

1

An Introduction to Postsecondary Historic Environment Education

Jeremy C. Wells and Barry L. Stiefel

Higher education is facing greater pressures for reform than perhaps at any other time in its existence. Costs are increasing faster than inflation while the guarantee of a good education seems ever more elusive to students and their parents. As a 2012 article in the *Economist* summarizes, just 57 percent of students complete a bachelor's degree within 6 years and in the process accumulate an average debt of \$26,000. Alarmingly, only a quarter of these graduates are judged as having a proficient level of literacy, perhaps due to a rather light average reading load of only forty pages per class.¹ Critics charge that universities are not delivering on their promise, instead focusing on maximizing revenue while ignoring their educational mission, and in the process offering useless or "dumbed down" degrees and producing graduates ill-prepared to enter the workforce.² Moreover, while the assessment of student learning is well developed in primary and secondary education, it is far less refined for postsecondary education, so in some respects we do not sufficiently understand to what extent university students are actually learning or not learning.³ As with many arguments, the reality of the state of higher education is complex with many shades of gray; clearly our anecdotal experiences lead us to believe that universities can and do produce well-qualified graduates, though some would argue that we could do better.

Outcomes-based learning is a concept that has been closely associated with the production of well-qualified graduates since its rise to popularity in the 1990s. This movement is far from new, however, with proposed origins related to the failure of the United States to launch the world's first artificial satellite in 1957. The fact that the Soviet Union beat the United States to this auspicious goal was construed to mean that the American educational system was a failure, and thus needed a complete overhaul.⁴ In this charged environment, John Carroll and Benjamin Bloom developed the concept of "mastery learning" in the 1960s that specified certain,

fixed behaviors as desirable outcomes of the educational experience while treating the time in which students should achieve these outcomes as a variable.⁵ Up until this point, "education" tended to be defined by how long students sat in a specific class rather than expectations of what the students would actually be able to learn. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, William Spady expanded mastery learning into the contemporary idea of "outcomes-based instruction," which required that all aspects of an educational system should be organized around a student's achievement of specific behavioral objectives.⁶ By the early 1990s, outcomes-based learning was a driving factor in curriculum development in primary and secondary education and began its rise to prominence within higher education.

Schools are increasingly acknowledging outcomes-based learning, along with its emphasis on accountability, and the importance of exploring diverse pedagogical techniques in an effort to improve teaching as well as to better defend the effectiveness of the academy in producing competent graduates. Across the higher education spectrum, curriculum design is moving "towards an outcomes-based, employment-related and market-oriented" system "increasingly informed by outside interests" with data derived from the assessment of learning outcomes.⁷ Not everyone is comfortable with this trend, however; there is significant disagreement that outcomes-based learning is the best or only tool for producing well-qualified graduates. Criticisms include claims that the approach results in "dumbed down" curricula that "indoctrinate" students and discourage independent thought; moreover, the basis of outcomes-based learning is not actually objective, but rather emphasizes the subjective values of its promulgators.⁸ While acknowledging the diversity of thought on the necessity of outcomes-based learning, the underlying assumption of the authors of this volume is that outcomes-based learning has sufficiently strong theoretical and empirical bases to have value, even if its implementation may sometimes be flawed.

Curricula, therefore, should be designed to achieve specific learning objectives while the effectiveness of pedagogical techniques should in turn be assessed against how well these objectives have been met. While larger and better known fields, such as the sciences, education, and English, have an abundance of literature on pedagogical techniques and curriculum design, similar resources for heritage conservation simply do not exist and there appears to be little or no evidence of an active discussion on outcomes-based learning in this field, much less pedagogical techniques and curriculum design. Part of this situation may be due to the fragmented, multidisciplinary nature of topics that address the historic environment from disciplines as broad as architecture, landscape

architecture, history, construction management, materials science, environmental psychology, and anthropology (among other possibilities) that make a focused approach difficult. Even agreeing on a common term to describe the activities that we, as professionals and academics, do in the historic environment has been difficult. Depending on the geographical location in the Anglophone world, it may be known as historic preservation, heritage conservation, architectural or building conservation, cultural landscape conservation, or conservation of the historic environment. In other languages, words used may be some variation of the English "cultural patrimony" (*patrimonio cultural* [Spanish], *patrimoine culturel* [French]), "cultural property" (*kulturgut* [German]), or "antiquarian" (*antikvarie* [Swedish]).

There is even disagreement as to whether or not our activities in the historic environment can be rightly called a discipline or if other disciplines simply engage in heritage conservation, but this is increasingly becoming a less popular perspective, especially in light of the long-established degree programs specializing in the historic environment at many universities and colleges around the world. These programs were based on the pioneering master's degree programs developed in the 1960s and 1970s at the University of York (U.K.), Columbia University, and Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey.⁹ Hundreds of programs have been created following these pioneers, and at all levels: diplomas, certificates, associate's, bachelor's, and doctoral degrees. Unique ontological orientations, epistemological perspectives, and methodological approaches define a discipline,¹⁰ and one could make the argument that heritage conservation as applied to the historic environment satisfies all three requirements. The conservation of the historic environment places a unique meaning on the authenticity of "historic" building and landscape fabric, has a well-developed body of knowledge independent of other disciplines, and its practitioners have created novel methodologies for the assessment of everything from building conditions to stakeholder values. Certainly, there is clear evidence that practitioners label themselves with one of the many terms for the conservation of the historic environment rather than using another disciplinary term, such as "architect," "urban planner," or "architectural historian."

Furthermore, there is also another application of "preservation education" to consider, as used by the library science field.¹¹ While library and archival materials are important aspects of material culture—indeed, they are artifacts—does the study of the proper treatment of books fall within the scope of "preservation education," as the field of the historic environment perceives it? We do not believe this to be the case.

Last, in the twenty-first century, assumed ideas behind authenticity and significance are increasingly being called into question. The traditional definition of authenticity, which is well documented in national and international doctrine, is defined by the presence of "intact" fabric that has borne witness to past events. While this "fabric-based" definition of authenticity is still widely taught and employed in professional practice, it is now recognized that there are other dimensions of authenticity that are far more ambiguous within historic contexts. When we discuss authenticity it increasingly needs to be qualified, as Peter Howard directs when he asks, "Which authenticity do you mean . . . the authenticity of the material? Of the context? Experience? Function? Site?"¹² The univocal meaning of authenticity, if it ever existed, is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain in the twenty-first century.

