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1. Background

1.1 The purpose of the evaluation map

Evaluations are intended to serve two purposes: accountability and lesson learning. The lesson learning function of evaluations is a public good. Lessons from one programme can inform decisions about a similar programme elsewhere. However, this lesson learning function is undermined by the fact that there is low discoverability of completed evaluations. Many have a short shelf life, not reaching an audience beyond the few people with a direct interest in that specific evaluation. Hence, while there is an increasing drive to use evidence, and more funding to generate new evidence, much existing evidence goes unread and unused. For example, the formative and process evaluations routinely conducted by large government and donor-funded programmes are generally not disseminated beyond the immediate stakeholder group and are generally not included in any databases. Similarly, researcher-driven impact evaluations, published in academic journals and working paper series, may not be easily available to policymakers.

This country evaluation map seeks to make recent development evaluations from Uganda visible and available in a single repository, identifying potential gaps in knowledge and opportunities for synthesising existing evidence for the use of policymakers in Uganda. Users can submit studies for inclusion in the map, thus giving the map a repository function.

The country evaluation is a specific type of evidence and gap map (EGM). EGMs take many forms; these can include maps of impact evaluations and effectiveness reviews but may also include process evaluations and mega maps which map just systematic reviews (Saran and White, 2018; White et al., 2020).

1.2 Scope of the evaluation map

The country evidence map will include all evaluations of development interventions implemented in Uganda from 2000 to 2018. ‘Evaluation’ is defined to include all major design types, i.e. formative, process, outcome, and impact evaluations. ‘Development’ is broadly defined to cover all interventions intended to either directly or indirectly improve the wellbeing of the Ugandan people. Technical studies (e.g. trials of new drugs to be used in other markets or testing new agricultural inputs) are excluded, although efficacy and effectiveness evaluations of the adoption and use of these technologies under field conditions are included.
1.3 Why it is important to develop the evaluation map

A preliminary scoping search suggested that there have been at least 500 evaluations of development interventions in Uganda since 2000. Most of these studies are not known to potential users. Moreover, as the number of evaluations grows, so does the scope for learning from the body of evidence contained in a group of studies on a particular issue. It is widely accepted that rigorous evidence synthesis of all available, relevant evidence is a superior approach compared to taking decisions based on one study that may prove to be an exception or on literature reviews based on non-systematic selection of studies.

1.4 Existing EGMs and/or relevant systematic reviews

To our knowledge this will be the first country evaluation map for all development evaluations for a single country. The Africa Centre for Evidence has published sector-specific maps for South Africa, e.g. for human settlements.\(^1\) Some countries, including Uganda, have a national evaluation database, but the studies in the database have not been mapped.\(^2\) Moreover, such databases are not based on a systematic search.

---

2. The Uganda database has not been maintained and there is not currently a working link to the database.
2. Objectives

The primary objective of the Uganda country evaluation map is to make the existing evaluations accessible to users, so as to support evidence-informed decision-making across government, development partners, and civil society.

The secondary objectives are to:

(i) Identify gaps in available evidence, and clusters of evidence suitable for systematic reviews;
(ii) Raise awareness of the use of evidence in policy and practice;
(iii) Initiate discussions around evaluation trends in Uganda, and systemic effects on evaluation transparency and quality; and
(iv) Provide proof of concept for the approach and testing use of country evaluation maps, as this map will be the first country evaluation map covering all sectors.

The research question being addressed to support these objectives is: what is the extent of the evidence base of evaluations of development programmes in Uganda?
3. **Methodology**

3.1 **Defining country evaluation maps**

Saran and White (2018) define EGMs as:

   A systematic visual presentation of the availability of relevant evidence of effects for a particular policy domain. The evidence is identified by a search following a pre-specified, protocol. Maps are accompanied by a descriptive report to summarise the evidence for stakeholders such as researchers, research commissioners, policy makers, and practitioners. Evidence maps summarise what evidence there is, not what the evidence says.

Similar to EGMs, country evaluation maps systematically search for relevant systematic reviews and primary studies based on a pre-specified protocol, and provide a graphical representation of available evidence. The scope of a country evaluation map includes all policy domains that affect the welfare of the people of the country, and include all types of evaluations, i.e. formative, process, outcome, and impact evaluations.

