

Landscape Preservation Education in the United States: Status in 2007

CARI GOETCHEUS

The field of landscape preservation¹ by its nature is multidisciplinary, drawing from horticulture, landscape architecture, historic preservation, geography, ethnography, anthropology, planning, public policy, economics, and other disciplines. The collective knowledge base of these disciplines assists landscape preservation practitioners to understand the intersection of culture and place holistically. Assuming that landscape preservation practitioners have this breadth of knowledge, they can provide contextual design solutions for historic landscapes. This paper looks at the evolution of landscape preservation education, with an emphasis on the years 1970-2007, when specific training emerged and was embraced. The question now is what landscape preservation education will be in the future.

Prior to the 1970s, there were important but scattered opportunities for landscape preservation education. At the turn of the twentieth century, interested practitioners studied garden literature for context and precedent, such as *The History of Gardening in England* (1895); *Old-Tyme Gardens* (1901); *American Estates and Gardens* (1904); *Medieval Gardens* (1924); and the seminal two-volume set, *Gardens of Colony and State* (1931) (Griswold in *The Garden Club of America* 2000). Geographer Carl Sauer's 1925 paper, *The Morphology of Landscape*, influenced a generation of cross-disciplinary practitioners interested in cultural landscapes. Coupled with observation of archeological research, building restoration, and preservation work at Williamsburg that began in 1926, landscape preservation practitioners learned through hands-on experience, working with people like landscape architect Arthur Shurcliff. By the 1930s, the short-lived Historic American Landscape and Garden project (1934-1939) set the precedent for research and documentation.²

In 1951, J.B. Jackson's *Landscape* magazine further broadened cultural landscape discussions to include the vernacular. After the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, development of historic preservation and American studies curriculums proliferated, although they focused primarily on buildings and broad social history. By the 1970s, landscape architect practitioners were asked to "update" a number of park systems, residential suburbs, and private estates that had been designed by Olmsted and other significant figures at the turn of the century. With these commissions, historic research and a reliable, contextual approach to rehabilitation work was needed. Academics and practitioners across the disciplines collaborated to develop philosophical tenets, methodologies, and standards for historic landscape research, analysis, evaluation, and treatment (U.S. Congress 1987; Fitch 1990).

By 1987,³ federal, state, local, and nonprofit agencies began to apply cultural landscape methodologies to the historic sites they managed. Those trends generated a need for professionals who understood cultural landscape issues and could apply contextual design solutions. Although several academic institutions began to incorporate cultural landscape lectures, courses, and workshops into their curriculums, they did not develop fast enough to meet the needs of some governmental and nonprofit agencies. Hence, a variety of non-traditional means of landscape preservation education evolved in the form of short training workshops.⁴ Lectures, courses, and training workshops continue today with an ever expanding body of literature addressing cultural landscape resources, research methods, and processes (Alanen and Melnick 2000; O'Connell 2001; Wilson and Groth 2003; Stipe 2003; Birnbaum and Hughes 2005; Allen 2007).

PERCEIVED LANDSCAPE PRESERVATION EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

Prior to undertaking this survey, there were four primary means of landscape preservation education: independent study via readings produced by international, national, and state agencies and organizations; participation in a cultural landscape workshop; work experience at a federal, state, or other agency or private firm that had a reputation for doing landscape preservation work; or enrollment in a landscape architecture, historic preservation or related program, and mentoring by an academic with interests ranging from landscape history and preservation to cultural resource management and public history.

A broad body of literature developed over time continues to be used for independent study. Adding to the references cited previously, National Park Service (NPS) cultural landscape documents produced during the 1980s are now considered essential base readings. Some of those key documents include Robert Melnick's white paper on *Rural Historic Districts*; Linda Flint McClelland, Robert Melnick, and Tim and Gennie Kellers's National Register bulletins on designed and vernacular landscapes; and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*, originally crafted by Lauren Meier and later refined by Charles Birnbaum, with input from numerous individuals and organizations. Organizations such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO) also created resolutions and documents concerning cultural landscapes. For example, the ICOMOS 1992 World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognize and protect cultural landscapes. Finally, State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), such as those in Georgia and Indiana, have begun to focus on cultural landscape issues by creating inventory forms that accommodate landscape elements.

Since the mid-1970s, the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, the National Association of Olmsted Parks (NAOP), the American Society of

Landscape Architects Historic Preservation group, NPS, UNESCO, ICOMOS, the National Preservation Institute, the Campbell Center, and other agencies and organizations have offered different types of cultural landscape training. Workshop formats ranged from one-day to week-long sessions, with workshops first focused on a broad overview of cultural landscape methodologies as case studies. Later, they became specialized, offering training on vernacular landscapes and application of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to specific types of landscapes. Many who attended such workshops did so to complement their independent study readings and project work. Workshop training opportunities do still exist, but they are less frequent.

