



**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships
Semi-annual Report
CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters Data**

**Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families
Data and Evaluation Unit
July 2014**

Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships Semi-annual Report CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters


Introduction

The Rhode Island Department of Children Youth & Families presents the Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnership semi-annual report, Calendar Year 2014 1st and 2nd Quarters. The report provides summary data on families opened to the FCCP from January 1 2014 through June 30, 2014.

I. Characteristics of Active Families

The Family Care Community Partnerships (FCCPs) had 1249 families active during the CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (active defined as opened at least 1 day or greater during the quarter). The total number of children served by the FCCP during these 2 quarters was 2302. A “target” child is identified within a family to allow for a single family record. A family may have more than one child receiving supports and/or services in the FCCP. Figure 1 shows that the proportion of families in the respective FCCPs during the last 6 quarters with the largest proportion of families in Urban Core.


Figure 1: Percentage of Families Active by FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RI Family Information System (RIFIS)

Figure 2 shows the race of the target child. Twenty nine percent are Caucasian/White followed by 5 percent African American/Black. Over 50 percent of children are identified as “Other”. Of those that were reported as “Other”, 28.6% were of Hispanic origin.


Figure 2: Race of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Seventeen percent of the active children in CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters identified as being of Hispanic origin.


Figure 3: Hispanic Origin of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS. Seven percent of the 1249 active families had missing data.

Figure 4 shows the median age of the child. The median age of the child has dropped to 7. It was consistently at age 8 for the last few years.


Figure 4: Median Age of Target Child in FCCP by FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 5 shows the primary language of target children. Seventy eight percent of the children speak English as their first language. The second language spoken by target children is Spanish (10.9 %).

Figure 5: Primary Language of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters




Data Source: RIFIS. Eight percent did not report a primary language.

III. Eligibility Criteria

There are three FCCP eligibility categories. A family may be eligible due to more than one eligibility criteria. Figure 6 shows the percent of FCCP families by their eligibility criteria during the last 6 quarters. Over three-quarters of the children are at risk of child abuse or neglect. The number of children eligible due to a SED has decreased to 17.3% from 22.3% from CY13 3rd and 4th quarters.

Figure 6: Percent of FCCP Families by Eligibility Criteria




Data Source: RIFIS.

Data was taken from FCCP Intake 1A completed in the reported quarters. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can check all that apply.

IV. Response Priority: Response severity among families and face-to-face contact time by Quarter

Figure 7 shows the percentage of families broken down by their respective response priority/category at the time of intake. The greatest proportion of active families was classified as “routine” rather than emergency or urgent within response priority (response severity). This trend has been consistent across quarters since the FCCP inception.


Figure 7: Percent of FCCP Families by Response Priority, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Each of the 3 DCYF severity-level response categories (Emergency, Urgent, and Routine) has a corresponding first face-to-face contact response time as defined in the FCCP Practice Standards. The largest proportion of CPS referrals is classified as routine. The median length of time to make a face-to-face visit with a family identified as routine stayed the same at 8 days from the previous two quarters. Figure 8 displays data on the adherence to the FCCP standards for first face-to-face contact with family according to severity-level response category.

Figure 8: Median length of time (hours) to first face to face contact with family by Response Priority, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

V. Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP

Table 1 displays data on the median and average length of time of families who transitioned from the FCCP over the two quarters. The median length of time in the third and fourth quarters of CY13 was 2.6 months. The median length of time increased slightly to 2.8 months during the first two quarters of CY14. The data is based on date opened to the FCCP to FCCP close/transition.

Table 1: Median and Average Length of Time in the FCCP

	CY13 1st and 2nd Quarters (N= 661)	CY13 3rd and 4th Quarters (N= 575)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N= 676)
Median	71.0	78.0	86.5
Average	108.2	124.2	127.2

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of closed cases during reported quarters.

Table 2 shows the median and average length of time a family spends with an agency. This table only includes families that have transitioned from the FCCP. The median length of time has been increasing over the last 18 months. The median length of time was 3.7 months during the first second quarters of CY14 whereas in the first two quarters of CY13 it was 3.2 months.

Table 2: Median and Average length of Time in the Agency

	CY13 1st and 2nd Quarters (N = 478)	CY13 3rd and 4th d Quarters (N = 420)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N = 503)
Median	97.0	107.5	113
Average	123.9	140.4	139.3

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of closed cases during reported quarters.

