Stop Rewarding Completion and Start Rewarding Competence



A safety director reviews the monthly training dashboard and sees what every executive wants to see.

Ninety-eight percent completion.

Only a handful of overdue courses.

Quiz scores are strong.

Supervisors have followed up with their teams.

The report looks clean enough for senior leadership, clean enough for an audit file, and clean enough to make the safety team feel like they’re staying ahead of compliance.

Then a worker is injured doing a task they were trained to perform.

The investigation doesn’t find an obvious missing record. The worker completed the module. The quiz was passed. The acknowledgment was signed. The training was assigned on time and completed before the incident.

But when investigators talk to the crew, the picture changes. The worker didn’t know how the procedure applied to that specific machine. The supervisor assumed the online course was enough. The quiz tested definitions, not real decisions. The procedure had been updated, but nobody confirmed workers could follow the new steps. Other employees admit they were confused too, but they passed the training because the answers were obvious.

The company didn’t have a training gap in the usual sense.

It had a competence gap.

That distinction is becoming more important as organizations add points, badges, leaderboards, dashboards, and automated learning paths to their safety training systems. These tools can help improve participation and retention, but they can also reinforce the wrong measure. If workers are rewarded for finishing, organizations may get more finishing. If supervisors are rewarded for closing

overdue assignments, they may close overdue assignments. If departments are ranked by completion rate, departments may push completion.

None of that proves workers can perform the task safely.

Completion matters. It shouldn’t be dismissed. An employer needs to know who received training, when they received it, what content was delivered, what version was assigned, and whether required learning was completed before exposure. Records are essential for compliance, audits, incident response, insurer reviews, and due diligence.

But completion is not the finish line. It’s the beginning of the evidence trail.

Competence is the ability to apply training in the real workplace, under real conditions, when the safe choice may be less convenient than the shortcut. Competence shows up when a worker recognizes an unexpected hazard, follows a procedure without being reminded, asks for clarification before starting, stops work when controls are missing, reports a near miss, or refuses to rely on habit when the task has changed.

That’s much harder to measure than completion.

It’s also what safety training is supposed to produce.

The problem is that most training systems naturally drift toward what’s easiest to track. Course completed. Quiz passed. Certificate issued. Badge earned. Points awarded. Team ranked. Those metrics are useful, but they can create a false sense of certainty if they become the main definition of success.

A worker can complete fall protection training without knowing how to inspect their harness properly.

A worker can pass lockout training without being able to identify all energy sources on the equipment they maintain.

A worker can finish a WHMIS or HazCom module without understanding how to connect a label, safety data sheet, and exposure risk during an actual task.

A supervisor can complete incident investigation training and still write weak findings that blame the worker instead of identifying system failures.

A team can rank first on a leaderboard and still have poor safety conversations on the floor.

That’s why safety leaders need to be careful about what they reward.

Gamification can make this better or worse. Used poorly, it turns completion into a competition. Used well, it can help organizations recognize the behaviours that lead to competence.

The first step is to stop treating all training as if it has the same purpose.

Some training is awareness. Awareness training introduces a topic, explains general expectations, and gives workers the language they need to recognize an issue. A short module on hazard reporting, emergency procedures, harassment prevention, or basic chemical safety may fit this category.

Some training is procedural. It teaches workers how to follow a specific process. Lockout, confined space entry, fall protection, forklift operation, respiratory protection, machine guarding, spill response, and incident reporting often require more than awareness. Workers need to know the steps and when to use them.

Some training is competency-based. It requires the worker to demonstrate that they can perform the task safely. That may involve observation, hands-on practice, supervisor sign-off, field verification, or practical evaluation.

Some training is leadership reinforcement. It prepares supervisors to coach, correct, investigate, document, and enforce expectations consistently.

These categories shouldn’t be measured the same way. A completion record may be enough to show that a worker received a general awareness message. It may not be enough for high-risk tasks where the worker must demonstrate skill, judgment, or procedural accuracy.

This is where points, badges, and recognition systems can become much smarter.

