**The Overlap between Juvenile Justice and Child Protection- Addressing Challenges of a Dual-System Response to Vulnerable Youth**

**Abstract**

Dual system youth are those involved in both child protection services and the juvenile system for their delinquency. The children and youths involved in these facilities usually have a history of maltreatment and neglect. While the dual systems have a common objective to ensure these children receive the needed care, support and guidance to lead a crime-free life and rehabilitate into society, their overlapping responsibilities often lead to institutional conflicts over ultimate authority to determine how the lives of these vulnerable children must be managed. The essay employs a qualitative research method relying on secondary academic sources to critically analyse whether eh responses of these dual systems to the vulnerable youths impair or ease their traumatic past and lead to better life outcomes. The essay findings will reveal that the dual system may not be completely effective in rehabilitating the vulnerable youths and instead often result in re-traumatising them by providing unstable placements out-of-home care, racial disparities and disengagement with education. Despite these shortcomings, the essay will identify strategies that promise to mitigate the challenges and offer pathways towards more supportive, equitable and better outcomes for the vulnerable crossover youths in the long run.
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# ****Introduction****

Dually involved youth represent a section of youth under the juvenile justice and child welfare systems simultaneously. Dual-system youth are also identified as ‘crossover youth’ as they have been engaged in delinquent activities and are victims of maltreatment (Kelley & Haskins, 2021). The crossover youth population have entered both the juvenile justice system and the child welfare services, at some point, as illustrated in Figs 1 and 2 below.



Figure 1: Crossover youth as victims of maltreatment and engagement in delinquent activities

Source: (Kelley & Haskins, 2021)



Figure 2: Crossover youth are often supervised by both the juvenile justice system and the child welfare system

Source: (Kelley & Haskins, 2021)

Context

A high proportion of justice-involved youth have past histories of abuse, neglect, or care. For instance, crossover youth in both Los Angeles and Arizona have been reported to experience mental health concerns. In contrast, 72 per cent of these youths have been subjected to parental substance abuse, 33 per cent were exposed to domestic violence, and 24 per cent were victims of parental mental health problems (Baglivio et al, 2016; Nash & Bilchik, 2009). Regarding the challenges and outcomes for youth in child protection services (CPS) and the juvenile system, the fragmented division of jurisdictions only makes them more vulnerable, thereby increasing recidivism rates. According to a 2022-2023 Australian report, Australian children involved in dual systems have poorer life outcomes compared to those with any child protection history, including higher rates of homelessness, mental health issues, and poorer educational and employment opportunities (White, Evans & Katz, 2024; White et al., 2024). Thus, there seems to be a direct link between delinquency and maltreatment, as children experiencing neglect or abuse are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour, which causes a large section of children receiving custodial sentences with juvenile services to have child protection histories, making them more vulnerable and traumatised (Levesque & Tomkins, 1995).

However, existing literature also points out the challenges posed by dual-system youth, especially with a lack of family support, maltreatment, and combined factors related to their experiences in the dual system can make them more vulnerable (Kelley & Haskins, 2021). In the above context, this essay aims to evaluate the implications of the overlap between CPS and the juvenile system and analyse whether this dual system can improve life outcomes for crossover youth or make them more vulnerable. Against this backdrop, this essay argues that the dual system fails to provide any support to the crossover youths but makes them more vulnerable by punishing their trauma with unstable placements and failing to give proper care. For this, the essay shall provide a comprehensive understanding of the dual system comprising CPS and the juvenile justice system and their respective roles in safeguarding and supporting the vulnerable crossover youth. The essay shall also analyse how the dual system has failed to rehabilitate the crossover youths with its fragmented approach and conflicting objectives that question its responsibility to ensure rehabilitation and overall well-being of the vulnerable children.

# ****Understanding Dual-System Involvement****

Crossover youth

In the adjudication of charges of child neglect or abuse by juvenile courts, the CPS acts as legal guardians for displaced children. Herz et al (2012) define cross-over children involved in both CPS and the juvenile system, also as dual-status growth, dually-adjudicated youth and dual-jurisdiction youth based on their engagement in different levels of systems. Crossover youth are defined as any youth who has been maltreated and was also involved in delinquent activities, but they may or may not have been subject to CPS or juvenile systems (Herz et al, 2012). Dually-involved youth are a subgroup of crossovers that have entered both CPS and juvenile services at some point (Kelley & Haskins, 2021). Dually-adjudicated youth is another sub-group of dually-involved youth that are not only formally being processed by both systems but are also subject to their formal control and care.