3.1.1 **Evaluation map framework**

The framework was developed through the following process:

- **Stage 1**: Initial framework constructed through consultation of strategy and policy documents as identified above;
- **Stage 2**: Consultation with the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) of Uganda on the proposed framework;
- **Stage 3**: Piloting framework with 10–20 included studies. The framework was finalised once the first 20 studies were coded.

3.1.2 **Population**

The relevant population for this map is both the people (including refugees) and institutions of Uganda. Hence, all residents of Uganda are included. The Ugandan diaspora, including Ugandan refugees in other countries, are not included. Population sub-groups that are coded are: rural/urban, poor, people with disabilities, children, youth, aged, ethnic minorities, refugees, and conflict-affected persons.

3.1.3 Intervention

The map covers all development interventions. The categorisation of the interventions follows the categories in Uganda's Vision 2040. The Vision has four main categories:

- Macroeconomic policies;
- Economic development;
- Social transformation;
- Governance.

The document text under each of these headings was used to identify sub-categories. For the initial coding some minor amendments were made to consolidate categories. As a result of the content found in studies, we relabelled two of the categories to better reflect what is in the studies:

- **Economic development** replaced Macroeconomic policies;
- **Sector development** replaced Economic development;
- **Social transformation** remained unchanged;
- **Governance** remained unchanged.

In addition, the sub-category ‘Care and protection of vulnerable groups’ has been replaced by the more commonly used term ‘Social protection’. The final labels are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Intervention categories and sub-categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>Macroeconomic strategies</td>
<td>Inflation policy. Government debt and borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings and investments</td>
<td>Savings including savings groups. Investment incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td>Banking sector. Microfinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance of payments</td>
<td>Exchange rate policy. Reserve management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public finance</td>
<td>Government revenue (taxation but not tariff barriers) and expenditure (fiscal policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector development</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Internal and external tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural and water resources</td>
<td>Agricultural development. Water resource management (irrigation, watershed development for agricultural purposes). Includes rural roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy, minerals, oil and gas</td>
<td>Energy sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industrial promotion and policy. Industrial zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Imports and export policies and incentives, including tariffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, technology, engineering and innovation (including knowledge and ICT)</td>
<td>R&amp;D. Incentives. Investment in telecoms and IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td>Labour market policy and interventions. Employment programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development</td>
<td>Urban planning, investment in the urban environment (except housing). Includes urban transport and road safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Land policy such as land ownership rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social transformation</td>
<td>Population, health and nutrition including water, sanitation, and hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and literacy (including early childhood development (ECD))</td>
<td>Schooling at all levels. Adult education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection (care and protection of vulnerable groups)</td>
<td>Social safety nets such as pensions. Also includes conditional cash transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Housing policies and programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National culture</td>
<td>Museums, theatre, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality and women's empowerment</td>
<td>Gender equality policies. Women's rights – awareness raising, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change, environment and natural resources</td>
<td>Environmental and climate change, including nature resource management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Constitutional democracy</td>
<td>Constitutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>Justice and police interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electoral and political processes</td>
<td>Support to national and local elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency and accountability</td>
<td>Support to free press. Anti-corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government effectiveness and regulatory quality</td>
<td>Institutional development for government agencies and regulatory authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace, security, and defence</td>
<td>Peace keeping and security interventions. Post-conflict interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4 Outcomes

The outcomes are based on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), again with some minor consolidation (see Table 2). The Government of Uganda has committed to developing a roadmap to achieve the SDGs, so the country evaluation map will be a useful tool in that work.

In order to reduce ambiguity in coding we combined some SDGs. The poverty and economic growth SDGs (1 and 8) are combined under ‘Economic development’. This approach does not contradict the multi-dimensional nature of poverty since the whole point of the SDGs, and their predecessor Millennium Development Goals, is to emphasise outcomes other than economic ones; hence the other dimensions of poverty are captured across the SDGs, e.g. health in SDG3. Energy and industry are combined (SDGs 7 and 9) as energy falls under industry so the outcomes are closely related. SDGs 12–15 all relate to environmental outcomes and so are readily combined, which is one of the steps undertaken to limit the number of columns in which a single study is coded.