In a similar sense, the meanings associated with "significance"—what places have and do not have value—are becoming increasingly diverse. Long associated with historical "facts" and aesthetical value, significance can now encompass social, cultural, and personal (experiential) values.¹³ The traditional concept of significance and these more contemporary meanings are often framed as "tangible" versus "intangible" values, respectively, but this dichotomy perpetuates the erroneous assumption that the value human beings associate with objects is somehow contained within the objects themselves.¹⁴ If, as it would indeed seem plausible, all values associated with historical objects are actually contained within the human frame, then all heritage is therefore intangible.¹⁵

It is not clear, however, how the increasing diversity of meanings associated with authenticity and significance should influence historic environment education, although as a number of chapters in this book suggest, the liberal arts may be particularly useful to better understand these meanings. Assuming that we make students better aware of these issues, how ought a broader definition of significance and authenticity affect practice, even when doctrines and regulatory environments tend to reinforce narrower, traditional interpretations? If authenticity and significance are foundational concepts for all research and practice in the historic environment, then this foundation is far from secure, as it is under attack from multiple perspectives. To meet this challenge, how should historic environment educators therefore address the multidimensional meanings associated with authenticity and significance in their research and teaching, especially in terms of how practice should be affected? This question, perhaps, is one of most significant ones for educators today, yet it has been addressed minimally, if at all, within a pedagogical frame.

The chapters in this volume that explore some of these issues are the result of “Preservation Education: Sharing Best Practices and Finding Common Ground,” an international conference held on September 8 and 9, 2012, in Providence, Rhode Island. This conference brought higher education leaders in historic environment programs together from across the globe. Attendees from the United States, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Italy, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom presented their research to explore outcomes-based education in an effort to produce better historic environment specialists and further define educators’ roles and responsibilities in the greater professional and public arena. While most attendees were from universities or colleges, vocational programs were also well represented.

The dearth of material on preservation/conservation education in relation to the historic environment was the impetus for both the “Preservation Education” conference and this publication. This book will hopefully provide a better basis for pedagogical methods for individuals responsible for postsecondary instruction at all levels—from the undergraduate to the doctoral—which address the historic environment. As far as the editors of this volume are aware, this is the first work of its kind that *exclusively* addresses historic environment education at the postsecondary (or tertiary) level that is published by an academic press and, as such, has undergone extensive peer review.¹⁶ There is therefore little precedent from which to base the selection and organization of this volume. The chapters herein are therefore representative of a broad range of pedagogical topics in an international context.

A number of similar conferences that have been convened, from the 1960s on, which also addressed historic environment education, but several characteristics make the 2012 “Preservation Education” conference unique. First, it was the first conference of its kind to emphasize learning objectives, assessment, outcomes, and specific pedagogical techniques. Previously, the focus has tended to be on content, topics, and theoretical principles. While these emphases are important, they miss the larger picture of understanding how students, in specific degree programs, should be held accountable in terms of learning outcomes. Second, its international focus is unusual, although not without precedent. The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) International Training Committee has hosted conferences with an international focus, for instance, but most educational conferences have focused on a national scale, such as those from National Council for Preservation Education (NCPE), the Conference on Training and Architectural Conservation (COTAC), and Heritage Canada Foundation’s National Roundtable on Heritage Education.

Third, the "Preservation Education" conference is the only one of its kind that has occurred outside of a membership organization, making it more accessible and open to participants from a wider variety of backgrounds. When all three of these characteristics are combined, the "Preservation Education" conference is justifiably unique and will hopefully set a new precedent that others will follow.

Last, the "Preservation Education" conference and this resulting volume were largely inspired by a lack of literature on the subject of historic environment education at the postsecondary level. For instance, NCPE only established the first refereed journal to focus on pedagogical topics in historic environment education in 2008. A literature review on topics related to historic environment education readily shows that there is a chronic lack of focus on pedagogy and curriculum development; specifically, there is little scholarship on assessing outcomes in the context of historic environment programs, defining what a "well-prepared" student is in relation to the job market or continued academic studies (the Ph.D.), and understanding expectations in regard to educating students to advance the discipline. This volume is therefore designed to provide a foundation for these topics and to encourage others to contribute original research and case studies to advance postsecondary level historic environment education.

Preservation Education: Sharing Best Practices and Finding Common Ground is unique within the field of academic study of pedagogical issues specific to preservation/conservation due to its breadth of subject matter, reflecting the growing number of people involved. In many ways it is a product, or an outgrowth, of a long tradition of analysis within preservation that has focused on training, which is sometimes called "best practices."¹⁷ In other words, the subject of the analysis has shifted from "what is the best way to fix a historic building?" to "what are the best ways for teaching people how to preserve historic properties (and why) according to the various standards that have been established?" Additionally, the historic resources are no longer just buildings, but a larger and more nuanced collection of landscapes, districts, sites, and objects. As the questions we ask have become more complex, the resulting analysis of pedagogical issues is increasingly multifaceted, recognizing there may be more than one way to approach the instruction of students through desired outcomes.

One Perspective on the Literature of Historic Environment Education

While acknowledging that historic environment education at the postsecondary level is a global endeavor, it is beyond the scope of this volume to conduct a complete literature review that encompasses aspects of

research and practice on six continents representing dozens of languages. Instead, we will offer the perspective from the United States as an example, not because it is necessarily representative of global practice, but because the editors are most familiar with this geographical area. What is discussed here will be applicable to North American practice in general and secondarily to other English-speaking contexts, such as the United Kingdom and Australia. We recognize that Asian, African, and Latin American contexts are not well represented in English-speaking literature and encourage others to more fully explore this area. Additionally, this review is not intended to represent a history of the historic preservation movement in the United States, as this has been done elsewhere.¹⁸ Michael Tomlan and Michael Woodcock have already addressed the history of graduate historic preservation programs in the United States, so this topic will also not be addressed in depth.¹⁹ What this review will accomplish, however, is a focus on seminal publications and events that influenced the development of the educational components of the field.

