional operations, education programs and treatment services were to establish the criteria and requirements for an effective classification system and to ensure that the resulting recommendations will be relevant and useful to SCDC. It is anticipated that the classification project will be completed in mid-September, 1978.

Affiliation With State Park Health Center, Department of Health and Environmental Control

To meet a statutory and professional obligation to provide adequate medical treatment to inmates, for several years SCDC has been exploring alternatives for providing acute medical/surgical services to replace the CCI Infirmary which was neither licensed nor accredited as a hospital. During FY 1978, an agreement was reached between SCDC and the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), whereby the latter would expand the State Park Health Center to accommodate in-patients from

SCDC. The fourth floor of the Center was renovated to meet security requirements for the exclusive use by inmate patients from SCDC. Whereas DHEC assumes the treatment responsibility for hospitalized inmates referred by SCDC's medical staff, SCDC provides security support under the supervision of the Midlands Regional Corrections Coordinating Office, Division of Regional Operations. The SCDC-DHEC agreement was formally effective April 17, 1978, when the first SCDC inmate patient was admitted.

As a result of this agreement, health care delivery in SCDC assumes the following configuration: The KCI Infirmary, which is currently being expanded, becomes SCDC's main sick call infirmary for out-patients and provides in-patient care for 22 convalescing inmates; the CCI Infirmary is utilized for routine sick call with bedspace for five or ten patients requiring short term convalescence; DHEC State Park Health Center provides medical and surgical services in the setting of a licensed and accredited general hospital, and sophisticated diagnostic and treatment services in areas such as coronary care, urology, etc., are provided through contractual services from local community hospitals. This configuration is considered to be more efficient, enabling SCDC to meet emerging and expanding legal and professional standards.

Review of American Correctional Association Accreditation Standards

As prison populations continued to soar in the nation and overcrowded conditions worsened, the courts continued to intervene on behalf of the incarcerated population. Several states were under court order to upgrade and expand facilities. As an alternative to court intervention, there have been increasing efforts to upgrade prison conditions through the development of minimum operating standards for correctional facilities. In this direction, the American Correctional Association's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections developed a set of field-tested standards and initiated an accreditation process to stimulate voluntary compliance by correctional systems. Because of other pressing priorities and resource limitations, SCDC did not participate in the accreditation process. However, it initiated, in January, 1978, a review of the Commission's *Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions* to anticipate any future need for compliance and accreditation. The review, conducted by the division directions, revealed that while SCDC was in practice complying with many of the standards, docu-

mentation to verify compliance as a condition for accreditation would require a major effort. Accordingly, plans were made at the end of FY 1978 to apply for a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant to conduct an extensive self-analysis as required under the Commission's accreditation process. Implementation of no cost standards and a feasibility study of other cost-involving standards would also be included in the scope of the project if funds are to be made available.

SCDC's Five Year Program Plan, 1978-80 through 1983-84

The South Carolina Department of Corrections, with other state agencies participated in the development of a five year program plan under the guidelines of the State Planning Office and the State Budget and Control Board. Subsequent to the initial notifications of the five-year program planning requirements in March, 1977, and the Governor's meeting in December, 1977, the departmental managers concentrated on planning activities in the second half of FY 1978. Internal planning procedures included developing assumptions pertaining to legal and programmatic requirements, projecting future inmate population levels, identification of deficiencies, developing objective/strategies to overcome deficiencies, and determining the cost of implementing objectives by program by year. In the course of developing the five-year program budget, five program areas emerged as encompassing all SCDC activities, which are internal administration and support; housing, care, security and supervision; work and vocational activities; individual growth and motivation and penal facility inspection services. With participation from all divisions and offices and ongoing overall departmental review from an agency review committee, the plan was completed and submitted to the State Planning Office on April 24, 1978. The plan shows that the costs of overcoming the current deficiencies and dealing with changing conditions are estimated at \$72 million over the five year period. At the end of FY 1978, this plan was being reviewed by the State Planning Office.

Reorganization of Prison Industries

As the growing inmate population made an impact on SCDC's institutional operations and budget, so did the population and financial pressures of recent years and other economic developments affected prison industry operations. In order to increase the efficiency and productivity of such operations and to ensure

their compatibility with the Department's mission and objectives, the Corrections Industries Project was undertaken by a contract consultant during FY 1978 to provide ongoing feedback to the State Auditor's Office and to SCDC's management. Initiated in August, 1977, the project identified problems, needs and remedial actions in areas of marketing and sales, production, organization and administration. To implement the necessary changes to meet the growing complexity of prison industries, a new organizational structure was developed and approved by the State Personnel Division. The new structure involved the formal staffing of a Sales and Marketing Branch in the Division of Correctional Industries, thereby allowing formal specialization of functions at the branch level and facilitating overall administration and coordination at the division level.

In addition to recommending and implementing organizational changes, the Corrections Industries Project also included a marketing survey and recommendations for new industries in the correctional facilities to be constructed in Greenville and Spartanburg; an industries expansion plan including capital needs thereof; an industries training plan and an analysis of the industries' financial requirements. Since the identification of needs and the implementation of organizational transitions were the emphasis of the project during FY 1978, the other tasks were continued into FY 1979.

Staff Training and Development

During FY 1978, two new staff training programs were implemented, one directed at managers and another for personnel at all levels. The Management Training Program was supported by the National Institute of Corrections as a technical assistance and demonstration project intended to serve as a model for replication by other correctional systems. The training strategy, curricula and materials were jointly developed by consultant trainers and SCDC's Management Training Council consisting of staff representatives from administration and operations. Before being formally incorporated into the training requirements for SCDC's managers, the training curricula and materials were tested via pilot training sessions, revised to incorporate participants' feedback, and reviewed by the Management Training Council. Moreover, certain departmental managers were identified, selected and trained to assist with staff training on an ongoing basis.

The Management Training Program, initiated towards the end of FY 1977 and fully operational in FY 1978, offers six courses to SCDC managers. These are: Agency Goals and Functions, Resource Management, Management Principles, Interpersonal Skills, Personnel Management and Leadership and Motivation. Each course was conducted in the form of two-day workshops, and the total program when fully implemented, will provide 120 SCDC managers with 48 hours of training per year. FY 1978 witnessed this program's first phase of development, testing and adoption. Full scale training will continue in FY 1979 with federal funding.

The In-Service Training Program was initiated in FY 1978 with LEAA funds, directed at a broader audience. Because of the increasing complexities of correctional operations, the emergence of legal issues and standards and the changes in policies and procedures, it became necessary to provide employees with continuing updates on these developments so as to assist them to more efficiently and effectively perform their duties. Accordingly, the In-Service Training session was initiated by the Division of Staff Training and Development in April, 1978. Each month two workshops are held; one pertains to correctional developments and trends at the national level, and the other covers SCDC policies and procedures, state personnel guidelines and other relevant topics such as the ten-year Capital Improvements Plan. These monthly training sessions will continue throughout FY 1979.

Crime Prevention Projects

Crime prevention, especially at the juvenile level, is receiving increasing emphasis as a means to combat soaring prison population. As numerous crime prevention projects emphasizing community involvement and citizen cooperation emerged around the nation, SCDC also contributed its share through two inmate projects, Operation Get Smart and Save the Children.

