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1. PREVIVA DESCRIPTION
PREVIVA PROGRAM AIM

-Prevention of violence and other risky behaviors associated with it, by means of the participation of municipal governments and communities, so that social processes are generated to guarantee their effectiveness in the long run.

-Program was funded by Luis F Duque
PREVIVA MODEL

J Richmond model adapted by Luis F Duque

Concrete programs

Empowerment, municipal authorities and community relationships

Action oriented information system

SUCCESSFUL PUBLIC POLICY
In Colombia, 10% homicides---relation with political and community violence
## Research and Intervention Lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Design, implementation and evaluation of surveillance system** | - Population survey  
- Surveillance fatal and non-fatal injuries |
| **Study of risk and protective factors** | - Family violence  
- Child abuse  
- Interpersonal aggression  
- Youth resilience |
| **Design and evaluation of interventions** | - Early child development program (Zero to five years)  
- Program to prevent aggression with pre-school and school children  
- Intimate partner violence  
- Others |
| **Design and evaluation of public policies** | - 22 municipalities of Antioquia, Colombia.  
- Interdisciplinary approach |
2. Design and evaluation of public policies to prevent violence
DESIGN OF PUBLIC POLICIES TO PREVENT VIOLENCE AND PROMOTE COEXISTENCE

- Actors mapping
- Interventions inventory
- Problem discussion and consensus
- Empowerment

Social science approach

Coexistence and security committees

Epidemiological approach

- Surveillance system
- Population survey: magnitude, Odd Ratio and Attributable Risk factors
- Evidence review

Applied in 22 municipalities of Antioquia, Colombia.
Victims, aggressors and witnesses, violence. Medellin metropolitan area, 2007. % and CI 95%).

Protective factors against interpersonal violence. Medellin metropolitan area, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Armed threat</th>
<th>Physical aggression with a weapon</th>
<th>Physical aggression without a weapon</th>
<th>Robbery without a weapon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>%PAR</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>%PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s watching</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-92.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of cooperation with local authorities</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-85.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 point increase Socioeconomic level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk factors for interpersonal violence. Medellin metropolitan area, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Threat with a weapon OR</th>
<th>Threat with a weapon %PAR</th>
<th>Physical aggression with a weapon OR</th>
<th>Physical aggression with a weapon %PAR</th>
<th>Physical aggression without a weapon OR</th>
<th>Physical aggression without a weapon %PAR</th>
<th>Robbery without a weapon OR</th>
<th>Robbery without a weapon %PAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anomy</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>86,1</td>
<td>7,52</td>
<td>86,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood violence</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>85,9</td>
<td>6,84</td>
<td>85,4</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>78,1</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>78,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social solidarity expectations frustration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>78,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of physical child abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,37</td>
<td>77,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating violence as a mechanism for conflict resolution</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>66,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating violence as an education method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>69,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control in the neighborhood</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>65,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>51,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment in the past year</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>50,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>29,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Risk factors for interpersonal violence. Medellin metropolitan area, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Threat with a weapon</th>
<th>Physical aggression with a weapon</th>
<th>Physical aggression without a weapon</th>
<th>Robbery without a weapon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>%PAR</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>%PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauvinist attitudes (machismo)</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>63,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically abused by mother in childhood</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>63,9</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>55,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>66,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of murder use for community defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education and professional activity frustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating violence for family and as a defense from society</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>69,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTS</td>
<td>PROTECTIVE AND RISK FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Family as source of attitudes, values, and practices with respect to violence and coexistence | - Communication and affection between children and parents; vigilant mother and father  
- Legitimacy of violence, especially as educational method  
- Machismo  
- Childrearing practices for early prevention of aggressive, risky, and criminal behaviors  
- Frustration over access to quality higher education (e.g., technical, university)  
- Frustration over professional or career opportunities  
- Distrust amongst citizens and between citizens and local authorities  
- Collective efficacy: social cohesion and taking care of the neighborhood  
- Acceptance of violation of norms  
- Lack of social responsibility and high individual efficacy |
<p>| Unequal and exclusive society |  |
| Lack of communication and trust amongst citizens and between them and authorities |  |
| Lack of civic culture for coexistence and security |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC POLICY STATEMENTS</th>
<th>PROGRAMS ADOPTED IN PUBLIC POLICY APPROVAL DECREED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of family coexistence</td>
<td>Early prevention of aggression. From prenatal up to 3 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of civic awareness and early prevention of violence (4 to 11 years of age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender oriented early prevention of intimate partner violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-socialization of severe domestic aggressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of inclusion and equity</td>
<td>Increasing access to high quality higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening already existing mechanisms of coordination among public and private universities and the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulation of the development of micro enterprises and productive chains among low SES population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience promotion among children and adolescents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening communication and interaction among citizens and between them and local authorities</td>
<td>Strengthening relationships between the Police and local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency of municipal institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening social cohesion and collective efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a culture of acceptance of formal and social norms for civic coexistence and security</td>
<td>Municipal social pacts for the culture of legality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-socialization of young gang members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

Scale and distribution (victimization, offender, witness)

Factors associated with each type of aggression - GROUP

Follow-up and evaluation

2004
Problem definition
- Risk and protective factors
- Identification of strategies

Goals definition

2007

Base line
Follow up to the goals and impact evaluation

2013
3. Design and evaluation of violence prevention programs
¿What is Pilas! program?

Program to promote the personal skills and prevent violence in preschool and school health.

Aim: To reduce violence and other risky behaviors (Use drugs and alcohol use, unsafe sex, school failure) in preschool and school.

To increase social skills and citizenship skills in children / as preschool and school age.

To reduce the beliefs that legitimize violence

With

- Pre-school and school teachers
- Parents and caregivers
- Activities with teachers and parents
PILAS! MEJORES ADULTOS, MEJORES NIÑOS

Components

- 12 activities with teachers
- 6 activities with parents and caregivers
- 2 hours
• Program reduce:
  • Direct aggression report by parents and children
  • Child abuse (moderate and severe) report by parents and children.

• Program increase:
  • Relationship and supervision with caregiver
  • Affect and communication with caregiver
  • Discussion of daily activities with children
  • Regulation of peers relationships.
  • Communicative skills
Early child development program and prevent the child abuse

Integrate health services, nutritional services and social services.

Previva design to psychosocial component → base on evidence→ improve parenting practices and prevent child abuse

Training to health care provider → implement the program.

Evaluation → with a RCT
Children 0–5 year Health care institutions

20 health care institutions

With intervention

Institutions n=10

Children and caregivers n=2,000

Follow up 1.5 years

Control group

Institutions n=10

Children and caregivers n=2,000

Follow up 1.5 years
1. Prevention of intimate partner abuse in families of former members of illegal armed groups (guerrilla and paramilitaries)

2. Prevention of domestic violence in general population

3. Promotion of the rule of law acceptance in communities

4. Adopting public policy on human security and violence prevention in municipalities

5. Pactos por la legalidad
PREVIVA
http://previva.udea.edu.co/
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