Many people have and continue to receive their landscape preservation education "on the job" at the NPS and in private firms that specialize in landscape preservation work. The NPS has been recognized both nationally and internationally as the primary federal agency with landscape preservation expertise. The NPS hired its first Washington, D.C.-based historical landscape architect in the late 1980s,⁵ to develop the Historic Landscapes Initiative and assist organizations, individuals, and the public at large with historic landscape questions and projects. By 1990, the Park Cultural Landscapes Program was created, with one employee hired to develop a program addressing the needs of historic landscapes in national parks. At the height of NPS interest in the cultural landscape programs (1980-2005), more than forty people worked in program positions across the country and in Washington, D.C. A large number of those employees acted as landscape preservation leaders and mentors for peers in associated fields, as well as for numerous young professionals who interned with the regional cultural landscape programs.

Several private practitioners, many of whom collaborated in the development of the base philosophical tenets and reference documents, managed firms that developed reputations as landscape preservation "experts."⁶ Those firms hired interested young professionals and trained them on the breadth of landscape preservation practice and

activities. Today, fewer of these types of apprenticeship training opportunities exist. Recent departures of long-term cultural landscape personnel from the NPS Washington office have created a gap in cultural landscape leadership in that agency, resulting in a greater reliance on apprenticeship training outside the federal government.

At the height of academic interest in landscape preservation (1970s-2000), landscape architecture programs employed professors who were interested in cultural landscapes, developed an expertise, and worked on projects that afforded them the opportunity to mentor students. Many of those academics assisted in developing the base philosophical documents for the field. Since the mid-1990s, historic preservation programs have used cultural landscapes as a medium to discuss broader preservation issues. Approximately 141 landscape architecture and historic preservation academic programs exist throughout the United States and Canada, where one can receive a formal education that may introduce a student to landscape preservation principles. Depending on the emphasis of the program and faculty interest, students may receive exposure to landscape preservation philosophy and practice via a one-hour lecture, semester-long course, or a discipline concentration.

THE NEED FOR LANDSCAPE PRESERVATION TRAINING

The depth of “training” individuals pursued would provide them with either a superficial or thorough understanding of cultural landscape philosophy and methodology. Because there is currently no consistent training curriculum, the amalgamation of training opportunities might not produce enough qualified cultural landscape professionals to meet the needs.

Informal discussions over several years with agencies, groups, and individuals assisted in understanding the breadth of this issue: NPS historical landscape architects who either do the work themselves or manage consultants; private

firms who engage in cultural landscape work; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in search of “qualified” consultants to bid on their projects; organizations such as the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation and the National Association of Olmsted Parks are frequently contacted to provide names of qualified individuals; and staff in numerous SHPOs across the country admit they have few to no colleagues in their office with cultural landscape training. Further, there is no formal landscape preservation training program in the NPS. In 1998, the NPS commissioned a study on gaps in knowledge in the cultural resources stewardship career fields. That study identified historical landscape architects as one of the top five occupations needing training.⁷ Funding priorities at the time did not allow for development of a comprehensive approach to address this need.

Individuals and firms who describe themselves as landscape preservation professionals come from a variety of disciplines, and few have training in more than one discipline. Hence, there is an inconsistency in base knowledge and expertise in cultural landscapes. Anecdotal evidence suggests that there are not now enough qualified people to undertake cultural landscape work.⁸

Nearly one hundred years after an interest in historic landscapes began, landscape preservation practitioners remain unprepared for government or private sector positions. This is a significant problem. Preservation professionals must engage in site design to assist in guiding contextual solutions that involve historic resources integral to our future quality of life. Further, landscape architects need preservation education to develop contextual designs that respect historic resources. Yet, no comprehensive landscape preservation curriculum has been developed or implemented to address these issues.

Alarming, many landscape architecture academic mentors who played a critical role in developing the philosophical tenets of the field and in training many of today’s design and preservation professionals have retired or are retiring soon. Who will lead the field of landscape preservation in the future? Who will teach core landscape preservation philosophy, tenets and approaches to future professionals?

LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review, conducted to understand the breadth of current landscape preservation training opportunities revealed a broad focus on three topics: general preservation education and specific historic preservation programs and their evolving curriculums over time (Tomlan 1994; Woodcock 1998; Pyburn 2005); preservation trade skills education (*APT Bulletins* 1988-2002; McGrath 1997; Preston 2006); and preservation as a profession (Longstreth 1999; O'Connell 2001).

Michael Tomlan of Cornell University provides an excellent overview of the development of preservation education, specifically related to the fields of architectural history and architecture since the late 1950s. Tomlan notes that from 1984-1994, only one article on preservation education was published. Although not addressed directly, it was clear planning and landscape architecture fit into Tomlan's preservation education timeline. David Woodcock of Texas A&M rounded out the preservation education story by adding the trade skills education component, as well as information about using HABS in preservation programs.