In January, 1977, SCDC reactivated Operation Get Smart, a project initiated in early 1960, which terminated in 1974 because of shortage of funds. Operation Get Smart is a public education effort intending to prevent crimes through the exposure of inmates' individual experiences with crime and incarceration. The Get Smart team, consisting of both male and female inmates, visits schools, churches and civic groups and participates in television and radio programs in order to reach the citizenry. During FY 1978, the Get Smart team, supervised by correctional officers, traveled 46,490

miles, visited 189 schools, 103 churches, and 44 radio stations and talked to 43 civic groups and 36 other organizations. The team's presentations were well received by an estimated audience of 105,000 youths and 21,000 adults during the fiscal year.

Another crime prevention effort concentrating on juvenile delinquents and offenders is the Save the Children program at CCI. This program was conceived and founded in May, 1977, by the CCI Inmate Advisory Council and with support from SCDC's officials, South Carolina family court judges, sheriffs and other professionals working with juvenile delinquents and offenders. In this program, inmates use a "tough" message to get across the harsh realities of prison life. The youths tour CCI and are advised to stay in school which would enable them to get useful jobs in order to avoid the fate of these inmates. It is hoped that such exposures to the adult prisons would deter the youths from further criminal behavior, thereby reducing juvenile crimes as well as commitments to adult prisons.

As of June 30, 1978, 1,398 youths and 645 adults have attended the Save the Children program since its inception in May, 1977. The program is considered to be working well and has received praise from various court and youth service officials. Except for stationery and postage for mailing and correspondence, Save the Children operations involve neither state appropriations nor federal funds.

To conclude, whereas FY 1978 was a year of relative stability with a modest inmate population increase and no major institutional violence and disturbances, SCDC set in motion and/or completed various projects and programs which will have a significant impact on the future inmate population level, configuration of the physical facilities, cost level and structure of construction and operations, as well as various other facets of institutional and inmate management.

**FEDERAL ASSISTANCE BEING RECEIVED BY OR
APPROVED FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
DURING FY 1978⁶**

**1. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION (LEAA)**

**a. Action Grants through the Office of Criminal Justice Programs,
Division of Administration, Office of the Governor.**

- (1) Extended work release program: \$173,267 for July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978; \$186,356 for July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979.
- (2) Updating South Carolina's prisons and jails inspection checklists manual for enforcing minimum standards: \$8,343 for April 1, 1978 to March 31, 1979.
- (3) Establishment of the Coastal Regional Corrections Coordinating Office: \$54,248 for May 1, 1977 to April 30, 1978; \$45,306 for May 1, 1978 to April 30, 1979.
- (4) Two grants to provide testing and referral services to mentally retarded/mentally handicapped inmates in SCDC: \$19,309 for March 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978; \$27,997 for February 28, 1978 to June 30, 1978.
- (5) Acquisition of legal resources for inmate library: \$30,000 for April 1, 1978 to June 30, 1978.
- (6) Expansion and improvement of the 30-day pre-release programs at Watkins Pre-Release Center and Blue Ridge Community Pre-Release Center: \$73,850 for May 1, 1978 to April 30, 1979.
- (7) Development of standards for inspection of South Carolina juvenile detention facilities: \$99,492 for June 1, 1978 to May 31, 1979.
- (8) Provision of extra-agency community based services to SCDC inmates: \$7,042 for June 1, 1978 to May 31, 1979.
- (9) Purchase of a remote job entry device and two modems for the automated correctional information system: \$39,389 for April 1, 1978 to September 30, 1978.
- (10) Addition of two area parole counselors and two secretaries in the Youthful Offender Division: \$46,776 for Feb-

⁶ Whereas the majority of these grants were awarded directly to SCDC from Federal sources; some were received through another State agency. This summary lists the grants by the Federal agency from which funds originated, with mention of the intermediate State agency if applicable.

ruary 1, 1977 to January 31, 1978; \$42,262 for February 1, 1978 to January 31, 1979.

- (11) Inservice training for 320 SCDC personnel: \$17,082 for April 1, 1978 to March 31, 1979.
- (12) Attendance at Jail Management Workshop by SCDC personnel: \$600 for May 1, 1978 to May 31, 1978.
- (13) Attendance at the American Correctional Association by SCDC personnel: \$1,895 for August 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977.

b. Discretionary Grants

- (1) Implementation of a Corrections Information System: \$175,000 for July 1, 1977 to March 31, 1978.
- (2) Economic Development Pilot Program, which is a modified work release program: \$274,918 for March 5, 1976 to February 16, 1978.
- (3) A participant-designed program for training and developing correctional managers at SCDC: \$99,893 for May 2, 1977 to June 20, 1978; \$112,288 for June 21, 1978 to June 20, 1979 (Funds available through the National Institute of Corrections).
- (4) Consultant services to assist the Futurea Therapeutic Community at Kirkland Correctional Institution: \$3,691 for March 15, 1978 to August 14, 1978 (Funds available through the National Institute of Corrections).

2. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The following grants were funded through the Office of Manpower Planning and Coordination, Office of the Governor, under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA):

- a. Continuation and expansion of testing and evaluation services at SCDC's Reception and Evaluation Center: \$127,536 for October 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977; \$171,515 for October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978.
- b. Multi-skills Training Project providing instruction in brick masonry, carpentry, and plumbing at Kirkland Correctional Institution; \$47,487 for March 24, 1978 to September 30, 1978.
- c. Individualized Training in self-concept improvement, reading, mathematics and other complementary skills to inmates at CCI: \$172,000 for May 1, 1978 to September 30, 1978.

- d. Assessment, counseling, instruction, referral, and follow-up services for incarcerated youths at five SCDC institutions: \$236,599 for May 1, 1978 to September 30, 1978.
- e. Bricklaying and auto mechanics courses at Aiken Youth Correction Center: \$74,491 for October 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977.
- f. Heavy equipment operation training at Wateree River Correctional Institution and a welding course at Central Correctional Institution: \$127,536 for October 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977.
- g. Operation Get Smart, a crime prevention project via inmate groups touring and lecturing at high schools: \$9,792 for December 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977; \$30,510 for October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978.
- h. Addition of fifty-eight security personnel for ward supervision at CCI and research of effects therefrom: \$505,013 for October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978.
- i. Placement of unemployed, under-employed and economically disadvantaged individuals on public service jobs at SCDC: \$448,448 for January 1, 1977 to July 31, 1977; \$839,222 for October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977 (two grants under Titles II and VI).
- j. Repairs/renovations at SCDC facilities: \$77,667 for March 1, 1978 to September 30, 1978.

3. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

- a. Through the State Department of Social Services, under Title XX of the Social Security Act, funding for the following social service programs for SCDC inmates was provided:
 - (1) a residential mental health unit;
 - (2) a mental retardation unit;
 - (3) a physically handicapped unit;
 - (4) community half-way house services; and
 - (5) group counselling services
 \$420,448 for July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978.
- b. Through the South Carolina Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, funding was received from the National Institute for Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to provide alcohol counselling and treatment services in the Midlands, and Appalachian Regions: \$15,094 for January 1, 1977 to December 30, 1977; \$11,207 for January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1978.

c. Grants through the South Carolina State Department of Education:

- (1) Adult Basic Education Program: \$84,576 for July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978.
- (2) Title I education funds for disadvantaged youths to upgrade education programs in SCDC: \$378,345 for July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978.
- (3) Six specialized Vocational Training Programs (carpentry, masonry, welding and automotive services) at MacDougall Youth Correction Center, Northside Correction Center, Givens Youth Correction Center, Central Correctional Institution, Kirkland Correctional Institution and the Women's Correctional Center: \$71,821 for July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978.

d. Through the S. C. State Library Board, the following two grants were received:

- (1) Purchase of reading materials for SCDC inmates: \$11,766 for October 1, 1976 to September 30, 1977; \$12,000 for October 1, 1977 to September 30, 1978.
- (2) Purchase of training films and projectors for seven institutions: \$1,863 for November 25, 1977 to June 30, 1978.

