

# **A Report on the Current State of Historic Preservation on the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Campus**

Report Prepared by

The Faculty Senate Task Force on Historic Preservation

Gerald F. Schroedl, Professor, Department of Anthropology, (chair)

Boyce Driskell, Director, Archaeological Research Laboratory

Sarah Weeks, Alumni Program Director, Alumni Affairs

Tim Ezzell, Director, Community Partnership Center

George Dodds, Associate Professor, School of Architecture

Stan Rabun, Professor, School of Architecture

Terry Ledford, Assistant Director, Facilities Services

Report Submitted to the Faculty Senate of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville,

Lou Gross, President

Deseriee A. Kennedy, Past President

October 2006

## Management Summary

The Faculty Senate Task Force on Historic Preservation finds that past policies and attitudes toward campus historic preservation have been minimal or inadequate in addressing the campus' rich architectural and archaeological heritage. While this situation has improved in recent years, particularly respecting prehistoric archaeological sites, fundamental issues concerning historic archaeology and architecture remain unaddressed. The task force offers 13 specific recommendations for correcting this situation. The major recommendations of the task force are:

- The university should conduct a thorough and exhaustive campus survey to identify and assess the historical integrity and significance of all archaeological and historical properties. The task force is happy to report that the university administration has endorsed efforts to obtain a grant from the Getty Foundation for this purpose and that funding for this project was approved in June 2006. This is a significant first step toward addressing this recommendation and placing historic preservation on a solid footing for the future of the campus.
- The university should establish policies that explicitly include the archaeological and historical characteristics of the campus in *all* campus development plans and in the procedures for developing such plans. Doing so will go a long way to insure that historic preservation issues are

appropriately addressed, thoroughly reviewed, and properly evaluated at an early stage in the planning process. Only in this way is it possible to make historic preservation a legitimate aspect of campus design, development, and management.

- It is both appropriate and necessary that the university nominate buildings and structures to the National Register of Historic Places *before* renovation occurs. Placing some properties on the Register is essential to establishing and maintaining a preservation ethic on campus. National Register status does not create any external restrictions on how the university may use its property. It is important that consideration of historic properties, including nominations to the National Register, is coordinated with the Campus Master Plan. The Master Plan in turn should recognize the need to protect historic properties on campus and adopt the procedures for doing so.

## Preface

The University of Tennessee takes great pride in its academic, research, and athletic traditions established over the last 200 years. As a land grant institution the university views itself as a progressive leader in teaching, research, and public service in the state of Tennessee and aspires to improve and maintain national and international academic ranking. The university is committed to providing leadership in the economic, cultural, and social development of the state. The architecture, landscape, and historic design of the university campus are physical representations of the university's rich history, academic traditions, athletic accomplishments, and commitment to the future development of Tennessee. Archaeological deposits are an important record of both the prehistoric occupation and historic development of the campus and its landscape that was established before Euroamerican settlement and that has continued to unfold since the settlement of Knoxville in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century.

In the same way that the campus community recognizes and preserves its traditions so should it seek to identify, preserve, and protect the historic fabric of its buildings, structures, objects, and archaeological sites. The university system and campus administrations, as care takers of the physical facilities and campus landscape, should be sensitive and vigilant in doing all they can to insure that campus historic and prehistoric properties are properly identified and appropriately preserved so that none are unnecessarily and needlessly altered, damaged, destroyed, or demolished. Just as the

university now provides important leadership in so many economic, scientific, humanistic, and social endeavors, it has the opportunity to seize a leadership role in historic preservation and the prospect of implementing an exemplary program for others to emulate. The Faculty Senate Task Force on Historic Preservation wholeheartedly recommends and encourages the university to do this.

### Membership and Consultation

The Faculty Senate Task Force on Historic Preservation was established in specific response to two articles that appeared in the Daily Beacon on November 24, 2004. One article discussed a Student Senate passed bill to establish a commission to promote historic preservation on campus. The second article lamented the absence of National Register properties on the campus and reiterated the university's policy toward nominating properties to the Register. A proposal to form the task force was approved by Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on 21 February 2005, under the leadership of Candace White.