While any contemporary built environment conservation course would readily acknowledge the foundational nineteenth-century works of John Ruskin²⁰ and Eugène Viollet-le-Duc,²¹ a number of influential publications arose in the twentieth century that were equally influential in creating the basis for accepted preservation/conservation rhetoric, although they are no longer read on a regular basis. By the turn of the twentieth century, preservationists in the United States were increasingly interested in the preservation and restoration work happening in Europe, as evidenced by numerous reports by the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society on visits to various preservation and restoration projects in many countries, including Great Britain.²² The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), located in England, published some of the earliest examples of educational material on conservation techniques, such as *Notes on the Repair of Ancient Buildings* (1903), Charles Reed Peers's "The Care of Ancient Monuments" published in *The Architectural Review* (1917),²³ and Albert Powys's *Repair of Ancient Buildings* (1929).²⁴ These widely read materials focused on technical details, emphasizing a scientific approach to practice, including the need for accurate documentation. In essence, they were taking the preservation principles espoused by the 1877 SPAB Manifesto and putting them into action.²⁵

While early American preservationists were reading these materials, they did not adopt the strict preservationist mentality of the Europeans, instead opting to restore buildings to a hypothetical period from the past. They did, however, adopt a similar scientific mentality in their efforts as with Joseph Everett Chandler's restoration of Paul Revere's house in Boston

from 1907 to 1908. A 1914 article from *The Architectural Record* describes Chandler's work as a process of scientific inference with archaeological overtones.²⁶ Such an approach achieved its full flower in the restoration and reconstruction of Colonial Williamsburg in the 1930s where any hint of "imagination" or "theatrical" methods was strongly discouraged. Only a "valid" scientific approach could restore the one and only "original reality" of a building, according to Colonial Williamsburg's architects. Fiske Kimball's 1935 assessment of the project was that it "evoked substantial accuracy and perfection."²⁷ To its inventors, Colonial Williamsburg was the "historic truth" based in "fact."²⁸ A complete issue of *Architectural Record* in 1935 (vol. 78, no. 6) featured a comprehensive chronicle of the work at Colonial Williamsburg and the principles of its restorers and helped introduce a new generation of architects to a specific philosophy behind the restoration of old buildings.

Not everyone agreed with the restoration philosophy at Colonial Williamsburg, however. William Sumner Appleton, the founder of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities (now called Historic New England), instead emphasized strict preservation over restoration, but, at the same time, was careful to advocate for similar scientifically oriented, archaeological techniques in documentation, and, when justified, restoration.²⁹ Appleton's publications that outline this approach helped frame the counterpoint to Colonial Williamsburg; eventually Appleton's ideas prevailed, especially with the National Park Service, but it would take many decades for this to be realized.

It was in the 1930s that the National Park Service started to assume an influential role in historic preservation practice, largely through the efforts of Charles E. Peterson. An early, published example of best practice in the United States is the 1935 edition of *Specifications for the Measurement and Recording of Historic American Buildings and Structural Remains*. It was "authored" by the Historic American Building Survey (HABS), which was part of the National Park Service, just two years after the program's creation. It is highly probable Peterson was the sole or contributing author of this publication, as he was responsible for creating HABS.³⁰ As the title implies, the purpose of this publication (and its subsequent reiterations under various titles to the present, such as the *HABS Field Guide*) is to instruct the reader how to best measure and record historic buildings using accurate, scientific methods.

After World War II, the National Park Service established its official stance on historic preservation, emphasizing "stabilization and preservation" rather than "restoration or reconstruction" and appropriated the words of Diderot, the eighteenth-century French archaeologist: "It is bet-

ter to preserve than repair, better to repair than restore, and better to restore than to reconstruct."³¹ Through its *Preservation Briefs* and *Preservation Tech Notes*, begun in the 1970s, the National Park Service has been responsible for promoting a wide variety of technical recommendations and establishing a philosophical approach to interventions. In a similar sense, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards,³² a series of documents outlining a doctrinal philosophy of treatment for preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, and the *National Register Bulletins* have been enormously influential on historic preservation education, justifying the basis for the identification of historic buildings and districts as well as their treatment.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) also played a leading role in the development of preservation education in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s by hosting a series of three conferences in Williamsburg, Virginia, that generated publications that addressed questions concerning the definition and scope of the field as well as the development of training and educational programs. The first of these conferences was the Seminar on Preservation and Restoration, which convened in September 1963 and sought to understand "the history of American preservation (including its European background), to analyze its philosophical basis, examine its present effectiveness, and to discuss ideal ways to shape its future."³³ This conference resulted in the book, *Historic Preservation Today*, which, for the first time, began to codify the boundaries of the discipline of historic preservation, its history, and its philosophy. The appendix of this work contains a page-and-a-half that addresses education, with an emphasis on establishing standards, apprenticeship programs, and reference books on historical building construction.³⁴ Arguably, Charles E. Peterson was likely the driving force behind these recommendations, emphasizing the need for students to be directly engaged in restoration work.³⁵

A year after the publication of *Historic Preservation Today*, in March 1967, the NTHP organized a second conference, "Principles and Guidelines Workshop II," which produced *Historic Preservation Tomorrow*, published in the same year. This book refined the work of the earlier conference, but it is the chapter by Walter Muir Whitehill that is of particular importance, as it describes the need to create a "corps of [preservation] technicians [such as] artisans competent to reproduce the early craft objects in wood, masonry and metal, to architects versed in restoration of individual buildings, to planners and landscape architects skilled in creating proper surroundings for them."³⁶ Whitehill called on schools of architecture to create these programs at the graduate level and for scholars to

research needed reference books on early American construction methods and techniques. He also encouraged institutions to create apprenticeship programs for craftspeople. Whitehill's chapter formed the basis of *The Whitehill Report on Professional and Public Education for Historic Preservation*, a document published by the NTHP in 1968, which formed the foundation of the new degree programs in historic preservation that American colleges and universities would create over the next decades.³⁷ This report advocated for the immediate creation of university and apprenticeship programs in partnership with the NTHP.

The third, and last, Williamsburg conference was "Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices," organized in 1972 in collaboration with the International Centre for Conservation (ICC) in Rome; it produced a publication by the same name in 1976.³⁸ The material presented at this third conference included a much stronger emphasis on art and materials conservation than in previous conferences, possibly due to the influence of the ICC. This work is particularly important as it presents in clear and unambiguous detail the professional roles of the preservation/restoration architect, historian, materials conservator, and preservation planner. It also includes a series of chapters on historic preservation education, including an analysis by Stephen Jacobs on the inadequacy of most universities to address the growing need to create preservation-specific programs, while lauding the nascent efforts of the preservation programs of Columbia University, Cornell University, the University of Florida at Gainesville, and the University of Virginia at Charlottesville.³⁹ The art conservation degree program at New York University's Conservation Center, which produced some of the first American architectural conservators, is described in detail, including its curricula and specializations.⁴⁰

