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Identifying and understanding criminal justice data is key to developing responsive solutions to state challenges and assessing what changes are successful. State leaders may be grappling with issues such as increased recidivism rates, significant corrections costs, fentanyl and methamphetamine use, upticks in violent crime, or the prevalence of people with mental illness intersecting with the justice system.

At the same time, state leaders may also be struggling to address acute shortages in the workforce, improve services for victims of crime, and increase opportunities for people returning to their communities from incarceration. Effectively addressing these challenges requires state leaders to carefully examine system operations, define the outcomes they want to see, and work collaboratively to adjust key policies, practices, and budgets to bridge the gaps.

Data is a critical tool for leaders who want to understand their state’s unique criminal justice challenges. This snapshot contains both national and state-specific data on crime, correctional populations, recidivism, and other important criminal justice metrics to equip state leaders to make informed decisions. These snapshots represent 1,200 pages of unique analyses for 50 states and the District of Columbia of data collected from over 75 sources. Not all data points were available in every state, so some figures may be left blank.

The snapshot examines data about the criminal justice system process at key decision-making points within the system. Starting with the point of entry of crime and arrest, through the corrections population — including those in custody and non-custodial settings — and ending with reentry and recidivism.

The goal of this snapshot is to provide state leaders with a big picture of key state data points across the criminal justice system. These data ground policy discussions and offer common starting points for essential conversations on how and where to improve the criminal justice system in each state.

Both national and state-specific data are included in the snapshot. The icon in the top-left corner of each page indicates whether the charts on that page use national or state data.
Despite concerns about increasing violent crime, far more people die due to suicide, alcohol, and drugs than homicide in the United States.

Nationally, four times more people died of drug overdoses and almost twice as many people died from suicide compared to homicide in 2022.

In South Carolina in 2022, 2,376 people died from drug overdoses, 1,948 deaths were alcohol induced, 870 people died by suicide, and 595 people were victims of homicide.

Figure 1. Cause of death
Rate per 100k residents, South Carolina
People involved in the criminal justice system are also often utilizers of behavioral health services. However, this means that the justice system can become a provider of last resort when these services are not available or are insufficient to meet a person’s needs. These people can often be served more effectively and at lower cost through robust community-based behavioral health services.

**Figure 2. Number of behavioral health providers**
South Carolina

By 2036, the projected number of addiction counselors, mental health counselors, and psychologists in South Carolina is estimated to be less than the projected need.

**Figure 3. Projected supply and demand of behavioral health providers**
South Carolina
Community and Behavioral Health
Substance use challenges and needs

State and local leaders face significant mental health, substance use, and housing challenges in their communities. Cross-system collaboration between public safety, health, and housing organizations and agencies is critical to improving outcomes for people in the justice system.

**Figure 4. Share of adults reporting alcohol or drug misuse in the past year**
South Carolina, 2021

![Bar chart showing the share of adults reporting alcohol or drug misuse in the past year in South Carolina, 2021.](image)

SAMHSA National Survey on Drug Use and Health

Based on admissions data from substance abuse treatment facilities, in 2022, 5,716 people in South Carolina were admitted for marijuana use, 2,030 for methamphetamine use, and 1,877 for other opioid use.

SAMHSA Treatment Episode Data Set

In 2022, 48 percent of drug overdose deaths in South Carolina were due to fentanyl or tramadol. There were 10.9 times more fentanyl deaths in 2022 than in 2015.

**Figure 5. Deaths due to overdose by drug type**
South Carolina

![Line chart showing deaths due to overdose by drug type in South Carolina.](image)

CDC National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System
The need for behavioral health services in the state is substantial.

892,000 adults in South Carolina experienced mental illness in 2021.

217,000 adults in South Carolina experienced serious mental illness in 2021.

663,000 adults in South Carolina received mental health services of any kind in 2021.

527,000 adults in South Carolina needed, but did not receive, treatment at a specialized facility for substance use in 2021.

Since 2012, the share of people in South Carolina without health insurance has decreased from 16.8 percent to 9.1 percent of the total community population.

Figure 6. Share of community population by health insurance coverage type
South Carolina

U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey
Community and Behavioral Health
Homelessness and poverty

3,608 people in South Carolina were experiencing homelessness in January 2022. The rate of 68 per 100,000 residents is the 2nd-lowest state homelessness rate in the region and the 2nd lowest in the country.

**Figure 7. People experiencing homelessness**
Rate per 100k residents, Southern Region, 2022

![Graph showing homelessness rates across Southern Region, 2022](image)

HUD Annual Homelessness Assessment Report

73,730 people in South Carolina were unemployed in August 2023. This community unemployment rate of 3.0 percent was the 11th lowest in the country.

**Figure 8. Share of renters with high rent burden**
South Carolina

![Graph showing share of renters with high rent burden](image)

U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey

717,348 people in South Carolina had incomes below the federal poverty level in 2022. This rate of 14.0 percent was 1.4 percentage points above the national poverty rate of 12.6 percent.