PUBLICATIONS/DOCUMENTS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS DURING FY 1978⁷

Regular Reports

Annual Report of the Board of Corrections and the Commissioner of the South Carolina Department of Corrections
 Monthly Report to the Board of Corrections
 Quarterly Statistical Report, Division of Planning and Research

Newsletters

Intercom, quarterly newsletter prepared by the Department's public Information Director for employees, inmates, and related organizations

About Face, bi-monthly newsletter prepared by the Department of Corrections' inmates

Special Reports

Inmate Construction Program

⁷ For previous SCDC publications and documents, see previous SCDC Annual Reports.

STATISTICAL SECTION

Preceding page blank

TABLE 2
SCDC AVERAGE INMATE POPULATION
1960-1978
(CALENDAR YEARS)

Year	In SCDC Facilities	In Designated Facilities ¹	Total Under SCDC Jurisdiction	Absolute Change Over Previous Year	Percent Change Over Previous Year
1960	2,073	...	2,073
1961	2,132	...	2,132	59	2.9
1962	2,226	...	2,226	94	4.4
1963	2,304	...	2,304	78	3.5
1964	2,378	...	2,378	74	3.2
1965	2,396	...	2,396	18	0.8
1966	2,287	...	2,287	-109	-4.6
1967	2,333	...	2,333	46	2.0
1968	2,362	...	2,362	29	1.2
1969	2,519	...	2,519	157	6.7
1970	2,705	...	2,705	186	7.4
1971	3,111	...	3,111	406	15.0
1972	3,300	...	3,300	189	6.1
1973	3,396	...	3,396	96	2.9
1974	3,931	...	3,931	535	15.8
1975	5,105	379	5,484	1,553	39.5
1976	6,064	675	6,739	1,255	22.9
1977	6,618	762	7,380	641	9.5
1978*	6,837	736	7,573	193	2.6

* Average calculated from January - June population figures.
¹ Since April 1, 1975, suitable county facilities have been designated as facilities to hold State inmates as a temporary measure to alleviate overcrowded conditions in SCDC facilities.

TABLE 3
SCDC AVERAGE INMATE POPULATION
1967-1978
(FISCAL YEARS)

Year	In SCDC Facilities	In Designated Facilities ¹	Total Under SCDC Jurisdiction	Absolute Change Over Previous Year	Percent Change Over Previous Year
1967	2,287	...	2,287
1968	2,378	...	2,378	91	4.0
1969	2,355	...	2,355	-23	-1.0
1970	2,537	...	2,537	182	7.7
1971	2,859	...	2,859	322	12.7
1972	3,239	...	3,239	380	13.3
1973	3,341	...	3,341	102	3.1
1974	3,542	...	3,542	201	6.0
1975	4,582	36	4,618	1,076	30.4
1976	5,696	568	6,264	1,646	35.6
1977	6,419	748	7,167	903	14.4
1978	6,709	738	7,447	280	3.9

¹ Since April 1, 1975, suitable county facilities have been designated as facilities to hold State inmates as a temporary measure to alleviate overcrowded conditions in SCDC facilities.

TABLE 4
PER INMATE COSTS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS¹
FISCAL YEARS 1973-1978

Fiscal Year	Based on State Funds Spent		Based on All Funds ² Spent	
	Annual Per Inmate Costs	Daily Per Inmate Costs	Annual Per Inmate Costs	Daily Per Inmate Costs
1973	\$2,419	\$ 6.63	\$3,145	\$ 8.62
1974	2,886	7.91	3,707	10.16
1975	3,430	9.40	4,147	11.36
1976	3,322	9.10	4,102	11.24
1977	3,384	9.27	4,075	11.16
1978	4,114	11.27	4,826	13.22

¹ Calculation of the SCDC per inmate costs is based on the average number of inmates in SCDC facilities and does not include state inmates held in designated facilities. Final figures on funds spent were audited for fiscal years 1973-1975, but unaudited for fiscal years 1976-1978.
² That is, state and federal funds and other revenues.

TABLE 5
EXPENDITURES OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FY 1978

Office	Total Expenditures*
1. Office of the Commissioner	\$ 519,844.00
2. Administration (Includes Divisions of Planning and Research, Correctional Industries, Finance and Budget, Personnel Administration, Staff Development, and Management Information Services)	3,068,865.00
3. Institutional Operations (Includes Divisions of Classification, Regional Operations, Support Services, Construction and Engineering, and Safety and Health Facility Inspection Services)	20,571,159.00
4. Program Services (Includes Youthful Offender Division and Divisions of Health, Educational, Community, and Treatment Services)	5,147,686.00
Employer contributions and fringe benefits	3,072,851.00
GRAND TOTAL SCDC	\$32,380,405.00

Source: Division of Finance and Budget.
* Includes State appropriations, federal funds, and other revenues.

TABLE 6
FLOW OF OFFENDERS THROUGH THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FISCAL YEARS 1977 and 1978

	Fiscal Year 1977	Fiscal Year 1978	Absolute Change	Percentage Change
SCDC INMATE GAINS				
New Inmates Received by R & E Center and ISC's ¹	5,588	5,370	-218	-3.9
Direct from courts	4,031	3,923	-108	-2.7
Transfers from counties	83	30	-53	-63.8
Parole revocation	121	80	-41	-33.9
YOA parole revocation	NA ²	89	-	-
Revocation of suspended sentence	297	228	-69	-23.2
YOA 5b ³	155	165	10	6.4
YOA 5c ³	867	809	-58	-6.7
YOA 5d ³	0	0	0	0.0
Transfers from DYS ⁴	30	39	9	30.0
Transfers, ICC ⁵	4	7	3	75.0
(Women) ⁶	(346)	(273)	(-73)	(-21.1)
Other Inmates Received	790	1,096	306	38.7
From DYS	1	0	-1	-100.0
Safekeepers	27	374	347	1,285.2
Hospital patients from counties	581	515	-66	-11.4
Escapees returned	164	171	7	4.3
Readmitted to count	17	36	19	111.8
TOTAL SCDC INMATE GAINS	6,378	6,466	88	1.4
SCDC INMATE LOSSES				
Released less good time ⁷	3,452	3,675	223	6.5
Released per court order	280	577	297	106.1
Paroled ⁸	921	1,244	323	35.1

	Fiscal Year 1977	Fiscal Year 1978	Absolute Change	Percentage Change
Pardoned	0	0	0	0.0
Escaped	206	202	-4	-1.9
Transferred to counties	660	670	10	1.5
Transferred to State Hospital	104	112	8	7.7
Transferred to DYS	0	0	0	0.0
Transferred, ICC	0	1	0	-
Death	24	20	-4	-16.7
NET GAIN/LOSS	731	-35	—	—

Source: Classification Division's Monthly Reports to the Board of Corrections and the Quarterly Statistical Reports.

¹ This category includes new inmates received by the Reception and Evaluation Center and the Greenville and Greenwood/Laurens Intake Service Centers.

² Not available. In FY 1977, YOA parole revocations were not shown as a separate category.

³ See Appendix B, page 65 for detailed explanation of the Youthful Offender Act.

⁴ DYS—Division of Youth Services.

⁵ ICC—Interstate Corrections Compact; through the ICC, an offender convicted of a crime in a party state may be transferred to his home state to serve his sentence, subject to the rules and regulations of the state in which he was convicted.