Preservation trade skills education articles focused on the NPS Preservation and Skills Training program, the Association of Preservation Technology's (APT) hands-on workshops, European training standards, and the need for similar training programs in the United States, as well as the development of the International Preservation Trades Network group.

The articles discussing preservation as a profession focused on elementary preservation education involving diverse groups in the profession in a general way. Richard Longstreth commented on the critical role architectural historians play in intellectualizing preservation, while *Landscape Architecture* magazine provided the only article addressing a landscape preservation specialization (O'Connell 2001). That interview with Lauren Meier featured an in-depth overview of the types of work done by historical landscape architects, with cursory comments on training.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Existing curriculums in landscape architecture and historic preservation do not fill the landscape preservation knowledge gap.⁹ The traditional landscape architecture program focuses on landscape systems, analysis, and design but not on the nuances of preservation, while the traditional historic preservation curriculum is strong in cultural research, preservation technologies, and treatments but not landscape history, design, or landscapes as part of the ecological system.

The overarching question of whether landscape architecture and historic preservation students are being taught the basics of cultural landscape philosophy and methods in their respective programs was broadly explored via a survey using the following three questions:

1. Who is teaching landscape preservation? (institutions, programs, and people)
2. How is landscape preservation being taught today? (curriculum and courses)
3. Has there been or is there a need to identify a formalized course of study?

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The process began by identifying contacts in the 141 accredited landscape architecture and acknowledged historic preservation graduate, undergraduate, and allied programs across the United States and Canada. Additionally, one United States federal agency and three NGOs known to have provided landscape preservation training in the past were also identified. Seventy-eight American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) accredited landscape architecture programs, fifty-eight National Council of Preservation Education (NCPE) acknowledged historic preservation programs, six Canadian landscape architecture programs, and four agencies and/or organizations were also identified.

Surveys tailored to each discipline (landscape architecture and historic preservation) were prepared for use during a thirty- to sixty -minute telephone

Table 1. Survey response rate

Contact Type	No. Identified	No. Responded	Response Rate
Undergraduate HP	12	7	58.3%
Graduate HP	24	13	54.2%
HP Allied Programs	21	8	38.1%
Undergraduate LA	44	20	45.5%
Graduate LA	33	15	45.5%
Canadian LA	5	3	60%
Agencies/Organizations	4	2	50%
TOTAL	144	68	47.2%

interview. All those interviewed were asked general information, such as name, academic title, full name of program and/or department in which the program resided, professional affiliations, and personal areas of expertise. Further, all were asked about landscape preservation and landscape documentation courses, faculty and student interest in landscape history and/or landscape preservation, and student placement, and were offered an opportunity for additional comments.

For landscape architecture programs, questions about history, professional practice, construction technology, and site analysis courses were also asked. Design studios were not specifically addressed, although those interviewed were told to note whether any topics were taught in a studio environment. For the historic preservation programs, questions were asked about historic preservation philosophy, professional practice, preservation technology and cultural resource inventory, evaluation, and treatment courses.

A total of sixty-four institutions (with eighty-three programs) that teach landscape architecture and fifty-four institutions (with fifty-eight programs) that teach historic preservation were contacted, with a survey response rate of 47.2%, as seen in Table 1.

SURVEY FINDINGS

The survey results confirm that landscape preservation philosophy, methodology, and contextual solutions are inconsistently taught across landscape

architecture and historic preservation curriculums. Sporadically taught as an individual lecture or a specialized course, the format depends largely on school, department, and faculty time and interest. As suspected, many of the academics and professionals who historically acted as mentors and leaders have already or will shortly retire. Finally, although there is a substantial difference in how each discipline approaches teaching landscape preservation, there continues to be a consistent desire by a small number of students to be exposed to the topic.

The Institutions, Programs, and People section compares data across the two disciplines, while the Curriculum and Courses section compares responses to discipline-specific questions.

Institutions, Programs, and People

An analysis of the data found that within their institutions over 55% of landscape architecture undergraduate and graduate programs reside in their own departments, while 50% percent of historic preservation programs have their own departments or are part of cultural resource departments (Table 2).

Landscape architecture programs typically offer four types of degrees at the graduate and undergraduate level,¹⁰ whereas historic preservation programs offer two types of undergraduate and graduate degrees in science or arts, with a range of preservation specializations. Both the undergraduate and graduate

Table 2. School/department in which program resides at institution

School/Department Type	Bachelors Program	Masters Program	Allied Program
Dept of LA	7	14	
School of Architecture-LA	3	9	
Dept. of Horticulture	0	2	
Dept of Geography	0	1	
Natural Resources	1	1	
History	2	0	0
Public History	0	1	0
Art History	1	0	1
Geography/Geology	0	1	0
American Studies	0	0	2
Building Preservation/Restoration	1	0	0
Dept of Historic Preservation/Cultural Resources	3	11*	3
School of Architecture-HP	0	0	2

* Of 11 Dept of HP, 9 are housed in Colleges of Architecture/LA/Design.

landscape architecture programs broadly categorize themselves as generalist. However, four graduate programs specifically noted they offer tracks related to landscape preservation.¹¹ The historic preservation undergraduate programs tend to emphasize planning, history, anthropology, archeology, or a trade skill, while the graduate programs emphasize planning, material conservation, architecture, and in some cases cultural landscapes.