At the time, the inclusion of New York University's university-level curriculum in a publication was unusual, and would remain so throughout the 1970s as the major focus on curriculum design was on primary and secondary, not tertiary (postsecondary), education. The first consequential work at the primary and secondary level was *Education Through Historical Preservation* (1979) by Eugene Cizek and Lloyd Sensat, which began as a program two years earlier in select Louisiana public schools.⁴¹ Their premise was "knowing our past helps us to understand the present and see the way toward a more meaningful and environmentally responsible future."⁴² In 1981, the Education Through Historic Preservation program was the first preservation education program to be given an Honor Award by the NTHP.⁴³ Roughly at the same time (1980), Carol D. Holden, Gary L. Olsen, and Michele R. Olsen produced *Historic Preservation Education: Curriculum Materials*. Both publications were lesson plan in-

struction manuals directed toward teachers of primary education. The manual by Holden, Olsen, and Olsen was funded by several preservation-related organizations, including the Champaign County Historical Museum, the Illinois Humanities Council, the National Endowment of the Humanities, and NTHP. These authors were "deeply concerned by the lack of understanding today's children show for their built environment," and thus went on to guide teachers how to teach the relevance of historic preservation, with an emphasis on architectural history.⁴⁴ Both *Education Through Historical Preservation* and *Historic Preservation Education: Curriculum Materials* differed significantly from early publications prevailing at the time, like *Children and Architecture* by Emily A. Barnes and Bess M. Young (1932), where the curriculum was focused on architectural history, design, and nomenclature—not on preservation or repair.⁴⁵

Robert Melnick and Richard Wagner published one of the first guidelines on the creation of postsecondary curricula for historic preservation programs in 1979. Their article identified six guidelines that all such programs should emphasize: there should be clear occupational outcomes, the material must emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of the field, only graduate programs should be created (undergraduate programs were inappropriate), new programs should be a natural outgrowth from related programs, there should be a focus on regional resources, and the programs should remain small to maximize quality.⁴⁶ Other, contemporary examples of curricula tended to instead focus on integrating a preservation concentration within an already existing built environment program, such as interior design or landscape architecture.⁴⁷

At the time, Melnick and Wagner's article was a rare example of published material providing guidance in postsecondary historic preservation education. In reaction to this lack of specific guidance on the development of postsecondary educational programs and their curricula, university educators formed NCPE between 1978 and 1980 at the instigation of the NTHP.⁴⁸ It was during this time that an understanding was emerging among academics in historic preservation that greater coordination and communication was needed for the purposes of facilitating new and assisting already extant preservation programs, fostering the exchange of ideas (both best practices and pedagogy), and creating better public awareness about the preservation field. Six years later (1986), the nonprofit Historic Preservation Education Foundation was chartered in order to disseminate information on important preservation issues not readily available to the public.

By the late 1980s, a broader academic discussion related to preservation pedagogy and curriculum design had emerged in the form of whitepapers.

Publications from more readily available and peer-reviewed sources, such as refereed journals and university presses, remained rare. Some of these whitepapers are available from the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTT), the Getty Research Institute, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) (Rome), as well as various research libraries. These papers have been produced by such organizations as the National Park Service, NTHP, and NCPE, among others. Examples include *A Heritage at Risk: A Report on Heritage Education (K-12)* and *Focus on 2000: A Heritage Education Perspective*.⁴⁹ A cross-referenced index of repositories as well as their holdings has yet to be developed, so the current extent of these whitepapers is not fully known.

The first historic preservation books that universities and colleges used as textbooks appeared in the 1980s. These works often found a home in the undergraduate and graduate preservation programs across the country, even though many of their authors did not necessarily intend them to be used in this way. James M. Fitch's *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*, published in 1982, was arguably the first such example.⁵⁰ Fitch's books, along with *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* by William J. Murtagh (1988), were popular because they were written in an easily understood photojournalist format, but their objective was still "formal training" and a basic level of understanding that historic places should be preserved.⁵¹ The great shift here was the intended (or unintentional) audience, which was now an educated person interested in a preservation introduction, in contrast to a technical publication for someone already trained in architecture, city planning, or archaeology, which was common up until this time.

The rise of the book targeted at preservation students took place shortly after two key events within the greater history-heritage umbrella: the bicentennial celebrations of American independence (c. 1975-87) and the formal organization of public history as a discipline (c. 1976-79). The 200th anniversary of the United States fostered people's interest in their historic past, especially in places where significant events had taken place, and so outreach to help foster public understanding of historic preservation needed to be developed. Furthermore, this approach, akin to the public history discipline, had to present the information in a way that was both meaningful and understandable. Previous publications, such as the HABS's *Specifications*, were too technical, targeting professionals in existing, well-established disciplines, rather than assuming their readers originated from a broader background. The new historic preservation textbooks made fewer

assumptions about their readers' disciplinary background and were ready tools to engage a broader public in the field.

One area that had broad implications for the public, yet relied on a specific disciplinary background, was law. The regulatory environment figures prominently in the identification and protection of historic resources and has broad impact on property owners and, as such, preservation law has been central to most historic preservation programs since their inception. Robert E. Stipe was an early leader in this area, catalyzing interest with his article, "Preservation Lawyers—Unite," in the July 1970 issue of *Preservation News*, written while he was on a Fulbright Fellowship in England. The NTHP hosted a conference on preservation law in Washington, D.C., the following year.⁵² Law journals, such as the *Duke University Law Journal* and the *Wake Forest University Law Review*, published editions devoted to preservation legal topics in 1971 and 1976, respectively.⁵³ In 1982, the same year that Fitch published his book, Stipe wrote the influential publication *Local Preservation Legislation: Questions and Answers* and *Historic Preservation in Foreign Countries*.⁵⁴ These kinds of exchanges in preservation legal approaches between Europe and North America sustain the tradition of exchanging ideas on theory and practice begun by Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc and John Ruskin in the nineteenth century.⁵⁵

In the twenty-first century, published articles on preservation education are increasingly focusing on an international context, such as in the Middle East, Latin America, and Asia, and the problems inherent with non-Western concepts of authenticity and intangible heritage,⁵⁶ which parallels the growth of new programs that address World Heritage, such as the M.S. in architecture-heritage conservation and preservation at the University of Minnesota. Other emerging themes include techniques to more effectively collaborate with other built environment professionals, even when there are significant differences, such as the mapping, bridging, and integrating model developed at the University of Hong Kong.⁵⁷ More is being published on curriculum design and pedagogical techniques, especially those focusing on experiential learning, such as the University of Pennsylvania's graduate "praxis" program⁵⁸ and service learning as part of Shepherd University's undergraduate historic preservation program.⁵⁹ Unique curricula, such as preservation engineering, are also being explored.⁶⁰ Last, there is an increasing focus on the role of liberal arts education in undergraduate programs, "balancing depth and breadth" in the curriculum, and raising questions in terms of the relationship between undergraduate and graduate education.⁶¹

Perhaps the most promising development in terms of scholarship in historic environment education is NCPE's creation of *Preservation Education and Research* (PER) in 2008, with Anat Geva and Nancy Volkman serving as founding co-editors. This is the first refereed journal in English focusing exclusively on issues of historic environment education.⁶² Although the journal is based in the United States, its focus is international and since its inaugural issue has published on a wide variety of pedagogical topics of interest to a global audience. It holds the promise of becoming an influential and essential resource for the historic environment educator.