Understanding the Overlap: When and How Dual-System Involvement Arises for Crossover Youth

The juvenile service system and the CPS often serve similar youths, and this overlap begins with child welfare intervention. The dual-system and overlapping take place when crossover youths who have past histories of neglect or abuse or domestic violence and lack family support often end up engaging in delinquent acts, causing prolonged stay in CPS and the juvenile system (Kolivoski, Goodkind & Shook, 2017). To understand how these systems have been dealing with crossover youths, it is important to know the origins of these two systems and how youths move across or between them. From a historic perspective, the shift in the concepts of adolescence and childhood led to the establishment of juvenile courts. Research suggests that to differentiate between children from adults, separate courts were established that addressed the specific needs of children and youths by introducing special programs for dependent, delinquent and neglected children and youths (Cicourel, 2017). The court held it responsible for the children and youths since allegations of delinquency were considered to be the aftermath of all he neglect and abuse inflicted on them. Additionally, studies have shown that government intervention in the personal lives of individuals has had a positive impact, particularly if the delinquency resulted from neglect or lack of family support and care. The rationale has been further supported by the concept of ‘parens patriae’ or ‘parent of the nation’, which also helps manifest the distinction between the concepts of children and adults and justify governmental intervention. Thus, it can be inferred that the courts have fused the ideas of deterring juveniles from engaging in further delinquent acts while considering their welfare as well. In contrast, scholars have criticised the intention asserted by the court and government as a means to meet the requirements of the court system and the child welfare agencies. Nonetheless, children's welfare agencies or institutional settings such as the juvenile service system have gained more attention as out-of-home placement options for youths who were under prolonged custody of the juvenile system, and the concept of *parens patriae* further justified the regulation and supervision of these youths, especially those who lacked family support or are poor.

Overview of pathways to identify crossover youths

The crossover youths are a highly vulnerable section of the population that requires both systems to coordinate to help them rehabilitate and achieve better outcomes. To help these vulnerable children, it is important to identify them based on their history of maltreatment or lack of family support, which form key contributing factors to their engagement in delinquent acts. First, youths with open child welfare cases are arrested for delinquent behaviour and entered into the delinquency system (Herz et al, 2012). Second, youths who are charged and are found to have a history of child welfare cases are then referred to child welfare agencies. Third, when a youth is arrested but without any past child welfare case history is referred to child welfare if a history of maltreatment is found. Last, the youth is arrested, adjudicated and placed in a correctional placement (Herz et al, 2012). However, even after the end of correctional placement time, the child lacks a safe home, resulting in referral to a child welfare centre. It can be said that juvenile delinquents are a section of people with elevated rates of trauma and psychological concerns. At the same time, child welfare youths show delinquent behaviour in addition to their psychological and traumatised lives. Both systems must coordinate their approaches to guide and protect these youths in rehabilitation. In contrast, it is argued that a lack of understanding and structural relationships amongst these agencies (Kim, Garcia & Lee, 2021). For instance, the staff of juvenile justice systems and child welfare services lack effective interactions, which often fail to identify crossover youths that have been engaged in both systems and are highly vulnerable, requiring special attention, support and care (Kim, Garcia & Lee, 2021). The findings suggest that collaboration between both juvenile justice and child welfare systems is indispensable for shaping the lives of juveniles for better outcomes, while their structural challenges or any failure in supporting or guiding these children may aggravate their already complicated and vulnerable lives.

# ****Potential Challenges****

Jurisdictional division- between child protection and juvenile justice authorities.

The institutional conflicts between these two systems in determining the ultimate authority of managing the lives of the crossover youths often have negative outcomes for these children. According to Boyer (1995), both the juvenile service system and CPS have shared responsibilities of acting as legal guardians for displaced children, particularly crossover youths. However, with an overwhelming increase in the number of crossover youths, dependent and neglected children have been burdening both the systems with caseloads and challenging their ability to offer effective care and support to the children. It is argued that while the systems recognise their shared and mutual responsibilities towards the children, institutional conflicts arise over which system has the ultimate authority to manage the lives of these vulnerable children, resulting in ineffective supervision and improper care (Boyer, 1995). Given the role of both child welfare agencies and the juvenile service system to safeguard a child from abuse or neglect by developing appropriate programs for a positive outcome for the children, the institutional conflict over authority and in their respective responsibilities may hurt them.

