

8/6 (1)

STANDARDS AND GOALS FOR  
SOUTH CAROLINA'S  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

58902

FY 77 STANDARDS

During the past several months, the Subcommittee on Standards and Goals of the Governor's Committee has been working to develop a comprehensive set of standards and goals for criminal justice development in South Carolina. As these standards and goals were developed, they were distributed to districts and state agencies for review and comment. This work provided significant input into the workshop establishing impact areas.

As discussed in Chapter I on the planning process, the work groups established in Workshops 3 and 4 determined the priority impact areas within the criminal justice system. Using the direction provided by the Standards and Goals Subcommittee, each work group developed statements of purpose and standards for each impact area.

The Governor's Committee, after review of the impact areas and attendant comments and standards, adopted a finite set of impact areas including the pertinent comments. These inputs provided the basis for establishing the specific standards for implementation in FY 77.

In accordance with federal guidelines, all input pertaining to those selected impact areas were reviewed for development of specific standards. A set of criteria was used in screening this input to determine where specific standards for implementation could be developed. Those criteria are as follows:

- 1) A specific standard for implementation must contain measurable criteria defining a level of performance or capability within the criminal justice system.

- 2) Distinct activities or situations must be identifiable that implement the defined standards.
- 3) Data must be available to measure the current level of performance or capability as described in the standards statement.

The following section describes all standards that could be developed from input by districts, state agencies, and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Council, as well as the Governor's Committee.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "On-line files fulfilling a common need of all criminal justice agencies, including wanted persons (felony and misdemeanor), and identifiable stolen items". (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 1.)

The "wanted persons" program is already written and on the shelf. Implementation is being delayed because the SLED/CJICS system does not have sufficient capacity to support the program. When the system is expanded, the program will be implemented.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

On line files complete except for "wanted persons," which will be operational by January 1, 1977.

3. DATA:

Data was obtained from SLED and a discretionary grant application under consideration by LEAA.

4. COST:

Expansion cost of the SLED/CJICS system is being addressed in a discretionary grant application. However, on-going costs associated with this part of the standard is approximately \$110,000.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "Computerized criminal history (CCH) files for persons arrested for an NCIC-qualified offense, with on-line availability of at least a summary of criminal activity and current status of offenders". (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 2.)

CCH data elements are received at SLED from the various segments of criminal justice. Upon initial receipt of the data, it is checked for completeness and accuracy. The data is then automated, and again edited for completeness and accuracy, in accordance with FBI NCIC/CCH criteria.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Currently 85% complete. Estimated to be operational by January 1, 1977.

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division.

4. COST:

The cost in the long range is being addressed in a OBTS/CCH discretionary grant application. However, current on-going cost in this area is approximately \$68,000 per year.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "Access by computer interface to vehicle and driver files." (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 3.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This part of the standard is operational.

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division.

4. COST:

The on-going cost for this is approximately \$12,000 per year.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "A high-speed interface with NCIC providing access to all NCIC files". (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 4.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This part of the standard is operational.

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division.

4. COST:

The cost for this interface is paid for by the FBI.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "Necessary telecommunications media and terminals for providing access to local users, either by computer-to-computer interface or direct terminal access". (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 5.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This part of the standard is operational.

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division

4. COST:

The on-going cost associated with the equipment is approximately \$235,000 a year.



1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "The computerized switching of agency-to-agency messages for all intrastate users and routing of messages to and from qualified agencies in other states." (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 6.)

The front-end message switching system will be upgraded to allow the functions to be computerized. This will enable SLED/CJICS terminal users to send and receive messages from agencies in other states automatically. Currently this is a manual operation. The interstate system used is the National Law Enforcement Teletype System (NLETS).

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

The first half of the standard is operational. The second half to be operational by January 1, 1977.

3. DATA:

Data was obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division and a grant application addressing the problem.

4. COST:

The cost of the equipment upgrade is being addressed in a discretionary grant application. On-going yearly cost to utilize the NLETS system is approximately \$10,000.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The state should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "The collection, processing, and reporting of Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) from all law enforcement agencies in the State with report generation for the Federal Government agencies, appropriate state agencies and contributors. (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 7.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This section (7) of the Central Repository Standard has been identified as a standard of its own, "UCR Participation". For particular details, that standard should be referred to.

