



Defining Supervision in a Professionally Packaged Way



Frank Delano and Jill Shah

There are many different definitions of supervision, some trying to capture its' essence in a sentence or two and others focusing on summarizing the functions supervision entails. Ireland (1994) suggests supervision is a process in which the goals of individuals are met and meshed to ultimately meet the goals of the agency. It is primarily an administrative tool concerned with quality assurance and quality control in the delivery of agency services. Kadushin (1985) saw supervision as comprised of three basic tracks; administrative, educational and supportive, with the supervisor having responsibility to deliver all three components to the supervisee in the context of the supervisory relationship. Austin (1981) defined supervision as

a process with designated functions involving relationships to produce the best possible services. Garfat (1992) speaks of a "S. E. T." format, using the functions of support, education, and training to define supervision as a learning process within the overall framework of enhancing the quality of services delivered to children and their families.

Professionally Packaged Supervision

In our efforts to compose a definition of supervision we have combined the main concepts of relationship and process in a package that creates a working definition of supervision which serves as a model to provide an overview of supervision and be a guide to the everyday functioning of the supervisor. In developing a

common theme for all our training and writing about supervision we have focused on the concept of a "professional package" defined as:

A cohesive concept that logically articulates a commonly accepted professional standard that depersonalizes an issue and stimulates a professional process. Consistent use of the package cultivates an organizational culture that promotes a standard of excellence, cultural competence, and highest quality services. (Delano and Shah, 2006, p. 38)

The concept of building a professional package focuses on framing issues in relation to commonly accepted professional standards and not on issues of personality or indi-

vidual shortcomings. Based on our professional package theme we suggest the following definition of supervision:

Supervision is a professional relationship that provides support, education, monitoring of quality, and creates a safe forum to reflect on professional practice. It should encourage constructive confrontation and critical thinking that informs and improves the practice of all parties. Respecting the inherent hierarchy in the relationship it should accept the responsibility to use power in a thoughtful manner. The dynamics of the supervisory relationship can create a parallel process in all other relationships including that of client/worker.

Ultimately supervision should be the vehicle to create dynamic growth, establish high professional standards, and enhance quality and culturally competent services. (Delano and Shah, 2007, p.7)

Supervision IS Support, Education, Quality Monitoring

In creating our definition we chose to establish our belief of the primacy of relationship in supervision in the first five words. Yet, supervision becomes quite complicated in that while it should embody many of the positive qualities of

all relationships, it should remain "professional" in its' context and actions. The ability for a supervisor to establish a positive professional relationship is dependent on the ability to be self reflective and to establish appropriate boundaries in the relationship. This is particularly difficult for supervisors in therapeutic settings since supervision relationships often have therapeutic qualities and expectations woven through them. For example, one of the "games" supervisees often play in supervision is *protect me, treat me, don't supervise me* (Kadushin, 1968). All of the games have health until a certain point, but in this game the supervisee attempts to be excused from responsibility for their actions by engaging the supervisor to focus on helping them with their personal issues as opposed to fulfilling the primary role of holding up the standards for quality work. This is a particularly difficult boundary for new supervisors in that they have probably been very confident in their therapeutic intervention skills but are yet to be confident in their supervisory role and skills, so they are more prone to falling prey to some of the games that chip away at the professional nature of the relationship. Alwon (2000) points out that supervisors that are promoted from within must also tune into the potential traps that exist in keeping the professional nature of the relationship as they are now supervising

former peers and possibly even friends. The professionally packaged supervisor will pay strong attention to being consistently self aware of keeping appropriate boundaries with supervisees and working to establish their professional image as a supervisor.

It is crucial for the supervisor to provide support for the worker in a variety of ways. The most concrete form of support would be for the supervisor to provide "hands on help" to the worker in difficult situations. This type of help can be extremely supportive, but to keep supervision professionally packaged the supervisor must monitor this to be sure that the hands on support is not preventing the worker from being empowered to do the work competently themselves, and does not compromise the role clarity in the relationship. One example of this would be a supervisor in a residential program who would often help staff pack up the clothes of a client who went AWOL from the program. It is often not a pleasant task and the supervisor felt that rolling their sleeves up to do the work together would create a feeling of support. This worked well until on one occasion the supervisor's staff interrupted an important meeting she was in with the Executive Director to see if "she was ready to pack the clothes." Obviously the attempt to be supportive had crossed the boundaries of clarity of roles and those roles