Instead of awarding a badge simply because someone completed a course, an organization can create badges that represent meaningful stages of readiness. For example, “Orientation Complete” may reflect completion of required new worker modules. “Lockout Procedure Reviewed” may reflect completion of a written procedure and quiz. “Lockout Demonstration Verified” should require supervisor observation or practical sign-off. Those are different milestones, and the system should make the difference visible.

That distinction protects the worker and the employer. It also gives supervisors a clearer role. The LMS can deliver the content and track the record, but the supervisor may still need to confirm that the worker can apply the procedure on the floor.

In many workplaces, this is the missing bridge. Online training is assigned by safety or HR. Workers complete it. Records are stored. Supervisors are told their team is trained. But nobody clearly owns the question, “Can this person now do the task safely?”

That question can’t be answered by a dashboard alone.

A stronger training system gives supervisors specific prompts. After a worker completes a module, the supervisor receives a field check: observe the worker performing the pre-use inspection, ask them to identify the isolation points, have them explain the rescue plan, watch them demonstrate the PPE inspection, or review a real incident scenario with them. The supervisor records whether the worker demonstrated competence, needs coaching, or requires retraining.

Now the record is stronger. It shows that training wasn’t only delivered. It was followed by observation and correction.

This is where gamification can reinforce competence instead of speed.

A worker could earn points for completing a scenario-based refresher, not for finishing fastest. A team could earn recognition for completing a hazard identification walk, not for having zero reported incidents. A supervisor could

earn progress toward a leadership badge by completing coaching conversations after training, not just by clearing overdue assignments. A department could be recognized for closing corrective actions linked to training gaps, not merely for achieving 100 percent completion.

The difference is subtle but powerful.

Completion asks, “Did they finish?”

Competence asks, “Can they do it?”

A good gamification strategy should move the organization toward the second question.

The temptation to reward completion is understandable because it’s visible and clean. Competence is messier. It requires judgment. It may reveal uncomfortable gaps. It may slow the process. It may require supervisors to spend time with workers instead of assuming the LMS has handled everything.

But that friction is part of real safety.

A workplace that only rewards completion may unintentionally train everyone to value speed and closure. A workplace that rewards competence sends a different message: we care whether the learning works.

That message matters because workers notice what the organization measures. If all the attention goes to overdue training, workers learn that the goal is to avoid being overdue. If all the recognition goes to fast completion, workers learn that fast completion is the valued behaviour. If all the dashboards show course status, supervisors may assume their role ends when the course is done.

If the organization measures supervisor follow-up, scenario performance, demonstrated skill, hazard reports, corrective actions, and refresher participation, workers learn something different. They learn that safety training is connected to how work is done.

That connection is what makes training defensible.

Imagine two versions of the same forklift refresher.

In the first version, workers complete an online course, answer a few quiz questions, and receive a badge. The leaderboard shows which shift completed the training fastest. The winning shift gets recognition. The dashboard looks excellent.

In the second version, workers complete a short online refresher that includes site-specific scenarios about blind corners, pedestrian crossings, battery charging, loading dock edges, speed limits, and operating near temporary storage areas. The quiz includes judgment-based questions. After completion, supervisors conduct short observations during actual work. Workers who demonstrate safe operation receive a verified refresher badge. Workers who struggle receive coaching and are observed again. The department is recognized when all workers complete the refresher and all required observations are done.

Both systems produce records.

Only one produces stronger evidence of competence.

The same approach can work across many safety topics.

For lockout, reward completion of the procedure review and practical demonstration of isolation and verification.

For fall protection, reward completion of training and supervisor-confirmed inspection, connection, and rescue plan understanding.

For heat stress, reward participation in seasonal refreshers, supervisor-led crew discussions, and early symptom reporting.

For incident investigation, reward supervisors for completing training, using a structured investigation tool, identifying system causes, and closing corrective actions.

For workplace violence prevention, reward completion of scenario training, reporting participation, and supervisor response practice.

For new worker orientation, reward completion of modules, site walk-throughs, mentor check-ins, and supervisor confirmation after the first week.

These examples matter because competence is rarely created in a single event. It's built through information, practice, feedback, observation, correction, and reinforcement. Gamification can help track those steps if the system is designed to value them.

