

**MISSION
AUSTRALIA**

Submission

Submission to The Treasury
and the Department of
Finance regarding the
National approach to
worker screening in the
care and support economy
consultation

October 2025

Contents

- Executive summary3**
- About Mission Australia4**
- Introduction4**
- The current system of worker screening checks is difficult for employers and workers to navigate and work with4**
- WWCCs and WWVP checks create considerable costs and administration for a national organisation 5
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and CALD workers face additional barriers to working in the care and support economy 6
- The national coverage and continuous monitoring components of the NDIS Worker Screening Check work well and should be retained in system redesigns..... 7
- A single national check would best address existing challenges and enhance the care and support economy over the long term9**
- A single national check better safeguards vulnerable Australians and reduces administrative burden and costs for organisations and workers 9
- The safety of vulnerable groups and alignment of reform efforts are critical elements in any national approach to worker screening..... 11
- Detailed planning, extensive consultation and careful implementation processes will effectively support the transition to a single national check.....13**
- Improvements to worker screening processes should prioritise safety and ease of use..... 13
- Co-design and consultation will improve accessibility and balance the nuances of government policies with equity of employment and care 14
- Effective change management approaches can include piloting the new system with a range of organisations, supporting providers to implement the changes and a phased introduction starting with high-risk sectors..... 15

Executive summary

Mission Australia is pleased to provide a submission to the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy* consultation. We strongly believe that the Australian Government should harmonise the current fragmented system of worker screening checks to improve efficiency and outcomes for children, service users and other care recipients.

Robust legislation, regulation and oversight are foundational to the protection and care of vulnerable Australians, and Mission Australia is fully committed to ensuring the safety of its service users and care recipients more broadly. The current system of worker screening checks is difficult for employers and workers to navigate and work with, with key challenges including: the number of checks required to work across multiple jurisdictions, sectors and programs; inconsistent legislation and requirements between jurisdictions and sectors; duplication across checks and systems; and language and accessibility barriers for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) workers, particularly those living and working in remote communities.

To best address existing challenges and enhance the care and support economy over time, Mission Australia strongly supports a single national check that replaces all existing checks. We believe that this option best safeguards children, service users and other care recipients by removing the gaps caused by fragmentation across jurisdictions, sectors and programs. A single national check, underpinned by the key design elements and features described in the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review*,¹ would streamline service delivery, administrative and compliance processes and improve consistency and portability for workers while reducing duplication and administrative and economic costs. Detailed planning, co-design and consultation with service users, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, CALD and LGBTIQ+ groups, and careful implementation processes will effectively support the transition to a single national check.

Mission Australia believes that a single national worker screening check is the simplest, safest, and most efficient way to strengthen the integrity of worker screening while supporting labour mobility and workforce growth in the care and support economy. This proposal also best aligns with the draft recommendation set out in the Productivity Commission's *Delivering quality care more efficiently* Interim Report to align care worker regulation and registration across Federal, state and territory governments by a) developing a national screening clearance for workers in the aged care, NDIS, veterans' care and early childhood education and care sectors and b) developing a national registration system, single portal for workers and mutual recognition arrangements for registered health workers.² We hope that our submission can contribute to national improvements in worker screening checks and enhance quality and safety for children, service users and other care recipients.

¹ The Treasury and Department of Finance (2025). *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review*. Retrieved 29 September 2025 from [National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy - Consult hub](#).

² Productivity Commission (2025). *Delivering quality care more efficiently, Interim Report*. Retrieved 7 October 2025 from [Interim report - Delivering quality care more efficiently](#).

About Mission Australia

Mission Australia is a national Christian charity that has been standing alongside Australians in need since 1859. We combat homelessness, provide housing, assist struggling families and children, address mental health issues, fight substance dependencies, support people with disability and much more. Together, we stand with Australians in need for as long as they need us. In 2023-24, we supported 160,520 people through 477 programs and services across several areas including homelessness, housing, strengthening communities, children and families, youth, employment and disability.