Eighty percent of the survey respondents were long-term faculty,¹² with 66% percent of the landscape architecture respondents noting an interest or specialty in cultural landscapes or landscape history. Although 33% in the historic preservation programs noted they had an interest in landscape history or cultural landscapes, 53% noted a specialization in landscape architecture, architecture, materials conservation and planning, as seen in Table 3.

When asked about membership in professional organizations, not surprisingly the respondents noted similar organizations: the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, National Association of Olmsted Parks, Vernacular Architecture Forum, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, ICOMOS, Public History, Congress of New Urbanism, the American Society of Environmental Historians, and the George Wright Society.¹³

To determine whether there was a difference between historic and current interest in teaching the topic, participants were asked about former and current faculty interest with the results in Table 4. Currently, 85% of landscape architecture undergraduate and graduate faculty acknowledge interest in landscape history or cultural landscapes, while historically it was 51%. Interestingly, 64% of both current and former historic preservation faculty have an interest in the topic, although one third of those are part of associated departments, such as geography (Table 4).

Survey results confirm the perceived four ways to attain a landscape preservation education noted earlier. Most of the respondents did minimal independent study and attended workshops. Landscape architecture faculty also worked in private firms mentored by practitioners, while historic preservation faculty gained their knowledge through academic training, then mentoring.

For both programs, student interest was greater at the graduate level than the undergraduate level. Several of those interviewed noted that student interest grows over time, especially if a professor is enthusiastic about the topic. Regardless of discipline, less than 1% of total student enrollment is interested in the topic.

Table 3. Personal area of expertise

Expertise	LA Programs	HP Programs
Landscape History/Cultural Landscapes	18	10
Social/Behavioral	1	
Technology	1	
Parks/Open Space	1	
Brownfields/Ecological	2	
Art	1	
Generalist	2	
Refused to Qualify	1	
Landscape Architecture		5
Architecture		4
Material Conservation		4
Preservation Planning/Planning		3
Archeology		1
Building Pathology		1
Public History		1
Geography		1

Table 4. Faculty interest in landscape history or cultural landscapes over time

Status of Faculty	LA Faculty (35)	HP Faculty (28)
Current Faculty	20 BLA(a) 10 MLA(b)	1-U 11-G (c) 6-A (d)
Former Faculty	9 BLA 9 MLA	3-U (e) 8-G 7-A

(a) Once got into higher numbers tangential interest at best (broad landscape history); (b) numbers of faculty interested per program ranged from 1-7; (c) numbers of faculty interested per program ranged from 1-4; (d) most referenced adjuncts in other departments; (e) tangential interest at best.

Finally, landscape architecture programs have successfully placed graduating students in NPS internships under the guidance of historical landscape architects or with private practitioners who do some work with historic landscapes. In contrast, historic preservation programs place students at specific historic properties as site managers or in cultural resource management firms, where landscape preservation is one aspect of office project work.

Curriculum and Courses

Because each discipline emphasizes different topics and methods, survey respondents were asked specific questions about their curriculum, types of courses taught, and the course content and format. This section begins with a review of their collective response on landscape preservation and documentation courses offered, followed by summary responses to discipline-specific questions.

Landscape architecture programs offered cultural landscape education opportunities approximately ten years prior to historic preservation programs, in the early 1970s.¹⁴ Historic preservation programs associated with geography faculty and/or departments began offering studies on the topic in the late 1970s. Traditional preservation programs began to offer courses in the early 1980s, with most offering the topic in depth by the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s. Essentially, historic preservation programs have expanded their curriculums over the past two decades, whereas landscape architecture programs have shifted away from cultural landscapes towards ecology and sustainability.

Table 5 summarizes the common teaching formats used by both disciplines for landscape preservation courses. They range from one one-hour lecture to short units of one-to-three-week sessions to semester-long courses to independent study courses, where students work on faculty-driven projects. Both disciplines indicate that either a short seminar or a semester-long course is the most typical way to educate students, with lectures as the second most popular format. If there were not enough students to justify a full course, independent study was noted as a viable option. Cultural landscape

lectures/units/courses (hereafter collectively referred to as courses) are still taught in both programs, although less frequently. Landscape architecture programs offered primarily graduate level courses, while preservation programs noted courses are no longer taught at the undergraduate level and less frequently at the graduate level. In Canadian graduate landscape architecture programs, cultural landscape courses are no longer taught in the academic setting but as separate workshops to accommodate training for a variety of interested parties (Table 5).