⁶ Female offenders are initially received through R & E Center for photographing and fingerprinting only; they are transferred to the Women's Correctional Center for evaluation. The number of inmates received from each category includes both males and females. The total number of females received from all categories is also reported separately in the parentheses here. When totalling the number of inmates received, the numbers appearing in parentheses should not be included since it would result in double counting of females.

⁷ Included in this category are also youthful offenders conditionally and unconditionally released by SCDC's Youthful Offender Division, the number of which is shown in Table 16.

⁸ That is, paroled by the South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board. The numbers shown in this category do not include youthful offenders paroled (or conditionally released) by the Youthful Offender Division Parole Board. For Youthful Offender Division statistics, see Table 16.

42

43

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING COUNTY AND CORRECTIONAL REGION OF SCDC INMATES
ADMITTED DURING FY 1978
(JULY 1, 1978-JUNE 30, 1978)

Committing County	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹
Appalachian Correctional Region	1,027	41.8	812	33.7	68	53.5	66	45.6	1,973	38.4
Abbeville	13	0.5	21	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	0.7
Anderson	117	4.8	52	2.1	6	4.7	7	4.8	182	3.5
Cherokee	58	2.4	31	1.3	3	2.4	1	0.7	93	1.8
Edgefield	13	0.5	32	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.7	46	0.9
Greenville	360	14.6	308	12.7	24	18.9	28	19.3	720	14.0
Greenwood	60	2.4	67	2.8	5	3.9	10	6.9	142	2.8
Laurens	81	3.3	115	4.8	0	0.0	4	2.8	200	3.9
McCormick	2	0.1	14	0.6	0	0.0	4	2.8	20	0.4
Oconee	34	1.4	7	0.3	7	5.5	2	1.4	50	1.0
Pickens	115	4.7	26	1.1	4	3.1	0	0.0	145	2.8
Saluda	9	0.4	24	1.0	1	0.8	3	2.1	37	0.7
Spartanburg	165	6.7	115	4.8	18	14.2	6	4.1	304	5.9
Midlands Correctional Region	945	38.2	1,124	46.3	30	23.7	59	41.0	2,158	41.5
Aiken	122	5.0	78	3.2	4	3.1	4	2.8	208	4.0
Allendale	4	0.2	15	0.6	0	0.0	2	1.4	21	0.4
Bamberg	5	0.2	10	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	0.3
Barnwell	14	0.6	24	1.0	0	0.0	3	2.1	41	0.8
Calhoun	6	0.2	7	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	0.2
Chester	23	0.9	52	2.1	2	1.6	2	1.4	79	1.5
Chesterfield	14	0.6	36	1.5	1	0.8	4	2.8	55	1.1
Clarendon	9	0.4	14	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	0.4
Darlington	26	1.0	25	1.0	0	0.0	2	1.4	53	1.0
Dillon	16	0.6	27	1.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	44	0.8
Fairfield	18	0.7	23	1.0	1	0.8	2	1.4	44	0.8

44

Committing County	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹
Florence	55	2.2	75	3.1	1	0.8	4	2.8	135	2.6
Kershaw	24	1.0	22	0.9	1	0.8	1	0.7	48	0.9
Lancaster	75	3.0	68	2.8	2	1.6	2	1.4	147	2.8
Lee	15	0.6	23	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	39	0.8
Lexington	88	3.6	42	1.7	3	2.4	0	0.0	133	2.6
Marion	15	0.6	30	1.2	1	0.8	1	0.7	47	0.9
Marlboro	21	0.8	19	0.8	1	0.8	0	0.0	41	0.8
Newberry	28	1.1	43	1.8	0	0.0	3	2.1	74	1.4
Orangeburg	43	1.7	68	2.8	1	0.8	2	1.4	114	2.2
Richland	114	4.6	214	8.8	5	3.9	11	7.6	344	6.7
Sumter	58	2.4	82	3.4	2	1.6	5	3.4	147	2.8
Union	37	1.5	22	0.9	1	0.8	1	0.7	61	1.2
York	115	4.7	105	4.3	4	3.1	8	5.5	232	4.5
Coastal Correctional Region	411	16.8	396	16.4	17	13.4	10	6.9	834	16.1
Beaufort	34	1.4	22	0.9	1	0.8	0	0.0	57	1.1
Berkeley	37	1.5	9	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	46	0.9
Charleston	147	6.0	196	8.1	9	7.1	9	6.2	361	7.0
Colleton	9	0.4	27	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	0.7
Dorchester	31	1.3	17	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	48	0.9
Georgetown	15	0.6	32	1.3	1	0.8	0	0.0	48	0.9
Hampton	3	0.1	7	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	0.2
Horry	117	4.8	55	2.3	6	4.7	1	0.7	179	3.5
Jasper	8	0.3	10	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	0.3
Williamsburg	10	0.4	21	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	31	0.6
Out-of-State	7	0.3	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	0.2
Unknown	68	2.8	87	3.6	12	9.4	10	6.9	177	3.4
TOTAL	2,458	99.9	2,420	100.0	127	100.0	145	100.4	5,150	99.6

45

Source: Division of Management Information Services.

¹ Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

² This number does not correspond to total gains as shown in Table 6, Flow of Offenders Through the South Carolina Department of Corrections, because the scope of the latter includes unsentenced offenders, pre-sentence youthful offenders, county safekeepers, and escapees.

TABLE 8
OFFENSE DISTRIBUTION¹ OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1978
(JULY 1, 1977-JUNE 30, 1978)

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total	
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent ²
Unknown	9	2	0	1	12	0.2
Stated Charge Not Clear	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Sovereignty	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Military	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Immigration	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Homicide	106	170	13	22	311	6.0
Kidnapping	16	2	1	0	19	0.4
Sexual Assault	41	57	1	0	99	1.9
Robbery	138	248	8	7	401	7.8
Assault	150	240	8	21	419	8.1
Abortion	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Arson	22	10	1	2	35	0.7
Extortion	1	2	0	1	4	0.1
Burglary	248	201	5	1	455	8.8
Larceny	1,090	885	38	45	2,058	40.0
Stolen Vehicle	115	109	2	0	226	4.4
Forgery and Counterfeiting	133	146	16	29	324	6.3
Fraudulent Activities	96	52	26	12	186	3.6
Embezzlement	1	1	2	0	4	0.1
Stolen Property	88	103	6	2	199	3.9
Damage to Property	62	31	2	2	97	1.9
Dangerous Drugs	359	133	19	13	524	10.2
Sex Offenses	35	37	0	0	72	1.4
Obscene Materials	3	4	0	0	7	0.1
Family Offenses	122	224	0	1	347	6.7
Gambling	1	2	0	0	3	0.0
Commercialized Sex Offenses	0	1	0	0	1	0.0
Liquor	12	12	0	0	24	0.5
Drunkenness	113	97	7	4	221	4.3

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total	
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent ²
Obstructing the Police	57	77	1	6	141	2.7
Flight-Escape	65	27	0	1	93	1.8
Obstructing Justice	27	30	0	3	60	1.2
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Weapon Offenses	73	93	0	4	170	3.3
Public Peace	41	52	9	6	108	2.1
Traffic Offenses	511	300	5	8	824	16.0
Health-Safety	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Invasion of Privacy	6	11	3	0	20	0.4
Smuggling	1	1	0	1	3	0.0
Election Laws	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Anti-Trust	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Tax Revenue	0	3	0	0	3	0.0
Conservation	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Vagrancy	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	0	2	0	0	2	0.0
Property Crimes	16	9	0	1	26	0.5
Morals-Decency Crimes	1	0	0	0	1	0.0
Public Order Crimes	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES³	3,759	3,374	173	193	7,499	—
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS³	2,458	2,420	127	145	5,150	—

Source: Division of Management Information Services.

