

TOWN of CARY

> Home > Departments > Town Manager's Office > Public Information > Surveys and Research > 2006 Biennial Survey > Police Department

Police Department

Police Department

The performance of the Cary Police Department was assessed with a set of 10 questions, including one open-ended item. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Department in the past two years. In this case, it was approximately 32% (31% in 2004) or 129 respondents. Again, a nine-point scale from "very poor" to "excellent" was used.

The Police Department had a profile that remained very positive in 2006 though there was a small decline in the several of the means and grades. The respondents rated the performance of the Police Department (Tables 13-17 placed in descending order of ratings) very positively on *competence* (B+), *courteous* (B+), *fairness* (B+), *response time* (B) and *problem solving* (B). However, the means and grades decreased for 4 of 5 of these dimensions compared to 2004. The mean for *problem solving* did increase very slightly, but the grade remained unchanged.

Table 13. Police Department: Competence.

Year	Mean	Very Poor	2	3	4	Average	6	7	8	Excellent	Grade
		1				5				9	
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 14. Police Department: Courteous.

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

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

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

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

The officers, clerks, dispatchers, animal control, and detectives contacted were rated on three dimensions (Table 18). They were rated very high (A-) on *efficiency*, *competence*, and *courteousness* (Tables 19-21). Note there were decreases in the means for the *competence* and *courteousness* dimensions while there was a slight increase in the mean for *efficiency*. Overall, the rating for the actual person contacted remained positive and very high. An open-ended question (Appendix C) asked respondents to "list services they would like from the Cary Police Department that are not now being provided or should be provided with greater support." The most common response was to increase police patrols and visibility especially in neighborhoods (mentioned 18 times), followed by increase speed limit enforcement (mentioned 15 times), and better enforcement of traffic laws (mentioned 5 times). There were 15 comments indicating the Police are doing a good job.

Overall, although 4 of the 8 grades (including 6 of the 8 means) measured for the Police declined slightly this year; the Police Department's marks remain high. It is important to keep in mind the percentage of "excellent" responses continued to be high for all of the service dimensions.

Table 18. Police Department: Person Contacted.

Person Contacted	Number	Percentage
Officer	74	57.8
Clerk	3	2.3
Dispatcher	17	13.3
Detective	7	5.5
More than one type of contact	18	14.1
No Answer	1	0.8

Table 19. Police Department: Efficiency of Person Contacted at Department.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
06	8.08	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	6.3	2.7	10.8	13.5	63.1	A-
04	8.06	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	2.1	0.0	12.8	8.5	68.1	A-
02	8.25	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.1	2.0	8.2	24.5	59.2	A-
00	8.20	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	10.9	18.2	61.8	A-
98	7.60	6.1	0.0	2.4	1.2	6.1	2.4	4.9	29.3	47.6	B

Table 20. Police Department: Competence of Person Contacted at Department.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	Average 5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
06	8.11	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	4.5	2.7	8.0	17.0	63.4	A-
04	8.20	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.2	6.5	0.0	8.7	10.9	69.6	A-
02	8.25	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	6.1	6.1	24.5	59.2	A-
00	8.09	1.8	0.0	1.8	0.0	5.5	1.8	7.3	23.6	58.2	A-
98	7.79	3.7	0.0	2.5	1.2	4.9	3.7	7.4	24.7	51.9	B+

Table 21. Police Department: Courteousness of Person Contacted at Department.

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

06	8.08	2.6	0.9	0.0	0.9	4.3	2.6	9.5	17.2	62.1	A-
04	8.26	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	10.9	10.9	71.7	A-
02	8.29	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.2	4.2	27.1	60.4	A-
00	8.04	5.5	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	1.8	3.6	21.8	63.6	B+
98	7.38	2.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.7	7.4	11.1	24.7	49.4	B-

Police Department Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations for contact with the Police Department are shown in Tables B70-B77. They indicated the highest level of contact (in order) were among \$20,001-\$30,000 income level (45.0%), 18-25 year olds (43.5%), \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (39.1%), those without internet access (39.1%), and African-Americans (37.5%). There was also a slightly higher level of Police contact for other races (36.4%) and 27511 zip code (35.9%).

The crosstabulations were conducted for age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, race, and zip code on the five service dimensions. Most of the grades were high and consistent with the few lower marks coming from small sample size groups as was the case for *competence* (Tables B78-B85). However, the Police did receive a lower mark of C+ for *courteousness* (Tables B86-B93) from apartment dwellers. The grades for *fairness* (Tables B94-B101) were generally high and consistent. *Response time* (Tables B102-B109) did receive two lower marks of C+ from apartment dwellers and the \$70,001-\$100,000 income level. In addition, the *problem solving* (Tables B110-B117) service dimension also had a lower grade from apartment dwellers (C+).



Cary Town Hall, 316 N. Academy St., Cary, NC 27513 (919) 469-4000
[About the Site](#) | [Privacy & Security](#) | [Feedback](#)