When asked if the course had been taught on an ongoing basis, the answer was a resounding no; courses are taught sporadically. The frequency of teaching the topic is directly related to course enrollment, faculty schedule, and student interest. The course is taught as frequently as every other year or as infrequently as once every five years. Changes in faculty were noted particularly by the preservation programs as a reason for intermittent offerings. At the graduate level, landscape preservation courses are open to both graduates and undergraduates (usually permission was needed for undergraduates), while only undergraduates may participate in undergraduate preservation programs.

Table 5. Teaching formats for landscape preservation courses

Teaching Format	LA Programs	HP Programs
Lecture	5 BLA 1 MLA	3-G (a) 3-A
Unit	1 BLA 2 MLA	
Seminar/Course	2 BLA(b) 7 MLA	7-U (c) 8-G 1-A
Independent Study/Project	2 BLA 3 MLA	

(a) One commented that interested students had to go to the landscape architecture department to get that kind of training; (b) two undergraduate seminars are proposed for implementation in near future; (c) two noted they no longer taught the topic although they did formerly; remainder noted seminars/courses that were broader, i.e. cemetery class, landscape architecture history class, or part of a design studio. One did note an American cultural landscapes class in the geography department.

In both programs, the landscape preservation course is primarily an elective, although two programs did require the course for all students in the major. For those programs that offer a certificate in historic preservation, the course is required as a part of the certificate curriculum. In both disciplines, the course is open to students outside their discipline.¹⁵

Because few textbooks are available specific to cultural landscapes and landscape preservation, it is not surprising that there was little difference between the programs. There was a resounding preference to create a reading packet that pulled from a variety of sources rather than using a particular text. National Register bulletins were mentioned frequently, with *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America* most commonly referenced as the primary text (Alanen and Melnick 2000). Other books mentioned include *With Heritage So Rich* (National Trust for Historic Preservation 1983) and *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation* (Page and Mason 2004).

A question concerning landscape documentation courses was asked for two reasons: first, to understand what the academic definition of landscape documentation is, and second, to determine whether the recently released Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) documentation guidelines were being taught or used in either of the programs. In landscape architecture programs, the definition of landscape documentation was initially thought to be surveying. However, when the concept of HALS documentation was explained, few programs felt they offered a traditional landscape documentation class that included measured drawings, photography, and written narratives.

Within the landscape architecture programs, 11% (half in undergraduate, half in graduate programs) indicated a landscape documentation course subject to project availability. The coursework focused on drawings and in some cases photography. Contrary to the landscape architecture interpretation, preservation programs tended to interpret landscape documentation as traditional cultural resource documentation methods, primarily National Register

survey work, of which 42% acknowledged they did. Once again, after HALS documentation was explained, the programs acknowledged that more often than not there were photographs or written narratives but few measured drawings.

Twenty-five percent of landscape architecture programs offered work on cultural landscape projects, some since the 1980s. Thirty-nine percent of historic preservation programs noted work on these projects, although research and basic survey work were emphasized more than drawings and design/treatment solutions as in the landscape architecture programs.

Once again, in both disciplines at the graduate level, such courses are open to both graduates and undergraduates. Primarily an elective, this was especially true if it was a measured-drawing-based documentation course. Similar to landscape preservation coursework, for those programs that offer a certificate in historic preservation, the course is required as a part of the certificate curriculum.

As for a standard reference used in the landscape documentation courses, although most of the respondents knew that HALS existed, they were not familiar with the guidelines, and few if any used them in their classes. The landscape architecture programs tended to use the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) guidelines for their documentation course and might mention the HALS program in passing. The historic preservation programs primarily used the HABS guidelines, sometimes used the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) guidelines, but rarely used the HALS guidelines.

Discipline-specific Responses

Landscape architecture programs were asked about landscape architecture history, professional practice, construction technology, and site analysis courses, while preservation program respondents were asked about historic preservation philosophy, professional practice, preservation technology, and cultural resource inventory, evaluation, and treatment courses.

Typically, the landscape architecture history course is a two-semester survey course, where the first semester emphasizes prehistory in Europe and Asia reaching into the 1900s, while the second semester crosses the ocean to the United States and continues the survey up to contemporary times. Because emphasis can be on early U.S. landscape architecture history (i.e., Olmsted, park design, Country Place era, etc.), sometimes it is difficult to reach contemporary design periods by the end of the semester. Since this could have a long-term impact on the preservation of Modern landscapes (those less than fifty years old), some graduate programs offer a separate Modern landscape architecture course. Additionally, 26% of the programs acknowledged some type of focus during the history course on regional or local styles or professionals.¹⁶ In comparison, only those preservation programs associated with geography faculty/departments noted a landscape history class.