Introduction

Mission Australia welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission to the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy* consultation. We strongly believe that the Australian Government should pursue greater alignment in quality and safety regulation of the care economy to improve efficiency and outcomes for vulnerable Australians, and welcome the directions outlined in the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review*. Harmonising the current fragmented system of worker screening checks will benefit employers and workers by streamlining compliance and reducing duplication, costs and administrative burden. It can also improve safety across sectors and cultivate a mobile workforce that is more responsive to supply demands.

We hope that our submission can contribute to national improvements in worker screening checks and enhance quality and safety for children, service users and other care recipients.

The current system of worker screening checks is difficult for employers and workers to navigate and work with

As a national organisation, Mission Australia is subject to 13 accreditation standards and nine auditing bodies across our service delivery functions, and we must manage worker screening processes within multiple jurisdictions. We are required to comply with over 300 pieces of legislation and regulation, which necessitates dedicated teams and positions for quality and safeguarding. For example, in the last three years our Risk and Assurance Team has grown from seven to 10 FTE, and we need to regularly outsource to boost our internal auditing capacity. In addition, Mission Australia employs many people who work in more than one jurisdiction which involves unique local processes for many worker screening checks, including: assessing the risk a prospective or current worker poses; names for checks; age requirements; validity periods; application and renewal rules; application time; processing time; and payment provision and processing.

Robust legislation, regulation and oversight are foundational to the protection and care of vulnerable Australians, and Mission Australia is fully committed to ensuring the safety of its service users and care recipients more broadly. The purpose of describing our difficulties with current worker screening systems is so that subsequent reforms can address them in a way that maintains or strengthens existing safety and quality guardrails, including those for worker fitness and probity checks, and removes the gaps that compromise the best interests of children, service users and other care recipients. Throughout this document we will use the term “workers” to refer to both employees and volunteers.

WWCCs and WWVP checks create considerable costs and administration for a national organisation

Working with Children Checks (WWCCs) and Working with Vulnerable People (WWVP) checks are particularly burdensome for Mission Australia and the majority of its workers. The current regime is a significant source of risk given the fragmentation across Australian jurisdictions. Specific challenges include:

Determining who needs a verification

- Some states require that Board Directors, Executives and senior management hold a WWCC for their states (e.g. SA) while others do not have this requirement. Managing the different jurisdictional requirements and costs is challenging for staff who are required at times to travel to Mission Australia workplaces across Australia
- Some states require workers to hold a WWCC/WWVP check even if they are in a different state but are accessing children’s records (e.g. NSW)
- During secondments or temporary internal movements, some states require workers to obtain the WWCC/WWVP check of the new state while some states do not if the movement is for a short duration

Submitting applications

- Not all states allow online applications. Some allow applications through physical mail, although this process takes some time. Other states require current or prospective workers to visit a service centre to complete the application (e.g. NSW) which can impose unnecessary burdens. For example, a prospective worker from New Zealand could not start their role without a NSW WWCC clearance, which requires them to travel to NSW to finalise their application
- Some states have particular documentation requirements which create unnecessary wait times, e.g. NSW does not accept laminated documents

Verifying and commencing employment or volunteer work

- Most states require workers to receive their card in the mail or have an approval email before they can commence with an organisation, while WA allows workers to start work with a verified application

- NT allows workers to commence with a three-month exemption
- WA allows workers to commence work with a volunteer card and renew it as a paid employee card once the volunteer card expires, while other states require a non-volunteer card

Renewals

- States such as QLD, WA and NSW allow workers to continue working while their card renewal is in progress. Others, such as the NT and TAS, require the check to be renewed to continue working
- Renewal windows are highly inconsistent across states. Staff can apply for a renewal six months prior to expiry in SA and VIC, 16 weeks prior to expiry in QLD, three months prior to expiry in ACT, NSW and WA, two months prior to expiry in the NT and one month prior to expiry in TAS

Linking and delinking

- VIC requires workers to link themselves to their organisations
- NSW does not require workers to link or delink themselves
- ACT does not have a way for employers to verify, link or delink workers, so employers must email the relevant ACT Government department
- QLD, TAS and SA have portals with log in IDs where employers can link and delink workers
- NT and WA require the completion of online forms to link workers to an organisation. To delink workers, employers must email the relevant NT Government department or complete an online form in WA

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and CALD workers face additional barriers to working in the care and support economy

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) workers experience additional language- and accessibility-related barriers, and limited identification documents mean they are either precluded from participating in the care and support economy or incur higher costs to procure and verify documentation. Mission Australia values diversity in its workforce, as this enhances the organisation's productivity and worker engagement and promotes equality, inclusion and culturally competent approaches to service delivery, for example, by enabling support to be delivered in a way that suits service users' needs, and allowing service users to feel more comfortable with, and better understood by, their workers. The difficulties that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) workers experience with worker screening processes also affect Mission Australia's ability to meet government targets that aim to increase the employment of peoples who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander.