Conflicting objectives of the two concepts: welfare vs. accountability

Delving further, the relationship between child welfare agencies can be challenging due to a lack of clarity regarding their respective responsibilities. Statutory schemes designate specific objectives that are different for the judicial system and CPS, which makes their objectives contradictory (Hirsch, Dierkhising & Herz, 2018). For instance, in child maltreatment cases, juvenile courts are held responsible for adjudicating charges against parents and for appointing a legal guardian for the child under the jurisdiction of juvenile courts. On the other hand, CPS are responsible for investigating charges and licensing of substitute care homes for the dependents or crossover youths (Boyer, 1995). These findings indicate conflicting objectives of these two systems, where one imposes charges and the other investigates the charges and decides on substitute care homes for the youths. This is often challenging due to failing to offer needed care to the vulnerable youths while performing their respective responsibilities. Conversely, it is argued that these statutorily-assigned responsibilities between the juvenile system and child protection agencies are often ambiguous and signify substantial overlap (Herz et al, 2012). For instance, according to a US study, while many juvenile systems refuse to intervene with dispositional decisions of the children's welfare agencies, identifying that such decisions are strictly within the jurisdiction of the Child Protection agencies. On the other hand, other courts have recognised that juvenile courts have broader jurisdiction than the administrative agencies, including their power to direct the agencies on any particular dispositional matters (Herz et al, 2012). Nonetheless, given that the decisions of the children welfare agencies are regarded as crucial for reshaping the lives of dependent and neglected children for the better, the contradicting objectives and institutional conflicts associated with the dual system ultimately affect the vulnerable youths when their decisions do not meet the needs of the children.

Lack of information sharing and case coordination

Without functional data sharing and linkage between the juvenile system and CPS often lack coordination of the dual-systems and fail to offer effective remedies to the crossover youths. The information related to children during their entry into the juvenile justice system is crucial for CPS to make the required effort in determining the best outcomes for the youths in the long run. According to the National Institute of Justice in the US, it recognises the significance of any information related to the history of a child in the CPS agency to figure out the appropriate intervention in the best interests of the children (Kolivoski, Goodkind & Shook, 2017). It can be inferred that children entering into juvenile system may have a history of prolonged stay in child care agencies as victims, which is crucial for the juvenile court to consider while making required decisions for the children. On the other hand, Kolivoski, Goodkind and Shook (2017) highlight the challenge in determining precise statistics on the number of crossover youth and the lack of information sharing is often considered a contributing factor. In contrast, (models) argue that while sharing of information is critical for helping this vulnerable section of the population, it is equally important to ensure that information is not shared when there is no need to ensure the personal interests of individuals are safeguarded. For instance, self-incriminating data may surface in interviews with youths or published articles across systems, which may cause more harm than benefit to the juveniles and their families if due care is not exercised in information sharing. Therefore, given that crossover youths represent a relatively unrecognised sub-population in each of these dual systems, information sharing is crucial to provide them with the required support and care. However, proper guidance and care must be taken while sharing information to protect the private interests of the individuals.

# Implications of the Dual-system

Re-traumatisation due to institutional discrimination

While involved in the juvenile justice and CPS, the crossover youth may further encounter additional challenges resulting from discrimination and harsh sanctions within the dual system itself. According to Kim, Garcia and Lee (2021), youths with records of maltreatment or abuse tend to receive stricter sanctions than juveniles without such a history of abuse or neglect. Additionally, crossover youths of colour are often sanctioned more than necessary by their offence, which partly reflects ethnic or partial disproportionalities in the child welfare facilities. To support this argument, studies have shown that 17 per cent of crossover youths are more likely to be diagnosed with mental health disorders than those involved in either juvenile or CPS (Kim, Garcia & Lee, 2021). The findings suggest that the existence of high mental health services among the crossover youths must be given adequate support, care and mental health services. On the contrary, prior studies suggest that the majority of dual systems provide access to mental health services to the affected youths. The National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being [NSCAW] examined the collaborative role played by the dual systems in addressing behavioural and mental health issues (Kim, Garcia & Lee, 2021). The results revealed nearly 80 per cent of the dual systems offered the youth inpatient/outdoor mental health services (Kim, Garcia & Lee, 2021). Nonetheless, although the dual systems offer mental health services for the inmates, systematic inequalities often act as constraints for the maltreated youth, thus, re-traumatising them during their stay in these facilities.

