

Randy Thomas

Abstract

This chapter discusses the issues associated with law enforcement and the LGBT community. It describes the structure of law enforcement in the USA, the role that law enforcement plays in the criminal justice system and the current relationship between law enforcement and the LGBT community. This chapter also focuses on the victimization of LGBT elders, the criminal justice response, and the need for better outcomes. Information is presented on the legal structure that impacts law enforcement response and the need to understand the interaction between LGBT elders and the criminal justice system. This chapter will also look at law enforcement training and possible prescriptive actions needed to improve to elder LGBT victimization.

Keywords

Law enforcement • Criminal code • LGBT community • Law enforcement policies • Law enforcement training

Utah Police Officer on Leave for Refusing Gay Pride Parade Assignment

A Salt Lake City police officer has been put on leave due to allegations that he refused

to work this weekend's Utah Pride Parade. "If you refuse to do an assignment, that's going to be a problem inside the police department," police spokeswoman Lara Jones said Friday of the officer's need to follow orders. Internal affairs are investigating the officer's refusal, while he is on paid leave Jones confirmed. She would not discuss the officer's reason for refusing the assignment, but said "the vast majority of

R. Thomas (✉)
Exodus International, Orlando, USA
e-mail: Cdr251@gmail.com

officers, when they come to work, they understand that they leave their personal opinions at home and serve the community.”

The Salt Lake Tribune, June 9, 2014

Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the issues associated with law enforcement and the LGBT community. It will explore the structure of law enforcement in the USA, the role that law enforcement plays in the criminal justice system, and the current relationship between law enforcement and the LGBT community. It will also focus on the victimization of LGBT elders, the criminal justice response, and the need for better outcomes. Additional discussion will be presented addressing the legal structure that impacts law enforcement response and the need to understand the interaction between LGBT elders and the criminal justice system. The chapter will also examine law enforcement training and possible prescriptive actions needed to reduce elder LGBT victimization.

Learning Objectives

By the end of the chapter, the reader will be able to:

1. Identify relevant issues of policing that impact the LGBT community.
2. Discuss the history of police/LGBT community relations.
3. Identify the critical issues associated with LGBT elder victimization.

4. Describe service models and intervention strategies that are effective in addressing police/LGBT victimization.

Introduction

Historically, a challenge of law enforcement has been “policing” a diverse population. Confronted with daily contact that can often be viewed from the complex perspectives of both the officer and any individual, the risk of misunderstanding can be great. This is particularly true of the officer’s interactions with what is often characterized as the “minority” community. This could focus on such elements as race, gender, and sexual orientation. This chapter will specifically address LGBT issues and the complex interactions with law enforcement. The challenge will be in not only addressing the concerns of the LGBT community as a whole but also the elders who identify as LGBT.

The primary function of all law enforcement agencies is to protect the public and ensure that laws are obeyed. Law enforcement officers are charged with the duty to enforce laws created by legislative bodies and are most often the gatekeepers to the broader criminal justice system. The system is comprised of law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and corrections. As a rule, the focus of law enforcement is on investigating crimes. All elements of the criminal justice system share a common ethical principle of equitably enforcing the law and protecting the public. Generally, applying this principle means that the system owes a duty to the community and to the public at large, rather than to an individual victim. Any criminal conduct is viewed as an act against the entire community and not just a private wrong. It is critical that any issue involving law enforcement includes a comprehensive understanding of the structure and function of law enforcement at every level (Brandl et al. 2007).

The complexity and diversity of the law enforcement function in the USA is not often understood. Media and television entertainment frequently present a false picture of the nature of policing at every level. Popular shows such as *Law and Order: SVU* and *Cops* (one a creative product, the other a reality show) never truly present the complexity of the average officer's day. The dramatic depictions never address the fact that there are over 17,000 law enforcement agencies in the USA at the local level (United States Department of Justice 2011). Television most often creates the impression that every agency is similar to those in New York or Los Angeles and has vast resources and expertise to apply to every case. In fact, over half of the law enforcement agencies in the USA have less than 10 personnel (United States Department of Justice 2011). We are a nation that prides itself on the ability to provide law enforcement services, even at the lowest level of government.

