

Police Department

The performance of the Cary Police Department was assessed with a set of 6 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 approximately 25.7% (31.9% in 2006) or 104 respondents. Table 15 indicates most of the respondents had contact with an officer (68.3%) or a dispatcher (18.8%) with minimal contact with an animal control (3.4%), clerk (1.7%) or detective (0.9%).

Table 15. Police Department: Person Contacted.

Person Contacted	Number	Percentage
Officer	80	68.3
Dispatcher	22	18.8
Animal Control	4	3.4
Clerk	2	1.7
Detective	1	0.9
Not Sure	8	6.8

The Police Department was assessed on 5 service dimensions on the same 9-point grading scale (Tables 16-20) placed in descending order of ratings). The Police had an excellent profile that has improved significantly from 2006. The respondents rated the performance of the Police Department very strong this year with the grades improving for *courteous* (B+ to A), *competence* (B+ to A-), *fairness* (B+ to A-), *response time* (B to A-) and *problem solving* (B to B+). Overall, all of the means increased this year as well as the grades for the 5 service dimensions. These means represent the highest ratings earned for the Police service dimensions to date.

Table 16. Police Department: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 17. Police Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 18. Police Department: Fairness.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 19. Police Department: Response Time.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 20. Police Department: Problem Solving.

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

Police Department Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, race) for contact with the Police Department are shown in Tables B79-B86. The highest levels of contact (in order) was among apartment dwellers (41.9%), \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (38.5%), 18-25 age group (37.0%), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (34.3%), and \$50,001-\$70,000 income level (32.4%). The lowest levels of Police contact was the over 65 age group (17.4%) and \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (17.4%).

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 B87-B94), *competence* (Tables B95-B102), *fairness* (Tables B103-B110), and *response time* (Tables B111-B118). The only lower grade outside of small sample size subgroups was the grade of C from the 56-65 age group for *problem solving* (B119-B126). Otherwise, the grades were generally high and consistent for *problem solving*.