More general difficulties encountered through the different worker screening systems, which are experienced by all organisations and workers, reflect those described in the *National approach to*

worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review. These include inconsistent risk assessment and reporting practices, which may result in offences or misconduct being assessed differently across jurisdictions or critical information being missed, and processing delays which result in recruitment bottlenecks that reduce service capacity and wages.

In general, Australia's worker screening systems are inconsistent, duplicative, expensive and difficult for both organisations and workers to navigate, manage and administer. We welcome the program of work agreed in August 2025 by the Standing Council of Attorneys-General to deliver a national approach and address systemic gaps in WWCCs and WWVP checks, such as implementing mutual national recognition of negative WWCC and WWVP decisions (including negative notices, suspensions and interim bars). However, the above issues, outside of ensuring transparent, accurate and timely worker information, should also be addressed as part of making a reformed system more robust, efficient and practical.

The national coverage and continuous monitoring components of the NDIS Worker Screening Check work well and should be retained in system redesigns

The national footprint of the NDIS Worker Screening Check, and its continuous monitoring, are effective and should be retained. The NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission oversees NDIS Worker Screening Checks in every state and in the NDIS and aged care sectors, which results in simpler and more thorough monitoring of registration and compliance. This system could also serve as a model for the national expansion of other worker screening systems. The use of risk-assessed roles instead of blanket requirements is also seen as working well.

Mission Australia supports the proposed expansion of the NDIS Worker Screening Check to cover the aged care sector.³ We agree that this reform would help to reduce cost, duplication and administrative burden, and improve the flexibility and mobility of the disability and aged care workforce.

³ Australian Government Department of Health, Disability and Ageing (2025). *Screening requirements for the aged care workforce*. Retrieved 30 September 2025 from [Screening requirements for the aged care workforce | Australian Government Department of Health, Disability and Ageing](#).

Case study: Checks for NDIS Partners in the Community

As a National Disability and Insurance Scheme (NDIS) Partner in the Community (PiTC), Mission Australia and its care workers are subject to a range of checks, many of which duplicate or overlap with each other. Three examples of these kinds of challenges are:

- The number of checks required - staff require both national and jurisdictional checks, and staff working across national programs are required to hold WWCCs and WWVP checks specific to each state they work in. Some staff have up to seven checks, allowing them to work across three regions
- Additional national checks for particular programs - for the NDIS PiTC program, every staff member is also required to undergo Commonwealth Government Eligibility and Suitability Screening. This check requires the applicant to provide information that enables the assessment of their identity, eligibility to work in Australia and their integrity and reliability (via the Nationally Coordinated Criminal History Check, a directorship check, a bankruptcy check, employment history, security questionnaire and referee checks)
- The requirement for workers to undergo both police checks and a NDIS Worker Screening Check - NDIS and aged care and employment services workers must renew their Nationally Coordinated Criminal History Check every three years. All workers in NDIS and aged care (apart from non-essential workers in aged care) must additionally maintain a NDIS clearance, which is also monitored via police records. This duplication creates additional administrative and financial burden for the organisation and the worker

A further complication arises when managing conflicts of interest between PiTC and NDIS provider services. Rather than Mission Australia registering as one organisation with the NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission and linking all its workers to the organisation, Mission Australia must have separate registrations for each funded program or provider, and link its workers to the program or provider they are funded by. This means that Mission Australia's workers are separately registered to either aged care programs (as a NDIS provider) or PiTC services (as PiTC is not a NDIS provider but funded directly by the National Disability Insurance Agency). The PiTC registration sits unused from a provider registration perspective but is used to link workers in the back end. Mission Australia has two separate registrations to ensure it appropriately manages the conflicts of interest that exist because of the way the organisational registration process is implemented by the NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission.