¹ Before January, 1977, offense data on admissions were generated from the old computer system which adopted a different categorization of offenses. Moreover, before July, 1977, for inmates having committed multiple offenses, only the most serious offense was included in the computation of offense distribution. Since July, 1977, for inmates having committed multiple offenses, all offenses are included in the computation of offense distribution. Because of these changes in definition and programming, comparing previous offense data with the information herein is cautioned.

² Percentages in this column are based on the total number of offenders, not the total number of offenses.

³ The total number of offenses exceeds the total number of offenders because some offenders committed multiple offenses.

TABLE 9
SENTENCE LENGTH DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1978
(JULY 1, 1977-JUNE 30, 1978)

Sentence Length	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹
YOA ²	481	19.6	350	14.5	24	18.9	9	6.2	864	16.8
1 Year or Less	786	32.0	850	35.1	51	40.2	68	46.9	1,755	34.1
1 Year: 1 Day—3 Years	452	18.4	451	18.6	26	20.5	33	22.8	962	18.7
4-5 Years	204	8.3	171	7.1	6	4.7	9	6.2	390	7.6
6-10 Years	207	8.4	235	9.7	6	4.7	5	3.4	453	8.8
11-20 Years	100	4.1	121	5.0	1	0.8	3	6.2	231	4.5
21-29 Years	41	1.7	52	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	93	1.8
30 Years and Over	9	0.4	34	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	43	0.8
Life	39	1.6	30	1.2	6	4.7	1	0.7	76	1.5
Death	2	0.1	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.1
Unknown	137	5.6	124	5.1	7	5.5	11	7.6	279	5.4
TOTAL	2,458	100.2	2,420	99.9	127	100.0	145	100.0	5,150	100.1
Number of inmates, excluding YOA, life, death and unknown sentence	1,799		1,914		90		124		3,927	
Average sentence length of these inmates	3 Years 1 Month		4 Years 2 Months		2 Years 2 Months		2 Years 2 Months		4 Years 2 Months	

Source: Division of Management Information Services.
¹ Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
² Youthful Offender Act.

TABLE 10
AGE DISTRIBUTION¹ OF SCDC INMATES ADMITTED DURING FY 1978
(JULY 1, 1977-JUNE 30, 1978)

Age	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²
Under 19	360	14.6	311	12.8	20	15.7	6	4.1	697	13.5
19-21	405	16.5	317	13.1	18	14.2	20	13.8	760	14.8
22-24	432	17.6	417	17.2	16	12.6	30	20.7	795	15.4
25-27	243	9.9	338	14.0	15	11.8	25	17.2	621	12.0
28-30	186	7.6	253	10.4	8	6.3	15	10.3	462	9.0
31-34	183	7.4	255	10.5	8	6.3	13	9.0	459	8.9
35-39	165	6.7	155	6.4	8	6.3	10	6.9	338	6.6
40-49	235	9.6	167	6.9	17	13.4	12	8.3	431	8.4
50-59	131	5.3	86	3.6	3	2.4	4	2.8	224	4.3
60 or Over	43	1.7	28	1.2	3	2.4	0	0.0	74	1.4
Unknown	75	3.0	93	3.8	11	8.7	10	6.9	289	5.6
TOTAL	2,458	99.9	2,420	99.9	127	100.1	145	100.0	5,150	99.9
Average Age	28		28		28		28		28	

Source: Division of Management Information Services.
¹ This distribution reflects the age of inmates as of June 30, 1978.
² Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 11
DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING COUNTY AND CORRECTIONAL REGION OF SDC INMATE
POPULATION AS OF JUNE 30, 1978

50

Committing County	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹
Appalachian Correctional										
Region	1,328	42.7	1,207	29.4	65	46.7	81	43.1	2,681	35.6
Abbeville	18	0.6	35	0.8	1	0.7	3	1.6	57	0.8
Anderson	196	6.3	111	2.7	6	4.3	6	3.2	319	4.2
Cherokee	56	1.8	25	0.6	2	1.4	1	0.5	84	1.1
Edgefield	11	0.4	44	1.1	0	0.0	1	0.5	56	0.7
Greenville	465	14.9	469	11.5	28	20.1	27	14.4	989	13.1
Greenwood	53	1.7	108	2.6	5	3.6	6	3.2	172	2.3
Laurens	61	2.0	62	1.5	1	0.7	9	4.8	133	1.8
McCormick	3	0.1	15	0.4	0	0.0	3	1.6	21	0.3
Oconee	56	1.8	18	0.4	5	3.6	2	1.1	81	1.1
Pickens	164	5.2	45	1.1	3	2.2	5	2.6	217	2.9
Saluda	5	0.2	14	0.3	1	0.7	2	1.1	22	0.3
Spartanburg	240	7.7	261	6.4	13	9.4	16	8.5	530	7.0
Midlands Correctional										
Region	1,188	38.0	1,983	48.6	41	29.3	74	39.4	3,286	43.6
Aiken	138	4.4	111	2.7	4	2.9	4	2.1	257	3.4
Allendale	3	0.1	24	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	27	0.4
Bamberg	6	0.2	20	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	26	0.3
Barnwell	16	0.5	28	0.7	0	0.0	2	1.1	46	0.6
Calhoun	6	0.2	15	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	0.3
Chester	33	1.0	68	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.5	102	1.4
Chesterfield	11	0.4	47	1.2	1	0.7	5	2.6	64	0.8
Clarendon	13	0.4	37	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	50	0.7
Darlington	32	1.0	50	1.2	1	0.7	4	2.1	87	1.2
Dillon	16	0.5	32	0.8	1	0.7	2	1.1	51	0.7
Fairfield	20	0.6	30	0.7	1	0.7	2	1.1	53	0.7
Florence	72	2.3	152	3.7	4	2.9	3	1.6	231	3.1

51

Committing County	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹
Kershaw	34	1.1	50	1.2	1	0.7	1	0.5	86	1.1
Lancaster	81	2.6	69	1.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	152	2.0
Lee	13	0.4	29	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.1	46	0.6
Lexington	101	3.2	67	1.6	4	2.9	3	1.6	175	2.3
Marion	15	0.5	51	1.2	0	0.0	2	1.1	68	0.9
Marlboro	37	1.2	42	1.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	81	1.1
Newberry	36	1.2	56	1.4	1	0.7	2	1.1	95	1.3
Orangeburg	52	1.7	132	3.2	2	1.4	3	1.6	189	2.5
Richland	185	5.9	495	12.2	6	4.3	23	12.2	709	9.4
Sumter	77	2.5	143	3.5	4	2.9	6	3.2	230	3.0
Union	43	1.4	39	1.0	1	0.7	2	1.1	85	1.1
York	148	4.7	196	4.8	4	2.9	7	3.7	355	4.7
Coastal Correctional										
Region	570	18.2	851	20.9	23	16.5	23	12.2	1,467	19.6
Beaufort	46	1.5	55	1.4	2	1.4	2	1.1	105	1.4
Berkeley	53	1.7	33	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.5	87	1.2
Charleston	207	6.6	423	10.4	9	6.5	16	8.5	655	8.7
Colleton	21	0.7	45	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	66	0.9
Dorchester	40	1.3	35	0.8	2	1.4	0	0.0	77	1.0
Georgetown	23	0.7	52	1.3	1	0.7	0	0.0	76	1.0
Hampton	3	0.1	17	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	0.3
Horry	153	4.9	137	3.4	8	5.8	4	2.1	302	4.0
Jasper	17	0.5	19	0.5	1	0.7	0	0.0	37	0.5
Williamsburg	7	0.2	35	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	42	0.6
Out-of-State	7	0.2	4	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	0.1
Unknown	32	1.0	29	0.7	10	7.2	10	5.3	81	1.1
TOTAL	3,125	100.1	4,074	99.7	139	99.7	188	100.0	7,526	100.0