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division

4. COST:

On-going "UCR Participation" costs associated with the Central Repository are approximately \$40,000 a year.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "In conjunction with criminal history files, the collection and storage of additional data elements and other features to support offender-based transaction statistics, (OBTS)". (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 8.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This section (8) of the Central Repository Standard has also been identified as a standard of its own, "OBTS/CCH Development". For details, that standard should be referred to.

3. DATA:

Data was obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division and a discretionary grant application under consideration by LEAA.

4. COST:

The cost is being addressed in a OBTS/CCH discretionary grant application.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "Entry and updating of data to a national index of criminal offenders in the NCIC Computerized Criminal History file". (There are ten sections in this standard; this is Part 9.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This part of the standard is operational.

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division

4. COST:

The cost for access to the NCIC/CCH file is paid by the FBI.

1. STANDARD: Central Repository

The State should continue to develop the central repository which serves as a centralized location for the collection, processing, storage and dissemination of criminal justice information.

The central repository should develop a system that provides the following service: "Reporting offender-based transaction statistics to the Federal Government". (There are ten sections to this standard; this is Part 10.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

This part will be implemented when Part 8 becomes operational (current estimate is 1979-1980).

3. DATA:

Data obtained from the State Law Enforcement Division.

4. COST:

Cost estimates will not be available for another year.

1. STANDARD: UCR Participation

All local law enforcement agencies should participate in the UCR Program by regular and continuous submission of both the Incident and Booking forms as outlined by the State Law Enforcement Division (SLED).

All sheriff's and police departments shall participate in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program utilizing the Incident and Booking Reports as the documentation for recording and submitting of information required by the program as outlined in the UCR Guide manual distributed by SLED.

The Incident and Booking reports shall be submitted on a weekly basis. The data for the last week of the month shall be submitted by the close of the second day of the following month. This will ensure SLED of receiving the final portion of the monthly data in time to make whatever corrections are necessary. It is essential that all data be as complete, accurate, and timely as possible. In order to ensure adequate records coordination, all reports must include an accurate case number.

SLED shall provide computerized reports back to the contributing agencies by the 15th of each month. This will be the data submitted for the prior month.

SLED will provide the training, necessary documentation, and an initial supply of Incident and Booking Report forms to enable each agency to enter the program with as little effort as possible. It will be the responsibility of each agency, however, to purchase the report forms after the initial supply from SLED is depleted.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Statewide Local Agencies

<u>Current</u>	<u>January 1, 1977</u>	<u>July 1, 1977</u>
77%	92%	97%

3. DATA:

Data was derived from SLED reports and grants awarded in this area.

255 Total number of agencies  
197 Agencies in compliance (77.3%)  
18 Agencies in partial compliance (7.0%)  
40 Agencies not participating (15.7%)

4. COST:

Estimated average costs for one year:

1. To add agencies not now participating	
a. For five large agencies:	
81,000 incident forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	\$ 3,645
27,000 booking forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	1,215
	<u>\$ 4,860</u>
b. For thirty-five small-medium agencies:	
22,680 incident forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	\$ 1,021
7,560 booking forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	340
	<u>\$ 1,361</u>
c. For eighteen small-medium agencies in partial participation:	
13,500 incident forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	\$ 607
4,500 booking forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	203
	<u>\$ 810</u>
d. Equipment-File Cabinets:	
35 two-drawer, legal size w/locks @ \$60 ea.	\$ 2,100
5 four-drawer, legal size w/locks @ \$130 ea.	650
	<u>\$ 2,750</u>
Subtotal (Part 1)	<u>\$ 9,781</u>
2. Newly participating agencies not yet funded:	
a. For six large agencies:	
97,200 incident forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	\$ 4,374
32,400 booking forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	1,458
	<u>\$ 5,832</u>
b. For forty small-medium agencies:	
29,160 incident forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	\$ 1,313
9,720 booking forms @ \$45 per 1,000 copies	438
	<u>\$ 1,751</u>
c. Equipment-File Cabinets:	
40 two-drawer, legal size w/locks @ \$60 ea.	\$ 2,400
6 four-drawer, legal size w/locks @ \$130 ea	780
	<u>\$ 3,180</u>
Subtotal (Part 2)	<u>\$ 10,763</u>
TOTAL UCR COST	<u>\$ 20,544</u>

1. STANDARD: OBTS/CCH Development

Development of OBTS/CCH should be continued and expanded in all areas of criminal justice. (There are five parts in this standard; this is Part I - Law Enforcement)

A. Fingerprint Cards

All state, county and city law enforcement agencies should submit a fingerprint card on every individual under lawful arrest. Not included will be juvenile and traffic offenses (with the exception of DUI's, manslaughter and hit and run).

