

Police Department

The performance of the Cary Police Department was assessed with a set of nine questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Police Department in the past two years. In this case, it was 29.9% (25.7% in 2008) or 121 respondents. Table 13 indicates most of the respondents had contact with an officer (81.0%), dispatcher (14.1%), or animal control (5.8%) with limited contact with a clerk (4.1%) or detective (1.7%). None of the respondents surveyed had contact with a District Commander. The results in the table represent several multiple contacts with different individuals in the Police Department by the same individual.

Table 13. Police Department: Person Contacted.

Person Contacted	Number	Percentage
Officer	98	81.0
Dispatcher	17	14.1
Animal Control	7	5.8
Clerk	5	4.1
Detective	2	1.7
District Commander	0	0.0
Not Sure	7	5.8

The Police Department was assessed on 5 service dimensions (*courteous*, *competence*, *response time*, *fairness*, and *problem solving*) on the same 9-point grading scale (Tables 14-18) placed in descending order of ratings). The Police continue to have an excellent profile which is approximately the same as 2008. All the service dimensions measured earned an impressive grade of A-. This year there were three means that did decrease (*courteous*, *competence*, and *fairness*). However, the mean decreases were minimal with the exception of *fairness*. The grades for these three dimensions were unchanged except for *courteous* in which the grade declined from A to A-. It is important to note the overall mean decrease for *courteous* was negligible falling only from 8.43 to 8.40 which resulted in the grade dropping slightly (A to A-). The mean decrease for *fairness* was somewhat larger falling from 8.32 to 8.19. On the positive side, there were two means that increased (*response time* and *problem solving*) this year with relatively large mean improvements. In fact, both these dimensions earned their highest mean ratings to date. This also resulted in the grade for *problem solving* improving from a B+ to A-. Overall, the Police earned very strong marks again in 2010 with all the service dimensions earning A- grades.

Table 14. Police Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
10	8.40	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.0	3.4	16.8	73.9	A-
08	8.43	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.9	9.8	15.7	69.6	A
06	7.98	2.4	0.0	0.8	1.6	6.3	2.4	11.1	15.9	59.5	B+
04	8.11	3.2	2.4	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.8	4.0	15.9	69.0	A-
02	8.24	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.8	2.3	3.0	6.8	20.3	63.9	A-
00	7.95	1.5	2.3	0.8	1.5	5.3	3.0	7.6	19.7	58.3	B+
98	7.72	3.3	1.1	2.2	2.2	3.9	4.4	9.9	21.0	51.9	B

Table 15. Police Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
10	8.32	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.8	3.4	1.7	3.4	14.4	72.9	A-
08	8.36	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.9	8.7	19.4	65.0	A-
06	7.99	1.7	0.0	0.8	1.7	7.5	0.8	11.7	18.3	57.5	B+
04	8.13	2.6	1.7	0.9	0.9	3.4	2.6	4.3	15.4	68.4	A-
02	8.23	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.5	3.8	3.1	10.0	20.8	60.0	A-
00	7.89	3.1	2.4	0.8	0.0	2.4	5.5	7.1	24.4	54.3	B+
98	7.62	2.2	2.2	2.2	5.5	3.9	2.8	9.4	21.5	50.3	B

Table 16. Police Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
10	8.31	1.1	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	1.1	8.4	15.8	68.4	A-
08	8.18	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	4.4	14.3	15.4	61.5	A-
06	7.75	1.9	2.9	1.0	1.9	5.8	5.8	9.7	13.6	57.3	B
04	7.90	2.8	1.9	0.9	1.9	7.5	2.8	4.7	12.1	65.4	B+
02	7.99	0.0	1.7	0.9	0.0	6.1	3.5	13.9	20.9	53.0	B+
00	7.59	4.4	2.7	0.9	1.8	0.9	5.3	15.0	23.0	46.0	B
98	7.30	5.4	2.4	2.4	3.6	4.2	2.4	14.3	25.6	39.9	B-

Table 17. Police Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade

Year	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Grade
10	8.19	3.4	1.7	0.8	0.8	2.5	0.0	4.2	15.1	71.4	A-
08	8.32	1.1	0.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	1.1	11.0	15.4	68.1	A-
06	7.87	1.7	0.9	0.9	2.6	6.9	1.7	11.2	19.8	54.3	B+
04	8.10	3.5	1.7	2.6	0.0	1.7	0.9	4.3	15.7	69.6	A-
02	8.18	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	3.1	3.1	4.7	21.1	63.3	A-
00	7.74	3.9	3.1	2.4	1.6	3.9	1.6	4.7	20.5	58.3	B
98	7.49	3.9	2.8	2.2	3.4	7.3	1.7	8.4	18.5	51.7	B-

Table 18. Police Department: Problem Solving.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
10	8.09	3.6	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.7	0.9	10.8	17.1	63.1	A-
08	7.83	5.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.7	6.7	13.5	62.9	B+
06	7.70	1.0	1.9	0.0	4.8	10.6	3.8	7.7	15.4	54.8	B
04	7.69	3.6	4.5	0.0	2.7	4.5	1.8	9.1	14.5	59.1	B
02	7.79	3.3	0.0	0.8	1.7	3.3	6.6	14.9	18.2	51.2	B+
00	7.56	4.2	4.2	0.8	0.8	2.5	4.2	14.4	19.5	49.2	B
98	7.05	6.3	1.1	5.1	3.4	7.4	4.0	14.8	18.2	39.8	C+

Knowledge of Police District

Cary divides the Town into three separate police districts as part of their GeoPolicing efforts. The respondents were asked if they knew the district they reside in. Table 19 indicates almost 98% of the respondents did not know the district they are presently in. The respondents were also asked to name either a captain or lieutenant on their district command team. Appendix F shows the responses to this question. Due to the fact most respondents did not know their district, the number of responses was limited to only five.

Table 19. Respondent Knowledge of Policy District.

Year	District 1	District 2	District 3	Don't Know
10	0.2	1.0	1.0	97.8

Police Department Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary) for

contact with the Police Department are shown in Tables B78-B84 in Appendix B. The highest levels of contact (in order) was 56-65 age group (42.9%), townhouse/condo dwellers (42.1%), over 10 year residents (34.9%), and \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (34.3%). The lowest levels of Police contact was the Asians (9.1%), apartment dwellers (9.7%), 0-1 year residents (12.5%), and \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (13.0%). The same set of crosstabulations for the person contacted at the Police Department are shown in Tables B85-B91. The highest contact with police officers was \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (94.4%), those with a college degree (87.2%), and over 10 year residents (86.8%). The highest contact with clerks was for 56-65 age group (22.2%) and those with high school/some college (11.1%). The highest contact with dispatchers was over \$100,000 income level (20.0%) and females (19.7%). The highest contact with animal control was \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (11.1%), those with high school/some college (8.3%), and females (8.2%). There was limited interaction with detectives and no contact with district commanders.

The crosstabulations were conducted on the same variables on the service dimensions. The grades were generally high and consistent across the subgroups for *courteous* (Tables B92-B98), *competence* (Tables B99-B105), *response time* (Tables B106-B112), *fairness* (Tables B113-B119), and *problem solving* (B120-B126). There were no grades below B other than in a few of the small sample size subgroups (n<10).