Source: Division of Management Information Services.
¹ Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 12
TYPE OF OFFENSE DISTRIBUTION¹ AS OF JUNE 30, 1978

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total	
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent ²
Unknown	33	18	0	1	52	0.7
Stated Charge Not Clear	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Sovereignty	0	1	0	0	1	0.0
Military	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Immigration	1	0	0	0	1	0.0
Homicide	423	793	32	71	1,319	17.5
Kidnapping	26	8	1	0	35	0.5
Sexual Assault	134	279	1	0	414	5.5
Robbery	512	1,282	31	32	1,857	24.7
Assault	349	592	12	27	980	13.0
Abortion	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Arson	37	23	2	1	63	0.8
Extortion	1	1	1	1	4	0.0
Burglary	471	516	4	1	992	13.2
Larceny	1,624	1,404	29	43	3,100	41.2
Stolen Vehicle	146	131	1	0	278	3.7
Forgery and Counterfeiting	206	235	19	29	489	6.5
Fraudulent Activities	102	50	31	12	195	2.6
Embezzlement	3	2	1	0	6	0.1
Stolen Property	131	154	5	2	292	3.9
Damage to Property	60	30	1	1	92	1.2
Dangerous Drugs	424	297	14	27	762	10.1
Sex Offenses	47	39	0	0	86	1.1
Obscene Materials	6	2	0	1	9	0.1
Family Offenses	55	66	0	1	122	1.6
Gambling	4	0	0	0	4	0.0
Commercialized Sex Offenses	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Liquor	3	3	0	0	6	0.1
Drunkenness	15	12	2	0	29	0.4

Offense Classification	Male		Female		Total	
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	Number	Percent ²
Obstructing the Police	13	62	0	2	107	1.4
Flight-Escape	329	208	11	15	563	7.5
Obstructing Justice	20	12	0	1	33	0.4
Bribery	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Weapon Offenses	123	174	4	10	311	4.1
Public Peace	7	7	3	0	17	0.2
Traffic Offenses	341	169	3	3	516	6.8
Health-Safety	2	0	0	0	2	0.0
Civil Rights	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Invasion of Privacy	1	1	0	0	2	0.0
Smuggling	19	17	0	0	36	0.5
Election Laws	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Anti-trust	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Tax Revenue	0	2	0	0	2	0.0
Conservation	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Vagrancy	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	0	2	0	0	2	0.0
Property Crimes	17	16	0	1	34	0.4
Morals-Decency Crimes	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Public Order Crimes	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENSES³	5,715	6,608	208	282	12,813	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF OFFENDERS³	3,125	4,074	139	188	7,526	-

Source: Division of Management Information Services.

¹ Before January, 1977, offense data on inmates were generated from the old computer system which adopted a different categorization of offenses. Moreover, before July, 1977, for inmates having committed multiple offenses, only the most serious offense was included in the computation of offense distribution. Since July, 1977, for inmates having committed multiple offenses, all offenses are included in the computation of offense distribution. Because of these changes in definition and programming, comparing previous offense data with the information herein is cautioned.

² Percentages in this column are based on the total number of offenders, not the total number of offenses.

³ The total number of offenses exceeds the total number of offenders because some offenders had committed multiple offenses.

TABLE 13
SENTENCE LENGTH DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC INMATE POPULATION AS OF JUNE 30, 1978

Sentence Length	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White		Number	Percentage Distribution ¹
	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹	Number	Percentage Distribution ¹		
YOA ²	388	12.4	284	7.0	23	16.5	4	2.1	699	9.3
1 Year or Less	209	6.7	200	4.9	14	10.1	18	9.6	441	5.8
1 Year 1 Day—3 Years ..	487	15.6	500	12.3	27	19.4	36	19.1	1,050	14.0
4-5 Years	396	12.7	418	10.3	11	7.9	19	10.1	844	11.2
6-10 Years	633	20.2	849	20.8	19	13.7	34	18.1	1,535	20.4
11-20 Years	497	15.9	869	21.3	22	15.8	48	25.5	1,436	19.1
21-29 Years	183	5.8	387	9.5	4	2.9	8	4.2	582	7.7
30 Years and Over	95	3.0	237	5.8	3	2.2	2	1.1	337	4.5
Life	205	6.6	285	7.0	12	8.6	11	5.8	513	6.8
Death	4	0.1	6	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	0.1
Unknown	28	0.9	39	1.0	4	2.9	8	4.2	79	1.0
TOTAL	3,125	99.9	4,074	100.0	139	100.0	188	99.8	7,526	99.9
Number of inmates, excluding YOA, life, death and unknown sentence	2,500		3,460		100		165		6,225	
Average sentence length of these inmates	8 Years		11 Years		7 Years 1 Month		8 Years 1 Month		10 Years	

Source: Division of Management Information Services.
¹ Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
² Youthful Offender Act.

TABLE 14
AGE DISTRIBUTION¹ OF SCDC INMATE POPULATION AS OF JUNE 30, 1978

Age ¹	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White		Number	Percentage Distribution ²
	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²	Number	Percentage Distribution ²		
Under 19	267	8.5	274	6.7	16	11.5	4	2.1	561	7.4
19-21	414	13.2	454	11.1	22	15.8	12	6.4	902	12.0
22-24	614	19.6	759	18.6	14	10.1	35	18.6	1,422	18.9
25-27	416	13.3	709	17.4	11	7.9	30	16.0	1,166	15.5
28-30	322	10.3	615	15.1	15	10.8	24	12.8	976	13.0
31-34	332	10.6	494	12.1	12	8.6	23	12.2	861	11.4
35-39	277	8.9	273	6.7	15	10.8	16	8.5	581	7.7
40-49	262	8.4	267	6.6	18	12.9	24	12.8	571	7.6
50-59	127	4.1	127	3.1	5	3.6	8	4.2	267	3.5
60 or Over	40	1.3	47	1.2	2	1.4	2	1.1	91	1.2
Unkknown	54	1.7	55	1.4	9	6.5	10	5.3	128	1.7
TOTAL	3,125	100.1	4,074	100.0	139	99.9	188	100.0	7,526	99.9
Average Age	29		28		29		31		28	

Source: Division of Management Information Services.
¹ This distribution reflects the ages of inmates as of June 30, 1978.
² Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 15

CUSTODY GRADE DISTRIBUTION BY COMMITTING CORRECTIONAL REGION, RACE AND SEX OF SCDC INMATES AS OF JUNE 30, 1978

Custody Grade	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹
Appalachian Correctional Region										
AA Trusty	137	10.3	123	10.2	14	21.5	18	22.2	292	10.9
A Trusty	573	43.1	461	38.2	19	29.2	32	39.5	1,085	40.5
B Medium	469	35.3	545	45.2	30	46.2	30	37.0	1,074	40.0
C Close	90	6.8	37	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	127	4.7
M Maximum	46	3.5	27	2.2	1	1.5	0	0.0	74	2.8
Unknown	13	1.0	14	1.2	1	1.5	1	1.2	29	1.1
TOTAL	1,328	100.0	1,207	100.1	65	99.9	81	99.9	2,681	100.0
Midlands Correctional Region										
AA Trusty	205	17.2	369	18.6	11	26.8	11	14.9	596	18.1
A Trusty	350	29.5	631	31.8	10	24.4	27	36.5	1,018	31.0
B Medium	424	35.7	772	38.9	20	48.8	36	48.6	1,252	38.1
C Close	81	6.8	68	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	149	4.5
M Maximum	109	9.2	117	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	226	6.9
Unknown	19	1.6	26	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	45	1.4
TOTAL	1,188	100.0	1,983	99.9	41	100.0	74	100.0	3,286	100.0