A single national check would best address existing challenges and enhance the care and support economy over the long term

Mission Australia strongly agrees that a single national check (Option 2) is the simplest, safest, and most efficient way to strengthen the integrity of worker screening (including outside of the care and support economy) while supporting labour mobility and workforce growth within the care and support economy. Although this option is more expensive, will involve a longer implementation timeframe and requires substantial effort to align different systems, regulations and legislation, over time it will reduce fragmentation and complexity, and improve safety, quality, consistency and efficiency relative to Option 1 (expanded mutual recognition of worker screening checks and standardisation of WWCCs/WWVP checks).

A single national check better safeguards vulnerable Australians and reduces administrative burden and costs for organisations and workers

As a national organisation that runs many national programs, Mission Australia supports the implementation of a single national check that is consistent and transferrable across all programs (national and local), sectors and jurisdictions. From a safeguarding perspective, a single screening and registration process would protect vulnerable Australians by reducing opportunities for unsuitable individuals to move between jurisdictions or sectors undetected, and aligns more closely with existing government frameworks such as the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations,⁴ which advocates for embedding child-safe governance, continuous monitoring, and cultural safety across all care settings. Our position is also supported by the Productivity Commission's *Delivering quality care more efficiently* Interim Report which recommends that Federal, state and territory governments align quality and safety regulations in the care and support economy by a) developing a national screening clearance for workers in the aged care, NDIS, veterans' care and early childhood education and care sectors and b) adopting a unified approach to worker registration across the aged care, NDIS and veterans' care sectors, supported by a national registration system and single portal for workers and mutual recognition arrangements for health workers already registered through the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme. As noted earlier, work is already underway to deliver a national approach and address systemic gaps in WWCCs and WWVP checks, and introduce a NDIS and Aged Care Worker Screening Check that applies across both the NDIS and aged care sectors. Building on these programs of work to create a single national check that covers all programs, sectors and jurisdictions will further strengthen the integrity of worker screening checks and the quality of care and support provided to children, service users and other care recipients.

⁴ Australian Human Rights Commission (2018). *National Principles for Child Safe Organisations*. Retrieved 1 October 2025 from [National Principles for Child Safe Organisations](#).

From an organisational perspective, a single system would enable Mission Australia to streamline our service delivery, administrative and compliance processes, and one large change with a longer transition period would be more efficient and cost effective over time than multiple smaller and staggered changes (as each change is resource intensive, costly and has flow on effects across multiple organisational systems). For example, a uniform set of rules around who requires a verification (e.g. Board Directors, Executives, senior management, frontline workers, those with access to children's records, volunteers), and one application form submitted through one portal creates clear expectations and standards, reduces the chances of staff falling between the cracks of multiple processes and lessens both the associated administrative burden and risks to the organisation (e.g. in terms of compliance to ensure checks are current and relevant, and by enabling a faster risk response). This option would also reduce the time needed to onboard new staff, whose commencement can be delayed because their checks do not clear in time. These savings would mean that Mission Australia could devote more time and resources to our core business of providing care and support across the housing and homelessness, disability, aged care, mental health, community development and employment, education and training sectors.

A single national worker screening check would also improve consistency for workers, while reducing duplication and the administrative and economic costs of maintaining multiple clearances, applying for new checks if their circumstances change (e.g. if they move states or organisations, or are employed under a new contract or government program) or losing wages due to processing delays that postpone their start date (a circumstance that is particularly frustrating if a worker already has a valid check in a different state or sector). Over time, a portable national check may improve workforce mobility and grow and diversify the care and support economy, for example, by improving participation rates for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, CALD and LGBTIQ+ groups and increasing volunteer involvement.