VII. FCCP Referral Source

Table 3 displays the percent of DCYF Child Protective and Intake referrals made to the FCCPs. Consistent with previous quarters, DCYF indicated investigation remains the greatest proportion of referral source among these three referral categories.

Table 3: Percent of DCYF Referral Sources

	CY13 1st and 2nd Quarters (N = 1305)	CY13 3rd and 4th d Quarters (N = 1203)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N = 1249)
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	33.7%	34.2%	33.3%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	20.7%	20.9%	21.1%
DCYF: Intake ISR	4.4%	5.6%	4.9%

Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 4 lists the top 5 referral sources to the FCCP. DCYF referrals make up over half of the referrals followed by self referrals (13.0%) and school (4.9%).

Table 4: Top 5 Referral Sources, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N=1249)
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	33.3%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	21.1%
Self Referral	10.4%
DCYF: Intake ISR	4.9%
School System or Education Agency	5.4%

Data Source: RIFIS.

IX. Number of Team Meeting Occurrences by Quarter

Table 5 presents the number of team meeting occurrences. The table includes children/youth that were open to the FCCP for 30 days or greater as a mechanism to potentially reduce the number of children/youth who would be closed to the FCCP and have insufficient time to have a family team meeting occur.

Table 5: Number of FCCP Team Meetings, by FCCP region, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

	East Bay	Northern RI	Urban Core	West Bay	State
Number of Team Meetings	441	162	307	202	1,112
Child/Youth open to FCCP 30 days or greater*	176	253	515	212	1156

Data Source: RIFIS Consumer Assessment Responses by Program. * Child/Youth are those that were open to FCCP for more than 30 days. Some of the children/youth included in these numbers may have closed prior to the time a team meeting occurring.

X . Outcomes**FCCP Close Reason – Differences by the Close Reason**

Table 6 presents data on the FCCP close/transition reasons. The percent of families whose closed/transitioned reason was Wrap completed and goals achieved decreased slightly to 44.4% during CY14 1st and 2nd quarters from 44.8% in the last two quarters of CY13. Closed/transition reasons of “Family Declined Service”, and “Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home” increased during the first six months of CY14 from the last two quarters of the previous year.

Table 6: Top 10 FCCP close reasons, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	CY13 1st and 2nd Quarters (N=661)	CY13 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=575)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N=676)
Team agrees wrap goals have been met*	38.1%	44.8%	44.4%
Unable to contact family	18.5%	13.7%	10.8%
Family declined service	10.6%	10.6%	10.9%
Team agrees wrap goals were not met **	6.3%	7.8%	7.9%
Other	7.7%	5.6%	4.0%
Triaged and Referred Out	4.4%	3.7%	3.1%
Family moved out of area	3.6%	3.1%	4.1%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	3.6%	2.8%	3.4%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed from home	2.3%	2.6%	3.3%
Transfer target child to another FCCP	1.1%	1.7%	2.7%

Data Source: RIFIS. * The family met partial/most/all goals in any of the 4 phases of Wrap. **The goals were not met in any of the 4 phases of Wrap. Data based on the number of closed cases during reported quarters.

Families can complete Wrap at any of the 4 stages. Table 7 shows that 55 percent of the families that met their Wrap goals did so during the “transition” phase of Wrap. Six percent completed partial goals/needs and 49.0% met most/all goals/needs.

Table 7: Phase of Wrap, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

Phase of Wrap	Partial goals/needs met	Most/all goals/needs met
Engagement	3.7%	8.7%
Planning	7.7%	3.3%
Implementation	12.7%	9.0%
Transition	6.0%	49.0%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during January 1 to June 30, 2014.

Table 8 presents data on the top close reasons by referral source categories. Amongst the 5 referral sources, the percent of families in the FCCP with a “positive” close reason of “team agrees the Wrap goals met” comprise the largest proportion of close reasons in the 1st and 2nd Quarters.