The Historic Preservation Task Force members were appointed in consultation with the Faculty Senate President Candace White and include:

Gerald F. Schroedl, Professor, Department of Anthropology, (chair)

Boyce Driskell, Director, Archaeological Research Laboratory

Sarah Weeks, Alumni Program Director, Alumni Affairs

Tim Ezzell, Director, Community Partnership Center

George Dodds, Associate Professor, School of Architecture

Stan Rabun, Professor, School of Architecture

Terry Ledford, Assistant Director, Facilities Services

Beside their own interest and expertise in matters pertaining to historic preservation and cultural resource management, the task force members, alone or as a group, obtained information from:

The Tennessee Historical Commission

Tennessee Division of Archaeology

Knox Heritage

Knoxville/Knox County Metropolitan Planning Commission

The Getty Foundation

Dr. Betsey Creekmore, Associate Vice Chacellor, Space and Facilities  
Management

Mr. George Criss, Director, Facilities Planning

Dr. William Dunne, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Charles Faulkner, Professor, Department of Anthropology

The task force also received unsolicited inquiries from persons, some of whom are alumni, concerned about the historic preservation of the campus. This included members of the Tennessee Preservation Trust and other members of the University community sensitive about campus historic preservation.

No formal or systematic examination, identification, or assessment of historic properties was made by the task force. The task force focused on two related issues: (1) current university policies and procedures respecting historic preservation; (2) recommendations for implementing more enlightened and contemporary policies and procedures respecting historic preservation.

### Principles and Definitions

Language used in this report is consistent with the content and meaning of terms and concepts used by professional historic preservation planners in both the private and public sectors. This is consistent with the scope of historic preservation planning and cultural resource management as developed and practiced by architects, historical architects, historical archaeologists, prehistoric archaeologists, and historians. It is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for: (1) Preservation Planning, (2) Evaluation, (3) Registration (4) Historical Documentation (5) Architectural and Engineering Documentation, (6) Archaeological Documentation and (7) Rehabilitation as issued by the United States National Park Service.

**The National Register of Historic Places** is the nation's inventory of historic places and the national repository of documentation on the variety of historic property types, significance, abundance, condition, ownership, needs and other information.

**The Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record**

(HABS/HAER) is an integral component of the federal government's commitment to historic preservation. The program documents important architectural, engineering and industrial sites throughout the United States and its territories. A complete set of HABS/HAER documentation, consisting of measured drawings, photographs, and written history plays a key role in accomplishing the mission of creating an archive of American architecture and engineering and in better understanding what historic resources tell us about America's diverse ethnic and cultural heritage

**Historical significance** as used here means the quality of being important in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture that is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

**Historical integrity** as used here means the ability to convey significance. More specifically historical integrity means that a property is sufficiently well preserved or unchanged that its historical significance is apparent.

**Section 106 Review** is the portion of the National Historic Preservation Act that requires private and public entities to determine the effect of their undertakings on cultural properties on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places if they use federal funds for construction or land modification activities or if their activities require a federal permit or license.



**Campus or university campus** refers only to the facilities and property of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville campus. This means the main campus and the agricultural campus, including land referred to as the Cherokee Farm or Dairy Farm.

**University administration** means individuals at the campus and university systems level having responsibility for the care and supervision of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville campus. Care and supervision includes but is not limited to developing and carrying out plans for the construction of new buildings and structures, for the renovation restoration, and rehabilitation of existing structures, for the demolition of buildings, and for the planning of roads, utilities, and landscaping.

### Background

As best as can be determined prior to 1997, no formal relationship existed between the university, local government, or Knoxville citizens concerned with the historic preservation of the campus and its surrounding neighborhoods. In conjunction with the 1982 Knoxville World's Fair, the university apparently was involved in discussions regarding preservation of several houses on campus. Attempts by university employees to nominate these (probably in the late 1970s) to the National Register of Historic Places were rejected by university officials and according to informants the buildings were demolished several years later. At one time university personnel also

proposed placing the Tyson house on the National Register of Historic Places, but its nomination also was not permitted to go forward.

In 1987, The Knoxville/Knox County Metropolitan Planning Commission issued a historic sites survey and cultural resources plan for the city and county. The report included identification of “Romanesque Revival and Gothic Revival buildings which formed the original portion of the University of Tennessee campus” as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The report further commented that: “The University of Tennessee has a less than desirable record preserving historic structures.” In 2001, the entire campus was named one of the “Ten Most Endangered Properties” in Knox County by Knox Heritage.

In 1997, at the urging of a small group of faculty, following the demolition of the Turner house (the present location of the Burchfiel Geography Building), Chancellor William Snyder convened a Historic Preservation Committee. The committee was chaired by Betsey Creekmore and included academic and administrative personnel. Dr. Snyder asked the committee “to recommend a plan for documenting structures that will eventually be razed for expansion and that are worthy of documentation; identifying any significant archaeological sites on the main campus which should be investigated and a plan for doing so.” The committee met twice, one of which was an informational meeting conducted by the staff of the Tennessee Historical Commission regarding historic preservation planning and its possible application to the campus. In convening the committee, it was made clear that university policy was not to nominate campus

historic buildings to the National Register of Historic Places until after they were renovated. Since the late 1990s, interested groups and individuals have continued to raise concerns about historic campus buildings and both prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, including the Cowan house (proposed for demolition), the Woodruff Carriage House (now extensively renovated), the Claiborne-Kellar house (demolished 2005), and various building renovations such as Berry Hall, Estabrook Hall, Ayres Hall, Melrose Hall, and Strong Hall.