In one case we separate out the SDG – agriculture and nutrition. Nutrition outcomes may come from a range of interventions, some agricultural and some not. The outcomes that fell in the aggregated category will fall clearly in one or the other. For example, food security measured by number of meals a day falls under nutrition, whereas calorific equivalence of domestic food production falls under agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic development (including poverty and employment) – SDGs 1 and 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable agriculture – SDG 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition – SDG 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing – SDG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education – SDG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender – SDG 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation – SDG 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy, industry and infrastructure provision – SDGs 7 and 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development – SDG 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability – SDGs 12, 13, 14, and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and justice – SDG 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global partnerships – SDG 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality – SDG 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 summarises the inclusion criteria for studies in the map. Following the standard approach, these inclusion criteria are defined according to the PICOS; that is:

- **Population**: who are the eligible target group for the interventions evaluated in the study?
- **Intervention**: what sort of interventions are eligible for inclusion?
- **Comparison**: what sort of comparison groups are eligible (applies only to effectiveness studies)?
- **Outcomes**: what outcomes are eligible for inclusion?
- **Study designs**: What study designs are eligible for inclusion?

### Table 3: Summary of PICOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>Ugandan citizens or people resident in Uganda (including refugees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>All interventions to increase the welfare of Ugandan citizens or people resident in Uganda (including refugees), either directly or indirectly. Excludes: studies that test a technology rather than adoption of a technology⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>All outcomes (as captured by SDGs), including intermediary outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studies</strong></td>
<td>All evaluations of a socio-economic development intervention of any evaluation design. Multi-country evaluation reports and reviews were included provided the study had sufficient codable information clearly related to Uganda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Criteria for including and excluding studies

#### 3.2.1 Types of study designs

All evaluation designs will be included. The main typology is based on a modification of Scriven's (1967) distinction between formative and summative evaluations. Evaluations will be classified as being as one of five types:

- **Formative evaluations**: these are evaluations undertaken at the early stages of a programme or during a pilot to inform programme design;
- **Impact evaluations**: these are evaluations that make a quantitative assessment of the difference the intervention makes to the indicators of interest. Only studies with a comparison group, or which otherwise control for selection bias (e.g. instrumental variables) will be coded as impact evaluations. Before-versus-after studies with no comparison group will be coded as outcome evaluations (even if they make claims about impact). Impact evaluation designs will be coded as randomised controlled trials and other impact evaluations;

---

⁵ Trials of new drugs or industry or scientific testing of, for example, communications equipment are not included. However, studies in which these products are used with intended end users are included.

- **Process evaluations**: ex-post assessments of the intervention, usually focusing on issues such as management and implementation and stakeholder perceptions. Process evaluations may be either qualitative or quantitative, in the latter case reporting data such as characteristics of programme participants and trends on outcomes;

- **Outcome evaluations**: report project area (treated population) outcomes before and after, or just after, the intervention with no comparison group. We do not consider such designs to be valid measures of impact so keep them separate from impact evaluations;

- **Evaluation synthesis**: studies summarising several evaluation studies from Uganda. This does not include multi-country studies for which Uganda is one case study, but studies summarising two or more evaluations undertaken in Uganda.

Since the inclusion criteria pertain to the evaluation of development interventions in Uganda, systematic reviews are not included in this map. However, synthesis of sets of Ugandan evaluations are included.

### 3.2.2 Types of settings

The map includes all evaluation studies undertaken in Uganda regardless of setting.

### 3.2.3 Search strategy

Evaluations, especially process and formative evaluations, are predominately grey literature published on agency websites rather than in academic journals. Therefore, a traditional search of academic databases will not identify many of these studies.