would need to be re-clarified. Another example of support would be for the supervisor to provide, or advocate for, appropriate resources for staff to do the work effectively. An area of support that is extremely sensitive for a supervisor is being able to “back the decisions” of staff. The supervisor has to allow for staff to have the latitude to occasionally make a decision that might not be the most preferred one and still feel supported while drawing a clear line on what kinds of decisions will not be supported. For instance, a supervisor should be clear that they will not be supportive of decisions that are not ethical in nature, knowingly harmful in some way, reflect significantly poor practice standards, or go against the best interest of the child. While a supervisor should want to be supportive of a decision a worker makes with a child, it should not be at the expense of fairness to the child, quality of service, or something that may be going against the grain of the treatment plan. A supervisor should show strong support for the worker by being clear and stating which decisions will not be supported. On the other hand there should also be clarity on areas where a supervisee can make an independent decision that may be different than what the supervisor would have preferred and still be supported.

Education is one of the primary responsibilities of a supervisor. The supervisor

should provide a number of options for the worker to learn the concepts and skills necessary to do their jobs in a competent manner. This can take place in formal trainings done by the supervisor or in providing training opportunities for the supervisee inside or outside of the agency. The supervisor should be aware of emerging trends in the field and provide access to articles or books that would help the worker keep pace. Much education can also come from the supervisor role modeling techniques and interventions and allowing the supervisee the ability to ask questions about their practice. Perhaps the most important piece of the educational responsibility of the supervisor is to create a climate for learning in as many ways as possible. This would include providing the structural opportunities discussed above but also developing a philosophy that mistakes are primarily a way to learn and improve practice as opposed to a reason to look for blame. In his book “Good to Great” Collins (2001) points out the importance of a leader learning to “conduct autopsies without blame” as way to create a learning culture in an organization. The focus on developing this culture of learning clearly parallels what a supervisor would hope to teach a worker about helping children see mistakes as a natural part of growth and learning and will also help to create a safe forum for the supervisee to be

willing to share their practice in supervision.

Fulfilling a basic role of supervision to monitor quality the supervisor can use many different strategies to make assessments in this area. One concrete method is for the supervisor to do a certain amount of supervision using “management by walking around.” This allows the supervisor to directly observe the supervisee in practice and opens many opportunities to discuss their practice with the supervisee. Of course, the amount of management by walking around has to be balanced with the reality of when the supervisor is present the worker may be presenting one way that may be different than when they are not being observed. Attention should also be given to the question of whether having a supervisor present so often will stifle the creativity and independence of the worker and if it will feel like the often objectionable “constrictive style” of supervision (Rosenblatt and Meyer, 1975) or micromanagement. Another key in being able to monitor quality is to clearly establish what “quality” is for your program. This can be done through establishing clear and measurable goals, setting and communicating what are considered to be standards of excellence, and communicating desirable outcomes in management and client practice. The ability to accurately monitor quality is directly tied to the overall level of professionally

One concrete method is for the supervisor to do a certain amount of supervision using “management by walking around.”

Regular supervision sessions with mutually shared agendas that are valued will set a solid base for this to take place.

packaged supervision. Creating safe forums for supervisees to share their practice, doing regular and collaborative staff evaluations, and establishing high standards across the program culture will all enhance this process and ultimately lead to the bottom line of quality client service.

In composing this definition we have consistently been impressed with how much all the areas of professionally packaged supervision we suggest seem to come together and intertwine. The ability of a supervisor to create a safe forum to reflect on professional practice will significantly enhance the ability for so many of the desired qualities of supervision to emerge more clearly. We often stress that with the privilege of professional judgment comes a responsibility for reflective practice. We feel strongly that this responsibility goes to the very heart of ethical and quality practice in the helping professions. A worker can always take personal responsibility to be reflective on what they are doing, but doing so in supervision itself with the opportunity for support, challenging, and learning becomes crucial to enhance growth and maintain high quality service. A supervisor should make concerted efforts to establish and maintain that safe forum.