Although not quite the same as a landscape history course, most historic preservation philosophy is provided in an introductory course that exposes students not only to the language and forms of historic preservation but the history of the field and its base conservation tenets. When asked if landscape preservation is introduced in such a course, the typical response was that there might be a lecture or short unit on landscape preservation projects as part of a larger discussion. However, preservation programs seem to rely on the diversity of incoming students' backgrounds (specifically graduate students) to expose students to the topic.¹⁷

Landscape architecture programs typically offer a professional practice course that exposes students not only to business organization types and practices and legal and ethical issues regarding health, safety, and welfare issues but also to the scope of a landscape architect's work. When asked if landscape preservation was consistently mentioned as an area of project work that could be pursued, the answer was a resounding no as the overwhelming emphasis is on private and public practice. Over 50% of respondents thought it might be mentioned during a one-hour lecture or in passing in either the professional practice class or the

landscape architecture history class. Unlike landscape architecture programs, preservation programs do not have specific professional practice courses. However, they do have a type of course that exposes students to the breadth of work they may encounter during their career. When asked if landscape preservation was mentioned in that type of class, most noted it might be possible but more than likely the student might be exposed to the idea more fully in a seminar or in a documentation (survey) class.

Because landscape architecture project work might very well occur on a site that has remnant cultural resources, a question was asked about exposing students to sensitivity towards historic construction materials and technologies. Generally, the response was no. However, 17% of undergraduate and graduate landscape architecture programs did note they do expose their students to historic materials.¹⁸ Historic preservation programs are fairly good at educating students on historic materials and creating sensitivity towards their conservation, so a question was asked concerning the sensitivity applied to material conservation of landscape features, such as walls, fences, and even plants. In most cases respondents mentioned stone walls or cemeteries, but other landscape features, especially plant materials, were not acknowledged.

Because the site analysis process plays such a critical role in a landscape architect's understanding of place, a question was asked about researching and acknowledging historic and/or cultural resources during the site analysis process. Overwhelmingly, programs responded affirmatively. However, there is generally not a separate site analysis course; rather, the process is incorporated into the design studio. Only the University of Massachusetts noted a course on landscape process and patterns that incorporates cultural landscape concepts.¹⁹ The site analysis process usually occurs more than once during a landscape architecture student's academic career, so depending on the types of projects, at least one would have historic or cultural resources as part of the unique resources on site. Finally, respondents commented that the greatest difficulty with incorporating historic or cultural resources into the

site analysis process is not necessarily the project or the content but the differing opinions among faculty as to what site analysis is, with some faculty covering more topics than others.

In comparison to the landscape architecture site analysis process, a fair amount of historic preservation coursework revolves around how to identify and inventory cultural resources, how to complete National Register survey forms, how to evaluate properties using National Register criteria, and how to propose appropriate design treatments. As such, a question was raised concerning landscapes as a resource. Preservation respondents noted that landscapes were definitely acknowledged as a type of resource that should be incorporated into the process as it relates to the National Register survey and evaluation process. However, few programs suggested that the survey or evaluation techniques for landscapes were further elaborated upon in research courses, projects, or specific landscape preservation courses.

As can be seen in this brief summary of the findings, each academic discipline has its strengths and weaknesses in the way it currently approaches landscape preservation education.

THE FUTURE OF LANDSCAPE PRESERVATION EDUCATION

The preservation and management of cultural landscapes requires complex training in landscape history, geography, ethnography, ecology, regional planning, public policy, economics, materials conservation, and the material culture of the built and natural environment. As the physical result of human interaction with the natural world, cultural landscapes require preservation strategies that incorporate sensitive design with responsible resource management. To apply sensitive design, one must have knowledge of both design and conservation practices. The survey results clearly reveal that existing landscape architecture and historic preservation curriculums do not fully meet the breadth of education needs for a landscape preservation practitioner.

Perceptions concerning the role of each discipline towards landscape preservation varied widely; one of the most poignant discussions revolved around the relevance of cultural landscapes. Two overarching societal factors play against a full appreciation, study, and preservation of cultural landscapes: the division between nature and culture in the minds of Americans and the social fragmentation and mobility of people no longer tied to place. This combination makes the cultural landscape concept very difficult to understand, let alone pursue. Although landscape architects may consider landscape preservation less relevant today than the currently fashionable “sustainability,” which emphasizes an ecological approach, it is interesting that historic preservationists perceive cultural landscapes as an extremely useful tool to address issues critical to the future of preservation. This dichotomy may be attributed to a fifteen-year acknowledgment gap: landscape architecture acknowledged cultural landscapes in 1975, while preservation has only recognized cultural landscapes since the late 1980s.