This publication, as an edited book, is a first—a volume specifically devoted to historic environment education—within the United States, and possibly abroad, to be published by an academic press. The previous efforts, such as by NCPE and Columbia University's Preservation Alumni, were produced by preservation interest groups. Like the publications that came before this, we hope that it becomes a link in a continuously growing chain of understanding on this very important matter, such as a monograph completely devoted to the subject.

The Best Practices Shared and the Ground Found in Common

With the past literature on preservation education behind us what did we—the editors and contributors to this project—find for the present? Moreover, what directions for the future are we going (as well as where are we not)? We begin with Regina Faden's "You Don't Have to Give Up What You Love: Liberal Arts at Work," with her interest in museum studies—an allied field to historic preservation. According to Faden, at a time when Americans are questioning the value of higher education, many parents and students want to be reassured that their significant financial and personal investment toward an undergraduate liberal arts education is not frivolous. Her premise comes from the fact that many undergraduate colleges traditionally fail their students, particularly those in the arts and humanities, by not defining the skills students learn at school and their practical and meaningful application—unless it means graduate school. Liberal arts colleges need to help students identify and apply the skills they learn at college, possibly as part of an internship. Then college graduates will be able to pursue a career without having to forfeit the subjects they love because they do not know how to find a place that values their skills and interests. Robert Russell continues with a similar analysis, expanding it into a comparative study called "First Pete and then Repeat? Fundamental Differences in Intention between Undergraduate and Grad-

uate Preservation Programs.” Russell argues that despite the increasing emphasis in undergraduate education across the country on what is essentially job training—the direct (and frequently explicit) correlation between a major and an assumed future employment trajectory—the goal of undergraduate liberal arts education should not be directly related to employment. Conversely, the common purpose of graduate training in historic preservation is preparation for a professional career. Few choose academia or some other path. Therefore, even though there might appear to be significant overlap in undergraduate and graduate curriculums, the ultimate goals of the two enterprises are different enough that what may appear to be the same is actually something very distinctive at the graduate level from what is taught to undergraduates.

Robert W. Ogle, in “Thinking and Doing: A Twenty-First Century Pedagogy for Preserving the Historic Architectural Artifact,” explores the historical American educational models that were designed to resuscitate the skills requisite of the craft tradition and why they failed. He also reviews the recent revival in heritage preservation and how certain colleges and universities are addressing student and market demand. The preservation integrated learning model (PILM)—which looks at status quo, field school, strategic partnership, and full integration for curriculum design—references the historic craft tradition yet integrates the relational concepts of thinking-doing, head-hand, theory-practice within a framework that recognizes recent advances in preservation technology and the vertiginous variety of contemporary higher education institutional structures in the United States. According to Ogle, PILM serves as a roadmap for administrators, faculty, researchers, practitioners, and stewards of heritage property to see a clearer pathway to reuniting “thinking and doing” in preservation education, especially at the undergraduate level.

Andréa Livi Smith’s “The Development of a Preservation Planning Board Game” studies the experience of senior undergraduate historic preservation students as they develop and design a preservation planning educational game at a liberal arts institution as part of their final project prior to graduation. The course included the design and administration of a questionnaire to assess aspects of preservation planning best adapted to game inclusion. The course itself was a valuable learning experience for the students, who had to deepen their mastery of preservation planning concepts and terms as well as work together toward a common goal.

In order to broaden our horizons (referring to the predominantly North American audience reading this book) we also look at international perspectives, beginning with Silvio Mendes Zancheti and the “Challenges and Dilemmas in Heritage Conservation,” looking at Brazil and other

parts of the world. Zancheti's approach is on using scientific and cultural approaches to conservation. Continuing with the discussion in Latin America is the chapter "Benefits of Using Qualitative Methodologies in the Evaluation of Preservation Training Programs' Performance in Developing Countries: A Case Study of the Northeast Region of Brazil," co-authored by Karla Nunes Penna and Elisabeth Taylor. Within their research they delve into the issue of establishing parameters for evaluating performance of preservation training programs in developing countries, which has (so far) proven challenging to institutions and professionals. Educational programs set within harsh social, economic, and political contexts where heritage preservation is not usually seen as an essential component of the urban development process in the face of poverty and social inequality are confronted with issues affecting the outcomes of evaluations. Considering these issues is essential in order to establish appropriate quality levels for training programs. Evaluations made within this situation demand personal reflections and in-depth understanding of a given context, meaning the evaluation should not depend entirely on quantitative methods. Gathering information through qualitative methods provides new insights into the experiences of individuals, groups, and communities, and highlights "invisible" issues. Their aim is to present some of the benefits of utilizing qualitative ethnographic methods to evaluate the performance of conservation training centers based on "more realistic" standards.

Looking to Europe is the example of Sweden, in "Integrated Conservation of Built Environments: Swedish Reflections from Three Decades of Program Development," co-authored by Bosse Lagerqvist, Ingrid Martins Holmberg, and Ola Wetterberg. Beginning with the bachelor's program in Integrated Conservation of Built Environments at the University of Gothenburg in 1978, and into the mid-1980s, preservation was a local experiment until it was considered acceptable in Sweden's higher education curriculum. As a program that brought together scholarly traditions from the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, as well as technology, it was gradually accepted due to the growing societal need for professionals mastering the complex problems involved when preserving and developing built environments. Since 1978 the development of content and structure has been balancing three pedagogical perspectives: the subject matter (history of built environments), professional practices, and theoretical perspectives with reflection on subject matter and practices. This chapter discusses the perspectives of the program's pedagogics and challenges that provide useful insights on practice-based higher education, as well as the necessity to generate research that could contextualize coursework with knowledge and meaning.

From the Middle East, the cradle of humanity's earliest built environments and architectural monuments, is a contribution by Shelley-Anne Peleg entitled *Saving the Stones—Practical Conservation Training Program: A Case Study of the International Conservation Center, Citt'adi Roma (in Acre, Israel)*." According to her research there is a moral responsibility in the way cultural heritage is preserved, entailing an ongoing need for new approaches. It means that conservation must continue to develop and adopt new holistic approaches that address social values as well as the obvious building materials and construction and safety issues. Her case study is that of Acre, Israel, where the heritage there to be preserved includes the Christian Crusaders and Muslim Ottomans, which is administered by the Jewish state's Israel Antiquities Authority and multiple academic institutions. It is within this historic city, built on many layers of civilization, that modern life continues. Ongoing conservation and development procedures present true challenges and questions. Prerequisites for the conservation training programs in Acre include sharing, exchanging, and facilitating students from backgrounds of history, art, archaeology, and architecture as well as law, theology, sociology, and cultural studies.