The country EGM thus uses a search strategy customised for different sources based on the source of the study and study type. There are four such sources:

- **Evaluations commissioned by official development partners**, such as the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the World Bank (we call these externally commissioned evaluations);
- **Locally commissioned evaluations** by government agencies;
- **Evaluations commissioned by non-governmental agencies**; and
- **Impact evaluations** that are searched for separately in the 3ie database, which is the largest single comprehensive source of impact evaluations.

**Externally commissioned evaluations**: the main development partners each have a global evaluation repository that can be searched by country, hence allowing identification of Ugandan studies. The main such repositories to be searched are:

- **USAID’s Development Experience Clearinghouse**, selecting evaluations (Final Evaluation Report and Special Evaluation) and then Uganda: [https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/evaluations.aspx](https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/evaluations.aspx);

- Other official agencies, such as Sida, deposit their reports in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Research Centre, which is searched for Uganda: www.oecd.org/derec/?hf=5&b=0&s=score

Finally, the 3ie impact evaluation repository (www.3ieimpact.org/evidence-hub/impact-evaluation-repository) is searched for impact evaluations, using country Uganda.

Where the database allows a data range then the search is for 2000-. If that is not possible then records pre-2000 were removed by manual screening.

**Locally commissioned studies:** To identify locally commissioned studies, staff of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Department of OPM wrote to the evaluation sections of all government agencies to ask them to supply evaluations completed in the last 10 years.

**NGO-commissioned studies:** These are grey literature that will not be identified through the usual databases. Hence, we searched Google and Google Scholar using the very general search string ‘Uganda evaluation’ (not an exact string), applying the >=2000 date range. Piloting showed that this approach did identify NGO-commissioned studies and Masters thesis not already included (with limited duplication of studies that are included from the search of repositories listed above). We also included names of some of the major non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working in Uganda in the search string, e.g. ActionAid, Aga Khan Foundation, CARE, Concern, Heifer International, Hunger Project, International Rescue Committee, Oxfam, PANOS Eastern Africa, PATH, Save the Children, Sightsavers International, Water Aid, Worldwide Fund for Nature, and World Vision.

In addition to the above, it is expected that further evaluations will be submitted as a result of dissemination of the Evaluation Map.

It is recognised that this is not a full search to the standards of the Campbell Collaboration. Such a search would include a database search and a search of Masters and PhD theses from the main universities in Uganda. This search is not possible given the budget constraints of this map, but will be carried out if further funds become available. If that is possible we will also compare the results from this customised quick search to a full database search.

3.2.4 **Screening and selection of studies**

The screening and coding tools were developed based on the framework and piloted on a set of studies from across sources. Staff from Makerere and OPM received training in screening and coding to carry out the bulk of the work. Screening was conducted either in the...
databases themselves, in an Excel download of the search results, or using EPPI-Reviewer depending on the source. Where search results could be downloaded to a spreadsheet, screening was performed on the spreadsheet. If not, one screener screened online results, entering accepted studies into EPPI-Reviewer where they were rescreened by two screeners. All screening and coding was done by two researchers independently, with third-party reconciliation.

3.2.5 Data extraction, coding, and management

The studies were coded to extract bibliographic information, and the interventions, outcomes, and filters reported above. Coding was done in duplicate with third-party reconciliation.

3.2.6 Units of analysis

The units of analysis for the map are the individual studies where each entry represents a combination of an SDG and a type of evaluation. However, a single study may be entered multiple times depending on issues covered and study design employed (e.g., a study may count as both an impact evaluation and a process evaluation). That is, a single study may be coded under more than one intervention sub-category and more than one outcome if appropriate.

3.2.7 Quality appraisal

Critical appraisal will not be undertaken at this stage, but is considered for future editions of the map should funding become available.

3.2.8 The online map

An interactive online version of the map is generated using EPPI-Mapper. The map includes a link to each study. Since many of the studies in the map are grey literature it is a challenge to ensure all links continue to work if the study does not have a DOI. All links will be checked each time the map is updated.

3.2.9 Dissemination and use

Dissemination and use is expected to come from:

- Co-creation of the map with the OPM and the Africa Centre for Systematic Reviews, Makerere University;
- Engagement with the Uganda Evaluation Association so the map is known and used by their members;
- Promoting the map to the Uganda Management Institute for use on the diploma in M&E.