So how can this gap be used to the advantage of landscape preservation education? By encouraging landscape architecture to fully embrace sustainability that includes contextual and continuous use of cultural landscapes, while simultaneously encouraging historic preservationists to fully apply their skills in planning policy and conservation methods to sprawl, which directly impacts cultural landscapes at a different scale. If this occurs, perhaps a meeting of minds might also occur.

As for curriculums, a further difficulty lies with the interplay of context and design. Understanding context and the palimpsest of cultural landscapes makes for better designers, yet design schools may perceive an emphasis on context rather than design as diminishing the end product. Unfortunately, many design schools feel that only “original” design is good design. However, isn’t the greatest form of flattery imitation, or in this case respect for what exists?

Finally, the survey data suggest that the design and culture era is evolving as future landscape preservation practitioners refocus on both ecological and cultural qualitative approaches when applying design solutions to historic resources.

Dire predictions concerning the major loss of our historic resources over the next century as new built environments emerge compel preservation and design professionals to become conversant on every type of historic resource – buildings, landscapes, interiors, etc. The clash of massive quantities of land consumed by sprawl with the complexity of cultural landscapes tends to make these landscapes invisible and undervalued. To make historic landscapes visible, it is critical to train preservation advocates in both preservation and design so they can positively affect their conservation.

So what now? If preservation is serious about landscapes as cultural resources to be conserved and managed, and landscape architecture is truly concerned about maintaining and enhancing regional and local character, doesn't it seem reasonable that baseline knowledge on cultural landscapes should be taught to all these future professionals? The good news is there are new leaders filling the landscape preservation education knowledge void. The first step is defining the breadth of baseline landscape preservation knowledge, so existing curriculums can be expanded to provide educational opportunities that will produce qualified landscape preservation professionals.

CARI GOETCHEUS

Clemson University, South Carolina

Cari Goetcheus, an assistant professor in the Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture at Clemson University, S.C., holds a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture from Utah State University and a Master of Historic Preservation from the University of Georgia. Her research interests include landscape preservation education, the physical evolution of land uses, vernacular landscapes, and the impact of African American culture on the landscapes of the Southeast. Ms. Goetcheus has worked in both the public and private sector as a historical landscape architect. On a volunteer basis at the national level, she was instrumental in developing the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) program and its documentation guidelines. Recent projects include development of the Clemson University Preservation Plan funded by the Getty Foundation Campus Heritage Grant program;

working with ten African American communities near Charleston, to document their traditional basketmaking places; and working on a scenic byway management guide for the Sumter National Forest.

ENDNOTES

1. In this paper, the term "landscape preservation" encompasses conservation and continued compatible reuse of historic land-use patterns and elements (historic buildings, structures, archeological sites, vegetation, cultural traditions, etc.), rather than the ecological aspects of land conservation.
2. The Historic American Landscapes and Garden project was undertaken by members of the American Society of Landscape Architects in 1934. The intent was to document forty historic sites in Massachusetts, adapting the recently developed Historic American Buildings Survey documentation process.
3. In 1987, the National Park Service updated its management policies and for the first time defined landscapes as cultural resources to be managed.
4. The National Park Service's Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, the nonprofit National Preservation Institute, and Campbell Center for Historic Preservation Studies provided various forms of landscape preservation training at the time.
5. Although the NPS hired Robert Melnick to craft a white paper on cultural landscapes in the late 1970s/early 1980s, and Cathy Gilbert had been working in the Northwest region of NPS for several years forwarding thoughts on cultural landscapes, Lauren Meier was the first historic landscape architect hired by the NPS Washington Office to create a national program focused on historic landscapes.
6. Private firms that have worked or continue to work prominently with cultural landscapes and "train" young professionals in the philosophy and methods of landscape preservation include but are not limited to Anthony Walmsley and Associates, Land and Community Associates, LANDSCAPES, the Jaeger Company, and John Milner and Associates.
7. From June 1998 through November 2000, the NPS conducted a Servicewide Training Needs Assessment for all employees in or associated with the Cultural Resources Stewardship Career Field – 14 occupation groups ranging from historians and museum management specialists to historical landscape architects. The intent was to obtain baseline data to identify existing and future training needs of employees and determine training priorities for employees in various occupational groups. The report summary identified historical landscape architects as one of the top five career fields in need of training to fill in those gaps in knowledge.
8. A formal research study is needed to definitively prove such a need exists and to define the gaps in knowledge.
9. This study was limited to the disciplines of landscape architecture and historic preservation, as past leaders in landscape preservation. Additional study of landscape preservation education activities offered by other disciplines would add to understanding the complex nature of the field.