B. Final Dispositions

Until new disposition forms are designed and implemented, dispositions will continue to be reported on: Final Disposition Report SLED #CJICS-8; and Final Disposition Report FBI #R-84 if applicable.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

A. Fingerprint Cards - Fingerprint cards should be submitted on all adult individuals under lawful arrest by the following schedule:

<u>Current</u>	<u>Beginning July 1, 1976</u>	<u>Beginning Jan. 1, 1977</u>
50%	75%	100%

B. Final Disposition Reports - Although final dispositions are reported, a clear implementation schedule is not known at this time; programs will be developed for accurate tracking and projecting final disposition reporting.

3. DATA:

A. Fingerprint Cards - SLED will provide whatever training is necessary in addition to the fingerprint cards, fingerprint kits, envelopes and postage. Currently, approximately 29% of the agencies are submitting fingerprint cards at the 50% level.

B. Final Disposition Reports - SLED will also provide whatever training is necessary in addition to the disposition forms, envelopes and postage. The FBI furnishes postage paid envelopes for their forms.

4. COST:

The cost for this standard is covered under on-going costs listed in the Central Repository Standard.



1. STANDARD: OBTS/CCH Development

Development of OBTS/CCH should be continued and expanded in all areas of criminal justice. (There are five parts to this standard; this is Part 2 - Prosecution.)

A. Final Dispositions

Until new disposition forms are designed and implemented, dispositions will continue to be reported on: Final Disposition Report SLED #CJICS-8; and Final Disposition Report FBI #R-84 if applicable.

B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR)

The Attorney General's Office should continue to develop the CDR program which includes transferring the CDR system to the SLED computer and modifying the software programs and submission forms to incorporate all required OBTS/CCH data elements.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

A. Final Dispositions - Final dispositions should continue to be submitted on existing forms. An implementation schedule for the new forms is not known at this time.

B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR) - Transfer of the CDR system to the SLED computer should take place by August, 1976. Modification to the CDR submission forms is expected to begin around August 1976 and be completed before the end of the year. This will allow for a training period before implementing the new forms in January 1977.

It is anticipated that work will begin on software programs by August 1976. Program development and modification will continue for some time.

3. DATA:

A. Final Dispositions - SLED will continue to provide whatever training is necessary in addition to the disposition forms, envelopes and postage. The FBI furnishes postage paid envelopes for their forms. Although there are no precise percentage figures on dispositions submitted, currently overall submission to SLED from all areas is approximately 20%.

B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR) - Currently the CDR system covers the proceedings from General Sessions Court with all 46 counties participating.

4. COST:

- A. Final Dispositions - All forms, envelopes, and postage costs in this standard are paid by SLED and the FBI.
- B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR) - Estimated cost for this portion is approximately \$15,000.

1. STANDARD: OBTS/CCH Development

Development of OBTS/CCH should be continued and expanded in all areas of criminal justice. (There are five parts to this standard; this is Part 3 - Courts.)

A. Final Disposition

Submit Final Disposition Report(s) SLED #CJICS-8, and FBI #R-84 if applicable, as outlined in the instructions on the back of the form.

B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR)

Continue development and support of the CDR system.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

A. Final Dispositions

Until new disposition forms are designed and implemented, dispositions will continue to be reported on: Final Disposition Report SLED #CJICS-8; and Final Disposition Report FBI #R-84 if applicable. Currently, only General Sessions Courts are submitting final dispositions through the CDR system. There is no estimate at this time when the CDR system will be implemented below the General Sessions level.

B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR)

There is no estimate at this time when development of the CDR system will be completed. However, a modified form for submitting data is expected to be implemented in January, 1977.

3. DATA:

- A. Final Dispositions; and
- B. Criminal Docket Report (CDR)

Data was obtained from SLED, the Attorney General's Office who is developing the CDR system, and the Comprehensive Data System (CDS) Action Plan.

4. COST:

There will be no costs involved with this portion of the standard.

1. STANDARD: OBTS/CCH Development

Development of OBTS/CCH should be continued and expanded in all areas of criminal justice. (There are five parts to this standard; this is Part 4 - Corrections.)

A. Corrections Information Systems (CIS)

Continue development of CIS as outlined in the corresponding discretionary grant.

B. Fingerprint Cards

Continue submission of fingerprint cards to SLED on those offenders coming under Corrections' jurisdiction.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

A. Corrections Information System (CIS) - Development of CIS is continuing with the first phase scheduled for completion by December, 1976.