In comparison, the option of expanded mutual recognition of worker screening checks and standardisation of WWCCs/WWVP checks does not offer the same scale of benefits, despite being easier and perhaps faster to implement. Under this option, the existing fragmentation would persist, with workers and organisations still required to navigate four separate checks. As noted in the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review*, this option also creates a new risk of forum shopping, where workers may apply for checks in jurisdictions with lower fees or less stringent criteria, potentially undermining safety and fairness. Overall, expanded mutual recognition of worker screening checks and standardisation of WWCCs/WWVP checks would only partially reduce the complexity and cost of the existing systems, as workers and providers would still face multiple touchpoints and processes, and inconsistent standards and risk assessments would maintain or expand the risks associated with differences in legislation, risk criteria, and operational processes in the current systems. Similarly, alternative models may not produce the same scale of benefits to safety, quality, efficiency and labour mobility as a single national check.

The safety of vulnerable groups and alignment of reform efforts are critical elements in any national approach to worker screening

Mission Australia supports the incorporation of the key design elements and the common design features described in the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review* into a single national worker screening check for the care and support economy. We strongly agree that the safety of vulnerable groups is paramount, that regulation should enhance safety and be targeted, risk-based and proportionate, that reform efforts should be aligned and aim to reduce burden and that cultural safety should be embedded. As summarised in Table 1, many of these elements and features are likely to appropriately address key challenges with the current systems and effectively underpin a national approach to worker screening (ideally in the form of a single national check).

Table 1. Key issues and the design features of a national approach to worker screening that may address them.

Issue	Design features that address the issue
Fragmentation of checks across states and sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement one national check with continuous, near real-time monitoring of criminal and relevant non-criminal conduct - Implement a single clearance standard to help prevent unsuitable individuals from entering or remaining in the workforce - Ensure that the worker screening check does not conflict with other work-related registrations or requirements for specific professions (e.g. Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency registration for nurses or psychologists), or investigate how these systems could complement each other to minimise duplication and increase efficiency. For example, the worker screening check could screen and monitor for banning orders held by the Aged Care Quality and Safety Commission or reprimands or suspensions issued by the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency; currently the onus is on the employer to check these in addition to managing the existing checks
Cross-border workers needing multiple or duplicate checks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce a single national check that is fully portable across states and sectors. This would allow care and support workers in border communities and multi-jurisdiction roles to maintain one clearance, reducing cost and complexity while ensuring consistent safety standards nationwide

<p>Inconsistent risk assessment and reporting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a national risk assessment framework informed by existing standards, frameworks and recommendations such as the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations, the NDIS Practice Standards and the Aged Care Quality Standards
<p>Barriers for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and CALD workers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-design the system with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leaders and Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisations - Provide free or low-cost applications, multilingual resources, and flexible identity verification options - Implement policies and training that ensure respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) and LGBTIQ+ communities, consistent with existing frameworks such as the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations (Principle 4)
<p>Processing delays</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use automated database checks and a myGov “single front door” to expedite low-risk applications while reserving manual assessment for complex cases - Implement and appropriately resource alternative non-digital pathways for remote or low-literacy applicants
<p>Privacy and trust concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Embed strong privacy safeguards, independent oversight, and transparent appeal mechanisms - Implement regular public reporting and evaluation to drive continuous improvement, consistent with existing frameworks such as the National Principles for Child Safe Organisations (Principles 9 and 10)

Detailed planning, extensive consultation and careful implementation processes will effectively support the transition to a single national check

The transition to a national approach to worker screening in the care and support economy will necessitate detailed planning, extensive consultation and careful implementation processes to ensure that the new system enhances safety and quality, promotes equity and inclusion and effectively manages risk and change.

Improvements to worker screening processes should prioritise safety and ease of use

A single national check would offer simplicity, uniformity and efficiency, and should apply to all programs and services within the care and support economy regardless of where they are based or how they are funded or managed. Reviewing each of the current Federal and state systems to identify the most effective practices, and assessing program- and sector-specific requirements, may be a useful starting point. In terms of planning and design, a single national check would also need to consider:

