

The CECA Best Practice project

The balance of number and nature of applications for the BP award is interesting for us to consider after 5 Years and at the end of a presidency

The number of applications is relatively steady even if linked to the calendar of the conference, beginning of summer when General conference, autumn when CECA, leaving then more time to work on the project presentations. We squashed this last year, with a good result, the working calendar for the jury and the publication preparation

Year	Conference venue	Applications	Awards
2012	Yerevan, Armenia	26	5
2013	General conference Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	15	5
2014	Alexandria, Egypt	35	5
2015	Washington D.C. USA	24	5
2016	General conference Milan, Italy	23	5
Total		123	25

The repartition by continent and countries is also interesting

Continent	Country	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total	Awards
Europe								
	Armenia		1 A	1		2A	4	2
	Belgium			1			1	
	Denmark		2 A	1		1 A	4	2
	France	2		7 A	5	1 A	15	2
	Germany	2 A		2 A			4	2
	Greece	4	1 A				5	1
	Italy	5 A	1 A	5 A	1	2	14	3
	Lithuania		1	1			2	
	Macedonia		1				1	
	The Netherlands			4 A			4	1
	Portugal	1A					2	1
	Romania		1			1	2	
	Russia			1		2	3	
	Spain	1	2	1	1	1	6	
	Switzerland			1			1	
	United kingdom	1			1 A		2	1
	Total Europe						70	15
Americas								
	Argentina	2	1	1			4	
	Brazil	2 A		3 A	5 A	2	12	3
	Costa Rica			1	1	1	3	
	Canada	2		1	2	1	6	
	Mexico		1 A			1	2	1

	Peru				1		1	
	United states	3	1	3	3 A A		10	2
	Venezuela			1			1	
	Total Americas						39	6
Asia								
	Korea				2A		2	1
	Singapore					3 A	3	1
	Total Asia						5	2
Africa								
	Malawi	1					1	
	Tanzanie	1 A					1	1
	Zambia					3	3 A	1
	Total Africa						5	2
Australia								
	Australia				1		1	
	Total Australia						1	0
Total							120	25

The general feeling of those of us that have followed several moments of the project, specially the jury, is that the projects have improved in presentation throughout the years, following the improvement of the tool and its consequence on the precision of the award template.

The aspects still to be improved are characteristic of the present development of museum education in most countries:

- A very strong attention given to the audience needs and characteristics
- A genuine interest in original means and methods to better serve these audience
- A weaker attention given to the description of the content of the programme and how the chosen education or mediation tools serve best the communication of this content, whatever its nature.
- A general difficulty in giving the program a research environment : accompanying research (existing experiences and results, existing theoretical ground, front end evaluation) and appreciation research (impact, evaluation)

The awards are given to the projects covering best these issues.

The last improved version of the BP tool, less complex in wording and clearer in layout, should better support the future candidates in this direction, becoming more and more a museum education training tool both for professionals and future professionals.