This fragmentation of policing makes it difficult to draw wide inferences about police–community interaction. This situation is further complicated by the fact that there is no national standard addressing the delivery of police services in an individual community. The very definition of what constitutes a criminal act is determined by each state. Therefore, the statutory construct that establishes the legal environment for law enforcement is state-specific and can vary to a large degree from state to state. Differences in state and local perceptions and experience affect how officers approach the LGBT community. Recent legal issues such as defining sexual behavior, marriage equality, and discrimination directed toward LGBT individuals have demonstrated and highlighted cultural differences in every state. The relationship between sexual orientation and the code of laws of individual states only compounds the difficulty in discussing police behavior and the LGBT community.

Unfortunately, and all too often, the legal structure has defined the LGBT community in terms of behavior that has been codified as criminal. Although the courts have overturned many of these criminal statutes, they can often create an environment for law enforcement in

which LGBT individuals are viewed as “criminals” rather than victims. Specifically, this is found in an aggressive enforcement or moral's offenses such as solicitation and indecent exposure. Often this is done in the context of community policing.

Defining “To Protect and Serve”

Before addressing specific issues of the LGBT community and law enforcement, it is important to clarify the concept of “protect and serve” and the reality of providing police services. While the entire concept of protect and serve makes an ideal short statement to put on the side of police vehicles, it does not explain who gets “protected” or “served.” The words do not provide sufficient guidance or detail as to the complex nature of responding to community calls for service.

Though the primary focus of law enforcement is to respond to reports of suspected criminal activity, in many communities law enforcement is the only public service agency with a 24-hour, 7-day a week response capability. Other public agencies that have this ability are often limited in their mandate to respond (e.g., emergency medical services, fire departments). It is often the case that the public contacts law enforcement to respond to incidents that are clearly not related to any criminal offense, an example being civil disputes. This type of response represents the “serve” function.

Since the 1980s, with the rise of community policing, the “protect” part of the law enforcement function has changed significantly. Community policing was based on the recognition that law enforcement had become “removed” from the environment that they were serving. These efforts were an acknowledgment that law enforcement had a larger role to play in creating safe communities that addressed the concerns of all members of a community. It was not simply responding to calls from the public.

The actual outcomes of this approach have not always been effective; however, they do show that law enforcement has made an effort to promote a

more inclusive service approach. This approach has not always reduced the tension between certain segments of society and the police. A recent Executive Session on Policing conducted by the Harvard Kennedy School and the National Institute of Justice focused on the concept of “rightful policing,” an approach that challenges concept of simply enforcing the laws but on the importance of the perception citizens have of their contact with the police. Simply put, it is critical that this contact be respectful and legitimate, an important concept when addressing the concerns of the LGBT community (Mearns 2015). Critical to all this discussion is an understanding of whom law enforcement is protecting and serving with respect to the LGBT population. In a research brief prepared by the National Center on Elder Abuse (National Center on Elder Abuse 2013), it has been estimated that 9 million Americans identify as LGBT, and of those, 1.5 million may be over 65. These data provide a clearer picture of who may be in need of both service and protection. It is probably safe to assume that these numbers may underestimate the size of LGBT persons because of reluctance to disclose their sexuality. While valid victimization rates for this group are difficult to ascertain, LGBT elders have responded to studies indicating that they have been victimized due to sexual orientation and gender identity. The National Center on Elder Abuse emphasizes that such incidents take place in both community and facility settings and that the LGBT population has been largely ignored in research (Walsh et al. 2011). This situation is further compounded by barriers to reporting abuse, such as homophobia, fear of authorities, and legal issues (Cook-Daniels 1997).

LGBT elders have been subjected to various forms of abuse (see Chap. 17). The most prevalent is verbal abuse based upon their sexual orientation and gender identity. Financial exploitation of gay elder men is also an issue (Meyer 2011). However, this situation is clearly seen in the one form of victimization that almost always creates a law enforcement response—

domestic violence. Many states have domestic violence statutes that do not recognize same-sex relationships in the statute (Network for Public Health, n.d.). Law enforcement then must rely on general criminal statutes pertaining to assault. The ability to provide victim services such as orders of protection is not available because of this deficit in the law. The lack of legal recognition of relationships can hamper law enforcement attempts to craft a solution that holds an offender accountable and protects the victim. LGBT domestic violence is a significant problem and one that most often confronts law enforcement. The ramifications of reporting domestic violence by a victim can be extremely negative. Doing so can result in family rejection, isolation, and a lack of concern by the community at large. Coupled with a lack of services and a legal structure that supports the victim, it is fair to assume that reporting will be very low.