A supervisor should contract clearly that while they can never guarantee blanket confidentiality for things a supervisee may share they will

make every effort to respect confidentiality of discussions. A basic guideline for what the supervisor may feel a need to share elsewhere might parallel the process Hoghghi (1988) sets forth in the "need to know" concept. Regular supervision sessions with mutually shared agendas that are valued will set a solid base for this to take place. The supervisor can enhance the safe forum of supervision sessions by a commitment to hold sessions regularly, minimizing interruptions and using the opportunity to encourage the supervisee to share their practice by asking critical thinking questions and exhibiting excellent active listening skills. The willingness of the supervisee to openly share their practice should be a clear expectation of professional growth and competence and should be a focal point of the supervisee's performance evaluation. This can only happen successfully if the supervisor has been able to support the safety of the forum by establishing the culture of learning described above.

Confrontation and Critical Thinking

Few could argue that constructive confrontation and critical thinking are necessary components in a supervisor being able to effectively do their job. However, many supervisors are reluctant to confront in their efforts to be a competent manager and maintain status quos. They "allow" confrontation and critical

thinking but don't push it to the next level. We feel strongly enough about the importance of confrontation to clearly add in the word encourage in our definition of the supervisor's role in confrontation and critical thinking to emphasize the crucial role these two processes play in professionally packaging your supervisory practice. Many times supervisors avoid confrontation because they want to be seen as "nice," they are not confident in their competence at confronting effectively, they have already waited too long to confront (and have thus already validated the behavior), or they are concerned the reaction of the worker to being confronted will create a backlash that will make the situation worse. With these concerns about confronting many supervisors overcompensate when they actually do confront and the interaction comes across in an authoritarian way and ends up being perceived as displeasure with the worker, and not the desired effort to improve a professional practice. We feel much of this struggle comes from the fact that most definitions and impressions of "confrontation" have negative or aggressive connotations. As a result we developed a working definition of confrontation that will reframe the concept to better fit the growth potential confrontation brings. We define confrontation as:



- A pro-active intervention to intercept and redirect behavior that may require change and
- To create a forum to better understand and guide the judgment/practice of both parties in order to ultimately improve quality and culturally competent services. (Delano and Shah, 2007, p. 6)

Using this definition as a guideline the supervisor can contract to encourage confrontation in the relationship by stressing the reason for confrontation is primarily to create a forum to better understand the worker's practice and vice versa. Crucial in the definition is the idea that the supervisor enters the confrontation with an open mind that perhaps the behavior they are confronting does not need to change, but is simply one the supervisor does not fully understand. The supervisor may agree the behavior they want to understand better may actually be more effective than what their impression of it was and it may serve to help them improve his/her own practice. It is important that the supervisor does not confront what they perceive to be a deficit in the worker or the worker's personality, but to frame the confrontation in what we call a "professional package" (Delano and Shah, 2007). This requires that the confrontation target a commonly accepted professional standard possibly not being met as opposed to the worker not performing well. For

example, if a worker is late to work in their role of supervising children the confrontation should not focus on the worker's work ethic but on the commonly accepted standards of being at work when scheduled and maintaining a safe level of supervision for children. The entry in to the confrontation should be focused on creating the professional forum to discuss practice and we strongly recommend most confrontations begin with the opening of "help me understand" or "what was your intent?" It is crucial the supervisor deliver the opening genuinely wanting to understand and with appropriate tone. This kind of confrontation model also is an excellent role model for the direct service worker in how they should be confronting children in their care. Our confrontation definition highlights the mutual learning expectations from confrontation and will hopefully allow the supervisor to encourage the supervisee to see it as a regular and normal part of their relationship that should be able to flow in both directions with the supervisee being comfortable confronting the supervisor with the same "help me understand" approach.

Gilberg and Charles (2002) have noted that supervisors give answers but great supervisors ask questions. By creating a culture that encourages the worker to think critically and outside of the box the supervisor establishes an excellent

base for growth for the supervisee, and a constant process of reflecting on current practices. Again, we feel strongly it is not enough for a supervisor to allow critical thinking but to actively encourage and make it a clear desired quality in the program. One way to do this is to create a diverse team (age, gender, experience, ethnicity, etc.) with a strong emphasis on looking at the impact of cultural differences on interventions and practice. We believe that the nature of diversity can (and should) bring some conflict and trouble in a program. The professionally packaged supervisor will welcome the challenges diversity brings and accept the responsibility to work through the difficulties to capitalize on the richness that develops when the different cultural perspectives are blended together. Other ways to encourage critical thinking in a program include having portions of team meetings set aside for just brainstorming, setting up suggestion boxes, and honoring the quality improvement process that looks at critical incidents with the primary eye of "what have we learned?" and not "who should we blame?." One of the keys to professionally packaged supervision is for the supervisor to pay careful attention to the message they are sending in their program around how mistakes are handled and how new ideas are received.