56

57

Custody Grade	Male				Female				Total	
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White			
	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹	Number	Percent ¹
Coastal Correctional Region										
AA Trusty	101	17.7	121	14.2	5	21.7	6	26.1	233	15.9
A Trusty	196	34.4	261	30.7	7	30.4	8	34.8	472	32.2
B Medium	175	30.7	402	47.2	10	43.5	8	34.8	595	40.6
C Close	29	5.1	15	1.8	1	4.3	0	0.0	45	3.1
M Maximum	63	11.0	44	5.2	0	0.0	1	4.3	108	7.4
Unknown	6	1.0	8	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	1.0
TOTAL	570	99.9	851	100.0	23	99.9	23	100.0	1,467	100.2
Out-of-State and Unknown Committing Region										
AA Trusty	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
A Trusty	16	41.0	24	72.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	43.5
B Medium	5	12.8	2	6.1	10	100.0	10	100.0	27	29.3
C Close	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
M Maximum	17	43.6	7	21.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	26.1
Unknown	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	39	100.0	33	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	92	100.0
SCDC Total										
AA Trusty	444	14.2	613	15.0	30	21.6	35	18.6	1,122	14.9
A Trusty	1,135	36.3	1,377	33.8	36	25.9	67	35.6	2,615	34.7
B Medium	1,073	34.3	1,721	42.2	70	50.4	84	44.7	2,948	39.2
C Close	200	6.4	120	2.9	1	0.7	0	0.0	321	4.3
M Maximum	235	7.5	195	4.8	1	0.7	1	0.5	432	5.7
Unknown	38	1.2	48	1.2	1	0.7	1	0.5	88	1.2
TOTAL	3,125	99.9	4,074	99.9	139	100.0	188	99.9	7,526	100.0

Source: Division of Management Information Services and Division of Planning and Research.
¹ Percentage distribution may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 16
YOUTHFUL OFFENDER DIVISION STATISTICS FY 1978
(JULY 1, 1977-JUNE 30, 1978)

	Fiscal Year	Fiscal Year	Absolute Change	Percentage Change
	1977	1978		
Total YOA Admissions	1,125	1,061	-64	-5.7
5b's ¹	158	150	-8	-5.1
5c's ¹	967	911	-56	-5.8
5d's ¹	0	0	0	0.0
Total YOA Releases	943	846	-97	-10.3
Conditional ²	874	775	-99	-11.3
Unconditional ³	69	71	2	2.9
Total Number Under Division Supervision at End of Year	1,463	1,742	279	19.1
Number Incarcerated at End of Year	639	781	142	22.2
5b's	36	14	-22	-61.1
5c's	603	767	164	27.2
5d's	0	0	0	0.0
Number of Conditional Releases Under Supervision at End of Fiscal Year	824	961	137	16.6

Source: Youthful Offender Division's Monthly Reports to the Board of Corrections.
¹ See Appendix B for detailed explanation of the Youthful Offender Act.
² These refer to YOA offenders released from institutions to parole supervision under the Youthful Offender Division.
³ These refer to individuals who are removed completely from the supervision of the Youthful Offender Division.

TABLE 17
PAROLE BOARD ACTION¹ DURING FY 1978
(JULY 1, 1977-JUNE 30, 1978)

Inmate Location	Number Considered	Number Paroled			Percent Paroled		
		Parole	Provisional Parole	Total	Parole	Provisional Parole	Total
Community Work Release Centers	352	321	6	327	91.2	1.7	92.9
Maximum/Medium Custody Institutions	616	174	122	296	28.2	19.8	48.0
Minimum Custody Institutions	633	253	116	369	40.0	18.3	58.3
Women	90	57	10	67	63.3	11.1	74.4
Designated County Facilities	175	115	32	147	65.7	18.3	84.0
TOTAL	1,866	920	286	1,206	49.3	15.3	64.6

Source: Classification Division's Monthly Reports to the Board of Corrections.

¹ This table presents the outcome of parole hearings held by the South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board during the fiscal year and does not include inmates paroled by the Youthful Offender Division of SCDC.

TABLE 18
DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC PERSONNEL BY RACE AND SEX AS OF THE END OF FY 1978¹

	White	Black	Other Races	Male	Female	Total
Security Personnel ²	464	455	9	783	145	928
Non-Security Personnel Staff	623	174	5	529	273	802
SCDC TOTAL	1,087	629	14	1,312	418	1,730

Source: Division of Personnel Administration's Monthly Reports to the Board of Corrections.

¹ That is, as of the payroll date closest to the end of the year.

² Security personnel includes all uniformed personnel: correctional officers, correctional officer assistant supervisors, correctional officer supervisors, and chief correctional officer supervisors.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF SCDC SECURITY STRENGTH BY FACILITY AS OF JUNE 26, 1978¹

Facilities	Number of Correctional Officers Authorized	Number of Correctional Officers Actually Assigned			Avg. Inmate Population	Number of Inmates Per Authorized Correctional Officer
		Male	Female	Total		
Appalachian Correctional Region	146	128	18	146	1,067	7.3
Blue Ridge Community Pre Release Center	10	8	2	10	191	19.1
Cherokee Correctional Center	12	10	2	12	69	5.8
Duncan Correctional Center	11	10	1	11	52	4.7
Givens Youth Correction Center	13	11	2	13	99	7.6
Greenwood Correctional Center	14	12	2	14	97	6.9
Hillcrest Correctional Center	11	10	1	11	105	9.5
Intake Service Center	12	12	0	12	71	5.9
Laurens Correctional Center	14	11	3	14	58	4.1
Northside Correctional Center	12	11	1	12	47	3.9
Oaklawn Correctional Center	13	12	1	13	105	8.1
Piedmont Community Pre-Release Center	9	8	1	9	83	9.2
Travelers Rest Correctional Center	12	10	2	12	90	7.5
Regional Training and Transportation Officers	3	3	0	3	—	—
Midlands Correctional Region	190	147	39	186	1,445	7.6
Aiken Youth Correction Center	33	23	10	33	204	6.2
Campbell Pre-Release Center	10	7	3	10	120	12.0
Catawba Community Pre-Release Center	10	8	2	10	67	6.7
Employment Program Dormitory	7	5	2	7	70	10.0
Goodman Correctional Institution	16	12	4	16	92	5.8
Lexington Correctional Center	11	9	2	11	77	7.0
Lower Savannah Community Pre-Release Center	5	5	0	5	51	10.2
North Sumter Correctional Center	22	21	2	23	103	4.7
Palmer Pre-Release Center	10	8	1	9	97	9.7
Reception and Evaluation Center	27	24	3	27	248	9.2
Walden Correctional Institution	15	9	3	12	119	7.9

Facilities	Number of Correctional Officers Authorized	Number of Correctional Officers Actually Assigned			Avg. Inmate Population	Number of Inmates Per Authorized Correctional Officer
		Male	Female	Total		
Watkins Pre-Release Center	16	13	2	15	149	9.3
Women's Work Release	6	1	5	6	48	8.0
Regional Training and Transportation Officers	2	2	0	2	—	—
Coastal Correctional Region	43	41	2	43	467	10.9
Coastal Community Pre-Release Center	7	6	1	7	82	11.7
MacDougall Youth Correction Center	36	35	1	36	385	10.7
Non-Regionalized Institutions and Centers	553	462	83	545	3,862	7.0
Central Correctional Institution	260	235	25	260	1,698	6.5
Kirkland Correctional Institution	121	105	13	118	958	7.9
Manning Correctional Institution	58	51	7	58	424	7.3
Maximum Security Center	29	28	0	28	101	3.5
Wateree River Correctional Institution	35	30	5	35	412	11.8
Women's Correctional Center	50	13	33	46	269	5.4
TOTAL SCDC FACILITIES	932²	778	142	920³	6,841⁴	7.3

Source: Division of Personnel Administration and Division of Planning and Research.