Of special concern is the treatment of transgender persons. The most frequently occurring issue is the profiling of transgender persons as “sex workers.” Other issues may be targeting these individuals by asking for identification and “policing” of public bathrooms designated as male or female. Sometimes, this law enforcement behavior may be coupled with racial profiling that treats these individuals as potential “suspects.” A difficult issue for law enforcement is how to handle transgender persons if they are arrested. The most common practice is to place them in cells based upon genitally determined sex rather than their gender identity. While this places them at great risk of abuse by fellow detainees, it should be understood that this creates a practical challenge for jail/corrections administrators (Amnesty International 2005). The Atlanta (GA) Police Department adopted a policy outlining how to interact with transgender, intersex, or gender nonconforming individuals (APD.SOP.6180). It requires that officers treat these persons in a manner appropriate to their gender identity even though it may be different than that assigned at birth. It also addresses

concerns with how this will be recorded on written documents and does so in way that meets the requirements of the agency and the individual (Atlanta Police Department 2014).

In 2014, the United States Department of Justice began a program addressing the issue of law enforcement and transgender persons, particularly women (The Crime Report 2014). It will be a program that will provide transgender cultural training to local agencies across the country. The core dilemma for law enforcement is developing policies that address such issues as how to address transgender persons, and how are they recorded on a report and the housing in detention. All require not only sensitivity by the officer but administrative procedures that acknowledge the issue but still meet the legal and data collection requirements of the criminal justice system (Police 2013).

Of significant importance is the lack of victimization data for elders. That fact, coupled with the hidden issue of LGBT elder abuse, makes any discussion of law enforcement response difficult. It must be understood that law enforcement can be “data driven.” Any evaluation of police services often relies upon crime statistics. The primary vehicle for this discussion is the reporting mechanism used nationally by most law enforcement agencies, the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS). It utilizes standardized definitions of criminal behavior and captures data with respect to the level of crime by type, victim, and offender characteristics and the relationship between them. This issue becomes critical when attempting to evaluate the impact of crime on the LGBT community. It is almost impossible to determine victimization levels given the manner in which the data are captured. Consequently, it is difficult for law enforcement to make a data-driven case that there exists a problem of crime directed toward the LGBT community and almost impossible to focus on elders. This is most important when law enforcement is developing problem-based enforcement services. Much more needs to be done in this area.

The History of Police and the LGBT Community

The relationship between the police and the LGBT community has historically been an adversarial one. The criminalization of same-sex behavior has put law enforcement in the position of enforcing laws that specifically target the LGBT community. This creates a climate in which LGBT persons are not protected from criminal behavior of others (Amnesty International 2005). Also, this creates conflict whereby same-sex conduct can result in an individual being treated as either a criminal or a victim, depending on the circumstances and the law enforcement response to a specific incident. Police interaction with individuals is often determined by the officer’s biases and the department’s organizational attitude toward a particular group. This is reflected in the quoted newspaper article at the beginning of this chapter. The Amnesty International Report (2005) discusses police targeting of LGBT individuals and selective enforcement of moral offenses such as lewd conduct and solicitation. For example, a common occurrence is a transgender person walking down the street being stopped and questioned about solicitation. This targeting creates a large barrier to addressing positive change and reflects current practice and policy of many law enforcement agencies.

This targeting of moral offenses also reflects a concept in Community-Oriented Policing that targets “quality of life” issues. This approach is designed to create a safer community by aggressively enforcing laws against minor offenses such as public drunkenness, loitering, vandalism, or public urination. The prime example of this style of policing is found in the New York Police Department. Although many contend that this has led to a significant reduction in overall crime in New York, it has also led to accusations of targeting minority populations (Amnesty International 2005). Therefore, it is also an accurate observation that these quality of life offenses can also be used to target the LGBT community.

A survey by Lambda Legal of LGBT individuals as well as those with HIV found that 73 % of respondents (1682 of 2376) reported negative face-to-face contact with the police. These interactions are divided between those that address misconduct and those that demonstrate an unsatisfactory response. Overall, the results demonstrate not only a pattern of hostile attitudes but also an inadequate response to reports of victimization (Lambda Legal 2012).

