

POLICE DEPARTMENT



POLICE DEPARTMENT

The performance of the Cary Police Department was assessed with a set of six 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 26.8% (20.0% in 2020) or 107 respondents. Table 20 indicates most of the respondents had contact with a police officer (65.0%) or dispatcher (18.7%). There was somewhat more limited contact with Animal Control (8.9%) or clerk (6.5%).

Table 20. Police Department: Person Contacted (Yes %)

PERSON CONTACTED	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Officer	80	65.0
Dispatcher	23	18.7
Animal Control	11	8.9
Clerk	8	6.5
Detective	1	0.8
District Commander	0	0.0

The Police Department was assessed on five service dimensions (**courteous, competence, response time, fairness, and problem solving**) on the same 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) placed in descending mean order (Tables 21–25). The Police continued to have an excellent overall rating but with a small decline from 2020. The grades remained unchanged for two of the service dimensions and declined for three others. The grade remained at the A level for **response time** with the mean increasing (8.46 to 8.53) which represents the highest mean earned to date. In addition, the grade remained at the A- level for **problem solving** although the mean decreased (8.35 to 8.08). Three service dimensions saw grade declines this year from A to A- including **courteous** (8.58 to 8.39), **fairness** (8.58 to 8.26), and **competence** (8.53 to 8.20). Note that none of the changes reached statistical significance. Overall, very solid ratings for the Police with all the grades in the A to A- level. See Appendix B for selected Police cross tabulations (B172–B225).



POLICE DEPARTMENT

Table 21. Police Department: Response Time

YEAR	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	GRADE
2022	8.53	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.2	5.9	12.9	76.5	A
2020	8.46	3.6	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	5.5	5.5	83.6	A
2018	7.82	9.3	0.0	1.9	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.9	14.8	68.5	B+
2016	8.40	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.0	4.3	2.9	4.3	82.9	A-
2014	8.01	3.9	0.0	1.3	1.3	5.2	1.3	5.2	18.2	63.6	B+
2012	8.36	2.6	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	5.3	9.2	77.6	A-
2010	8.31	1.1	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	1.1	8.4	15.8	68.4	A-
2008	8.18	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	4.4	14.3	15.4	61.5	A-
2006	7.75	1.9	2.9	1.0	1.9	5.8	5.8	9.7	13.6	57.3	B
2004	7.90	2.8	1.9	0.9	1.9	7.5	2.8	4.7	12.1	65.4	B+
2002	7.99	0.0	1.7	0.9	0.0	6.1	3.5	13.9	20.9	53.0	B+
2000	7.59	4.4	2.7	0.9	1.8	0.9	5.3	15.0	23.0	46.0	B
1998	7.30	5.4	2.4	2.4	3.6	4.2	2.4	14.3	25.6	39.9	B-

Table 22. Police Department: Courteous

YEAR	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	GRADE
2022	8.39	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.0	2.8	1.9	4.7	15.0	72.9	A-
2020	8.58	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	0.0	2.5	5.0	86.3	A
2018	8.26	4.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.6	16.9	70.8	A-
2016	8.14	3.2	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.8	4.8	13.6	71.2	A-
2014	8.09	5.1	0.0	0.8	2.5	0.0	1.7	5.1	16.9	67.8	A-
2012	8.53	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.6	1.6	4.8	15.3	75.0	A
2010	8.40	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.0	3.4	16.8	73.9	A-
2008	8.43	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.9	9.8	15.7	69.6	A
2006	7.98	2.4	0.0	0.8	1.6	6.3	2.4	11.1	15.9	59.5	B+
2004	8.11	3.2	2.4	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.8	4.0	15.9	69.0	A-
2002	8.24	0.8	0.8	1.5	0.8	2.3	3.0	6.8	20.3	63.9	A-
2000	7.95	1.5	2.3	0.8	1.5	5.3	3.0	7.6	19.7	58.3	B+
1998	7.72	3.3	1.1	2.2	2.2	3.9	4.4	9.9	21.0	51.9	B

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Table 23. Police Department: Fairness