The best known prehistoric archaeological site identified on the campus is the burial mound located on the agricultural campus. This site remains well protected and is the only property on the Knoxville campus listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was nominated and placed on the register in 1976. Sporadic surveys to locate archaeological sites were conducted on College of Agriculture land in the late 1960s but none of the discovered sites were placed on the register, nor have they been systematically reevaluated in recent years. Further surveys made in 2005 located prehistoric archaeological sites on land managed by the College of Agriculture. Several of these sites were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Known Civil War encampments are situated on the Hill and in Circle Park, but the full nature and extent of any associated archaeological deposits is presently undetermined.

Under state law, archaeological sites on state land are protected. Further consideration of archaeological sites are implemented under both state and federal law should human burials occur or are thought to occur on a particular property. The

university, in addition, is subject to provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act if development or construction is funded by the federal government or if it requires a federal permit or license. Renovation of interior space in existing buildings funded with federal money is not generally subject to Section 106 review. Under Tennessee law the Division of Archaeology can make recommendations to the State Building Commission respecting archaeological assessments related to state funded projects. The law requires all state agencies to cooperate with the Division of Archaeology in these efforts.

### Current Policy

A governing principle of the University of Tennessee Master Plan adopted in 1994 (now under review) is to encourage historic preservation efforts. The plan calls upon the university to “respect the historic character of existing buildings of architectural significance in all planned renovations.” The plan further calls upon the university to “collaborate with historic preservation groups within the community to preserve articles of historical or architectural significance.” The university has no formal policy for implementing this principle.

Current approaches to preservation of historical properties on the campus are largely idiosyncratic and ad hoc. When buildings are identified for renovation the Associate Vice Chancellor for Space and Facilities in consultation with the UT system Office of Facilities Planning, and UT, Knoxville units that will support the facility

assemble a Facilities Program document. Academic and non academic units who are identified as the future occupants of the building are involved in developing this review document following university “Guidelines for Development of Building Programs for New Facilities and Capital Renovations.” These guidelines make no mention of historic preservation, not even allowing for possible National Register nominations after a proposed renovation is completed.

The Task Force reviewed the Estabrook Hall Facilities Program document. The document provides a brief history of the building, and recognizing its original construction in 1898 and expansion in 1906 states: “The challenge to the architects will be to devise a structure on a constrained site that meets the program requirements, while preserving the character represented by the 1906 addition of UT’s second oldest campus building.” So while acknowledging the building’s historical nature, the report provides no guidance on what constitutes preservation of its 1906 character.

The Task Force also reviewed the Ayres Hall Facilities Program document. It explicitly recognizes the building’s historical significance and provides some guidance regarding its renovation. The report states: “ The renovation must be a sensitive restoration of its unique architectural features and ensure its transformation within the framework of the history and traditions of the institution into a modern facility in which the offices of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Arts and Sciences Advising Office, and the Department of Mathematics will be permanently housed, and in which Physics faculty and projects will be housed until the renovation of Nielsen is

completed.” The report goes on to say, “The renovation of Ayres Hall must be a landmark renovation, sensitive to the tradition and stature of this fine structure.” The report offers specific recommendations for preservation of architectural features on the first floor and the building’s exterior. Respecting historical integrity of the second and third floors, however, the report is clear that these portions of the structure, “have been much modified, and preservation of the original architectural character is not a requirement.” Thus while providing encouragement and some guidance on what constitutes historical preservation of Ayres Hall, the document clearly suggests that not all the building is worthy of a sensitive or landmark renovation. Only a thorough review informed by historic preservation principles can determine what constitutes adequate preservation of this significant structure.

The university is obligated under state law to have its facilities programs approved by the State Building Commission, and the Tennessee Historical Commission is given the opportunity to comment on possible effects on historically significant structures. The Building Commission’s review, however, is the last item prior to the preparation of architectural drawings and letting of contracts. By then trying to alter the university’s plans to include consideration of historic preservation is virtually impossible. There is no formal documentation prepared when a building is considered for demolition, although a letter is submitted to the State Building Commission indicating the university’s intentions and Facilities Services takes record photographs of the building.