Little has been done to determine whether LGBT elders are treated differently than their heterosexual counterparts. When the issue of sexual orientation or gender identity is factored into a situation of mistreatment of elders, reliable inferences are difficult to make about treatment of LGBT elders. Most of the literature addressing law enforcement and the LGBT community does not account for age differences.

Creation of a positive relationship. While there are certainly many more studies of negative police conduct toward the LGBT community than positive conduct, there has been a national trend toward law enforcement agencies developing policies that emphasize the creation of a more positive relationship with this community. One strategy is to create an LGBT unit or one nested in another community-based function. However, as mentioned above, the majority of law enforcement agencies within the USA had less than 10 officers, and so the creation of a specialized unit or function is not possible.

Policy Box 26.1: A model structure for a LGBT function within a department

The mission of the LGBT Liaison Unit/Person includes:

- Fostering positive relations between the LGBT community and the department by providing a liaison for community members who may be crime victims and have information or issues of concern to the police department.
- Working with the various units in areas with a large, visible LGBT community

within them, to address concerns of that area.

- Assists in productive dialogue with investigative units concerning LGBT-related crimes.
- Works in partnership with other city agencies, other law enforcement entities, and community-based organizations, education, and involvement in other LGBT-related issues.
- Maintaining an interactive role in recruit-based and in-service police trainings regarding the LGBT community.
- Assisting the department in assessing and adjusting current policies and procedures and their impact on the LGBT community.

Legal structure and crimes perpetrated against LGBT persons. Another significant issue is the legal structure as it relates to crimes against LGBT individuals. The criminal code in most states is gender-neutral. This becomes a problem with those codes that address interpersonal violence (e.g., domestic violence statutes). As stated earlier, many states do not recognize same-sex relationships, which affect how law enforcement reacts to an incident. The recent United States Supreme Court decision regarding marriage equality (*King v. Burwell*) will significantly impact domestic violence statutes and law enforcement enforcement response.

Of significance is the problem of hate crimes. Only five states do not have a hate crime law (i.e., Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, South Carolina, and Wyoming); however, considerable variations exist in who is covered by these laws. Fifteen states recognize neither sexual orientation nor gender identity, 15 states only recognize sexual orientation, and 15 states recognize both sexual orientation and gender identity (Human Rights 2013). These disparities create a confusing and state-specific issue when it comes to designing a law enforcement response that fits all agencies in

the USA. In 2009, Congress passed the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Act (NOLO 2015). The key provisions of the act that impact local law enforcement are focused on providing technical, forensic, and prosecutorial support to agencies when they investigate a violent crime that may be motivated by sexual orientation, gender identity, or a violation of local hate crime laws. It also provides for financial support for expenses associated with the investigation. On the surface, this is a very positive step in furthering a better system for responding to crimes against LGBT persons. However, it does require a local law enforcement agency to apply for the assistance. It also may be difficult to build a prosecutable case if the state statutes do not address hate crimes or the hate crime definition does not include LGBT persons.

Creating an Effective Police Response

The law enforcement community has long been recognized the need to address the issue of diversity. Mentioned earlier, many agencies have created specialized units to create a better response. Training standards have been adjusted to include policing diverse communities, and many communities have developed policies and procedures that recognize concerns of minorities. With the majority of law enforcement agencies having so few officers (US Department of Justice 2008), specialized units are located only in large, resource-rich agencies. What then, are the ideal responses to improve services to the LGBT community and in particular the elderly population?

Tailoring the response. The initial challenge is to design a police response that pertains to most agencies, regardless of size. First, there has to be a problem statement or description that will provide the framework for change. The central issues will be training and accountability. All significant changes in law enforcement have

resulted in changing the content of training. The other issue will be the need to provide for accountability in police interactions with the community. Both areas are critical to creating and sustaining an effective change in law enforcement.

In the USA, police officers receive their training through a system that contains initial entry, in-service, and advanced courses. While there are no national standards for law enforcement training, each state or local government establishes a system of police officer standards and training designed to meet their needs. The length and content of training varies widely, with a requirement to receive in-service training after entering the force not always applied.

Law enforcement training academies are varied in how they are structured. In some states, they are operated by the state and train all law enforcement candidates, and in others, they are operated by individual agencies or regional academies meeting the needs of several jurisdictions. In others, they are part of a technical school system and students fund their own training and there is no agency sponsorship. Although every state sets the training requirements for law enforcement certification and curriculum content, it is often very fragmented system in terms of quality. The average length of initial entry training is 761 hour (about 19 weeks), and the longest training time is about 965 hours, with some as short as 604 hours. Many academies require an additional field training experience ranging from a high of 1678 hours to a low of 225 hours. The majority of training time is spent in two areas—firearms and self-defense. Both of these areas are considered low-frequency events with high risk (driving is often considered in this area as well) (United States Department of Justice 2009).