In South Carolina in 2022, 144,945 people (27 percent of all renters) had rent that was more than half their incomes.
Between 2019 and 2022, violent crime fell in 32 states (plus D.C.) and rose in 18 states.

Figure 9. Percent change in violent crime, 2019 to 2022

The FBI stopped Uniform Crime Reporting Program Summary Reporting System (SRS) data collection in 2020, which decreased the number of agencies that submitted their crime data and thus reduced the reliability of state estimates in 2021. In 2022, they allowed agencies who were unable to submit NIBRS data to submit SRS data again. 94 percent of the U.S. population was covered in the 2022 crime data submissions to the FBI, with most states providing close to complete data. However, the population upon which the estimates were derived decreased by over 10 percent in three states: Florida, Hawaii, and Illinois, so conclusions about crime changes in those states should be interpreted with additional caution.

Murder is down 12 percent year to date compared to last year in the largest cities.

Figure 10. Year-to-date murders
170 cities, as of November 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Murders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>8,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>7,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 170 of the largest cities that publish murder data publicly, 100 cities had fewer murders in 2023 than in 2022. In data reported as of November 13, 2023, there have been 1,028 fewer murders this year compared to the same point last year in these cities.
There were 121,935 property index crime incidents reported to police in South Carolina in 2022.

South Carolina had the 5th-highest property crime rate in the region and the 13th-highest property crime rate in the country.

Figure 11. Property index crime reported to police
Rate per 100k residents, Southern Region, 2022

There were 25,955 violent index crime incidents reported to police in South Carolina in 2022.

South Carolina had the 4th-highest violent crime rate in the region and the 9th-highest violent crime rate in the country.

Figure 12. Violent index crime reported to police
Rate per 100k residents, Southern Region, 2022

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
In 2022, the property crime rate in South Carolina (2,308 per 100,000 residents) was 18 percent higher than the national average (1,954 per 100,000). Between 2012 and 2022, property crime decreased by 40 percent in South Carolina.

**Figure 13. Property index crime reported to police**
Rate per 100k residents

The rates of burglary and larceny were higher in South Carolina than the national average, while the rate of motor vehicle theft was lower. Burglary decreased by 63 percent, the largest change of any property crime. The next largest change was larceny, which decreased by 34 percent.

**Figure 14. Property index crime reported to police by offense**
Rate per 100k residents

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
In 2022, the violent crime rate in South Carolina (491 per 100,000 residents) was 29 percent higher than the national average (381 per 100,000). Between 2012 and 2022, violent crime decreased by 12 percent in South Carolina.

**Figure 15. Violent index crime reported to police**
Rate per 100k residents

The rates of rape and robbery were lower in South Carolina than the national average, while the rates of aggravated assault and homicide were higher. Homicide increased by 59 percent, the largest change of any violent crime. The next largest change was robbery, which decreased by 58 percent.

**Figure 16. Violent index crime reported to police by offense**
Rate per 100k residents

In 2013, the FBI updated its rape definition to be more inclusive, so comparisons before and after should be interpreted with caution.

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
Focusing just on crime in urban areas ignores a growing challenge in rural America where nationally, homicides increased 41 percent between 2012 and 2022, from 3.4 per 100k to 4.8 per 100k.

**Figure 17. Homicides by jurisdiction type**
Rate per 100k residents, 3-year moving average, South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of homicides</th>
<th>Homicide rate per 100k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Police Department</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>261.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington Police Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeburg Public Safety</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Police Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jurisdiction Types**

- **Medium city**
  - Population between 50k and 250k
- **Small city**
  - Population less than 50k
- **Suburban**
  - Non-city within a metropolitan area
- **Rural**
  - Not in a metropolitan area

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
The rate of property victimizations in 2022 was 71 percent lower than in 1993.

Figure 18. Property victimizations
Rate per 100k households, United States
- Other theft
- Burglary
- Trespassing
- Motor vehicle theft

The rate of violent victimizations in 2022 was 70 percent lower than in 1993.

Figure 19. Violent victimizations
Rate per 100k residents, United States
- Simple assault
- Aggravated assault
- Robbery
- Rape
According to the National Crime Victimization Survey, only 42 percent of violent victimizations nationwide were reported to the police in 2022.

Of the victimizations that were reported to police, the demographic make-up of victims differs from the general population. People of certain age groups, races, and genders are more often victims of crime than would be expected based on their share of the total population.

**Figure 20. Share of victims of violent crime compared to share of total population**

South Carolina, 2022

People between the ages of 18 and 34 were 2.0 times more likely to be victims of violent crime relative to their share of the total South Carolina population.

Black people were victims of violent crime 2.0 times more often than their share of the state population.

In South Carolina, 80 percent of victims of violent crime were of the same race as the person perpetrating violence against them.

The share of women and men who were victims of violent crime was almost the same as their percentage in the total population.