B. Fingerprint Cards - This portion of the standard is operational.

3. DATA:

A. Corrections Information System (CIS) - Data obtained from the Department of Corrections and discretionary grant progress reports and revision requests.

B. Fingerprint Cards - Data was obtained from the Department of Corrections and SLED.

4. COST:

A. Corrections Information System (CIS) - Cost for this part of the standard is being paid for by a Part E discretionary grant.

B. Fingerprint Cards - There is no cost associated with continuation of this part of the standard.

1. STANDARD: OBTS/CCH Development

Development of OBTS/CCH should be continued and expanded in all areas of criminal justice. (There are five parts to this standard; this is Part 5 - Probation, Parole & Pardon.)

- A. Data Base - Modify and update existing data base.
- B. Fingerprint Cards - Continue submission of fingerprint cards to SLED on those individuals who come under jurisdiction of Probation, Parole and Pardon

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

- A. Data Base - Modification to the existing automated data base is expected to begin about January, 1977.
- B. Fingerprint Cards - This part of the standard is already operational.

3. DATA:

- A. Data Base - The current data base has information on approximately 65,000 clients. General direction of development in this area is outlined in an OBTS/CCH discretionary grant application currently under review by LEAA.
- B. Fingerprint Cards - Fingerprint cards are received by SLED on all clients who come under the jurisdiction of Probation, Parole and Pardon. This provides positive identification of an individual and in many cases data not previously recorded on some clients.

4. COST:

- A. Data Base - Part of this cost will be assumed by SLED and part by a discretionary grant.
- B. Fingerprint Cards - There is no cost associated with continuation of this part of the standard.

PAGE 20 LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

1. STANDARD: Communications Systems

To provide all law enforcement agencies in each county with an adequately designed basic radio communications system as specified in the South Carolina Law Enforcement Radio Communications Plan.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>1977</u>
76%	100%

3. DATA:

Eleven counties are not in full compliance with the plan. Full operation capability requires completion of the regional repeater stations.

4. COST:

It will cost an estimated \$670,000 to complete the statewide radio communications system in one year.

1. STANDARD: Juvenile Intake

Each family court, and each probate court in counties where there is no existing family court, should have available to it adequate intake services, to be provided by a professionally trained intake officer in the ratio of one intake officer to every 500 juvenile delinquency referrals, the intake staff to be under the supervision of the court judge or other statutorily designated agency.

This standard is designed to provide better services to children and decrease the amount of court time expended in making determinations in cases characterized by a questionable factual basis. These two ends will be achieved through the diversion and referral of children in need of the assistance provided by a social service agency and through the utilization of preliminary screening procedures which render for judicial scrutiny only those cases most in need of judicial determination.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

	<u>Current</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>
	49%	60%	70%	76%	86%	91%
Number of Additional Intake Officers to be Added State-wide	12	12	12	12	12	12

3. DATA:

There are presently twenty intake officers working in twelve family courts. In addition, seven intake officers are operating in seven probate courts.

With a state-wide referral total of 16,550, a total of fifty-five (55) intake officers are currently needed to attain compliance with the standard.

4. COST:

Total first-year costs to be incurred in reaching the levels of compliance set forth above are projected as follows:

<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>
\$127,000	\$127,000	\$127,000	\$127,000	\$127,000

The cost of each additional officer will vary depending upon the prevailing salary level in each given jurisdiction. Costs are projected on the basis of inclusion of line items for salary and fringe benefits only.



1. STANDARD: Juvenile Probation

Each family court, and each probate court in counties where there is no existing family court, should have available to it adequate supervisory services to be provided by professionally trained probation counselors in the ratio of one counselor to every thirty-five (35) juveniles on probation, the counselors to act under the supervision of the court judge or other statutorily designated agency.

This standard is designed to increase the level of supervision which can be provided by any court having jurisdiction over matters involving juvenile delinquency. It is believed that increasing the level of supervision will increase the net rehabilitative effect upon probationed youth.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

	<u>Current</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>82</u>
	43%	50%	56%	62%	69%	75%	81%
No. of Additional Probation Counselors to be Added Statewide	13	13	13	13	13	13	13

3. DATA:

There are presently seventy-nine (79) probation counselors serving in thirty family and probate courts. With a statewide total of 6,469 delinquents on probation, the present state need is 185 with 106 new counselors needed to bring the state into full compliance with the standard.