Special topics. Important to any discussion of LGBT issues training will often fall under community policing or special topics. In most academies, the average number of hours for cultural diversity topics is eleven and content devoted to hate/bias crimes is four (United States

Department of Justice 2006). Training experts support the contention that the most effective way to train law enforcement is through discussion and application through practical problems (Amnesty International 2005). A key issue is also the content of bias/diversity training. Unless it is sensitive to the needs of the officers and content has been developed with community input, such training may lack validity. Any training program directed toward changing behavior (in this case, toward the LGBT community) must have the strong support of agency administration and must emphasize institutionalized and long-term effects. While there have been successful efforts in training and policy and procedures for addressing persons with disabilities or mental health needs, the same effort has not been done for the LGBT community. This could serve as a model.

Accountability. Accountability is another key component of a more effective response and relies on standards set by the agency and its leadership. Its foundation is a set of policies that present a commitment to diversity and fair and equitable responses to community needs that include mechanisms to handle complaints. Most law enforcement agencies have some sort of internal affairs' process to handle citizen complaints. A central issue is whether a citizen feels comfortable filing a complaint and that is there a perception that the process is fair and open. There are many different ways to approach this problem; all rely on the public's perception of fairness and transparency. A critical issue for LGBT individuals is the perception of fair and respectful treatment. The model for meeting this need is often the creation of a special function within the agency to address LGBT issues.

Discussion Box 26.1: Improving the Police Response to LGBT Victims

Officers from the Thomasville Police Department have responded to a domestic violence call. Upon arriving, they discovered that the person who called, John Roberts, had been assaulted by Pete Sanger. After separating the parties, the officers conducted an initial investigation that

included interviewing both individuals, observing injuries to John, and documenting indications of a struggle in the living room. Thomasville is in a state that has a mandatory arrest domestic violence statute.

Discussion Questions:

1. What steps can the officers take to protect the victim and hold the offender accountable?
2. What victim services might be available to the victim?
3. What training should the department do to address the issue of victimization in the LGBT community?
4. How would the officer's personal bias impact the response?
5. What policies should the department have to address this issue?

An Effective Response Model. Many law enforcement agencies have created an organizational function that recognizes diverse groups. Often, this is a reaction to a crisis or a series of negative actions. These agencies represent a diverse range of communities with respect to size and resources available to law enforcement. In Fort Worth, Dallas, New York, Washington, D. C., Chicago, and Salem, Massachusetts have created LGBT liaison units (Stiffler 2010). What they all have in common is best reflected in the mission statement of the New York Police Department's Community Affairs LGBT Liaison Unit, which includes fostering positive relations, providing a liaison for community members who may be victims of a crime, and maintaining an interactive role in recruit-based and in-service training. These activities are critical in addressing the need to better serve the needs of the LGBT community (NYPD-Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Liaison Unit, n.d.).

Discussion Box 26.2: Developing Effective Policies and Procedures to Improve Police Response to LGBT Victims

Your department has seen an increase in crime directed at LGBT elderly individuals. A concern has been expressed by advocacy groups that your department has not responded appropriately in many cases and that there is a feeling that your officers are not adequately sensitive to their needs. You have been asked by the city administrator to develop and a plan to improve the department's response to this issue.

Discussion Questions:

1. What steps need to be taken to assess the scope of the problem?
2. What are the key elements in developing a policy in this area?
3. How will you address officer concerns?
4. What training should the department do to address the issue of victimization in the LGBT community?
5. How will you evaluate the effectiveness of any change in policy or procedure?
6. Who should be included in the development of the policy?

International approaches. The international community has a less than stellar record respecting the rights of LGBT persons. This is reflected in the global media attention to violent acts directed at LGBT individuals and includes state-sponsored legislation negatively impacting the rights of those individuals. The United Nations (UN) is slowly recognizing this problem and its rightful place in the larger issue of human rights. In 2011, the UN Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) issued a brochure calling attention to criminalizing homosexuality. It specifically addresses such topics as the death penalty for consensual sex acts, age of consent for homosexual and heterosexual acts, and enabling LGBT persons fleeing prosecution to avoid returning to their home countries. How this impacts the law enforcement function in the various nations remains to be seen.