---

Race categories include people of any ethnicity, and many Latino people may be counted as White. Not enough law enforcement agencies collect ethnicity data to make reliable estimates for the Latino population.

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
In 2021, state and local governments in South Carolina spent $1,411,790,000 on law enforcement services. This was 2.4 percent of the overall state and local expenditures and $272 per resident.

**Figure 21. Law enforcement expenditures**
Total per resident, Southern Region, 2021

![Graph showing law enforcement expenditures per resident in the Southern Region, 2021.](image)

U.S. Census Bureau Annual Survey of State and Local Government Finances

---

**Figure 22. Police officers and detectives employed**
Rate per 100k residents

**Figure 23. Police officers and detectives per violent crime**
Rate per reported violent crime incidents

![Graphs showing police officers and detectives data.](images)

BLS Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics
FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program SRS

Law enforcement staffing can impact how agencies allocate resources to solve violent crime. For example, severe staff shortages can reduce investigative personnel or increase the number of cases that individual officers are managing. It is critical that agencies have the personnel to implement effective evidence-based policing strategies in collaboration with their communities.
The demographic make-up of people arrested for violent crime differs from the general population. People of certain age groups, races, and genders are arrested more often than would be expected based on their share of the total population.

**Figure 24. Share of people arrested for violent crime compared to share of total population**

South Carolina, 2022

People between the ages of 18 and 34 were 2.4 times more likely to be arrested for violent offenses relative to their share of the total South Carolina population.

Black people were arrested for violent offenses 2.2 times more often than their share of the state population.

Men were arrested for violent crime 1.7 times more often than their share of the state population.

Race categories include people of any ethnicity, and many Latino people may be counted as White. Not enough law enforcement agencies collect ethnicity data to make reliable estimates for the Latino population.

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
Between 2012 and 2022, the number of violent crimes reported to law enforcement that were not cleared by an arrest or other means increased. Nationally, 62 percent of violent crimes known to law enforcement went unsolved in 2022.

**Figure 25. Unsolved rate of violent crime reported to police**
South Carolina

In 2013, the FBI updated its rape definition to be more inclusive, so comparisons before and after should be interpreted with caution.

In South Carolina, 52 percent of violent crimes were not solved in 2022, 10 percentage points better than the national average. Robbery was the violent crime least frequently solved in 2022, with 66 percent of incidents reported to police not solved.

**Agencies with the lowest rate of unsolved violent crimes in South Carolina:**
- Lancaster County Sheriff’s Office (7%)
- Pickens County Sheriff’s Office (21%)
- Georgetown Police Department (23%)
- Laurens County Sheriff’s Office (24%)
- Easley Police Department (25%)

Includes agencies with 50 or more reported violent crimes.

Rates of unsolved crime vary across agencies for many different reasons including jurisdiction size, staffing, and access to investigative resources. Better understanding of the drivers of agency clearance rates can help policymakers target resources and identify opportunities for technical assistance where it might be needed most.

See note on page 7 for more information about FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program data quality.
Institutional Corrections
Total correctional control

Nationally, the rate of total correctional control across prisons, jails, and community supervision has fallen since 2007. In 2020, all correctional populations dipped sharply and continued to decrease through 2021.

However, despite this downward trend, the current rate of correctional control is still more than twice as high as it was in 1980. The vast majority of people under correctional control are on community supervision with over half on probation in 2021. Jail populations make up the smallest population under correctional control after a steep decline in 2020.

Figure 27. Population under correctional control
Rate per 100k residents, United States

Figure was recreated from the Council on Criminal Justice
Nationally, the rate of jail incarceration in 2021 was down 23 percent from its peak in 2007. Jail populations rebounded in 2021 after dropping sharply in 2020.

**Figure 28. Jail population**
Rate per 100k residents, United States

In 2021, 71 percent of people (440,000 people) confined in jail in the United States were not convicted of a crime and awaiting court action on a current charge or being held for other reasons. In 1982, 57 percent of people in jail were being held without conviction.

**Figure 29. Share of jail population by conviction status**
United States
In 2021, state and local governments in South Carolina spent $802,051,000 on corrections. This was 1.4 percent of the overall state and local expenditures and $154 per resident.

**Figure 30. State and local corrections expenditures**
Total per resident, Southern Region, 2021

Nationally, states are struggling to hire and retain corrections officers. Staffing shortages impact correctional system operations, the availability of programming and reentry services, as well as the overall safety of staff and people who are incarcerated.

**Figure 31. Corrections officers employed**
Rate per 100k residents

**Figure 32. Number of incarcerated persons per corrections officer**
Rate per corrections officer
Nationally, the prison incarceration rate in 2021 was down 31 percent from its peak in 2007.

**Figure 33. State prison population**
Rate per 100k residents, United States

In 2021, 62 percent of people in state prison were convicted of a violent crime, compared to 46 percent in 1990. Compared to 1990, the rate of prison incarceration for violent offenses was 52 percent higher, and the rate of incarceration for drug offenses was 35 percent lower in 2020.