The language also matters. Adult workers are more likely to respect recognition when it sounds operational, not childish. "Safety Hero" may not land well in a tough industrial environment. "Authorized Equipment Orientation Complete," "Supervisor Coaching Pathway," "Incident Response Ready," or "Field Verification Complete" feels more tied to work. The recognition should match the seriousness of the responsibility.

Safety leaders should also be careful with leaderboards. A leaderboard based on completion alone can create pressure to rush. A leaderboard based on competence may be harder to design, but it's more useful. For example, a team-based dashboard could show progress toward completion of a seasonal readiness campaign, including training, supervisor talks, inspections, and corrective action closure. The team is not rewarded for being the fastest. It's recognized for being ready.

That's a more defensible use of visibility.

There's another reason to shift from completion to competence: training fatigue.

Workers get tired of training when it feels disconnected from the job. They get especially tired of training that asks them to click through obvious material, answer simplistic questions, and then return to a workplace where the real problems are never addressed. When gamification is added to that kind of training, workers may feel patronized. The badge becomes a symbol of the problem.

Competence-based recognition feels different because it connects training to real work. It tells workers, "This isn't just a module. This is about whether

you can do the job safely, whether your supervisor supports you, and whether the organization is paying attention.”

That’s harder to dismiss.

It also helps safety leaders defend the value of training to senior management. A completion dashboard says the organization is assigning training. A competence dashboard says the organization is improving readiness. That’s a stronger conversation with executives, insurers, auditors, customers, and regulators.

For organizations using SafetyNow or a similar training platform, the opportunity is to use the system as the backbone of a broader learning process. The LMS can assign the content, track completion, store records, manage refreshers, and support consistent delivery. But the organization should connect that digital record to supervisor follow-up, practical checks, site-specific procedures, and corrective actions. The technology supports the system. It doesn’t replace field leadership.

That’s the central point.

Safety training is not defensible because a worker clicked through a module.

It becomes defensible when the employer can show that the training was relevant, accurate, delivered on time, understood, reinforced, and applied.

A good recognition system should help create that evidence. It should not distract from it.

To make that shift, safety leaders can start with a simple review of their current metrics. Look at what the organization celebrates. Is it 100 percent completion? Fastest department? Lowest overdue count? Most courses completed? Highest quiz average?

Then ask what those metrics might be teaching workers and supervisors.

If they teach people to finish quickly, redesign them.

If they teach people to hide uncertainty, redesign them.

If they teach supervisors to push training without coaching, redesign them.

If they teach workers that the safest learner is the fastest learner, redesign them.

Better metrics might include completion before exposure, scenario performance, supervisor observations completed, practical demonstrations verified, retraining after deficiencies, hazard reports submitted, corrective actions closed, field coaching conversations, refresher participation, and competency sign-offs for high-risk tasks.

Not every topic needs every measure. The system should be proportionate to the risk. A short awareness module may only need completion and a basic knowledge check. A high-risk procedure may require observation and verification. A supervisor training path may require demonstration through incident response, inspections, and coaching quality.

The point is not to make training more bureaucratic. The point is to make the evidence match the risk.

This is where safety teams can use gamification with discipline. Points can reward repeated practice. Badges can represent meaningful readiness. Progress paths can show development. Team recognition can reinforce shared accountability. Leaderboards can be used carefully for campaigns, not careless competition.

But the target must be competence.

When workers earn recognition for demonstrating safe behaviours, the organization sends a stronger signal. When supervisors earn recognition for coaching and verification, the organization strengthens the bridge between training and work. When teams earn recognition for hazard reporting and corrective action, the organization supports prevention instead of paperwork.

That’s how gamification becomes serious.

The future of safety training won’t be won by organizations that produce the most digital badges. It’ll be won by organizations that understand what those badges should mean.

A badge that says “course completed” has limited value.

A badge that reflects training, practice, supervisor verification, and readiness for the task is different.

That badge tells a stronger story.

It says the employer didn’t just deliver information. It checked whether the information could be used.

And in safety, that’s the story that matters.