Often policing borrows effective techniques and procedures from the larger international system of law enforcement. However, it is virtually impossible to conduct a reasonable discussion of this issue with respect to the international law enforcement community. The model for law enforcement in the USA has its genesis in the British system. That system is found in most of the former Commonwealth countries such as Canada or Australia. We can often share a common approach to policing; however, these countries have a more centralized form of policing and are not as fragmented as in the USA. The best example of a positive response is to look at a Canadian law enforcement example. While we share many similarities with our northern neighbor, law enforcement in Canada is a more centralized system with local, provincial, and federal agencies. The major cities have control over their local law enforcement, and there are other more regional structures such as Quebec and Ontario. The law enforcement function in the rural areas and those local governments that lack resources is the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). The RCMP provides law enforcement support to all levels of government. During the period 2012–2013, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP) developed a resource document for the LGBT community (Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police 2013). It addresses concerns across the entire spectrum of issues in police/LGBT interactions and could serve as a model for police response in the USA.

Summary

Challenges facing law enforcement and the public safety of LGBT elders are complex. A “one size fits all” approach will not address the diversity of the law enforcement function in the USA. A severe lack of sufficient research on the victimization of elders, particularly among members of the LGBT community, makes it difficult to explore in-depth the law enforcement

response to these individuals. Admittedly, the law enforcement response to the LGBT community has historically focused on the enforcement of offenses that target their sexual orientation rather than crime perpetrated against them. While many of these offenses have either been overturned by the courts or are no longer enforced, this legal approach clearly puts these individuals in the category of offenders and ignores the fact that they are often victims of crime. This problem is exacerbated by a lack of understanding by law enforcement officers of the complex lives these people may live.

Finally, there is a lack of understanding on the part of many citizens of the fragmented system of policing in the USA, a problem further complicated by the fact that the criminal code varies from state to state and that enforcement of these laws is part of a system response that includes prosecutors and the courts. Over 17,000 law enforcement agencies make it difficult to craft a response addressing the needs of every agency. The response to the challenge of providing public safety to the LGBT elder community lies in the need to recognize that a growing problem exists to craft a solution that fits an individual community and then to implement it in such a way that institutionalizes that solution.

Learning Exercises

Self-check Questions

1. What types of challenges do law enforcement agencies face when responding to the concerns of LGBT elders?
2. What makes the victimization of LGBT elders difficult?
3. What statutory constraints impact responding to the victimization of LGBT elders?
4. What does research tell us about the concerns of LGBT individuals when dealing with law enforcement?
5. How does the criminal code make it difficult for law enforcement to adequately protect LGBT elder victims?
6. How effective are hate crime statutes in providing protection to LGBT individuals?

Experiential Exercises

1. Identify a law enforcement agency that has a specialized unit addressing LGBT persons and interview the officers assigned to this unit.
2. Develop a training program for law enforcement that focuses on LGBT issues.
3. Develop a model policy for law enforcement response to LGBT concerns.
4. Identify a LGBT victim and conduct an interview that details their experience with law enforcement.

Multiple-choice Questions

1. The primary function of law enforcement is to provide____?
 - (a) Service
 - (b) Protection
 - (c) Enforce the laws
 - (d) Enforce private actions
2. Law enforcement owes a duty to____?
 - (a) An individual
 - (b) The criminal justice system
 - (c) The courts
 - (d) The community
3. One of the major issues confronting any study of law enforcement is____?
 - (a) Fragmentation
 - (b) Policy
 - (c) Training
 - (d) Community studies
4. Enforcement of criminal statutes is based upon____?
 - (a) State statutes
 - (b) Federal guidelines
 - (c) Individual officer decisions
 - (d) Community pressure
5. There are over _____ local law enforcement agencies?
 - (a) 14,000
 - (b) 15,000

- (c) 16,000
 (d) 17,000
6. The majority of local law enforcement agencies have less than _____ officers?
 (a) 9
 (b) 10
 (c) 11
 (d) 20
7. The standards for the delivery of police services are set by _____?
 (a) The state
 (b) The local government
 (c) The federal government
 (d) Not anyone
8. Community-Oriented Policing targets what type of activity?
 (a) Quality of life
 (b) Crime
 (c) Service
 (d) Victimization
9. The creation of specialized units addressing LGBT issues is complicated by what fact?
 (a) Community standards
 (b) Size of the department
 (c) Laws
 (d) Training standards
10. Law enforcement training standards are set at what level?
 (a) The state
 (b) The federal government
 (c) The local government
 (d) The individual agency