**Figure 34. Share of state prison population by most serious offense**
United States
Declines in the national prison population have primarily been driven by a decrease in people held for nonviolent offenses.

Between 2010 and 2020 in South Carolina, the prison population serving sentences for nonviolent offenses decreased by 47 percent, while the prison population serving sentences for violent offenses decreased by 15 percent.

**Figure 35. Prison population by most serious offense type**
South Carolina

![Graph of prison population by most serious offense type in South Carolina.](image)

In 2020, the average length of stay of people released from prison who were serving time for a violent offense in South Carolina was 5.5 years. This is 10 percent higher than the national average prison stay for violent offenses of 5.0 years.

**Figure 36. Average length of stay (years) of people exiting prison**
South Carolina, Prison terms for violent offenses

![Graph of average length of stay for people exiting prison in South Carolina.](image)
Nationally, the probation population rate in 2021 was down 37 percent from its peak in 2007.

**Figure 37. Probation population**
Rate per 100k residents, United States

![Bar chart showing probation population rates from 1980 to 2020.](image)

Figure was recreated from the Council on Criminal Justice

In 2021, roughly equal numbers of people were on probation for violent, property, and drug offenses. Compared to 2001, a larger share of people on probation in 2021 had been convicted of a violent offense, and a smaller share had been convicted of a public order offense.

**Figure 38. Share of probation population by most serious offense**
United States

![Line chart showing the percentage of probationers by offense type from 2005 to 2020.](image)

BJS Probation and Parole in the United States
South Carolina had the 12th-lowest probation supervision rate in the country in 2021.

States across the country have taken steps to safely reduce supervision populations, improve supervision success, and focus resources on those most likely to reoffend. The focus of these policy changes includes implementing evidence-based interventions to encourage behavior change, limiting returns to prison for technical violations, and providing earned compliance credits to reduce supervision terms among others.

Since 2011, the number of people on probation in South Carolina has decreased by 26 percent.

Data is not available.
Reentry is a significant aspect of our criminal justice system. More than 90 percent of incarcerated individuals are released back into the community.

Effectively preparing someone for release and providing the support they need in the community affects whether they succeed or return to the corrections system. Parole release policies and practices have a significant impact on prison populations. In South Carolina in 2020, there were at least 1,414 people in prison with sentences between 1 and 25 years who were eligible for parole. This group made up 14 percent of the total prison population.

Figure 42. Parole eligibility of prison population
South Carolina, 2020
- Currently eligible
- Eligible in 1-5 years
- Eligible in 6+ years
- Not eligible or missing

In 2020, 63 percent of people leaving prison in South Carolina were granted conditional release. 4 percent of people released from prison were released 3 years or more after their parole eligibility date.

Figure 43. Releases from prison by post-release status
South Carolina, 2020
- Conditional
- Unconditional
- Other or unknown

Figure 44. Releases from prison by time to parole eligibility
South Carolina, 2020
- On-time or early
- 1-2 years after eligibility
- 3 years or more after eligibility
- Unknown or missing
Nationally, the parole population rate in 2021 was down 12 percent from its peak in 2011.

**Figure 45. Parole population**
Rate per 100k residents, United States

In 2021, 36 percent of people on parole had been in prison for a violent offense, and 30 percent of people had been in prison for a drug offense. Compared to 2001, a larger share of people on parole in 2021 had been convicted of a violent offense, and a smaller share had been convicted of a drug offense.

**Figure 46. Share of parole population by most serious offense**
United States
South Carolina had the 9th-lowest parole supervision rate in the country in 2021.

Since 2011, the number of people on parole in South Carolina has decreased by 37 percent. The share of people successfully completing parole was 89 percent in 2021 and 74 percent in 2011.

**Figure 47. Parole population**  
South Carolina

![Parole population graph for South Carolina](image)

**Figure 48. Share of successful exits from parole**  
South Carolina

![Share of successful exits from parole graph for South Carolina](image)

**Figure 49. Admissions to prison for parole violations**  
South Carolina

![Admissions to prison for parole violations graph for South Carolina](image)

*Data is not available.*
Collateral consequences impact employment opportunities either by restricting access to occupational licenses needed to work in certain fields, restricting access to business licenses needed to pursue self-employment, or directly limiting the ability of employers to hire or retain workers with certain conviction histories.

In South Carolina, 72 percent of collateral consequences for convictions are employment related.

**Figure 50. Number of employment-related collateral consequences by type**

South Carolina

56 percent of consequences in South Carolina are mandatory and prohibit, without exception, the employment, retention, or licensing of a person with a conviction for a specified offense.

61 percent of consequences in South Carolina may be indefinite in duration.

**Figure 51. Number of employment-related collateral consequences by field**

South Carolina

---

**Graphs and Diagrams**

- **Figure 50**: Bar chart showing the number of employment-related collateral consequences by type in South Carolina.
- **Figure 51**: Bar chart showing the number of employment-related collateral consequences by field in South Carolina.
Reentry and Recidivism
Arrests, convictions, and returns to prison

Of people released from prison in 2012, 71 percent were arrested within 5 years of release, 54 percent were convicted of a new offense, and 46 percent returned to prison.