While international perspectives on preservation education are incredibly valuable and rich, there is also much to be learned from distance learning—education that can take place from *anywhere* (in contrast to somewhere) by means of new technologies and modes of communication. We begin with Henry Russell and Philip Leverton's "Delivering a Changing Conservation Curriculum by Distance Learning in the Twenty-First Century." Russell and Leverton provide a U.K. perspective on the changing shape of university- and college-level education in the field of preservation as the twenty-first century unfolds. Emphasis is placed on the delivery of programs by means of distance learning, enhanced by e-learning capabilities, rather than provision by means of full-time, classroom-based tuition. The evolution of the concept of "heritage" is discussed, with regard to both the range of buildings, structures, and their settings afforded this status, and the growing awareness of the need to understand the significance of such assets from a range of perspectives. The question is asked as to whether our established understanding of what constitutes a "program" is undergoing change as the notion of the traditional "place-based" higher education institution comes under challenge. The emergence of opportunities for learning through massive open online courses (MOOCs) is noted. It is argued that opportunities may emerge for an increasingly more diverse range of students to register from a global pool of online options in order to meet their particular interests in heritage conservation.

In comparison to Russell and Leverton's chapter is "Public History, Adult Students, and the Community: Moving Beyond the Distance-Education Classroom," by Anastasia L. Pratt. Each of the courses brings the theories and methods of public history to the students' local communities. Students visit, analyze, and work with local museums, historical societies, archives, and libraries. They complete oral history interviews of local people. They become part of their community's history. In venturing into the community, local historians, archivists, librarians, teachers, and storytellers are invited to join us in the academic world. Programs ranging from webinars to speaking engagements are a natural outgrowth of this interaction. Of particular interest is the interplay of public history with preservation education.

The origins of preservation education have a strong root in design-related pedagogical studies, such as architecture and interior design, but not exclusively. Paul Hardin Kapp, Lauren Weiss Bricker, and Luis G. Hoyos's study, "Documentation and Design in Association: Historic Preservation Design Using Social History, Advocacy, and Drawing in the Architecture Design Studio," found that historic preservation programs can challenge the traditional curricula offered by schools of architecture. Moreover, historic preservation concentrations offered within larger architectural programs present unique opportunities for the education of designers—whether they are focusing on preservation or not. From the onset, students encounter a building, or a grouping of buildings and spaces; however, they often are not introduced to broader history that both created them or affected them. Moreover, architecture students often lack an understanding of historic context that is embedded in the historic resource. The historic preservation design instructor's primary objective is to introduce to students how to understand and document hierarchical characteristics of historic environments. Their approach explores design pedagogy that incorporates material documentation, understanding, theory, and practice of historic preservation, specifically through the use of social history, advocacy, and graphic presentation in the historic preservation studio. The primary goal in this pedagogical approach is to widen the range of applications of the students' architectural skills while recognizing that architecture has social implications within the patrimony of the city.

Diniz Moreira and Luiz Manuel do Eirado Amorim continue the study of preservation architect pedagogy with "Training in the Conservation of Modern Architecture: A Latin American Experience" and the challenges of preserving modern architecture. Issues pertaining to modern buildings include the use of new materials that were not fully understood in terms of their long-term performance; the use of traditional materials in

new ways; the misconception that modern buildings required little maintenance or were maintenance-free; and the misunderstanding of the patina as a dirty stain (and not as a natural sign of aging). In this context, it is necessary to prepare architects and engineers to face the new challenges posed by the conservation of this built heritage. Therefore, they argue that there is a need for specific training in the conservation of modern architecture that differs from the traditional one. By considering these training issues, we also expect to contribute to the discussion of the major challenges faced by the conservation of modern architecture.

Focusing specifically on building interiors is Melissa Santana and Valerie L. Settles's innovative research on "Integrating Historic Preservation into the Undergraduate Interior Design Curriculum." They have found that interior design education most frequently focuses on developing new spaces; however, it is increasingly important for designers to utilize existing buildings in pursuit of more sustainable design strategies. Although many believe that sustainable design addresses only environmental issues, it also encompasses economic and social aspects, as does historic preservation. Consequently, Santana and Settles see historic preservation as a natural choice for inclusion in an interior design curriculum because it is a technique that allows students to integrate sustainable characteristics into a design solution. Due to this natural fit, students are able to understand preservation terminology and apply the standards that are often required for a certified rehabilitation.

Robert Benedict and Cari Goetcheus add to the design-related pedagogical milieu through the real estate profession in "The Critical Role of Preservation in Graduate Real Estate Curricula." Their premise is that preservation curricula have long offered single courses in related fields to broaden the horizons of preservation students, yet a consistent dilemma has been balancing the need to provide preservation-focused skill sets (i.e., preservation theory, historic style identification, preservation law, etc.) with rudimentary exposure to the variety of discipline realms in which preservation resides (i.e., real estate development, public policy, land use planning, etc.). This chapter delves into one of those discipline realms within which preservation resides, real estate development, to address a perceived curricula gap within graduate real estate programs. The perceived weakness in real estate pedagogy is that for real estate development students interested in the adaptive reuse of historic properties and/or taking advantage of historic tax incentives there is little preservation training currently offered, yet a demand exists.

The last two contributing chapters, "Social Science Research Methodologies and Historic Preservation: Broadening the Possibilities for a

Preservation Thesis" by Jeremy C. Wells and "Learning Among Friends: Using Heritage-Based Educational Practices to Improve Preservation Law Pedagogy," by Barry L. Stiefel and Gilbert S. Stiefel, propose that how pedagogical methods are used in preservation programs may need to be reconsidered for qualitative improvement. Each of their approaches has studied others who have questioned the way we learn best. Wells looks at the empirical master's thesis, exploring areas in which social science research methodologies can be applied to specific historic environment research questions. While there is a wide array of social science research methodologies available from grounded theory to phenomenology, many of these approaches can be a poor fit given the limited resources and disciplinary background of a master's student, but a few, such as content analysis, lend themselves more naturally to the pragmatic approach demanded by master's-level research. Wells also discusses ways to more effectively mentor students, especially in the problems encountered with human subject research, such as obtaining appropriate samples along with the importance of creating and sticking with a work plan.

Stiefel and Stiefel propose that historic preservation professionals' perspectives are shaped by educational experiences. Indeed, certain subjects may be learned more efficiently using methods developed by other cultures. This premise is exhibited in the teaching of historic preservation law and legal practice. The traditional Socratic method, as developed by Harvard University's Christopher Columbus Langdell, is compared with the *havruta* method used by the Jewish people, with preservation law used in place of Jewish religious law in a secular academic setting. Therefore, exposure to learning about preservation using methodologies developed by different cultural traditions might facilitate a richer experience, including other subjects besides preservation law.