In this regard, Hirsch, Dierkhising and Herz (2018) further highlight some key factors that may contribute to the re-traumatisation of the dual-system youths, which include institutional racism present in these public systems. Hirsch, Dierkhising and Herz (2018) describe how racial and ethnic disparities in child welfare facilities and juvenile facilities are noticed in the crossover population. For instance, youths with mental health issues are often subject to non-cooperation due to differences in philosophies, mindsets, cultural or ethnic differences and technical challenges in recognising and tracking cases across systems. Thus, racial or ethnic inequalities in offering mental health services raise additional concerns about the competency of these dual systems in addressing institutional disparities against the crossover youths. In contrast, White, Evans and Katz (2024) assert that geographic, demographic and historic context differ in terms of racial minorities or institutional racism in both judicial and child protection systems. For instance, the US data on dual systems re-arresting dually-involved population reveals that children of colour have been more likely or frequently involved in the dual system compared to the whites and other racial minority groups, irrespective of their differences in offending behaviour. Alternatively, in the UK, a study has shown that youths of white ethnicity were found to be more criminally engaged than those belonging to minority ethnic backgrounds (White, Evans & Katz, 2024). However, youths belonging to mixed-parentage or Caribbean background were more likely to face racial disparity in employment, which consequently impacted future employment opportunities, stability and rehabilitation of the crossover youths within the dual system (White, Evans & Katz, 2024). On the other hand, a Canadian study reveals that children belonging to the First Nations were over-represented in both systems, reflecting the socio-economic inequalities encountered by Indigenous populations of the nations, necessitating immediate culturally appropriate policies and programs (White, Evans & Katz, 2024).

A similar racial inequality is illustrated by a study in New Zealand, where about 96 per cent of children involved in the dual system belong to the Maori community, with limited availability of their records or information necessary to address their vulnerabilities and offering needed care (White, Evans & Katz, 2024). Additionally, girls in the juvenile system are more likely to have parents who are convicted of some crime, and the overlap in both juvenile delinquency systems and child protection services like out-of-home placements mostly contributes to the risk of re-traumatisation and mental illness (Mitra & Panda, 2016). Nonetheless, these findings illustrate how demographic, geographic and cultural differences between the nations highlight the racial disparities that act as additional challenges for dual-system youths, making their vulnerability, leading to negative outcomes like re-offending.

Increased the risk of recidivism

Maltreatment and challenges in dual systems facilities often contribute to juvenile delinquency, and crossover youths pose a higher risk of engaging in adult crimes. According to Ball, Baidawi and FitzGerald (2024), the history of maltreatment experienced by children in child protection welfare agencies is often linked with juvenile delinquency and committing crimes in adulthood or the future. A simultaneous study also reveals the likelihood of crossover youths who were placed out-of-home have been engaged in offending in their adulthood, especially if they have a history of placement instability (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). Further, additional risk factors like racial disparities often re-traumatise their lives, leading to future delinquency (White, Evans & Katz, 2024). It can be said that placement matters since youths placed in foster homes or those who received family support are more likely to have better outcomes than those placed in Child protection facilities. In contrast, research findings about the influence of out-of-home placement on the future delinquency of the crossover youths are not conclusive (Kolivoski, Goodkind & Shook, 2017). Moreover, it is also argued that most adolescents are only placed in out-of-home facilities when they have a record of severe abuse or maltreatment in their family or their mental health condition and behavioural problems that are likely to independently influence their future offending.

Negative impact of adversarial processes on dual-involved children

Crossover youths in dual systems are more likely to be affected by adversarial processes than those involved in a single system, aggravating their trauma. Research suggests that experiences of trauma and adversity further make the children vulnerable to an unstable living environment. According to a 2024 study, maltreated children are subjected to systematic harm such as placement instability, removal, harsh sanctions, custodial and offending contexts and homelessness (White, Evans & Katz, 2024). A research report by the Beyond Youth Custody Programme, which was a learning and awareness programme in England that worked with young juveniles, has shown a negative impact on dual-involved children (Beyond Youth Custody, 2025). For instance, a delinquent named ‘Adisa’ (full name not disclosed due to safety and privacy rules) was engaged in the delinquent system at the age of 16. He faced difficulties in leading a normal life initially and would stay locked in a room without any family support or any support from the protection centre. Another young man named Tyler was abandoned by her family as they considered him danger for being arrested at such early age and was placed at foster home through a charity providing accommodation for homeless youths (Beyond Youth Custody, 2025) While Tyler received support from child protection services but was depressed due to lack of parental or family support. These adversities are likely to cause additional trauma to the children who already have a past with mental health concerns or neglect, abuse or family violence.