**Figure 52. Cumulative percentage of people released from prison who had a recidivism event within 5 years of release**
34 states, 2012 releases

![Cumulative percentage of people released from prison who had a recidivism event within 5 years of release](image)

Nationally, the recidivism rate has been decreasing.
In 2005, 77 percent of people released from state prison were arrested within 5 years of release. Of people released in 2012, 70 percent were arrested within 5 years.

**Figure 53. Percentage of people released from prison who were arrested following release**
United States
Release year ■ 2005 ■ 2008 ■ 2012

![Percentage of people released from prison who were arrested following release](image)
17 percent of people exiting prison in South Carolina in 2020 were reincarcerated within 3 years.

Figure 54. Prison reincarceration rate
South Carolina, three-year lookback period

24 percent of people starting probation in South Carolina in 2019 were incarcerated within 3 years.

Figure 55. Probation incarceration rate
South Carolina, three-year lookahead period
Nationally, racial disparities between Black and White populations have decreased over the past decade. However, large disparities still exist.

**In the community:** Disparities in non-fatal violent victimization were almost eliminated in the past decade, but disparities in arrests have grown, such that the arrest rate for Black individuals is 2.3 times higher than it is for White people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black-White disparity, 2012</th>
<th>Black-White disparity, 2022</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-fatal violent victimization</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BJS National Crime Victimization Survey and FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program SRS

**Community supervision:** Disparities in community supervision decreased. While disparities shrunk by more than a third, the parole supervision rate in the Black community remains over 3 times higher than in the White population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black-White disparity, 2012</th>
<th>Black-White disparity, 2022</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BJS Probation and Parole in the United States

**Institutional corrections:** Disparities in institutional correctional settings have also decreased; however, the prison incarceration rate remains over 5 times higher for the Black population compared to the White population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black-White disparity, 2012</th>
<th>Black-White disparity, 2022</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BJS Annual Survey of Jails and BJS Prisoners in the United States
Racial disparities are pervasive across multiple community and behavioral health outcomes, in addition to the criminal justice system.

In South Carolina in 2023, the Black unemployment rate was 2.5 times higher, and the Latino unemployment rate was 1.8 times higher, than the White unemployment rate.

In South Carolina in 2022, 24 percent of Black people and 19 percent of Latino people earned incomes below the federal poverty level.

**Figure 56. Share of people with income below the poverty line by race and ethnicity**
South Carolina

![Graph showing the share of people with income below the poverty line by race and ethnicity in South Carolina.](image)

U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey

In South Carolina in 2021, White people died at a higher rate than Black people due to alcohol, drug overdoses, and suicide. Black people died at a higher rate than White people due to homicide.

**Figure 57. Cause of death by race and ethnicity**
Rate per 100k residents, South Carolina, 2021

![Bar chart showing the cause of death by race and ethnicity in South Carolina, 2021.](image)

CDC National Center for Health Statistics

Rates for some racial and ethnic groups are not available due to data suppression rules for small populations.


There are racial disparities for both victims of crime and people arrested.

The following victimization estimates only include those incidents that are reported to the police. According to the National Crime Victimization Survey, in 2022, national reporting rates across different racial and ethnic groups varied slightly, with White, Black, and Latino individuals reporting at higher rates (between 42 percent and 48 percent) compared to Asian and other racial groups (between 22 percent and 34 percent).

In 2022, the Black violent victimization rate was 3.1 times higher than the White violent victimization rate in South Carolina. Black people were arrested for violent crimes at a rate 3.8 times higher than White people.

Figure 58. Victimizations and arrests for violent crime by race
Rate per 100k residents, South Carolina, 2022

In 2022, Black people were arrested for property crimes at a rate 1.5 times higher than White people.

Figure 59. Arrests for property crime by race
Rate per 100k residents, South Carolina, 2022

Race categories include people of any ethnicity, and many Latino people may be counted as White. Not enough law enforcement agencies collect ethnicity data to make reliable estimates for the Latino population.
The national homicide rate of Black victims has been persistently higher than the rate of White victims, but the disparity grew between 2019 and 2021.

In 2021, Black people died by homicide at a rate close to 8 times higher than White people.

**Figure 60. Age-adjusted homicide deaths by race of victim**
Rate per 100k residents, United States

Nationally, homicides of Black victims were twice as likely to go unsolved in 2021 as homicides of White victims.

**Figure 61. Percentage of unsolved homicides by race of victim**
United States
Nationally, Black people experience the highest rates of correctional control, but other racial and ethnic groups also experience disparate outcomes compared to White people. These disparities are the result of many factors both in and outside of the criminal justice system.

