

EFF /Questions/Responses

1. What year was the offender use of social media policy (*Level 1 Offense 905*) adopted?
Answer: Offense #905, "Creating and/or Assisting With A Social Networking Site," was added to OP-22.14, "Inmate Disciplinary System," during its revision of July 1, 2012.
2. SCDC policies indicate that, with proper approval, staff may use online aliases for investigative purposes. Do SCDC investigators or contractors use, or have SCDC investigators or contractors ever used, online aliases on Facebook to investigate offender use of the social media sites?
Answer: Yes
3. Has SCDC ever asked for or received an inmate's social media password? Has SCDC ever required an inmate to access a social media site in the presence of a corrections officer, or otherwise accessed an inmate's social media profile?
Answer: We have received passwords from anonymous kites, from inmates informing on inmates, from the inmates themselves, and from family members/public sources. We do not and have not had an inmate access their social media page in an Investigator's presence. Yes, we have otherwise accessed an inmate's social media page.
4. Does SCDC offer any sort of reward or bounty to staff, members of the public, or contractors for identifying inmates on social media?
Answer: No
5. When an inmate is sentenced to disciplinary detention for a social-media-related violation, do they serve the entirety of the sentence imposed as a result of that violation?
Answer: When disciplinary detention sanctions are imposed for any violation, it is expected for the inmate to serve the total sanction imposed. Due to limited detention bed space, sanctions are regularly suspended. An inmates' behavior would be an important variable in determining whether a detention sanction would be suspended.
6. How often are sentences suspended? How often are inmates able to reduce their penalties related to social media violations through good behavior? How does SCDC apply a disciplinary detention sentence or other penalty when the length if the penalty is longer than the offender's actual prison sentence?
Answer: SCDC does not capture how often inmate's sentences are suspended. SCDC does not currently have a policy/procedure that reduces an inmate's disciplinary sanction for good behavior. If an inmate's detention sanction exceeds their actual prison sentence, the inmate is only obligated to serve their detention time up to their release from the agency.
7. Does SCDC have a total, or estimated total, of the number of good time days lost due to social-media-related infractions?
Answer: Total Number of Good Time Days Lost as a Result of Conviction on a Social Media Infraction by Calendar Year:

Year	# Convicted	Good Time Lost (Days)	Good Time Restored (Days)
2012	45	738	0
2013	170	5,667	0
2014	212	8,159	0
Total	427	14,564	0

8. SCDC's website includes an online tool for reporting inmates on social media. When was this tool implemented? How many submissions has SCDC received through the interface on the SCDC website since its implementation?
 Answer: Implemented May 16, 2014. 230 submissions but this includes cell phone and social media tips.
9. Does SCDC differentiate between offender profile pages and pages set up by members of the public seeking to bring attention to the offender's case?
 Answer: Yes, we investigate to try and prove/show that the inmate posted or at least had knowledge that the posting was made.
10. How many inmate takedown notices has SCDC filed with Facebook since the social media policy was instituted?
 Answer: Approximately 512 deactivation request were sent to Facebook.
11. How many SCDC employees have been sanctioned, fired, or prosecuted for smuggling mobile phones into prison facilities since the social media policy took effect?
 Answer: It appears the policy wasn't published until October 9, 2014. If you use that date, there have only been 2 employees sanctioned for Corrective Action Code 220 and both were for bringing in their phones but not for an inmate. However, the Employee Corrective Action policy was updated on October 1, 2007 to include introduction of cellular phones to code 220. Since that time, we have had 191 violations for code 220 but the code also includes introduction of drugs, alcohol and weapons. I have no way of identifying which of the 191 charges were just for introduction of cell phones.