Current policy regarding nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places appears to have been developed sometime in the 1970s or possibly 1980s in response to historic structures affected by the university's participation in the 1982 World's Fair. The earliest written evidence of the policy found by the Task Force is then Chancellor William Snyder's memorandum establishing a Historic Preservation Committee in 1997. So far as could be determined the policy is not found in any official university documents. The policy was publicly disseminated in the November 24, 2004 Daily Beacon article entitled "Campus Structures Noticeably Absent from Historic Registry." According to the article in which Betsy Creekmore articulates the university's policy, "We [the university] elected not to put our buildings on the Register until we have renovated them." According to the article this facilitates and expedites the renovation process. Creekmore is quoted further as saying, "We see no advantage of being on the National Register. There is no financial benefit to an institution like ours of being on the National Register". And finally, "We really don't have buildings that are historic. Being old is not necessarily historic." The current policy misunderstands the purpose of National Register of Historic places, it ignores the benefits of registration beyond monetary consideration, and it insures that campus historic properties are never likely to be recognized in any formal way through the National Register or any other means. It means that as plans are developed to renovate structures their potential historical significance is largely ignored.

From time to time the university has engaged in dialog with local groups, particularly Knox Heritage and the Fort Sanders neighborhood, but no formal working

relationship has been established with either Knox Heritage or with local government, particularly the Metropolitan Planning Commission. This is particularly unfortunate considering that MPC voiced concern over campus preservation in 1987 and in 2000 issued a comprehensive plan for the Fort Sanders neighborhood. Any discussions with these groups respecting historic preservation is informal or ad hoc usually depending on some one finding out (often through the media) that the university is developing plans to acquire or demolish properties.

### A Standard for Historic Preservation

The university has no formal policies, standards, nor guidelines for identifying, documenting, or assessing campus historical properties including buildings and archaeological sites. Such standards, however, are well developed and widely used throughout the United States. Criteria and procedures for identifying historic properties and for considering them in contemporary planning are well developed, readily available, and routinely used by Federal agencies, the Tennessee Historical Commission, the Tennessee Division of Archaeology, the Knoxville/Knox County Metropolitan Planning Commission, and many others. There is every reason to believe that these practices can be employed successfully at the University of Tennessee. They are widely available in numerous publications issued by the federal government including but not limited to: “How to Complete the National Register Registration Form,” “Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archaeological Properties,” How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,” “Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior’s



Standards and Guidelines,” and “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.” Furthermore, state agencies like the Tennessee Historical Commission and the Division of Archaeology as well as local agencies like the Metropolitan Planning Commission are more than willing to assist the university with its historic preservation needs. In fact an important component of their mission is to provide just such aid.

### A Campus Survey and Inventory

In order to properly consider historic properties in campus planning it is necessary to obtain an inventory of all properties and an assessment of their historical significance and integrity. Currently no such inventory exists. To correct this deficiency, the Chancellor’s office recently approved preparation and submission of a grant application to the Getty Foundation for a Campus Heritage Grant. In June 2006 the Getty Grant application was funded. Campus Heritage grants assist colleges and universities in the United States to manage and preserve the integrity of their significant historic buildings, sites, and landscapes. Eligible projects include those that focus on campus-wide preservation initiatives. Grants may be used to survey historic resources on campuses to create a comprehensive inventory and to prepare nominations for historic designation for buildings, sites, districts, and landscapes. Grants may also be used to create an historic preservation master plan or to augment an existing master plan with a historic preservation component. In 2005, the Getty Foundation awarded 10 grants totaling \$1.5 million. Since its inception in 2002 more that 60 grants have been awarded nation wide,

including grants to the University of Florida, the University of Georgia System, Atlanta, Ohio State University, the University of Oregon, The University of Virginia and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In Tennessee, Rhodes College and the University of the South, Sewanee each received a grant in 2004. The Getty Grant survey is an essential first step in compiling fundamental information about how many and what kind of historic resources occur on the Knoxville campus.

### Benefits to the University

No one at this time can be certain of which specific campus buildings, structures, or other properties are historically significant because there has never been a systematic and exhaustive attempt to identify and assess them. Without doing this first, any effort to consider historic properties on a case by case basis is likely to be inadequate and insufficient for lack of regard for the overall campus context. While no monetary rewards are directly available to the university for its historic preservation efforts from federal or state sources, there is every reason to believe that the good will created among employees, students, alumni and members of the Knoxville and Knox County communities will reap social and financial benefits for the university through gift giving and its improved reputation as a public citizen. Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that the university's visibility and positive support for historic preservation will encourage even greater preservation efforts within Knoxville and particularly in the Fort Sanders neighborhood where a strong historic preservation ethic already exists. It is well documented that property values of historic neighborhoods are greater on average than

comparable non historic neighborhoods. Property values increase at a greater rate in historic neighborhoods and it is known that owners of historic buildings and houses make significant contributions to the local economy by spending far more than the average for home improvements and repairs. Historic preservation creates jobs, and historic preservation is vital to heritage tourism. Historic sites are now the second largest tourist attraction in Tennessee. Thus the university's willingness to participate in historic preservation practice has a direct bearing on improving the local economy and the university's reputation locally and nationally. This can only have positive results for obtaining further public support for the educational mission of the university.