Compared to White adults, Black adults in South Carolina are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Comparison to White Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>2.4x more likely to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>2.0x more likely to be on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>3.9x more likely to be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>3.8x more likely to be on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to White adults, Latino adults in South Carolina are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Comparison to White Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Supervision Rate</td>
<td>69% less likely to be on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Supervision Rate</td>
<td>28% less likely to be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74% less likely to be on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to White adults, American Indian adults in South Carolina are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Comparison to White Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>53% less likely to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Supervision Rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Supervision Rate</td>
<td>27% less likely to be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to White adults, Asian adults in South Carolina are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Comparison to White Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>81% less likely to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Supervision Rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Supervision Rate</td>
<td>88% less likely to be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program NIBRS
BJS Probation and Parole in the United States
BJS Prisoners in the United States
# Data Sources and Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location in Snapshot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Murder Comparison</strong></td>
<td>AH Datalytics collects and displays year-to-date murder data made publicly available by 170 of the largest cities in the United States. Data include counts of year-to-date murders for the current and prior years, along with the “as of” date for which the count was made, and a link to the source of the count. This data is a good proxy indicator for the national change in murder from year to year and is available far earlier than national data from the FBI.</td>
<td>Figure 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Survey of Jails</strong></td>
<td>The Bureau of Justice Statistics administers the Annual Survey of Jails (ASJ), which describes the number of persons held in local jails, jail incarceration rates, inmate demographics, conviction status and most serious offense, the number of admissions to jail, jail capacity, inmate turnover rates, and staff employed in local jails. The ASJ surveys a representative sample of jails and estimated state and national figures from this sample. The 2021 ASJ sample consisted of 895 active jail jurisdictions, represented by 940 reporting units.</td>
<td>Figure 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Corrections Reporting Program</strong></td>
<td>The Bureau of Justice Statistics National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP) has been collecting administrative data on individuals in the prison and parole populations annually for 40 years. Case-level data on admissions, releases, and custodial prison populations are available, as well as data on parole entries and discharges, for participating jurisdictions. Nearly all states currently participate in the annual NCRP project, although many states do not submit complete data. Demographic data on age, sex, race, ethnicity, veteran status, and educational attainment are included in the collections.</td>
<td>Figures: 36, 42, 43, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Crime Victimization Survey</strong></td>
<td>The Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) is conducted annually through interviews with a nationally representative sample of about 240,000 people in about 150,000 households. The NCVS collects information about criminal victimization both reported and not reported to police and is a key source in understanding the full scope of victimization. NCVS data for 2006 are not comparable with other years and are omitted from the charts included here.</td>
<td>Figures: 18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prisoners in the United States</strong></td>
<td>The Bureau of Justice Statistics annual Prisoners in the United States reports are based on the National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) Program and provide an annual count of sentenced individuals who are under the jurisdiction of state correctional authorities or under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. To be included in the NPS survey, individuals must have received a sentence of more than one year, with the exception of unified correctional systems in AK, CT, DE, HI, RI, and VT, and consequently report on all individuals in their custody. The series includes prison population counts on the last day of the calendar year, prison admissions and releases, and rates of imprisonment. Demographic and offense characteristics of the imprisoned population are also collected and included in the statistical tables and reports. Additional detail in Prisoners in the United States is based on National Corrections Reporting Program data.</td>
<td>Figures: 32, 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Website References:**
- AH Datalytics: [www.ahdatalytics.com](http://www.ahdatalytics.com)
- Bureau of Justice Statistics: [bjs.ojp.gov/data-collection](http://bjs.ojp.gov/data-collection)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset Description</th>
<th>Corresponding Web Address</th>
<th>Figures/Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probation and Parole in the United States</strong>&lt;br&gt;Bureau of Justice Statistics&lt;br&gt;Most recent data: 2021&lt;br&gt;bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/probation-and-parole-united-states-2021</td>
<td>The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) annual Probation and Parole in the United States reports are based on the BJS Annual Probation Survey, Annual Parole Survey, and Federal Justice Statistics Program, which collect data on adults placed on correctional supervision (entries) or removed from supervision (exits) during the reporting year and on characteristics of the population at year end. The data include population characteristics such as sex, race or ethnicity, and most serious offense.</td>
<td>Figures: 38, 39, 40, 46, 47, 48&lt;br&gt;Text: pages 30, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 34 States in 2012: A 5-Year Follow-Up Period</strong>&lt;br&gt;Bureau of Justice Statistics&lt;br&gt;Report available: bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/rpr34s125fup1217.pdf</td>
