**Q. Everyone's heard the adage that employees don't leave companies, they leave bad bosses. Isn't this just a management training cry to impress supervisors?**

A. More than 57% of workers in a recent survey conducted by Developmental Dimensions International quit a job because of a "bad boss." Of those who stayed, a third gave quitting serious consideration. Here's the bottom line, according to analysis of data and experiences of managers: How managers handle their emotions and how they make other people feel are the strongest drivers of employee retention. More specifically, for many managers, their promotion or selection to lead others is often unexpected, and a third of managers don't like being the boss. With a growing millennial work population who place a high value on work-life balance, making a difference, and positive workplaces, the belief that these young professionals will respond even more negatively to a bad boss is a trend that is expected to continue. So, what makes a bad boss? According to the research, it's bosses who are overwhelmed, unfair, poor listeners, impersonal or disorganized, don't solicit feedback, and withhold responsibility from line workers. The EAP can help supervisors overcome most, if not all of these limitations.

Source: www.hrdive.com "Employees Really Do Leave Bad Bosses, Research Shows"

**Q. Can I learn the details of an employee's personal problems if a release is signed by the employee that allows me to have this information?**

A. An EAP would not have a release with the provisions you mention. Although an employee could sign such a release, it would be discouraged and considered inconsistent with EAP policy and purpose. It could undermine support for the program in general, distract from your role in focusing only on performance, complicate your relationship with the employee, and even jeopardize the program's being perceived as offering safe and ensured confidentiality, which is its most precious asset. Nothing prohibits an employee from sharing information voluntarily with others, including supervisors, of course.

**Q. A common complaint of management advisers is that supervisor documentation is not descriptive, factual, or measurable enough, or it is filled with emotional and subjective language. What other complaints or problems often interfere with effective supervisor documentation?**

A. Another issue interfering with documentation's usefulness is its being created too late or too long after problems are first noticed. It's rare for performance to be an even downward line of deterioration. Rather, deterioration may waver between problematic performance and surprising levels of high achievement despite the downward trend. This choppiness is often graded by supervisors on the high side, creating delays in administrative or corrective actions. This is coupled with employees bringing attention to their achievements or requesting recognition for satisfactory performance. Both tend to drive the curve up as supervisors delay and give troubled employees the benefit of the doubt. Another observation, particularly among alcoholic or drug-addicted employees, is high levels of performance in earlier years of addiction, when hard-driving work ethic and social skills produce a strong following of admirers, most of whom will enable the addict as time goes by. When substance use finally does affect performance negatively, denial or wait-and-see approaches ensue. Supervisors that engage the EAP early-on in their attempts to manage trouble workers risk fewer problems associated with delay and other forms of enabling.