Key

1. c
 2. d
 3. a
 4. a
 5. d
 6. b
 7. b
 8. a
 9. b
 10. a

Resources

American Civil Liberties Union: www.aclu.org/lgbt-rights
 International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission: www.iglhrc.org

References

- Alberty, E. (2014, June 6). Utah police officer on leave for refusing gay pride parade assignment. *The Salt Lake Tribune*. Retrieved June 9, 2014, from <http://www.sltrib.com>.
- Amnesty International. (2005). *Stonewalled: Police abuse and misconduct against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people in the U.S.* Retrieved January 14, 2015, from <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/AMR51/122/2005>.
- Atlanta Police Department. (2014). *Transgender interaction policy* Retrieved February 25, 2015, from <http://www.atlantapd.org/pdf/news-releases/175C2728-D143-4E88-BB16-43E1923D1F3A.pdf>.
- Brandl, B., Dyer, C., Heisler, C., Otto, J., Stiegel, L., & Thomas, R. (2007). *Elder abuse detection and intervention: A collaborative approach*. New York: Springer.
- Cook-Daniels, L. (1997). Lesbian, gay male, bisexual and transgendered elders: elder abuse and neglect issues. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 9(2), 35–49.
- Human Rights Campaign. (2013). *State hate crime laws*. Retrieved January 15, 2015, from <http://www.hrc.org/statelaws>.
- Lambda Legal. (2012). *Protected and served?* Retrieved January 15, 2015, from <http://www.lambdalegal.org/protected-and-served-police>.
- Meares, T. L. (2015). Rightful policing. *New perspectives in policing bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 248411.
- Meyer, H. (2011). *The LGBT senior population's risk of elder abuse*. Retrieved January 16, 2015, from <http://www.ecarediary.com/viewblog.aspx?BlogID=530>.
- National Center on Elder Abuse. (2013). *Mistreatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) elders*. Retrieved January 14, 2015, from http://www.ncea.aoa.gov/Resources/Publication/docs/NCEA_LGBT_ResearchBrief_2013.pdf.
- New York Police Department-Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Liaison Unit. (n.d.). Retrieved January 16, 2015, from http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/community_affairs/lgbt.shtml.

- NOLO: Law for All. (2015). *Hate crimes act (Mathew Shepard Act)*. Retrieved February 25, 2015, from <http://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/content/hate-crime-act.html>.
- Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police. (2013). *Best practices in policing and lgbtq communities in Ontario*. Retrieved February 25, 2015, from <http://www.oacp.on.ca/Userfiles/Files/NewAndEvents/OACP%20LGBTQ%20final%20Nov2013.pdf>.
- Police. (2013). *Dealing with transgender subjects*. Retrieved February 25, 2015, from <http://www.policemag.com/blog/training/story/2013/01/dealing-with-transgender-subjects.aspx>.
- Stiffler, S. (2010). *Police LGBT liaison units: how effective are they?* Retrieved January 16, 2015, from http://www.edgeboston.com/news/national///102392/police_lgbt_liaison_units:_how_effective_are_they?.
- The Crime Report. (2014). *How cops can learn how to protect trans gender women*. Retrieved February 25, 2015, from <http://www.thecrimereport.org/news/inside-criminal-justice/2014-05-can-cops-learn-how-to-protect-trans-women>.
- The Network for Public Health Law. *Domestic violence and same-sex relationships fact sheet*. (n.d.). Retrieved January 20, 2015, from https://www.networkforphl.org/_asset/lmb0yo/Master-List-of-SameSex-Domestic-Violence-Protections-Updated-1262012.pdf.
- United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2011). *Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 2008*. Retrieved June 10, 2014, from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2216>.
- United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. (2009). *State and local law enforcement training academies, 2006*, (Revised 4/1/09). Retrieved January 16, 2015, from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1207>.
- Walsh, C., Olson, J., Ploeg, J., Lohfeld, L., & MacMillan, J. (2011). Elder abuse and oppression: Voices of marginalized elders. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 23(1), 17–42.