A final chapter focuses on the outcomes of the scholarship. Here, the editors have analyzed where we appear to be now, the directions we appear to be headed, as well as other directions that should be considered. As mentioned previously, the intention of this scholarship is to be the beginning of a new line of inquiry—not the end all. We not only hope, but also look forward to what lies ahead in the teaching of historic preservation and how it can always be made better. In the words of the late Robert E. Stipe, "basically it [historic preservation] is the saving of people and lives and cities—not just buildings—that is important to all of us. We have before us the unparalleled opportunity, if we are determined, to contribute significantly to upgrading the quality of human existence. If we can achieve this, to some extent at least, the architecture and history [and everything else] will fall into place."⁶³

Notes

1. "Not What It Used to Be," *Economist* (1 December 2012), 29–30.
2. See Trevor Hussey and Patrick Smith, *The Trouble with Higher Education: A Critical Examination of Our Universities* (New York: Routledge, 2010).
3. See Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa, *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).
4. S. Hodge, "The Origins of Competency-based Learning," *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 47:2 (2007), 180.
5. John Carroll, "A Model of School Learning," *Teachers College Record*, 64 (1963), 723–33; Benjamin Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," *Evaluation Comment*, 1:2 (1968), 1–5.
6. William G. Spady, "Competency Based Education: A Bandwagon in Search of a Definition," *Educational Researcher*, 6:1 (1977), 9–14; William G. Spady, *Outcome-Based Instructional Management: A Sociological Perspective* (Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1981).
7. Ronald Barnett and Kelly Coate, *Engaging the Curriculum in Higher Education* (Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education, 2005), 38.
8. Kevin Donnelly, *Dumbing Down: Outcomes-based and Politically Correct—the Impact of the Culture Wars on Our Schools* (Prahan, Victoria: Hardie Grant Books, 2007); Phyllis Schlafly, "What's Wrong with Outcome-Based Education?" *The Phyllis Schlafly Report*, 26:10 (1993), 1–4.
9. Michael Tomlan, "Historic Preservation Education: Alongside Architecture in Academia," *Journal of Architectural Education*, 47:4 (1994), 187–96; John H. Stubbs and Emily Gunzburger Makaš, *Architectural Conservation in Europe and the Americas: National Experiences and Practice* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2011), 101.
10. Jack Amariglio, Stephen Resnick, and Richard Wolff, "Division and Difference in the 'Discipline' of Economics," *Critical Inquiry*, 17:1 (1990), 150.
11. See Association of Research Libraries, *Preservation Education in ARL Libraries* (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 1985); Susan G. Swartzburg, *Preservation Education Directory* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1988); and Michèle Valerie Cloonan, *Global Perspectives on Preservation Education* (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1994).
12. Peter Howard, "Historic Landscapes and the Recent Past: Whose History?" in *Valuing Historic Environments*, ed. Lisanne Gibson and John Pendlebury (Surry: Ashgate Publishing, 2009).
13. Jeremy C. Wells, "Authenticity in More Than One Dimension: Reevaluating a Core Premise of Historic Preservation," *Forum Journal*, 24:3 (2010), 36–40; Randall Mason, "Fixing Historic Preservation: A Constructive Critique of 'Significance,'" *Places*, 16:1 (2003), 64–71.
14. Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith, and Gary Campbell, "The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion," *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12:4 (2006), 339–55.
15. Laurajane Smith, *The Uses of Heritage* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2006), 54.
16. Since the 1960s, there are examples of individual chapters in broader publications that address historic environment education at the postsecondary level, which are discussed in the section addressing historic environment literature. In addition, the National Council for Preservation Education (NCPE) has released a series of unpublished booklets that address historic preservation education topics.
17. "Best practice" is the improvement of method or technique of a vocational skill applied to preservation practice. This is in contrast to pedagogy (the science of education), which ranges from early childhood development to advance skills acquisition.
18. For instance, see Charles Bridgham Hosmer, *Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg* (New York: Putnam,

1965); Charles Bridgham Hosmer, *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926–1949* (Charlottesville: Preservation Press, 1981); William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1997).

19. Michael A. Tomlan, "Observations on an 'Established Discipline': The Continuing Development of Preservation Education at the Graduate Level," in *Historic Preservation: Forging a Discipline: Proceedings of a Symposium in Honor of James Marston Fitch and Twenty Years of Historic Preservation at Columbia University*, ed. Beth Sullabarger (New York: Preservation Alumni, 1989), 57–64; Tomlan, "Historic Preservation Education," 187–96; David G. Woodcock, "Academic Preparation for Preservation Practice," *APT Bulletin*, 40:3/4 (2009), 43–49.

20. John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1849).

21. Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire Raisonné de L'architecture Française* (Paris: B. Bance, 1854).

22. An example of this type of investigation is from the *Twentieth Annual Report, 1915, of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society* (Albany: J. B. Lyon Company, 1915), which reported on preservation and restoration work in Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Sweden, and Italy.

23. Charles Reed Peers, "The Care of Ancient Monuments," *Architectural Review*, 41 (March 1917), 65–66.

24. A. R. Powys, *Repair of Ancient Buildings* (London: J. M. Dent; New York, E. P. Dutton, 1929).

25. The SPAB Manifesto emphasized the need to preserve old buildings (i.e., keep all layers of change as intact as possible) versus restore them. See <http://www.spab.org.uk/what-is-spab/the-manifesto/>.

26. "Restoration of the Paul Revere House, Boston," *Architectural Record*, 36 (July 1914), 80.

27. Fiske Kimball, "The Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia," *Architectural Record*, 78:6 (1935), 359.

28. William Graves Perry, "Notes on the Architecture [of Colonial Williamsburg]," *Architectural Record*, 78:6 (1935), 370–77.

29. William Sumner Appleton, "Destruction and Preservation of Old Buildings in New England," *Art and Archaeology*, 8:3 (1919), 131–83.

30. See Historic American Buildings Survey, *Specifications for the Measurement and Recording of Historic American and Structural Remains* (Washington, DC: Historic American Buildings Survey, 1935).

31. Newton B. Drury, "A Symposium on Principles of Historic Restoration: The National Park Service," *Antiques* (July 1950), 30.

32. See <http://www.nps.gov/hps/TPS/standguide/>. Although originally intended to evaluate federal historic tax credit projects and embedded in a regulatory framework, the Standards have been widely adopted across all levels of practice and education within the United States.

33. National Trust, *Historic Preservation Today* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1966), v.

34. *Ibid.*, 254, 255.

35. *Ibid.*, 220.

36. Walter Muir Whitehill, "Education and Training for Restoration Work," in *Historic Preservation Tomorrow* (Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1967), 32.