Table 8: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 5 referral source categories, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	Referral Source				
	DCYF	YDC (DCYF)	Self-Referral	School	Other
(N= 362)					
Team agrees Wrap goals have been met*	40.8%	33.3%	29.4%	35.3%	31.3%
Unable to contact family	17.1%	33.3%	23.5%	35.3%	23.8%
Family declined service	19.3%	0.0%	29.4%	23.5%	20.0%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met **	14.9%	33.3%	5.9%	5.9%	18.8%
Other	7.9%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	6.3%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during January 1 to June 30, 2014.

Table 9 presents data on FCCP top close reasons by 4 Referral Sources. Three of the 4 referral sources had the largest proportion of “positive” close reason of “Team agrees wrap goals met”. DCYF: CPI Request for Services had the highest proportion of “unable to contact family”.

Table 9: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 4 Referral Sources, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

(N=261)	DCYF: Indicated Investigation	DCYF: CPI Request for Services	DCYF: Intake ISR	Self-Referral
Team agrees Wrap goals have been met*	54.4%	25.5%	36.8%	29.4%
Unable to contact family	10.5%	26.6%	10.5%	23.5%
Family declined service	12.3%	26.6%	21.1%	29.4%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met **	12.3%	17.0%	21.1%	5.9%
Other	10.5%	4.3%	10.5%	11.8%

Data source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during January 1 to June 30, 2014.

Table 10 presents data on cases with a close reason reportedly as “opened to DCYF”. Child opened to DCYF refers to opening to DCYF Family Service Unit or DCYF juvenile probation.

Table 10: Percent of FCCP families with Close Reason reported as “Opened to DCYF”, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

	CY13 1 st and 2 nd Quarters	CY13 3 rd and 4 th Quarters	CY14 1 st and 2 nd Quarters
Child opened to DCYF	7.2%	6.2%	7.1%


Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters. Open to DCYF defined as to DCYF FSU or DCYF probation assigned or YDC.

XI. Functional Assessments

In addition to reasons for the family transition or closing as an outcome measure, functional assessments such as the North Carolina Family Assessment, among others, inform as to whether the family has made family functional improvement as it relates to the Wrap model approach.

The first two quarters of CY14, 73.2% of children who were opened more than 45 days to an agency had a NCFAS baseline completed. This is up from the last two quarters, (62.6%). Sixty six percent of the children who closed/transitioned between January 1 to June 30, 2014 and were open for greater than 45 days to an agency had a baseline and transition NCFAS. This increased from the previous two quarters of CY13, (60%).

Figure 9: Percent of FCCP families that completed NCFAS, at intake and transition



Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases that were open for greater than 45 days to an agency.

Ages & Stages and Ohio Scales

In addition to the NCFAS, the Ages and Stages Questionnaire and the Ohio Scales are two age dependent assessments whose completion rates remains low. Of those children who were open for greater than 45 days to an agency and were age 5 and under, 28.3% had a baseline ASQ. This is an increase from the previous two quarters in CY2013, (5.2 %). Twenty one percent of children who were open for greater than 45 days to an agency and were between the ages of 6-18 had a baseline Ohio Scales Parent Rating. This percentage also increased from the last two quarters of CY13 (13.0%). Table 11 shows the number of completed assessments.

Table 11: Percentage of Completed Assessments for Families Open to an Agency for more than 45 days, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

	CY14 1 st and 2 nd Quarters
Ages and Stages Baseline	28.3%
Ohio Scales Baseline - Parent	21.0%

Data Source: RIFIS. Calculation is determined from the agency intake start date.

Table 12 provides data on the average number of days to complete the NCFAS from family opening to an agency. The FCCP standards for completing a baseline NCFAS is 45 days.

Table 12: Average Number of days for NCFAS completion, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

	CY14 1 st and 2 nd Quarters
Average number of days to complete NCFAS baseline	19.2

Data Source: RIFIS. Calculation is determined from the agency intake start date.

NCFAS Outcomes, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

A 6 point scale is used to rate families ranging from “serious problem (-3)” to “clear strength (+2)”. Table 13 shows the percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and transition. Families appear to be improving in each of the domain areas.