10. Landscape architecture programs offer a bachelor of science in landscape architecture, bachelor in landscape architecture, as well as masters and doctoral degrees.
11. The University of Massachusetts, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Florida, and University of New Mexico identified cultural landscape or cultural resource management concentrations.
12. Program directors, professors, or associate professors.
13. For landscape architecture faculty, membership in ASLA and the Association of American Geographers was also common. The diversity of historic preservation faculty interests leads to a huge range of membership organizations, such as the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions, Preservation Trades Network, Preservation Leadership Initiative, Society for Ecological Restoration, American Association of State and Local History, National Council for Public History, Drystone Conservancy, Society for Architectural Historians, Society for Industrial Archeology, and Western History Society.
14. The following dates designate when landscape architecture programs started teaching about cultural landscapes to their students: 1970s – Illinois; 1974 – University of Wisconsin – Madison; 1980 – Michigan, Iowa, Texas Tech; 1982 – Ball State; 1985 – State University of New York (ESF), University of Georgia, University of Manitoba; 1987 – Oklahoma State University; 1990 – Pennsylvania State University, University of Florida, University of Washington and Guelph; 1992 – Texas A&M; 2001 – University of Massachusetts; 2002 – University of New Mexico.
15. Examples of students outside the landscape architecture discipline who have taken cultural landscape courses include students in architecture, horticulture, leisure studies, history, geography, art history, regional planning, planners, human ecology, archeology, and computer technology. Examples of students outside the historic preservation program who have taken cultural landscape courses include students in urban planning, performing arts, art history, history, architecture, landscape architecture, geography, interior design, construction science, business, education, horticulture, and museum studies.
16. Texas A&M (vernacular Texas); University of New Mexico (sand gardens and prehistory); Iowa State (Midwest School); University of Arizona (practitioners of the Southwest); University of Wisconsin - Madison (Midwest School); Utah State University (Laval Morris); Pennsylvania State University (regional landscape architects); University of Florida (native American landscape, colonial gardens); Michigan State (Geneva Gillette, Michigan state parks).
17. Preservation respondents noted that typically there was someone with a natural resource or horticultural interest in the program each year.
18. Auburn University, Florida A&M, University of New Mexico, and University of Manitoba specifically mentioned exposure to historic materials, while the University of Michigan stated the concept is embedded throughout the program, and Pennsylvania State University teaches its construction and materials course in Rome. Hence, an innate growth of awareness of historic materials.
19. This course was developed and highly influenced by the founding faculty member Ethan Carr. Mr. Carr is now at the University of Virginia.

REFERENCES

- Alanen, Arnold R. and Robert Z. Melnick, eds. 2000. *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Allen, David Grayson. 2007. *The Olmsted National Historic Site and the Growth of Historic Landscape Preservation*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Birnbaum, Charles A. and Mary V. Hughes, eds. 2005. *Design with Culture: Claiming America's Landscape Heritage*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Fitch, James Marston. 1990. *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*. Charlottesville: The University of Virginia Press.
- Hewitt, Mark Allen. 1994. "Architecture for a Contingent Environment." *JAE* 47(4): 197-209.
- The Garden Club of America. 2000. *Gardens of Colony and State: Gardens and Gardeners of the American Colonies and of the Republic before 1840*. Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Smallwood and Stewart.
- Longstreth, Richard. 1999. "Architectural History and the Practice of Historic Preservation in the United States." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58(3): 326-333
- McGrath, H. Thomas, Jr. 1997. "1977-1997: A Retrospective of the Work of the Historic Preservation Training Center." *CRM* 20(12): A1-A8.
- Melnick, Robert. 1979. "Preservation Education: Guidelines and Implementation of a Program." *APT Bulletin* 11(2): 53-59.
- National Trust for Historic Preservation. 1983. *Heritage So Rich*. Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press.
- O'Connell, Kim A. 2001. "From Myth to Reality." *Landscape Architecture* 91(6): 88-89.
- Ottavino, Kate Burns. 2006. "The Preservation Arts and Technology Curriculum at Brooklyn High School of the Arts." *CRM Journal* 3(1): 84-88.
- Page, Max and Randall Mason, eds. 2004. *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Preston, John. 2006. "The Context for Skills, Education and Training." *The Journal of Architectural Conservation* 12(3).
- Pyburn, Jack. 2005. "Historic Preservation in Architectural Education: Assessing the Past, Envisioning the Future." *Future Anterior* 2(2): 45-51.
- Sauer, Carl. O. 1925. "The Morphology of Landscape." *University of California Publications in Geography*. 2(2):19-53.

Stipe, Robert E., ed. 2003. *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Tomlan, Michael. 1994. "Historic Preservation Education: Alongside Architecture in Academia." *JAE* 47(4): 187-196.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. 1987. *Technologies for the Preservation of Prehistoric and Historic Landscapes – Background Paper*. OTA-BP-E-44 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wilson, Chris and Paul Groth, eds. 2003. *Everyday America: Cultural Landscape Studies After J.B. Jackson*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Woodcock, David G. 1998. "Historic Preservation Education: Academic Preparation for Practice." *APT Bulletin* 29(3- 4): 21-25.