4. COST:

Total first-year costs to be incurred in reaching the levels of compliance set forth above are projected as follows.

<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>82</u>
\$140,700	\$140,700	\$140,700	\$140,700	\$140,700	\$140,700

The cost of each additional counselor will vary depending upon the prevailing salary level in each given jurisdiction. Costs are projected on the basis of inclusion of line items for salary and fringe benefits only.

1. STANDARD: Alternative Residential Environments for Status Offenders

A community residential capability should be developed in order that alternative living arrangements can be provided for 205 juveniles committed for institutionalization following a status offense adjudication.

This standard is designed to facilitate and expedite state efforts which are currently being made to deinstitutionalize status offending delinquent youth into non-secure living environments.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

	<u>Current</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>
	63%	85%	100%
Number of Additional Group Homes to be Added Statewide		3	2

3. DATA:

The Department of Youth Services is currently contracting on a space-by-space basis for the placement of seventy (70) status offenders. In addition, the Department of Youth Services is in the process of completing development of four group homes as a part of the implementation of a \$1.5 million grant to deinstitutionalize status offenders statewide. Each home is expected to have a capacity of fifteen resulting in overall capability to handle sixty (60) youth.

Consequently, there remains a need for a capability to accommodate an additional seventy-five (75) youth.

4. COST:

The cost of each group home is projected to fall within the \$75,000 to \$110,000 range depending on the project design; that is, whether the facility targets the non-special, the recalcitrant, or the handicapped child.

Costs will vary, too, if another type of alternative living arrangement is selected in preference to the group home mode.

First-year costs to be incurred in fully implementing the standard are as follows.

<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>
\$376,000	\$250,000

1. STANDARD: Alternative Residential Environments for Criminal Offenders

The community residential capability should be developed in order that alternative living arrangements can be provided for 150 juveniles committed for institutionalization, on probation, and on parole following adjudication for a criminal offense.

This standard is designed to offer judges having juvenile jurisdiction dispositional alternatives to either in-home probation or institutionalization in a training school. These alternatives would impact most heavily upon those cases in which a child has no suitable home to which he or she can return and which will be conducive to both a reduction in criminality and a positive behavioral adjustment.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>
0%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%

3. DATA:

According to data gathered during the period of July 1975 through December 1975, one-third of the dispositions of juvenile offenders made by family court judges were in disagreement with the recommendations on dispositions made in those cases by the staff at Goldsmith Reception & Evaluation Center.

This one-third of cases where the recommendations were not followed resulted in the institutionalization of eighty-seven (87) youths where probation was considered appropriate by the Center's staff.

Taking into consideration the added fact that 62% of this group were criminal offenders and annualizing the above data, approximately 150 commitments to the training schools could be avoided each year if adequate alternatives could be added to the two presently existing and viable choices.

4. COST:

Costs will vary depending on the living mode selected.

There will be no costs incurred in implementing this standard during FY 77.

1. STANDARD: Target Hardening

To reduce the incidence rate of property crimes (including robbery) to the following levels through reduction of the vulnerability of possible crime targets.

larceny	18/1,000
vehicle theft	1.5/1,000
burglary	14/1,000
robbery	.7/1,000

The primary tactics in prevention of property crimes are target hardening and opportunity reduction. There are several methods available for prevention.

- a. potential victim education
- b. security surveys
- c. property marking or identification
- d. security ordinance and codes
- e. community crime watch
- f. environmental design

The variety of methods and uncalculatable costs make it virtually impossible to precisely determine how South Carolina will go about reducing these crimes at this time. Therefore, the implementation schedule should be viewed as an optimistic projection, not assurable levels.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

	Current	Rates Per Thousand			
		77	78	79	80
larceny	20.35	20.0	19.6	18.8	18.0
vehicle theft	2.40	2.1	1.7	1.6	1.5
burglary	16.26	16.0	15.3	14.6	14.0
robbery	1.08	1.0	.9	.8	.7

3. DATA:

South Carolina experienced the following rates of crime as reported through the UCR system.

larceny	20.35/1,000
vehicle theft	2.4/1,000
burglary	16.26/1,000
robbery	1.08/1,000

Approximately one-fourth of all counties experienced rates above those established in the standard.