<td>BJS uses criminal history records to study the number and types of crimes committed by state prisoners both prior to and following their release. The first study tracked a sample of state prisoners released in 11 states in 1983, and the second study followed a sample of state prisoners released in 15 states in 1994. Both studies had a 3-year follow-up period. The latest study tracked a sample of prisoners released in 34 states in 2012 for 5 years after release. These studies documented the arrest, conviction, and incarceration experiences of the former inmates within and outside of the state that released them.</td>
<td>Figures: 52, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics</strong>&lt;br&gt;Bureau of Labor Statistics&lt;br&gt;Most Recent Data: 2022&lt;br&gt;www.bls.gov/oes/</td>
<td>The Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS) program produces employment and wage estimates annually for approximately 830 occupations beginning with the May 2012 reference period. These estimates are available as a whole, for individual states, and for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas; national occupational estimates for specific industries are also available.</td>
<td>Figures: 2, 22, 23, 31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Area Unemployment Statistics</strong>&lt;br&gt;Bureau of Labor Statistics&lt;br&gt;Most Recent Data: 2023&lt;br&gt;www.bls.gov/lau/</td>
<td>The Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program produces monthly and annual employment, unemployment, and labor force data for Census regions and divisions, states, counties, metropolitan areas, and many cities. The state unemployment data in this report uses non-seasonally adjusted rates for the community population.</td>
<td>Text: page 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Multiple Cause of Death Centers for Disease Control and Prevention&lt;br&gt;Most Recent Data: 2022&lt;br&gt;wonder.cdc.gov/mcd.html</td>
<td>The Multiple Cause of Death database contains mortality and population counts for all U.S. counties. Data are based on death certificates for U.S. residents.</td>
<td>Figures: 1, 5, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisional Drug Overdose Death Counts</strong>&lt;br&gt;Centers for Disease Control and Prevention&lt;br&gt;Most Recent Data: 2022&lt;br&gt;wonder.cdc.gov/mcd.html</td>
<td>Provisional drug overdose death counts are based on death records received and processed by the National Center for Health Statistics. Data for 2022 is still considered provisional and subject to change. Drug overdose deaths may involve multiple drugs; therefore, a single death might be included in more than one category when describing the number of drug overdose deaths involving specific drugs.</td>
<td>Figure 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking the Size of America's Criminal Justice System</td>
<td>This series of interactive charts summarizes trends in crime, arrests, and correctional control (incarceration and community supervision), comparing current levels with their most recent peaks or valleys. Analyses reflect national data from the last two to six decades. Data were collected across various reports, data tools, and databases.</td>
<td>Figures: 27, 28, 33, 34, 37, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Violations and Their Impact on Incarceration</td>
<td>The Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center’s third report on the impact of supervision violations is based on 4 years of survey data from all 50 state corrections departments. Each state submitted survey data on the number of annual admissions and the year-end population of people who violated their community supervision annually from 2018 through 2021. The survey also broke down whether people were incarcerated for committing technical violations or violations associated with new criminal activity.</td>
<td>Figures: 41, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Crime Reporting Program National Incident-Based Reporting System</td>
<td>NIBRS is designed to improve the accuracy and reliability of crime statistics gathered by law enforcement agencies. Unlike the Summary Reporting System, which collects summary data on eight major crimes, NIBRS compiles detailed information on a broader range of offenses and collects data on each incident, including details about victims, offenders, and property involved. Not all law enforcement agencies and states report NIBRS data to the FBI, so some figures using NIBRS data are not included in this report. For other states, the FBI, along with BJS, developed estimation techniques to account for nonreporting agencies and missing or unknown information within a reported incident, where appropriate. Whenever NIBRS data is used in this report, we rely on the state-level estimates released by the FBI and BJS. States with too much missing data to make reliable estimates are excluded.</td>
<td>Figures: 20, 24, 58, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: page 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Crime Reporting Program Summary Reporting System</td>
<td>The Uniform Crime Reporting Program Summary Reporting System (SRS) gathers information from law enforcement agencies across the country on eight major index crimes, as well as additional details such as the number of arrests, clearance rates, and basic characteristics of the victims and offenders. One key difference between the SRS and NIBRS is that SRS is aggregate count data reported to the FBI by agency and by month, rather than incident-level data. Additionally, the range of offenses covered by SRS data is smaller than NIBRS data. One benefit of SRS data is that nearly all law enforcement agencies in the country are able to report SRS data to the FBI, meaning that SRS data released represents nearly all the report index crimes. In 2021, the FBI did not accept SRS data because of the transition to NIBRS. But in 2022, the FBI again began accepting SRS data from agencies who were not yet able to report NIBRS data. Because of this, 2022 estimates use both NIBRS and SRS data and are more reliable than 2021 estimates. In this report, when we use state-level SRS data, we use the “Estimated Crimes” dataset released by the FBI and used in the FBI's Crime in the U.S. reports. We also use the agency-level Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest dataset released by the FBI and cleaned and aggregated by Jacob Kaplan.</td>
<td>Figures: 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: pages 11, 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Projections</strong></td>
<td>Workforce Projections provide projections for the national supply of and demand for health professions by discipline using the Health Resources &amp; Services Administration's Health Workforce Simulation model. The estimates represent the supply, demand, and distribution of health care workers, to inform public policy decisionmakers to help prevent shortages and surpluses.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age-Adjusted Homicide Death Rates by Race and Sex 1980-2021</strong></td>