The Ethical Responsibility to use Power Thoughtfully

The ability of the supervisor to come in touch with the concept and reality of power woven throughout the supervisory relationship is crucial on the road to professionally packaging their supervisory practice. Both Hawthorne (1975) and Kadushin (1968) highlight how abdication of power, fear of power, and misuse of power will trigger so many of the unhealthy “games” played on both sides of the supervisory relationship. There is much structural power in the supervisory relationship that clearly favors the supervisor (Delano and Shah 2006). This would include the clear hierarchical “assigned authority” that exists in the relationship. Simply put the supervisor can always “pull rank.” Other structural power might include key roles in hiring, promotions, salary increases, and even termination of the supervisee’s employment. The supervisor’s structural power also includes a potential significant impact on the lifestyle of the supervisee. This would be particularly important to consider in the child and youth care field as it often entails shift scheduling and overtime portioning. These more concrete examples of a supervisor’s power are significant but most often a supervisor can be in touch with these examples of power and in most agencies there are a number of checks and balances to monitor how it is used. In composing our defi-

inition we chose to add the word “ethical” in connection with the supervisor using their power in a thoughtful manner. This was partially connected to encouraging wise use of the structural power but mostly to highlight what we feel is a much more potentially damaging, or potentially empowering, use of power by the supervisor. There are a number of areas of power a supervisor has in this relationship that are much more subtle and have far fewer checks and balances, other than a supervisor’s commitment to strong ethical standards for their practice. One example of this would be the power of the supervisor to control “access” in the relationship. This includes access to the supervisor for support, access to information, and access to others in the agency and the field. In connection to keeping the relationship in a strong professional zone the supervisor must be in touch with the power they have in the expectation of the supervisee to reveal more about themselves personally in the relationship. This might include a worker feeling they must reveal a personally sensitive reason to convince a supervisor for a day off or vacation, revealing medical information explaining why they are out ill, or discussing their counter-transference in practice. Perhaps the most compelling examples of the supervisor’s power is the ability to significantly impact the self esteem of the worker and the

ability to create an “image” of the supervisee in so many different forums. It is in these more subtle areas that a supervisor must be exceptionally thoughtful in regards to the ethical use of their power because of the lack of formal checks on their responsibility and the exceptional impact it will have on the overall trust and integrity in the supervisory relationship. We have developed a working definition of power:

Power is a sometimes structured, often subtle dynamic that has significant effect on any relationship. Power used to “control,” or used in a vengeful way, can be destructive, intimidating and have disastrous effects on a relationship—causing harm to all. Power used thoughtfully, respectfully, and wisely by critical thinkers can create the path for dynamic growth for all involved. (Delano and Shah, 2006, p. 37.)

By including the ethical standard to thoughtful use of power in our definition we are highlighting the crucial task for a supervisor to accept and respect the hierarchically reality that is inherent in the relationship by maintaining their responsibility to monitor quality, while thoughtfully looking for ways to balance the power in the relationship by empowering their supervisee to grow and improve their practice. In our previous article on



power in the supervisory relationship (Delano and Shah, 2006) we laid out a model to pro-actively balance the power and have modified it below:

- The task should match the skills. This entails a strengths-based look at a supervisee with attention to not putting them in a situation where they will look bad or predictably fail. It is important for the supervisor to keep a strengths-based focus while supportively challenging the supervisee to broaden their repertoire of strengths and skills (Gilberg and Charles, 2001).
- Contract the relationship. Supervision should entail an on-going series of contracts that establish and clarify roles and needs of the parties.
- Develop a "learning diagnosis" of each of your supervisees. Part of the contract in the relationship should be to assess with the supervisee how they learn best.
- Do the right thing, not always the best thing. A supervisor must always be aware of the political dynamics in a situation but should also balance power in the relationship by having a strong focus on acting with a high ethical priority. A manager does things right. A leader does the right thing.
- Care about the supervisee as an "individual." There is a need to maintain the relationship on a professional level, but the supervisor

should always be aware of the importance of supervision being a relationship between two people.