4. COST:

The cost required to reduce the levels of these crimes will depend upon the tactics used, effectiveness, scope, and

existing resources applied. The following are estimates of costs per unit of implementation for each possible method.

victim education	\$5,000 up, average \$20,000
security surveys	\$500 up, average \$5,000
property marking	\$500 up, average \$15,000
security ordinances	\$500-\$10,000, average \$5,000
community crime watch	\$500 up, average \$15,000

Many times more than one tactic may be combined in a single project. For example, a medium sized city could have a project for education, surveys, property marking and community crime watch for \$40,000 or less.

1. STANDARD: Partial Release Residence

Partial Release (pre-release and work/study release) should be provided for all appropriate inmates to ensure the gradual reintegration of offenders into the community. (Note: The implementation of policies and procedures on program services, relative to work/study release, should accommodate more minimum security long term inmates in non-traditional environments.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Not projectable

3. DATA:

SCDC presently has eight partial release centers; three 30-day pre-release centers and five 90-day pre-release centers.

Third quarter, FY 1976 indicated an average yearly intake of 4,916 inmates in the eight centers. The percentage of minimum security inmates, (eg. A or AA, good record inside institution, long-term) participating in partial release programs is not easily determined; but data does indicate an absolute change in capacity level at an average of 11.4. Sixteen percent (1,004) of SCDC's population could be housed in partial release (work/study) as well as 56% (3,513) medium security inmates.

4. COST:

The average low cost for basic in-house services per client is \$5,174 annually @ \$14.18 daily. Total cost for 16% of SCDC's population is \$5,194,696. This figure, however, is not an additional expenditure for SCDC. The initial average low cost of a small project, establishing capabilities, providing services for approximately thirty minimum long-term inmates at \$155,220 indicate long term cost reduction per year.

1. STANDARD: Special Environments for Mentally Retarded

Special environment coupled with proper treatment and services should be provided for approximately 250 inmates. (Note: The inmate population of SCDC should be screened through the use of psychological testing to identify the mentally retarded, and provide a special treatment environment that would lend itself to reintegration of the inmate.)

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>1977</u>
11.3% (identified inmates)	88.7%

3. DATA:

Seventeen inmates (considered non-functional) have recently been identified and placed in a special treatment environment while 158 inmates had an IQ score under 70 (2.60%). Approximately 4,032 have not been given standardized IQ tests at the end of FY 1975.

4. COST:

To identify the mentally retarded inmate population would cost approximately \$50,000.

1. STANDARD: Community-Based Corrections

To reduce over-institutionalization and provide for more efficient use of resources, minimum security community-based correctional environments should be expanded through regional administration with local orientation and emphasis on use of community resources. (Note: South Carolina should implement correctional programs and services on a regional basis, increasing the current two regions to four.) Each region should include facilities for the following inmate capacity:

- a. Region I - Appalachian - 1,085
- b. Region II - Midlands - 935
- c. Region III - Upper Coastal - 639
- d. Region IV - Lower Coastal - 713

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>1977</u>
50% ( 2 regions )	75%

3. DATA:

Currently, the S. C. Department of Corrections has two RCCO's in the Appalachian and Midlands regions. These regions contain the majority of SCDC institutions.

The Department is now having conducted a comprehensive study to determine facility needs to implement the community corrections concept. No estimate is available at this time.

4. COST:

The total cost of implementing two full regional offices is \$362,324. Additional costs involved in providing appropriate facilities are not projectable at this time.



1. STANDARD: Increase Educational Level (Law Enforcement)

Law enforcement agencies should establish an average educational level of thirteen years (completion of at least one year of higher education).

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Not projected

3. DATA:

Present Educational Levels

	<u># Sworn Personnel</u>	<u>% of Totals</u>	<u>Total Years Education</u>
9th	158	4.1	1,106
9th-11th	344	9.0	3,440
12th	2,260	59.3	27,120
13th	379	9.9	4,927
Assoc. Degree	354	9.3	4,956
14th	163	4.3	2,282
Bach. Degree	<u>155</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>2,480</u>
Total	3,813	100.0%	46,311

Total Years Education	Total Sworn	Average Educ. Level
46,311	÷ 3,813	12.1

Sworn officers in higher education courses:

Associate	-	393
Baccalaureate	-	82
Masters	-	23

4. COST:

Not available.

1. STANDARD: Personnel Increases (Law Enforcement)

All law enforcement agencies should increase their sworn law enforcement manpower levels to achieve the following minimum officers per 1,000 population:

Municipal agencies - 2.35/1,000  
Sheriff's departments - .8/1,000

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

	<u>76</u>	<u>77</u>
% of Total Needed (450)	0	2.2% (10 personnel)

3. DATA:

There are presently 1,378 sworn law enforcement officers employed in county sheriff's departments. They serve a population of 1,676,484 (total State population minus municipal population). This gives sheriff's departments a ratio of .8/1,000.