<td>The Division for Vital Records &amp; Health Statistics within the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) compiles the annual rate of deaths by homicide per 100,000 people in a specified group. DHHS calculates this rate for the state of Michigan and also calculates a national rate using the CDC's National Center for Health Statistics. An age-adjusted death rate is defined as “a summary rate of death that is developed using a standard population distribution to improve the comparability of rates for areas or population subgroups with differing age distributions.”</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homicide by Race</strong></td>
<td>The Murder Accountability Project is a nonprofit group organized in 2015 and dedicated to educating Americans on the importance of accurately accounting for unsolved homicides within the United States. This website gives police and the public easy-to-use access to two datasets maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation: the Uniform Crime Report from 1965 to the present and the Supplementary Homicide Report from 1976 to the present. The Murder Accountability Project, using the Freedom of Information Act, has also obtained data on more than 39,000 homicides that were not reported to the Justice Department in either of those databases. This information is the most complete data on U.S. homicides available anywhere.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Inventory of Collateral Consequences</strong></td>
<td>National Inventory of the Collateral Consequences of Conviction (NICCC) is an online searchable database that identifies and categorizes the statutes and regulations that impose collateral consequences in all 50 states, the federal system, and the District of Columbia, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. Each consequence is given a brief description and categorized by a number of features that describe the nature and operation of the consequence. This categorization helps with searching and filtering the consequences in the database and allows users to identify relevant consequences based on their common characteristics. It is searchable by keyword, consequence type, offense type, discretion, and duration.</td>
<td>51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Survey on Drug Use and Health</strong></td>
<td>The National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) releases state estimates for a limited number of substance use and mental health measures. They are generally based on two years of combined data and cover each state and the District of Columbia. NSDUH is a household survey of people living in the U.S. over the age of 12, not living in institutions such as prisons or nursing homes, not experiencing homelessness, and speak English or Spanish. The 2021 state data tables provide estimates for 35 measures of substance use and mental health by age group. 2021 estimates only include one year of data collection and therefore may be less accurate than prior releases.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dataset Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page/Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Episode Data Set</td>
<td>The Treatment Episode Data Set (TEDS) system comprises demographic and drug history information about individuals undergoing substance abuse treatment. TEDS data include data for individuals who are 12 years old or older and their demographic information such as age, sex, race/ethnicity, and employment status. Additionally, individuals’ substance abuse characteristics such as substances used, age at first use, route of use, frequency of use, and number of previous admissions are included.</td>
<td>Text page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>The American Community Survey is a nationwide survey that collects and produces information on social, economic, housing, and demographic characteristics about our nation’s population every year. In each year, the ACS surveys approximately two million households. One-year ACS estimates from 2020 are considered unreliable because of decreased data collection due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and are excluded. In this report, we use ACS tables B03002 (population by race and ethnicity), B27010 (health insurance), B25070 (rent burden), and B17001 (poverty).</td>
<td>Figures: 6, 8, 56 Text: page 6, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Survey of State and Local Government Finances</td>
<td>This survey provides local government data on debt and assets as well as revenues and expenditures by governmental function (i.e., police protection, fire protection, correction, etc.) of counties, cities, township governments, special districts and dependent agencies. In the data presented in this report, total expenditures of state and local governments are combined.</td>
<td>Figures: 21, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Homelessness Assessment Report</td>
<td>The Annual Homelessness Assessment Report (AHAR) includes Point-In-Time (PIT) estimates of the number of people experiencing homelessness, both sheltered and unsheltered. Estimates are based on one-night PIT counts conducted by local continuums of care (CoCs). HUD provides CoCs with methodological standards for conducting the PIT count, but CoCs determine their own methodology for conducting the counts, typically held during the last ten days of January. The AHAR contains national, state, and CoC-level PIT estimates of homelessness.</td>
<td>Figure 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-by-State Recidivism Data</td>
<td>Recidivism definitions vary by state. In these snapshots, we utilize whenever available, 3-year reincarceration rates for all prison releases and 3-year revocation rates for those serving time on probation. These definitions were most commonly seen across states. For some states, these definitions were not available; in these cases, other measures of recidivism are shown, including 3-year parole reincarceration rates and 3-year felony revocation rates. The most recent available 3-year recidivism data were those released from prison or supervised on probation in year 2019. For a significant portion of states, 2019 release/probation cohorts were not available and hence earlier release/probation cohorts were used. This included primarily those released in 2018 and 2017, but in some cases, earlier release cohorts were the most recent data found. Note that some states use calendar years when reporting on recidivism rates while others use fiscal years. For more information about recidivism in South Carolina, see: <a href="http://www.doc.sc.gov/sites/doc/files/Documents/research/SpecialReports/Recidivism_Rates_of_Inmates_Released_during_FY2016-FY2020.pdf">www.doc.sc.gov/sites/doc/files/Documents/research/SpecialReports/Recidivism_Rates_of_Inmates_Released_during_FY2016-FY2020.pdf</a>.</td>
<td>Figures: 54 and 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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