Table 13: Percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=302)

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)
Environment						
<i>Intake</i>	5.6	9.9	14.9	42.7	14.6	11.6
<i>Transition</i>	2.3	4.6	10.6	46.0	21.2	13.9
Parental Capabilities						
<i>Intake</i>	4.3	8.9	21.9	40.4	15.9	7.6
<i>Transition</i>	2.6	4.6	10.9	44.0	26.5	10.3
Family Interactions						
<i>Intake</i>	4.0	15.6	25.5	32.1	16.2	4.0
<i>Transition</i>	2.0	8.3	15.6	41.4	23.8	7.0
Family Safety						
<i>Intake</i>	7.6	11.6	19.5	44.7	9.3	6.0
<i>Transition</i>	2.6	5.6	8.6	55.6	16.6	9.3
Child Well-Being						
<i>Intake</i>	5.3	13.2	18.2	41.4	13.6	6.3
<i>Transition</i>	2.3	5.3	14.2	47.7	19.5	9.6
Social/Community Life						
<i>Intake</i>	2.6	5.0	14.2	54.6	14.6	7.6
<i>Transition</i>	1.3	3.0	8.6	55.6	19.9	9.9
Self-Sufficiency						
<i>Intake</i>	5.3	13.9	22.5	347.4	13.2	9.3
<i>Transition</i>	4.3	8.3	13.6	43.7	16.9	11.9
Family Health						
<i>Intake</i>	6.3	12.9	22.8	39.1	13.9	3.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.3	10.3	15.9	46.0	19.9	4.6

Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 9 shows the amount of change a family experiences from intake to transition in each of the NCFAS domains. For example, a family received a “-2” rating in the Environment domain at intake and at transition they received a “-1” rating. This change shows up as a positive change in the figure below. While a majority of the families did not experience any change from intake to transition, over two thirds of the families maintained positive scores from baseline to transition, ranging from 66.1% to 78.0%. Significant positive changes were found in all domains, ranging from 18.9% to 31.2%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 2.1% to 5.1%.

Figure 10: Percent of Families Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=302)




Data Source: RIFIS.

XII. FCCP Intake Data: Additional Child and Family Characteristics

The following figures show information taken from intakes conducted on the 1236 families who are reported on in this report and were open to the FCCP during CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters.

Figure 11 shows the family structure of the target child. Over 50 percent of the households are headed by single females.


Figure 11: Family Structure of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report.

Figure 12 shows the presenting concerns of the target child. Forty percent of the children indicated mental/behavioral health as a concern, followed closely by stressful life events (39.6 %).


Figure 12: Percent of Presenting Concerns of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can indicate up to five presenting concerns.

Figure 13 shows the caregiver/family concerns presented at intake. Forty three percent had mental health concerns followed by 41 percent who had stressful life events.

Figure 13: Percent of Caregiver/Family Presenting Concerns in FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can indicate up to five presenting concerns.

Table 14 shows the top 10 activities completed during the first two quarters of CY14. The data reflects the activities of the FSCC, not services children/families received.

Table 14: Top 10 FCCP Activities, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

Activities	CY14 1 st and 2 nd Quarters (N=2441)
<i>864 Families were open 45 more days to an agency during the reporting period.</i>	
FCCP Intake	20.4%
Case Management Services - Identified Child	13.3%
Supervisor Approval Date- Family Service Plan	10.1%
Strengths, Needs, Cultural Discovery	9.1%
Supplies	8.9%
Case Management – Parent	8.6%
Implementation	7.9%
Recreation (cost) – Identified Child	7.6%
Team Meeting	7.6%
Family Service Plan (Develop Initial Plan of Care)	6.7%


Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Activities Report. The percentage is calculated from the total number of activities recorded during CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters.

XIII. Families who re-enter the FCCP

Of the 1249 families that were active from January 1 to June 30, 2014, 24.5% of the families had previously received services from a FCCP. The following figures provide a snapshot of who these families are.

Figure 14 shows the average and median age of the target child. The median age of families previously served by a FCCP is slightly higher than the median age of the active population of the first two quarters of CY14.

Figure 14: Median and Mean Age of Target Child Who Re-entered FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 15 shows the top 5 referral sources for families who re-entered the FCCP. Almost 50% of the families were referred by DCYF (Indication investigation, CPI request for services or DCYF ISR).

Table 15: Top 5 Referral Sources of Families Who Re-entered FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

Referral Source	(N=232)
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	29.3%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	16.4%
Self Referral	15.5%
Other FCCP Organization	8.6%
DCYF: Intake ISR	6.0%

Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 16 shows the close reasons of families previously served by a FCCP. Fifty seven percent of families transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of completing Wrap. Three percent of families could not be contacted and 9.1% of families did not meet their Wrap goals.