Educational disengagement

Educational disengagement has been another major implication of the dual system that fails to provide a better outcome for the crossover youths or dually involved children. According to White, Evans and Katz (2024), dual-involved children are likely to face constraints in engaging with education. Based on studies examining administrative educational data, crossover youths hardly continue with their studies or engage in any higher education. Studies have shown that educational disadvantage leads to disengagement throughout adolescence for dually involved children (White, Evans, & Katz, 2024). For instance, Moore and McArthur (2014) have pointed out that expulsion and suspension from the education system have only led these crossover youths to engage in criminal activities. On the other hand, as asserted by Mitra and Panda (2016) state that education creates a ‘civilisation effect’ which prevents the likelihood of future delinquency and thus, reduces recidivism. It can be inferred that dually involved children not engaged in studies are more likely to become antisocial and commit crimes. However, Jäggi et al (2021) state that educational re-engagement of dually involved children can be made if the dual system provides for adequate care and educational support for the children. It is therefore crucial to employ appropriate methods to avert these adverse implications of the dual systems and ensure proper care and support for these vulnerable children or youths.

# Mitigating challenges

The high representation of children involved across both youth justice systems and child protection remains a significant concern. As discussed above, the factors contributing to higher representation of children in a dual system include maltreatment, abuse, domestic violence, lack of parental support or residential care that are linked with delinquent behaviour of children. On the other hand, the adversities experienced by these vulnerable children during their prolonged stay in the juvenile and child welfare facilities, such as racism, institutional disparities, lack of educational engagement and adequate support or guidance, mostly lead to re-offending and criminal adulthood. Ball, Baidawi and FitzGerald (2024) state that nations like the United States, the UK, Canada, and New Zealand have all been implementing policies to ensure that crossover youths have better outcomes instead of contributing to increasing recidivism rates. For this purpose, studies suggests four strategies that can be used to attain better outcomes for dually involved children across the globe mitigating the challenges that deprives these vulnerable section of the population of the needed care and support- joint practice protocols, policies reducing criminalising of the youths in out of-home care, special practice models like Crossover Youth Practice Model [CYPM] and crossover court lists.

Joint practice policies between the CPS and juvenile justice systems

Joint practice policies help support coordinated and collaborative care across these child protection and juvenile justice systems. A joint policy outlines key responsibilities and roles of juvenile facilities and Child welfare agencies, collaborative and information sharing, case planning guidelines and issue directions for addressing any common issues about the crossover youths (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). A unique joint policy, called JPP-AU-ACT in Australia, is found in the ACT and offers a management framework for both juvenile and CPS (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). Thus, these joint policies are useful for providing a detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of each system, including an assessment mechanism to ensure the dual system offers proper care and support for the maltreated and vulnerable children. On the contrary, it has been argued that joint policies often fail to outline the responsibilities and roles in details regarding how practitioners are likely to address the problems or vulnerabilities of diverse children and youths within the facilities, except for the joint policy in ACT Australia which includes details about cultural support team and their role while working with children or youths belonging to the Indigenous community (Baglivio et al, 2016). Thus, a joint policy can be an effective means to mitigate challenges related to a dual system when it specifies the roles, responsibilities of the facilities, appropriate planning, and appropriate measures to ensure it is culturally appropriate and can help rehabilitate diverse children for their better future.

Policies to reduce criminalisation of crossover youths placed in out-of-home care

Joint policies are used to reduce the criminalisation of youth and children in residential care where they are placed. In the UK and Australia, joint policies like CRC-AU-NSW1, CRC-AU-QLD, and CRC-UK-EW have been introduced to take care of children across the nations. The 208 England’s policy was introduced to ensure national consistency in caring for looked-after children and care leavers, which is the CRC-UK-EW policy. As suggested by Baglivio et al (2016), the underlying objectives of these policies are to avert any unwanted criminalisation of looked-after children or care leavers by supporting agencies in offering ‘trauma-informed care’, enhancing cooperative practices and information sharing programs. In Australia, the 2016 policy or the CRC-AU-NSW2 and in 2018, the CRC-AU-NSW1, CRC-AU-QLD, have been introduced to reduce criminalisation of children and crossover youths placed in residential care (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). While both Australian and UK policies have the same main objectives, the policies in Australia are more culturally inclusive as they provide detailed guidelines about how Aboriginal children and families must be addressed. Additionally, the policies in the UK encompass all looked-after children, while Australian policies are more focused on those placed in residential care only. Nonetheless, these policies prove to be effective in reducing criminalisation of dually involved youths based on the rationale that these children would not be criminals if they received proper parental support or lived in their homes with their families. According to UK data on the efficacy of these policies by the 2018 National Protocol from England, there has been a decline in criminalisation of crossover youths by 92 per cent and an 18 per cent decline in re-offending between 2007- 2018 (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). A recent 2021 Protocol of London further stresses on “engage with, hear and act on the voice of children in care” as an important aspect of implementing the objective of reducing criminalisation of crossover youths (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). These protocols or policies also consider looked-after children belonging to Asian, Black or any minority ethnic background as they are more vulnerable and more likely to be victims of racism and over-representation. Thus, these policies are effective in supporting the youths and children who have been subject to generational trauma or abuse or parental neglect by placing them in residential care or foster homes to ensure they are given proper care and guidance and do not engage in future delinquency.