- The appropriateness of using a tiered approach whereby different roles have different documentation requirements (e.g. roles where individuals have no or limited direct contact with children, such as Board Directors, Executives and senior management, could require different documentation to roles that involve frequent contact with children, such as a residential youth worker or early childhood coordinator). This may be one way to harmonise the disparities between states (e.g. regarding who needs a WWCC or WWVP check) and reduce some of the administrative burden on employers and workers, but these factors should be carefully balanced against the need to uphold rigorous safety and quality standards
- Whether the check is initiated by the worker or by the employer - at present, some checks are initiated by workers, and others are initiated by the employer. Each approach has benefits and drawbacks. For example, requiring the worker to initiate the check may mean they receive clearance faster and can commence employment earlier, but employers have less oversight of renewal dates. In contrast, requiring the employer to initiate the check improves oversight but requires more resources to manage, especially for larger organisations with many workers
- Whether all Commonwealth-funded programs will adopt a single national check - currently, additional worker screening requirements for Commonwealth-funded programs in the disability sectors are subject to additional worker screening checks. If these remain when new programs and services are rolled out as part of the disability reform environment (e.g. for foundational services and Navigator roles), they will reduce efficiencies and add complexity to national worker screening reforms. The requirement for additional worker checks should therefore not duplicate or overlap with any national approach

- How to efficiently separate conflicts-of-interest between aged care NDIS services and PiTC services in worker screening processes - Mission Australia provides both types of services and needs to manage conflicts of interest across multiple programs and jurisdictions. Having a centralised, organisation-wide process to manage conflicts of interest and simply recording worker screening requirements against organisations would be a more efficient approach than having separate processes for different programs, sectors and jurisdictions
- Clearer and more robust risk management processes when investigating misconduct or criminal behaviour - currently, each system and jurisdiction handles investigations into misconduct or criminal behaviour differently, and in some cases this can allow an individual under investigation to change states or employers and continue working with children and other vulnerable people. A single national check could introduce a consistent approach that better protects children, service users and other care recipients, provides clearer guidance for organisations and regulators and supports workers while investigations are underway. Reforms could include:
 - Temporarily suspending or restricting checks pending the outcome of an investigation, rather than the check remaining valid while the investigation is conducted
 - Directing organisations to vary an individual's duties while an investigation is conducted, as investigations can take a long time
 - Ensuring that employers finalise or conclude investigations even if the worker leaves mid-investigation and is employed elsewhere
- Amendments to data sharing and privacy legislation, and the intergovernmental agreement, to enable information to be shared across sectors and jurisdictions, as noted in the *National approach to worker screening in the care and support economy Competition Review*

Co-design and consultation will improve accessibility and balance the nuances of government policies with equity of employment and care

There are many opportunities to improve the usability and inclusivity of a single national check by co-designing and consulting with services users, and specifically the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, CALD and LGBTIQ+ communities, workers and organisations who provide or receive care and support. Issues that will benefit from co-designed solutions include how to provide easy access to multilingual support, non-digital application pathways and flexible identity verification options (including for remote communities such as Mornington Island), and how to balance recruitment and diversity targets with appropriate clearance thresholds. For example, Mission Australia highly values, and seeks to improve, the diversity of its workforce to better serve its service users and the communities it operates in. Government policies also encourage organisations such as Mission Australia to employ more people who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. However, the NDIS Worker Screening Check applications of prospective staff who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have been rejected because of low level criminal offences and Mission Australia has had no recourse to appeal these decisions; the organisation, prospective worker, service user and care and support economy are all deprived in these cases. Co-design and consultation on these issues are appropriate forums in which

to consider and balance the nuances of government policies and regulation with equity of employment and care in the care and support economy.

Effective change management approaches can include piloting the new system with a range of organisations, supporting providers to implement the changes and a phased introduction starting with high-risk sectors

To ease the transition to a national worker screening check, Mission Australia suggests:

- Extensively piloting the new approach with a range of organisations to test for any risks, challenges or unintended consequences. National organisations who operate across a range of jurisdictions and sectors and/or have multiple programs and funders may be particularly useful in this regard
- Offering funding or financial support to help providers manage the costs associated with transitioning to the new system (e.g. updating IT systems and training to upskill staff in legal and compliance-related areas)
- Considering a phased introduction beginning with high-risk sectors such as child-related work, disability and aged care
- Allowing workers to use existing checks until they expire, then automatically converting them to the national check
- Conducting an education campaign to inform workers, employers, and service users of the new requirements and benefits of a national approach to worker screening
- Implementing regular public reporting and evaluation to drive continuous improvement