Table 16: Top 10 Close Reasons of Families Who Re-entered FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

FCCP Close Reasons	(N=120)
Team agrees Wrap completed	57.4%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met	9.1%
Other	5.0%
Family moved out of area	5.8%
Target child opened to DCYF & removed from home	1.7%
Family declined service	4.2%
Target child opened to DCYF & remained in home	3.3%
Transfer target child to another FCCP	5.0%
Unable to reach family	3.3%
Triaged & referred out	2.5%

Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 17 shows the NCFAS ratings from baseline to transition for families previously served by a FCCP. The overall scores indicate an improvement over time.


Table 17: Percent of ratings of Families who Re-entered FCCP in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=67)

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)
Environment						
<i>Intake</i>	4.5	13.4	17.9	37.3	11.9	13.4
<i>Transition</i>	3.0	7.5	9.0	46.3	19.4	13.4
Parental Capabilities						
<i>Intake</i>	3.0	13.4	20.9	37.3	13.4	10.4
<i>Transition</i>	4.5	4.5	11.9	44.8	20.9	11.9
Family Interactions						
<i>Intake</i>	4.5	16.4	23.9	28.4	19.4	4.5
<i>Transition</i>	3.0	7.5	22.4	38.8	20.9	4.5
Family Safety						
<i>Intake</i>	6.0	14.9	23.9	32.8	11.9	9.0
<i>Transition</i>	6.0	6.0	9.0	55.2	13.4	9.0
Child Well-Being						
<i>Intake</i>	6.0	7.5	25.4	38.8	11.9	9.0
<i>Transition</i>	4.5	4.5	19.4	38.8	17.9	13.4
Social/Community Life						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	1.5	20.9	33.7	11.9	10.4
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	3.0	10.4	53.7	17.9	13.4
Self-Sufficiency						
<i>Intake</i>	7.5	16.4	22.4	26.9	17.9	7.5
<i>Transition</i>	3.0	13.4	17.9	37.3	16.4	10.4
Family Health						
<i>Intake</i>	6.0	14.9	32.8	34.3	9.0	1.5
<i>Transition</i>	3.0	16.4	20.9	44.8	7.5	6.0

Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 15 shows the amount of change a family experiences from intake to transition in each of the NCFAS domains. While a majority of the families did not experience any change from intake to transition, significant positive changes were found in all domains, ranging from 19.7% to 30.3%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 1.5% to 9.1%.

Figure 15: Percent of Families Who Re-entered FCCP Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=66)




Data Source: RIFIS.

XIV. Family Support Partners

During the first two quarters of 2014, 26.3% of the active children had a Family Support Partner (FSP) compared to 26.2% of children in the previous two quarters of CY13. The following figures/tables compare families with and without a FSP.

Figure 16 shows response priority by FSP. There is little difference in the response categories.


Figure 16: Response Priority by FSP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 17 shows the FCCP eligibility by FSP and there is little difference between the categories.

Figure 17: FCCP Eligibility by FSP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 18 shows the average and median length of time a child/family served by a FCCP. Children who worked with a FSP spent more time in the FCCP then children who did not have a FSP.

Table 18: Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP by FSP

	FSP (N=164)	No FSP (N=512)
Median	144.0	66.0
Average	165.1	115.1

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on families closed to FCCP during January 1 to June 30 2014. .

Table 19 shows the close reasons for families with and without a FSP. Fifty eight percent of families who worked with a FSP transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of completing Wrap compared to 39.9% of families who did not have a FSP. Twelve percent of families without a FSP could not be contacted and 13.5% declined to be served.

Table 19: Top 10 FCCP close reasons by FSP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	FSP (N=164)	No FSP (N=512)
Team agrees Wrap goals were met	58.4%	39.9%
Unable to contact family	7.9%	11.7%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met	6.1%	8.5%
Family moved out of area	4.9%	3.9%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	4.9%	2.9%
Other	3.7%	4.1%
Family declined service	3.0%	13.5%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed in home	2.4%	3.5%
Triaged and Referred Out	1.2%	3.7%
Change in target child	1.2%	0.4%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on families closed to FCCP during January 1 to June 30 2014.