There are presently 2,499 sworn law enforcement officers employed in municipal police agencies. They serve a population of 1,062,704 giving them a ratio of 2.35/1,000.

Law enforcement agencies with five or more sworn personnel would need 450 additional sworn officers to raise their manpower levels to the state average.

4. COST:

To provide ten sworn law enforcement officers would cost an estimated \$100,000.

1. STANDARD: Special Units

Every law enforcement agency with 25 or more sworn personnel should establish special units to deal with property crimes, juveniles and narcotics violations.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

	<u>76</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>
Units	0	2.4	4.8	7.2
% of Total Needed (84)	0	3%	6%	9%

3. DATA:

There are presently 39 departments with 25 or more sworn officers. There are 33 special units -- 14 narcotics units; 5 property crime units; and 14 juvenile units.

4. COST:

To provide every department with three special units would mean an increase of 84 units.

Average cost per unit:

- A. Narcotics - \$40,000
- B. Property - \$60,000
- C. Juvenile - \$20,000

An increase of 2.4 units per year would cost an estimated \$100,000.

1. STANDARD: Inservice Training

To increase detection of crime and apprehension of criminals through the development and/or expansion of police expertise resulting from 40 hours of inservice training for all law enforcement officers.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Not projected

3. DATA:

There are presently 39 law enforcement agencies with 25 or more sworn officers. There are sixteen agencies with 50 or more sworn officers. These agencies employ 2,369 sworn officers or 62% of total sworn officers.

Eleven agencies with 25-49 sworn officers have a training officer.

Nine agencies with 50 or more sworn officers have a training officer.

The average salary for training officers is \$10,000. They provide an average of 85 hours of inservice training for 1,511 officers per year.

At present, there are no agencies supplying contract services for inservice training to other departments.

4. COST:

Not available.

1. STANDARD: Diversion of Public Intoxicants

Every county should have 24-hour access to a detoxification facility.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Owing to the unknown availability of overlapping state and federal funding, an implementation schedule would not be feasible.

3. DATA:

Existing Detox Centers

Location	# beds	Bed Days	3-day capacity for year per client	Population Served	Beds per 10,000 Population
Charleston	18	6,570	2,190	259,900	.69
Florence	15	5,475	1,825	96,800	1.55
Greenville	20	7,300	2,433	265,800	.75
Orangeburg	6	2,190	730	103,200	.58
Columbia	26	9,490	3,163	249,300	1.04
Spartanburg	20	7,300	2,433	229,600	.87

Proposed Centers

Newberry	5	1,825	608		
----------	---	-------	-----	--	--

4. COST:

Need for detox beds is computed with formula suggested by the South Carolina Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{State Population} \\ 2,784,700 \end{array} \times .0083 \times 3 = \begin{array}{l} \# \text{ bed days} \\ 69339 \div 365 = \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \text{Beds} \\ 190 \end{array}$$

Existing Beds	105
Proposed Beds	5
Total	<u>110</u>
Statewide Need	190
Present Need	80

The average cost of a detox center bed per day is \$40.00, therefore:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{average cost} \\ \$40 \end{array} \times \begin{array}{l} \text{beds needed} \\ 80 \end{array} \times \begin{array}{l} \text{days} \\ 365 \end{array} = \begin{array}{l} \text{total cost for additional beds} \\ \$1,168,000 \end{array}$$

This figure does not include the cost of providing additional detox centers.

It is estimated that a van capable of transporting intoxicated persons would cost \$7,000. To supply one van to each of the existing and proposed detox centers would cost:

$$7 \times \$7,000 = \$49,000.$$

1. STANDARD: Presentence Investigation

To provide South Carolina's trial judges a basis for informed sentencing, a presentence investigation shall be conducted and a written report submitted where there is a potential sentence of incarceration for one year or more, for all first offenders facing incarceration, and in any other case where the judge requests such an investigation (approximately 15,000 reports). The report shall be completed within five working days after the determination of guilt.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>1977</u>
15%	40%

3. DATA:

In 1975, Probation, Parole and Pardon conducted 2,264 presentence investigations. From conviction data of the Attorney General in 1974, and 1975 projections, it is conservatively estimated that about 15,000 presentence reports would be necessary to meet the elements of the standard.