Crossover court lists

Crossover court lists have been implemented throughout courts o better support youths who have been involved in both family and criminal courts. The crossover list will help identify dually involved children and youths involved in court cases to allow information sharing about such youths so that both the court and CPS can make coordinated and consistent decisions related to the child’s protection (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). For instance, crossover lists have been implemented in Auckland, New Zealand, that is, CCL-NZ (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). This crossover lists strategy is effective in addressing any conflicts that may arise from juvenile or family courts and child welfare facilities operating separately, resulting in overlapping responsibilities. The lists provide a data linkage between the systems to ensure that the children or crossover youths are guided, protected and provided with proper care throughout their stay within the system. Based on formal evidence on the efficacy of this strategy in New Zealand, Judge Tony FitzGerald have mentioned in his article that Crossover Lists have successfully brought together protection and justice services in multiple contexts such as bail context, when discussing appropriate placements for young people and children and preventing them from any disadvantaged situation that may not be beneficial for the crossover youths (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). Therefore, it can be said that Crossover Lists can be useful to address the institutional conflicts and simplify the complex nature of the judicial process by providing necessary information about the children for both juvenile and child welfare and protection agencies to make a coordinated approach in safeguarding the vulnerable crossover youths.

Specialised practice models [CYPM]

The CYPM model is widely implemented as a holistic policy approach to minimise the involvement of crossover youths in the justice system using a more integrated and collaborative method. According to Ball, Baidawi and FitzGerald (2024), this model has been progressively implemented across many jurisdictions in the US as SPM-US-CYPM that encompasses the young children, family, courts, police, statutory and other relevant support services (Ball, Baidawi & FitzGerald, 2024). The CYPM defines crossover youths as dually adjudicated youths and aims at reducing their engagement with the justice system (Hirsch, Dierkhising & Herz, 2018). For this, the model aspires to reduce the number of youths from the out-of-home care, lower the disproportionate number of children of colour or minority ethnic communities that are over-represented. This model supports greater consistency in safeguarding this vulnerable population by creating policies, introducing specific practices for the crossover youths, enhancing cross-system engagement by providing accurate information, case management and data tracking tools (Hirsch, Dierkhising & Herz, 2018). This model is effective as it includes a detailed implementation procedure with a multitude of services associated with juvenile system and CPS such as identification of crossover youths, mental health services, treatment for substance use, parents and family counselling and other relevant services that would help offering proper guidance to these children and rehabilitate in the society.

# Conclusion

The above essay the dual system fails to provide any support to the crossover youths but makes them more vulnerable by punishing their trauma with unstable placements and failing to give proper care. The findings explained how dual systems work and their roles, responsibilities towards vulnerable or crossover youths who have been involved in both juvenile and CPS facilities. The essay findings showed that the dual systems often fail to offer adequate care and support to the youths and instead re-traumatises them in various ways. Dual system youth refers to children who are particularly vulnerable to mental health issues or record of maltreatment and neglect. Although the dual system offers mental health services but existing institutional racism may affect children of colour from accessing those services. Additionally, dual system youths disproportionately represented by colour were vulnerable to experiencing poor outcomes, including mental health concerns and risk of future delinquency, as they are often deprived of needed care and support. As discussed above, maltreated crossover youths are more likely to re-offend in the future if these systems fail to consider their well-being. Some of the major implications of the dual system on the vulnerable crossover youths are disengagement with education, re-traumatising them with racism, institutional conflicts, and placement instability in out-of-home care. Nonetheless, the study also outlined four effective strategies such as joint protocols, policies to reduce criminalisation of crossover youths, crossover court lists and the CYPM special models that can help dual systems to adopt a coordinated approach in safeguarding these vulnerable section of people ensuring that they have better life outcomes and do not engage in further criminal activities in future.
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