4. **Stakeholder engagement in preparation of the map**

This framework for the map was developed through a consultation process. The initial framework was constructed through consultation of strategy and policy documents and OPM. The framework and later the draft and final reports were discussed with the Advisory Group for their inputs and feedback.
5. Findings

5.1 Results from the search

The search was conducted in January and February 2019. The 3ie database is updated quarterly on a sectoral basis, so included studies are likely to be from early 2018 and before.

Table 4 shows the databases searched and number of studies in each database. We identified 617 evaluation reports. All included studies are published. Of these, just under 60% are reports and working papers and 40% are journal papers (there is just one exception, which is a dissertation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Located</th>
<th>Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ie database</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank (AfDB)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD DEReC</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey literature (google)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM manual search</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the customised search approach, all or nearly all studies found were eligible for inclusion. The exception was the OECD DEReC, where reports were excluded either because they were multi-country studies with insufficient information on Uganda to be included or duplicates of studies found in other repositories. In the case of AfDB, the table captures screening out by date, which was part of the search in other cases. In the case of the Google search, ‘located’ refers to those identified as eligible by screening and uploaded to EPPI-Reviewer, of which four were then excluded on rescreening.

5.2 The aggregate map

Table 5 shows the ‘aggregate map’, i.e. the total number of studies by intervention and outcome categories (the map is transposed compared to the online map so as to fit on the page). The colour coding is based on the arbitrary thresholds of: (1) well-evidenced area: 20 or more studies; (2) moderately evidenced area: 10–19 studies; and (3) poorly evidenced area: fewer than 10 studies.
### Table 5: Aggregate map (number of studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Macroeconomic policy</th>
<th>Economic development</th>
<th>Social transformation</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development (including poverty and employment) – SDGs 1 and 8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition – SDG 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable agriculture – SDG 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing – SDG 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education – SDG 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender – SDG 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation – SDG 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy, industry and infrastructure provision – SDGs 7 and 9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development – SDG 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability – SDGs 12, 13, 14, and 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, peace, and justice – SDG 16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global partnerships – SDG 17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality – SDG 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>412</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>617</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most heavily populated cell by far is the effect of social transformation interventions on health and wellbeing outcomes, with 285 studies. This reflects the preponderance of health research in the impact evaluation field. There are 13 other well-evidenced cells, five of which lay in the social transformation column, with each of education, gender and governance being well-evidenced. At the outcome level, economic is generally well-evidenced (being so for three of the four intervention categories). Finally, environmental sustainability, sustainable agriculture, energy and infrastructure and water and sanitation are well-evidenced for selected cells. More detail is reported on these cells below.

There are a reasonable number of moderately populated cells, especially in the social transformation column, but also including agriculture, education, governance, energy, and environmental sustainability. Nonetheless, there are some notable gaps, in particular a lack of studies related to nutrition, urban development, and inequality outcomes. In addition, the focus of many governance intervention evaluations appears to be mainly on governance outcomes, and much less on how these interventions affect a broader range of outcomes.

5.3 Disaggregated analysis by sector

Macroeconomic policy evaluations are reasonably spread across all sectors except balance of payments (Table 6). Evaluations of financial services and savings are not necessarily evaluations of interventions at the macro level; they also include microfinance interventions and savings groups and other interventions to support savings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macroeconomic policy</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings and investments</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic strategies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public finance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of payments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of the economic development intervention evaluations relate to agriculture and water resources. There are also many studies related to science, energy, and transport. Areas where more evaluations may have been expected given the importance of the issue are labour force, urban development, and land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and water resources</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, technology, engineering, and innovation (including knowledge and ICT)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy, minerals, oil and gas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport infrastructure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-thirds of social transformation interventions are in the area of health, but there are also a reasonable number of evaluation studies across all other sub-sectors except housing, for which there are only three studies (Table 8).

**Table 8: Social transformation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, health, and nutrition</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and literacy (including ECD)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and protection of vulnerable groups</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change, environment, and natural resources</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality and women’s empowerment</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest area for governance intervention evaluations is government effectiveness (Table 9), which includes evaluations assessing capacity-building activities for government officials. However, there are also a number of evaluations across all other sub-categories.