4. COST:

Cost of full presentence investigation implementation state-wide in 1977 is approximately \$2,000,000. This figure assumes an investigation caseload of 15,000, at two days per investigation with investigators working 49 weeks per year. Additionally it is assumed that clerical personnel would be added at the rate of one per 2½ investigators.

1. STANDARD: Judicial Training

Provide at least thirty hours of preservice training to all newly elected judges of courts of record of limited or general trial jurisdiction covering at least such subjects as pretrial and trial procedure, sentencing, juror orientation and selection, court-community relations, and court and caseload management.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>1977</u>
0	100%

Implementation percentage reflects percentage of new judges in compliance.

3. DATA:

Currently, no instate training program exists that can serve to acquaint newly appointed trial judges of courts of record of general or limited trial jurisdiction with his or her responsibilities.

4. COST:

With no significant number of new judges expected to be appointed during Fiscal Year 1977, costs can be limited to providing for the preservice training of at most nine new judges in out of state programs, at an estimated cost of \$15,000.

1. STANDARD: Judicial Training,

Provide at least 12 preservice and inservice hours of training for all summary court judges and support personnel on a statewide and/or local basis, covering subjects related to summary court functions and operations, and new developments in the law.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Not projected

3. DATA:

The overwhelming majority of all criminal cases are disposed of by summary court judges in South Carolina. In 1975, magistrates alone handled 335,000 criminal cases. Only seventeen magistrates are attorneys. State law does not set out any educational requirements for summary court judges. Summary court judges have jurisdiction of criminal cases with penalties up to \$200 or thirty days. Additionally, these judges issue warrants, set bail, and conduct preliminary examinations. Training is essential to ensure that the system works efficiently with proper safeguards for individual rights. Currently, South Carolina Court Administration offers substantial training opportunities for summary court judges through its Judicial Education office. Training opportunities are available for all new and experienced judges to meet and exceed the standard. However, no existing authority can compel attendance at training sessions. In 1975, over two hundred magistrates attended no training sessions at all.

4. COST:

Projected costs for implementation include funds for conducting statewide, regional, county, and individual training sessions for summary court judges, and accompanying printed materials at an estimated \$28,000 annually.



1. STANDARD: Judicial Training

Provide at least eighteen hours of inservice training for all judges of courts of record of limited or general trial jurisdiction, and appellate judges covering subjects such as pretrial and trial procedures, caseload management, and new development in the law.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>77</u>
0%	65%

Implementation applies to the number of judges meeting the standard.

3. DATA:

Currently, inservice judicial education in South Carolina is limited to about eight hours associated with the annual Judicial Conference (includes Supreme Court, circuit court, county courts with criminal jurisdiction). Meetings out of state are available, but travel, subsistence, and tuition are prohibitive for a large number of judges.

4. COST:

Projected costs are based on an instate meeting of two or three days with sixty eligible judges. Approximately \$14,000 should allow approximately 40 judges to meet the inservice training standard.

1. STANDARD: Prosecution Screening Standard

Every case flowing into a solicitor's office in South Carolina shall be thoroughly evaluated by prosecution staff prior to any grand jury action.

2. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

<u>Current</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>82</u>
10%	25%	40%	55%	70%	85%	100%

Implementation percentages reflect percentage of the state's total caseload being screened by solicitors.

3. DATA:

South Carolina has sixteen solicitors who prosecute criminal cases requiring grand jury indictments. In 1975, solicitors obtained 30,309 new indictments. This figure is a 16.5% increase over the 1974 indictment count. An important indication that inadequate case screening is being performed in South Carolina is the high nolle prosequi rate. In 1974, the overall nolle prosequi rate in the State was 22.2%. By county, the 1974 rate varied from a high of 37% to a low of 6.6%. Preliminary 1975 figures indicate a statewide nolle prosequi rate of about 28%. County rates vary from a high of 48% to a low of 7%. The Attorney General of South Carolina operates a Criminal Docket Report which collects information on the disposition of indictments. However, at the present time, no information is available on a systematic basis in the flow of cases from arrest to indictment. Comparisons of arrest figures with conviction figures indicate that a large number of individuals are slipping out of the system prior to indictment. For example, in 1975, there were 41,000 arrests for Type I crimes, but projected figures indicate only about 7,500 persons were convicted of Type I crimes.

4. COST:

Projected cost of a unit within a solicitor's office that would perform case screening and evaluation is \$51,000, including funds for an assistant solicitor, investigator, and secretary.

**END**