From Training to Transfer of Risk: Why Insurers Are Re-Evaluating Safety Programs as an Underwriting Signal in 2026



As the insurance industry moves into 2026, something subtle but important has changed in how risk is evaluated. Loss history still matters. Experience modifiers still matter. Payroll, classifications, and hazard profiles still matter. But quietly, behind renewal calls and underwriting committees, another question is carrying more weight than it did even three years ago.

Not “Do they have a safety program?”, but “Can they prove it works?”

Safety training has shifted from a compliance expectation to an underwriting signal. For insurers, underwriters, and brokers, the quality, consistency, and defensibility of training programs are increasingly being used as a proxy for how predictable a risk truly is. In a market defined by rising claim severity, tighter margins, and growing litigation exposure, training is no longer just a cost control. It is part of how risk is priced, accepted, restricted, or declined.

This shift did not happen overnight. It has been building through court decisions, claims investigations, and loss reviews where training assumptions failed under scrutiny. As 2026 approaches, the organizations that understand this shift are already adjusting how they assess risk. Those that do not are still relying on checkboxes that no longer protect them.

The End of “Training Exists” as an Underwriting Comfort

For years, safety training lived in a binary world. Either an employer had training or they did not. Either certificates existed or they did not. For underwriting purposes, that was often enough. A safety manual, a list of completed courses, and a statement that training was conducted annually satisfied most file reviews.

That approach worked when claims were smaller, litigation was less aggressive,

and expectations around due diligence were less defined. It no longer works in a world where a single serious injury can cost seven figures and where plaintiff counsel increasingly interrogates training quality, not just training presence. Loss prevention teams are now seeing the same pattern repeatedly. An employer technically complied. Training was delivered. A record existed. But when the claim unfolded, those records failed to hold weight.

Training was outdated. Refresher cycles were inconsistent. Supervisors were not trained to reinforce procedures. Employees transferred roles without updated instruction. Documentation existed, but it did not demonstrate that training was meaningful, current, or applied. From an underwriting perspective, this creates uncertainty. And uncertainty is what insurers price most aggressively.

Why Training Has Become a Proxy for Management Credibility

Underwriters rarely get to see how a company truly operates day to day. They rely on indicators. Claims history is one. Financial stability is another. Safety training has become a third, less obvious but increasingly influential signal.

When training programs are structured, documented, and consistently reinforced, they suggest something broader. They suggest that leadership takes operational discipline seriously. They suggest that systems are followed, not improvised. They suggest that when something goes wrong, the organization is more likely to respond in a controlled, defensible way.

When training programs are fragmented or informal, they suggest the opposite. They suggest that risk controls exist on paper but not in practice. They suggest that supervisors rely on tribal knowledge. They suggest that post-incident explanations will depend more on memory than evidence. In claims reviews, these signals matter. When insurers assess not just what happened, but how well an organization can defend its actions, training becomes a stand-in for overall risk maturity.

Claims Investigations Are Where Training Assumptions Collapse

The moment when training truly reveals its value or its weakness is not during onboarding. It is during a serious claim.

In the aftermath of a severe injury, insurers, legal counsel, and investigators begin asking very specific questions. When was the employee last trained on this task? Was that training job-specific or generic? Was it refreshed after equipment changes or process updates? Was the supervisor trained to enforce the procedure? Can the employer show that the training was understood, not just delivered? In many cases, the answers are uncomfortable.

Records show a course completion from five years ago. Training materials reference equipment no longer in use. Supervisors cannot demonstrate that they received recent instruction on enforcement responsibilities. The employee had transferred departments, but their training record did not follow them. None of these gaps are intentional. But intention is irrelevant once a claim escalates. What matters is whether the employer can demonstrate due diligence in a way that withstands scrutiny.

From an insurance perspective, these failures increase loss costs in two ways.

First, they weaken the employer’s defense, increasing settlement pressure. Second, they lengthen claims through disputes, expert reviews, and extended litigation.

Training Quality and Claim Severity Are Now Linked

One of the more uncomfortable trends insurers are grappling with is that claim frequency is not rising as fast as claim severity. Fewer incidents are resulting in disproportionately larger losses. Training plays a role in this. When employees are not adequately refreshed, minor incidents are more likely to escalate. Improper responses, delayed reporting, or unsafe improvisation can turn manageable injuries into complex claims.

Loss prevention teams increasingly observe that well-trained organizations do not just prevent incidents. They contain them. Employees recognize hazards earlier. Supervisors intervene faster. Reporting is cleaner. Medical responses are more appropriate. All of this influences ultimate claim cost.

Underwriters are beginning to factor this into how they view accounts. Two organizations may operate in the same industry with similar loss histories. But the one with stronger, better-documented training is often viewed as a more predictable risk moving forward.

Why Brokers Are Feeling the Pressure First

Brokers often experience this shift before employers do. Renewal conversations that once focused on pricing and deductibles now include deeper questions about training systems. Carriers ask brokers to clarify how training is tracked, how refreshers are managed, and how supervisors are involved.

For brokers, this creates both risk and opportunity. The risk is being caught between a carrier demanding more proof and a client unprepared to provide it. The opportunity is helping clients strengthen training programs before renewal pressure forces the issue.

Brokers who understand that training is becoming an underwriting signal can position themselves as advisors, not just intermediaries. Those who do not may find themselves explaining non-renewals that feel sudden but were actually predictable.

The Shift from Completion Metrics to Defensibility

One of the clearest changes heading into 2026 is the declining value of completion metrics alone. A spreadsheet showing that 98 percent of employees completed training is no longer persuasive if that training cannot be tied to specific risks, roles, and timelines.

Insurers are increasingly interested in defensibility. Can the employer show that training aligns with the hazards involved? Can they show that refreshers occur at reasonable intervals? Can they demonstrate that supervisors are trained differently than frontline workers? Can they produce records quickly and confidently when requested?

This is not about perfection. It is about credibility. A training program that is clearly structured and consistently applied is far easier to defend than one

that relies on informal practices, even if both technically meet minimum requirements.

What Sophisticated Insurers Are Quietly Doing Differently

While not always visible externally, many carriers are already adjusting internal loss control expectations. Some are weighting training quality more heavily in risk scoring models. Others are using training audits as part of renewal decisions, especially for accounts with recent losses.

Loss prevention recommendations increasingly focus on training cadence, supervisor involvement, and documentation quality, not just hazard identification. Insurers are recognizing that engineering controls alone are not enough if human behavior is not reinforced through training. This does not mean carriers are becoming training providers. It means they are becoming more discerning consumers of training evidence.

What This Means for 2026 and Beyond

As the insurance landscape tightens, safety training will continue to move upstream in risk evaluation. It will influence not just claims outcomes, but underwriting appetite, pricing stability, and long-term insurability. For insurers, this shift offers a way to differentiate predictable risks from volatile ones. For brokers, it offers a way to add value beyond placement. For employers, it offers a warning and an opportunity.

Those who treat training as a static obligation will find it offers less protection than it once did. Those who treat training as a living risk control will find it increasingly influences how insurers view their entire operation. In 2026, safety training is no longer just about teaching workers how to be safe. It is about demonstrating, convincingly, that risk is being actively managed. In an industry built on transferring risk, that demonstration matters more than ever.