¹ This date is closest to the end of the year, on which information for developing this table is available.

² This number excludes 18 authorized for the State Park Health Center and 6 for the Criminal Justice Academy, which are not SCDC facilities, and 1 authorized for the Get Smart Team.

³ This number excludes 18 assigned to the State Park Health Center and 6 assigned to the Criminal Justice Academy, which are not SCDC facilities, and 1 assigned to the Get Smart Team.

⁴ Since only SCDC facilities are being considered in this table, this average excludes inmates assigned to the Criminal Justice Academy, SLED Headquarters, the State Park Health Center and the Governor's Mansion.

APPENDIX

- A. Statutory Authority of the South Carolina Department of Corrections
- B. Youthful Offender Act
- C. Programs and Services Administered by the South Carolina Department of Corrections
- D. Counties Comprising South Carolina Planning Districts and Correctional Regions

Preceding page blank

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

The South Carolina Department of Corrections was created in 1960 by Section 55-292, South Carolina Code of Laws as follows: "There is hereby created as an administrative agency of the State government the Department of Corrections. The functions of the Department shall be to implement and carry out the policy of the State with respect to its prison system, as set forth in 55-291, and the performance of such other duties and matters as may be delegated to it pursuant to Law."

Section 55-291 as referred to in Section 55-292 sets out the Declaration of Policy as follows: "It shall be the policy of this State in the operation and management of the Department of Corrections to manage and conduct the Department in such a manner as will be consistent with the operation of a modern prison system and with the view of making the system self-sustaining, and that those convicted of violating the law and sentenced to a term in the State Penitentiary shall have humane treatment, and be given opportunity, encouragement and training in the matter of reformation."

Further significant statutory authority was provided the Department by Section 14, Part II, the permanent provisions of the 1974-75 General Appropriations Act which was signed on June 28, 1974. Section 14 is, in effect, an amendment of Section 55-321 and places all prisoners convicted of an offense against the State in the custody of the Department when their sentences exceed three months. The text of the statute is as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 55-321 of the 1962 Code, or any other provision of law, any person convicted of an offense against the State of South Carolina shall be in the custody of the Board of Corrections of the State of South Carolina, and the Board shall designate the place of confinement where the sentence shall be served. The Board may designate as a place of confinement any available, suitable and appropriate institution or facility, including a county jail or work camp whether maintained by the State Department of Corrections or otherwise, but the consent of the officials in charge of the county institutions so designated shall be first obtained. Provided, that if imprisonment for three months or less is ordered by the court as the punishment, all persons so convicted shall be placed in the custody, supervision and con-

trol of the appropriate officials of the county wherein the sentence was pronounced, if such county has facilities suitable for confinement."

This statute was amended by an added provision in the 1975-76 General Appropriations Act to provide for notification to the Department of Corrections of the closing of county prison facilities as follows: "Section 14, Part II, of Act 1136 of 1974 is amended by adding the following proviso at the end thereof: Provided, further, that the Department of Corrections shall be notified by the county officials concerned not less than six months prior to the closing of any county prison facility which would result in the transfer of the prisoners of the county facility to facilities of the Department."

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER ACT

The Youthful Offender Act provides for indeterminate sentencing of offenders between the ages of 17 and 21, extended to 25 with offender consent. The specific provisions of the Act are as follows:

Section 5b—This section allows the court to release the youthful offender to the custody of the Department's Youthful Offender Division prior to sentencing for an observation and evaluation period of not more than 60 days.

Section 5c—This section allows the court to sentence the youthful offender, between 17 and 21, without his consent, indefinitely to the custody of the Department's Youthful Offender Division for treatment and supervision until discharge. The period of such custody will not exceed six years. If the offender has reached 21 years of age but is less than 25 years of age, he may be sentenced in accordance with the above procedure if he consents thereto in writing.

Section 5d—This section provides that if the court finds that the youthful offender will not derive benefits from treatment, it may sentence the youthful offender under any other applicable penalty provision.

**PROGRAMS AND SERVICES ADMINISTERED BY
THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS***

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION	PROGRAM AREA/ACTIVITY
Community Services	Work Release; Extended Work Release; 30-Day Pre-Release; 120-Day Accelerated Pre-Release; Youthful Offender Referrals; Federal Offender Referrals; Educational Release; Title XX—Alston Wilkes Referrals; Economic Development Pilot Program; Provisional Parolee Referrals; Inmate Furloughs.
Health Services	Medical/Dental Sick Call; General Surgery; Orthopedic Surgery; Internal Medicine; Psychiatric Services; Optometry Services; Referral Services.
Educational Services	Adult Basic Education; Vocational/Technical Education; College Education Programs.
Treatment Services	Pastoral Services (includes Alcohol Rehabilitation Services); Psychological Services; Social Work Services; Recreational Services; Comprehensive Drug Abuse Treatment Program (includes Therapeutic Community); Horticulture Training Program; Title XX Services (Special Services for Physically Handicapped, Special Services for Developmentally Disabled, Special Services for Mental Health, Alston Wilkes Program, Special Services for Mental Health Region I—Appalachian); Arts-in-Prison Program.
Youthful Offender	Casework; Pre-sentence Investigation; Institutional Services; Parole and Aftercare Services; Follow-up Services.
Inmate Relations	Interview inmates in regard to grievances; represent inmates in cases involving infractions of rules; resolution of inmate grievances; represent inmates who appear before institutional adjustment committees.

* For detailed descriptions of these programs and services, see FY 1976 SCDC Annual Report, pages 35 and 49-57.

**COUNTIES COMPRISING SOUTH CAROLINA
PLANNING DISTRICTS AND CORRECTIONAL REGIONS**

APPALACHIAN CORRECTIONAL REGION

Planning District I (Appalachian) Anderson Cherokee Greenville Oconee Pickens Spartanburg	Planning District II (Upper Savannah) Abbeville Edgefield Greenwood Laurens McCormick Saluda
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

MIDLANDS CORRECTIONAL REGION

Planning District III (Catawba) Chester Lancaster Union York	Planning District IV (Central Midlands) Fairfield Lexington Newberry Richland
Planning District V (Lower Savannah) Aiken Allendale Bamberg Barnwell Calhoun Orangeburg	Planning District VI (Santee-Wateree) Clarendon Kershaw Lee Sumter
Planning District VII (Pee Dee) Chesterfield Darlington Dillon Florence Marion Marlboro	

COASTAL CORRECTIONAL REGION

Planning District VIII (Waccamaw) Georgetown Horry Williamsburg	Planning District IX (Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester) Berkeley Charleston Dorchester
Planning District X (Low Country) Beaufort Colleton Hampton Jasper	

END