Gabarro and Kotter (1980) describe supervision as a relationship between two fallible human beings with mutual dependence. A supervisor should determine and appreciate how the supervisee is valuable to them in the mutual relationship.

- Use shared agendas in supervision. Agendas are essential to structure the supervisory session. We recommend the format of a 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 agenda. For example, in a one hour supervision session, the supervisor would be responsible to devise 20 minutes of the agenda and the supervisee 20 minutes. Acknowledging every session will not be perfectly balanced in terms of needs, the supervisor will maintain responsibility for how to use the last 20 minutes with input from the supervisee.
- The supervisor should delegate outcome, not process, when they assess the supervisee has the basic ability to complete the task. Micro-managing is not a good use of power. By allowing for creativity in the process of completing a task the supervisor allows for growth and new ideas into the program
- The supervisor should encourage critical thinking. It is essential that supervi-

sors encourage supervisees to think on their own. This will help the supervisee in their own career development by creating comfort for thinking "outside the box" and the feeling of empowerment that brings.

- The supervisor should practice and encourage constructive confrontation. The supervisor should also teach the supervisee constructive confrontation skills and encourage the supervisee to use those skills in confronting them when appropriate.

Parallel Processes

The supervisory relationship is only one of many relationships in an organization. One only needs to think back to the impact of having a particularly good supervisory relationship and compare it to the impact of having a particularly negative one to get a sense of how the dynamics in the supervisory relationship can create impact in all other relationships in their lives. In child and youth care settings this concept is exceptionally important as the worker is so involved in developing and using relationships with the children as a primary way to deliver quality service. Garfat (2001) suggests that supervisory interactions should be an opportunity to learn about the doing of their work through experiencing a similar process in the relationship with their supervisor. In a parallel process the supervisee is able to feel

In a parallel process the supervisee is able to feel what a child may be experiencing in their relationship through what they are feeling in the relationship with their supervisor.

what a child may be experiencing in their relationship through what they are feeling in the relationship with their supervisor. It is extremely important for a supervisor to alert the supervisee to this dynamic and to encourage discussion about their experiences in supervision as a way to help them be reflective on their client relationships. Of course the parallel process can go in the other direction where the supervisee may mirror their supervisor's behaviors in their relationships with clients and families. Maier (1987) has said "caregivers are enriched or limited as agents of care according to the care they receive" (p. 120). This clearly suggests the argument that the quality of care and service given to clients is a direct connection to the quality of care given in supervision. Phelan (1990) describes three distinct developmental stages of a child and youth care worker that a supervisor needs to consider in designing their supervisory approach and interventions. Garfat (2001) points out supervisory interventions are most effective if chosen according to the workers ability. These developmental approaches to how a supervisor intervenes with a worker clearly parallel the approach a child and youth care worker should be using in interventions with children and also allow for a professionally packaged supervisor to role model the approaches so the worker actually experiences what they

should be delivering to children in their practice.

While the most obvious impact of parallel processes that develop from the supervisory relationship will be seen in worker/client relationships we suggest that the same dynamic is taking place in relationships throughout the agency at various organizational levels. We support this theory in the importance we place on a supervisor needing to be willing to own the responsibility to balance the power in their relationship with their own supervisor (Delano and Shah, 2006). This willingness to work to empower oneself in the relationship is another example of how a supervisor can role model empowerment for their supervisee and also enhance their own ability to perform their role more effectively. It is simply logical that a supervisor who is feeling empowered in their relationship with their own supervisor, will likely be more able to share the power with their supervisee. Simply put, it is much easier to deliver quality care and supervision when you are receiving quality supervision yourself.