37. Walter Muir Whitehill, *The Whitehill Report on Professional and Public Education for Historic Preservation* (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1968).

38. Sharon Timmons (ed.), *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices* (Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1976).

39. Stephen Jacobs, "The Education of Architectural Preservation Specialists in the United States," in *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*, ed. Sharon Timmons (Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1976), 457. At the time of the conference, in 1972, none of these universities had established a specific degree program in historic preservation. Columbia University and Cornell University would go on to establish master's programs in the 1970s, while the University of Florida continued with its original concept of housing preservation as a concentration within an architectural studies curriculum until it created its first preservation degree program in the 2000s. The University of Virginia still maintains that the best approach to training preservationists/conservationists is to create a specialization within other disciplines.

40. Lawrence Majewski, "The Education of Art Conservators," in *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*, ed. Sharon Timmons (Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1976), 481–92.

41. Eugene Cizek and Lloyd Sensat, *Education Through Historical Preservation* (St. Charles Parish, LA: St. Charles Parish Schools, 1979).

42. Will Fellows, *A Passion to Preserve: Gay Men as Keepers of Culture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 235.

43. Eugene Cizek, e-mail message to Barry Stiefel, 5 November 2012. We are greatly indebted to Dr. Cizek for the insights he provided with his early, groundbreaking preservation education research.

44. Carol D. Holden, Gary L. Olsen, and Michele R. Olsen, *Historic Preservation Education: Curriculum Materials* (Champaign, IL: The Center for the Study of Art and Architecture, 1980), Introduction (no page number).

45. Emily A. Barnes and Bess M. Young, *Children and Architecture* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University for Lincoln School of Teachers College, 1932).

46. Robert Melnick and Richard Wagner, "Preservation Education: Guidelines and Implementation of a Program," *Bulletin of the Association for Preservation Technology*, 11:2 (1979), 53–59.

47. Buie Harwood, "A Force for the Future: Preservation Education Case Study: Interior Design, Winedale Institute in Historic Preservation, University of Texas at Austin," *Journal of Interior Design*, 5–6:1 (1979), 23–32; Suzanne L. Turner, "Preservation as a Component in Curricula of Landscape Architecture," in *Research in Landscape Architecture: The Annual Meeting of the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture, August 20–23, 1980*, ed. Arnold R. Alanan (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980), 59–60.

48. Michael A. Tomlan, "The Early Years: Founding the National Council for Preservation Education," *Preservation Education & Research*, 3 (2010), 70–71.

49. National Council for Preservation Education, *A Heritage at Risk: A Report on Heritage Education (K–12)* (Burlington: University of Vermont Historic Preservation Program and the National Council for Preservation Education, 1987); and Caneta Skelley Hankins, *Focus on 2000: A Heritage Education Perspective* (Natchitoches, LA: National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, 1997).

50. Fitch was the founder of Columbia University's preservation program, the first in the country. The first editor (Jeremy Wells) used Fitch's book at the University of Pennsylvania while the second editor (Barry Stiefel) used it at Eastern Michigan University.

51. James M. Fitch, *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1982), i. See also William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (Pittstown, NJ: Main Street Press, 1988).

52. "Trust Sponsors 1st Conference on Preservation Law Problems," *Preservation News*, 11:6 (1 June 1971), 1–2.

53. Rufus Edmisten, "Tribute to Robert E. Stipe," *North Carolina Central Law Review*, 11 (1979-80), 201; and "Robert E. Stipe, 1929-2007," *Popular Government*, 73:2 (2008), 46-47.
54. Robert E. Stipe, *Local Preservation Legislation: Questions and Answers* (Albany: Preservation League of New York State, 1982); and Robert E. Stipe, *Historic Preservation in Foreign Countries* (Washington, DC: US/ICOMOS, 1982).
55. Norman Tyler, Ted Ligibel, and Ilene Tyler, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles, and Practice* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2009), 18-24.
56. Aylin Orbasli, "Training Conservation Professionals in the Middle East," *Built Environment*, 33:3 (2007), 307-22; Mirna Soto Medina and Luis Villacorta Santamato, "Built Heritage Conservation Education: A Reflection from Peru," *Built Environment*, 33:3 (2007), 323-41; Rahul Mehrotra, "Conservation and Change: Questions for Conservation Education in Urban India," *Built Environment*, 33:3 (2007), 342-56; Yongtanit Pimonsathean, "Conservation Education as a Form of Community Service in Thailand," *Built Environment*, 33:3 (2007), 357-70; Robert Garland Thompson, "On-site Conservation Training in Cambodia: A Critical Survey of Activities at Angkor," *Built Environment*, 33:3 (2007), 371-91.
57. Lynne D. DiStefano, Sharif Shams Imon, Ho-yin Lee, and Joseph J. DiStefano, "Bridging Differences: A Model for Effective Communication Between Different Disciplines Through Conservation Training Programs for Professionals," *City and Time*, 1:2 (2005), 1-15.
58. Frank Matero, "All Things Useful and Ornamental: A Praxis-based Model for Conservation Education," *Built Environment*, 33:3 (2007), 287-94.
59. Keith D. Alexander, "Reflections on Eight Semesters of Employing Service Learning in an Undergraduate Historic Preservation Course," *Preservation Education & Research*, 4 (2011), 83-92.
60. John A. Matteo, "Preservation Engineering: Framing a New Curriculum," *Preservation Education & Research*, 4 (2011), 93-106.
61. Andréa Livi Smith, "The Young Preservationists: Findings from the First Undergraduate Historic Preservation Education Symposium," *Preservation Education & Research*, 5 (2012), 87-96.
62. This is in contrast to the *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, which has primarily focused on pedagogical issues related to the contemporary built environment.
63. Robert E. Stipe, *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-first Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), xv.

University Press of New England

www.upne.com

© 2014 University Press of New England

All rights reserved

Manufactured in the United States of America

Designed by Christopher Kuntze

Typeset in Warnock Pro, Myriad Pro, Grotesque Condensed, and Empire Display by Westchester Publishing Service

For permission to reproduce any of the material in this book, contact Permissions, University Press of New England, One Court Street, Suite 250, Lebanon NH 03766; or visit www.upne.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Preservation education : sharing best practices and finding common ground /
edited by Barry L. Stiefel and Jeremy C. Wells.

pages cm

ISBN 978-1-61168-595-4 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-61168-596-1 (pbk. : alk. paper) —

ISBN 978-1-61168-597-8 (ebook)

1. Historic preservation—Study and teaching. I. Stiefel, Barry, editor. II. Wells,
Jeremy C., editor.

CC135.P715 2014

363.6'907—dc23

2014004398

5 4 3 2 1