YEAR	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	GRADE
2022	8.26	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.0	2.8	2.8	3.8	13.2	72.6	A-
2020	8.58	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.5	1.3	3.8	3.8	86.1	A
2018	8.17	4.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.2	2.2	4.5	15.7	69.7	A-
2016	8.06	3.2	1.6	2.4	0.8	3.2	0.0	7.2	11.2	70.2	A-
2014	7.89	5.1	0.9	0.9	3.4	0.9	6.0	3.4	13.7	65.8	B+
2012	8.39	1.7	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.7	3.4	5.1	14.5	72.6	A-
2010	8.19	3.4	1.7	0.8	0.8	2.5	0.0	4.2	15.1	71.4	A-
2008	8.32	1.1	0.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	1.1	11.0	15.4	68.1	A-
2006	7.87	1.7	0.9	0.9	2.6	6.9	1.7	11.2	19.8	54.3	B+
2004	8.10	3.5	1.7	2.6	0.0	1.7	0.9	4.3	15.7	69.6	A-
2002	8.18	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	3.1	3.1	4.7	21.1	63.3	A-
2000	7.74	3.9	3.1	2.4	1.6	3.9	1.6	4.7	20.5	58.3	B
1998	7.49	3.9	2.8	2.2	3.4	7.3	1.7	8.4	18.5	51.7	B-

Table 24. Police Department: Competence

YEAR	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	GRADE
2022	8.20	1.9	1.9	2.8	0.0	1.9	0.9	5.6	14.0	71.0	A-
2020	8.53	1.3	1.3	0.0	1.3	2.5	0.0	2.5	6.3	84.8	A
2018	8.06	5.6	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.2	4.5	3.4	13.5	69.7	A-
2016	7.97	4.0	1.6	2.4	3.2	1.6	0.8	4.8	11.2	70.4	B+
2014	7.93	5.1	0.8	0.8	1.7	2.5	3.4	5.9	14.4	65.3	B+
2012	8.40	1.7	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.6	6.9	11.2	75.0	A-
2010	8.32	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.8	3.4	1.7	3.4	14.4	72.9	A-
2008	8.36	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.9	8.7	19.4	65.0	A-
2006	7.99	1.7	0.0	0.8	1.7	7.5	0.8	11.7	18.3	57.5	B+
2004	8.13	2.6	1.7	0.9	0.9	3.4	2.6	4.3	15.4	68.4	A-
2002	8.23	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.5	3.8	3.1	10.0	20.8	60.0	A-
2000	7.89	3.1	2.4	0.8	0.0	2.4	5.5	7.1	24.4	54.3	B+
1998	7.62	2.2	2.2	2.2	5.5	3.9	2.8	9.4	21.5	50.3	B

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Table 25. Police Department: Problem Solving

YEAR	MEAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	GRADE
2022	8.08	3.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.8	6.7	15.4	66.3	A-
2020	8.35	3.9	1.3	0.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	2.6	7.8	81.8	A-
2018	7.88	5.7	1.1	2.3	0.0	3.4	3.4	4.5	12.5	67.0	B+
2016	7.91	5.0	1.7	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	4.2	11.7	70.0	B+
2014	7.76	6.0	0.9	0.9	1.7	2.6	4.3	9.5	13.8	60.3	B
2012	8.38	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	2.7	5.5	12.7	74.5	A-
2010	8.09	3.6	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.7	0.9	10.8	17.1	63.1	A-
2008	7.83	5.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.7	6.7	13.5	62.9	B+
2006	7.70	1.0	1.9	0.0	4.8	10.6	3.8	7.7	15.4	54.8	B
2004	7.69	3.6	4.5	0.0	2.7	4.5	1.8	9.1	14.5	59.1	B
2002	7.79	3.3	0.0	0.8	1.7	3.3	6.6	14.9	18.2	51.2	B+
2000	7.56	4.2	4.2	0.8	0.8	2.5	4.2	14.4	19.5	49.2	B
1998	7.05	6.3	1.1	5.1	3.4	7.4	4.0	14.8	18.2	39.8	C+

The respondents who gave lower scores (below 5) to any of the service dimensions were then asked about their concerns with the interaction. There were 12 total comments and the main concern was not being able to resolve the issue with 4 comments. All the comments are shown in Appendix F.