Supervision as the Vehicle to Competent Services

We wish to highlight our belief that dynamic growth, established high standards, and quality and more culturally competent services will be a natural outcome of a supervisor investing in building their professional package by engaging and performing

competently in the areas outlined in the previous sentences. By creating a safe forum to reflect on professional practice the supervisor will allow the worker to blossom in many ways and grow in the range of self reflection and understanding of his/her practice. That safe forum will also encourage critical thinking, constructive confrontation and facilitate the desired learning tone in the program. By using power thoughtfully to empower the worker (i.e delegation, etc.) the supervisor can create more avenues for dynamic growth. Education and support will inherently allow the worker to learn more about their role and themselves. Consistent use of constructive confrontation as we define it will help the worker and supervisor to see that they can learn even through disagreements and that learning can be a mutual process in the relationship. More culturally competent services will emanate from critical thinking, constructive confrontation, thoughtful use of power, education and a safe forum to talk about culturally relevant or culturally sensitive issues. High standards for supervision require that:

1. Supervision is a professional relationship that provides support, education, monitoring of quality and creates a safe forum to reflect on professional practice.
2. Supervision encourage constructive confrontation and critical thinking that



informs and improves the practice of all parties.

3. Respecting the inherent hierarchy in the relationship, supervision accept the ethical responsibility to use power in a thoughtful manner.
4. The dynamics of the supervisory relationship create a parallel process in all other relationships including that of the client/worker.

These key ideas can serve as a convenient guide for the supervisor to work with. Of course, this definition of supervision is meant to capture and reflect a picture of what supervisors need to do to help them successfully reach the bottom line of the overall purpose of supervision; to enhance quality service to clients.

In developing this definition we hope the reader will be able to use it as a daily guideline and barometer for their supervisory practice. We suggest that the supervisor share the definition with those they supervise and have consistent and open discussions about the level of the relationship in the areas outlined in the definition. This is meant to be a working document that encourages continual reflection on the process of professional supervisory practice and high quality service delivery to children and families.

References

- Alwon, F. (2000). *Effective Supervisory Practice 1*, Child Welfare League of America Press: Washington, D.C.
- Austin, M. J. (1981). *Supervisory Management for the Human Services*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers. pp 77-78.
- Delano, F. and Shah, J. (2006). Professionally Packaging Your Power in the Supervisory Relationship, *Scottish Journal of Residential Child Care*, 5(2), 34-44.
- Delano, F. and Shah, J. (2007). Using the "Professional Package" to Help Supervisors Confront in a Culturally Sensitive Manner, *Journal of Relational Child and Youth Care Practice*, 20(1), 5-11.
- Gabarro J. & Kotter, J. (1980). Managing Your Boss, *Harvard Business Review*, 58(1), 150-157.
- Garfat, T. (1992). SET: A Framework for Supervision in Child and Youth Care. *The Child and Youth Care Administrator*, 4 (1), 2-13.
- Garfat, T. (2001). Editorial: Congruence between Supervision and Practice. *Journal of Child and Youth Care*, 15(2), iii-iv.
- Garfat, T. (2001). Developmental Stages of Child and Youth Care Workers: An Interactional Perspective, *CYC-NET online*, Issue 24.
- Gilberg, S. and Charles, A. (2002). Child and Youth Care Practice: Foundation for Great Supervision, *Journal of Child and Youth Care*, 15(2), 23-31.
- Hawthorne, L. (1975). Games Supervisors Play, *Social Work* 20(2), 197-205.
- Hoghugh, M. (1988). *Treating Problem Children: Issues, Methods and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Ireland, R. (1994). How to supervise staff in the residential program. Unpublished manuscript. Staff Training Associates.
- Kadushin, A. (1968). Games People Play in Supervision, *Social Work*, 13(2), 127-136.
- Kadushin, A. (1985). *Supervision in Social Work* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY, Columbia University Press.
- Maier, H.W. (1987). *Developmental Group Care of Children and Youth: Concepts and Practice*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Phelan, J. (1990). Child Care Supervision: the Neglected Skill of Evaluation. In J. P. Anglin, C. J. Denholm, R. V. Ferguson & A. R. Pence (Eds.). *Perspectives in Professional Child and Youth Care* (pp. 131-142). New York: Haworth.
- Rosenblatt, A. and Mayer, J. (1975). Objectionable Styles of Supervision, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 39, 258-265.

Frank Delano is the Director of the JBFCs Institute for Child Care Professionalization and Training in Hawthorne, New York.



Jill C. Shah is the Director of Housing and Quality Management at Lenox Hill Neighborhood House in New York City.



The authors can be reached at professionalpackage@gmail.com