**Table 9: Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government effectiveness and regulatory quality</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and accountability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace, security, and defence</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional democracy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral and political processes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4 Type of evaluation study

Nearly 60% of studies contain process evaluation evidence and over 40% impact evaluations. There are very few formative evaluations, which may reflect that such studies often do not make it to the public domain.
Table 10: Type of evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of evaluation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact evaluation</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process evaluation</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome evaluation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total studies</td>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very notably, we found no synthesis of Ugandan evaluations. While we found several studies that included Uganda as one of several countries in an evaluation of a specific intervention, little or no attention appears to have been paid to learning from the bodies of evidence.

5.5 Nationality of authors

Over 40% of included studies have no Ugandan author and over a quarter a non-Ugandan lead author. Fewer than 15% have an all Ugandan team, and a similar amount have a Ugandan lead author with non-Ugandan team members.

Table 11: Nationality of authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality of authors</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of total studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan lead author with non-Ugandan authors</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan authors with non-Ugandan lead</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Ugandan authors</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ugandan authorship</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors not named</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Geographical coverage

Just over half of the studies have national coverage, though that may be overstated as it may include studies for which the geographical focus was unclear. For those evaluations for which geographical focus could be determined, most are in the central region, which includes Kampala, followed by Northern, which has been an area of donor focus on account of its post-conflict status.

5.7 Population sub-groups

There are many studies on children (118 studies) and youth (96) but also a fair number on the aged (41). There are also many studies for conflict-affected persons (66), though fewer for refugees (14). There are very few evaluations related to people with disabilities (just four).
6. **Summary**

The Uganda country evaluation map puts in the public domain 617 evaluations of development interventions in Uganda, which were published in 2000 or later.

A main purpose of the map is to increase the discoverability and therefore use of the evaluation evidence base. The map has been co-produced with both the OPM and researchers at the Africa Centre for Systematic Reviews and Knowledge Translation. The OPM has been using the map as part of its planning process (see below). The studies in the map have been one source for a scoping study of research on women’s groups in Uganda. The scoping review included studies with any research design; the map provided seven relevant studies, four of which had not been located from other sources.  

The country evaluation map was first presented at the 2019 Evaluation Week. As noted above, the results show a concentration of studies undertaken under health and wellbeing (SDG 3). As a follow up, the OPM embarked on developing an Evaluation Agenda for the health sector (with support from CLEAR-AA). The draft Evaluation Agenda is being finalised, and will be validated by April 2021.

The OPM also led Uganda’s Voluntary National Review (VNR) of the implementation of the SDGs, with the report being presented by the Minister for General Duties at the UN High Level Political Forum in October 2020. The VNR was predominately a desk review of existing evidence on SDG implementation. The OPM used the EGM to identify recent relevant studies across the different SDGs.  

The OPM has also embarked on developing the Evaluation Agenda for the National Development Plan III (2020/21–2024/25), which will be structured around the 18 programmes of the Plan. This presents another opportunity to utilise the map.

These examples will hopefully encourage other uses – such as learning lessons from past experience as to how best respond to the crisis caused by COVID-19.

One of the benefits of co-production is greater local dissemination and utilisation of the research product. At the same time, the most important finding of the map is that there are many opportunities to synthesise national studies to learn sector-specific lessons. However, the map shows that that sort of research has not been undertaken – even though there are many cells with good or moderate levels of evidence. This map provides a starting point for such research being undertaken to inform policy and programme design.

---

7 The map is not yet published but details may be found here [https://womensgroupevidence.org/our-work/country-specific-evidence-synthesis-on-women-s-groups-in-Uganda](https://womensgroupevidence.org/our-work/country-specific-evidence-synthesis-on-women-s-groups-in-Uganda).

8 [https://sdgs.opm.go.ug/vnr-presentation-to-the-high-level-political-forum/](https://sdgs.opm.go.ug/vnr-presentation-to-the-high-level-political-forum/)
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