### Findings

The Faculty Senate Task Force on Historic Preservation finds that past policies and attitudes toward campus historic preservation have been inadequate or minimal in addressing the campus' rich architectural and archaeological heritage. The university has no formal policies, standards, nor guidelines to identify, document, or assess campus historical properties including buildings and archaeological sites. Some historically significant archaeological and architectural properties may have been altered, demolished or destroyed.

The task force finds that the current policy of not nominating buildings or other properties to the National Register until after renovation is flawed and should be reconsidered. The result of this policy is that renovation is likely to destroy the historical

qualities or characteristics that make a building or structure historically significant and eligible for the register in the first place. An example is the Alumni Memorial Building. This building was possibly once eligible (no formal determination was made) for the National Register, but the renovation made such significant external and internal alterations to the fabric of the structure that it is probably no longer eligible. Under the current policy no buildings of any kind (before or after renovation) have ever been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places by the university, and only one campus property, the native American burial mound on the Agricultural campus, is listed on the Register.

The task force finds that a major obstacle to historic preservation is poor understanding of preservation law and related practices among campus staff, faculty and administrators. Many individuals, for example, harbor misconceptions about the National Register of Historic Places and appear to believe that National Register listing prevents renovations and demolitions, increases costs, and creates liabilities for the institution. This lack of understanding not only hinders campus preservation efforts but also reflects a poor understanding of applicable preservation law.

## Recommendations

- 1. The university should make a commitment to identifying and documenting all historically significant properties on the Knoxville campus and use this information in all aspects of campus planning.**

This should include but not be limited to the identification, documentation, and assessment of buildings, structures, objects, and both historic and prehistoric archaeological sites. This information should be considered when making decisions about the design and placement of new buildings, all building renovations, landscape development, and the placement and reconfiguration of roads and utilities.

**2. The university administration should support a campus wide survey of historical properties and the creation of a campus preservation master plan.**

The university administration endorsed the Getty Grant application. The task force is hopeful that the administration and all members of the university community will assist and cooperate in every possible way with those engaged in the Getty Grant work. Furthermore, the task force is hopeful that the university administration regards the Getty Grant work as a significant first step in fostering a campus preservation ethic, rather than a single, limited, or irrelevant exercise.

**3. The university should adopt and utilize nationally recognized standards, principles, and practices for identification and documentation of the campus' archaeological and historic properties.**

The university should adopt and utilize the procedures and guidelines developed and commonly employed by the federal government throughout the United States as its

external standard for historic preservation. The university routinely measures its accomplishments against international and national standards. It should do no less respecting historic preservation on the campus.

**4. The university administration should create a historic preservation advisory board directly charged with the responsibility of insuring that historic preservation issues are fully addressed in the planning, maintenance and construction of university buildings and landscape alterations.**

At a minimum the board should include the Executive Director of Capital Projects, the Director of Facilities Planning, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Space and Facilities Management, and the Executive Director of Facilities Services as well as faculty, staff, and student representatives. The board would be responsible for making sure that historic preservation issues are appropriately addressed early in the planning stages whenever the university proposes a building for renovation or demolition, and that similar consideration is afforded whenever the university plans a new building or alters the campus landscape including construction or refurbishing utilities and roads. Every facilities program document prepared by the university should include a full consideration of historic preservation, and all the guidelines for preparing such documents should specify this. One faculty member of the advisory board should participate in preparation of program documents, and in discussions with the design team to assist with the identification and protection of significant historical features within a

project. This person would be charged with gathering and providing such information for the board.

**5. The university should develop written cooperative agreements with local historic preservation groups to better articulate and accomplish mutual preservation goals.**

Such agreements should include but not be limited to Knox Heritage, and Knoxville and Knox county governments, specifically the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The university should enter into a formal working relationship with these groups regarding implementation of the Fort Sanders Neighborhood Plan and any other relevant plans that foster an historic preservation ethic. The university should implement a memorandum of agreement with the Tennessee Historical Commission so that considerations of eligibility and nomination to the National Register of Historic Places as well as the Section 106 process can be expedited.

**6. Historic preservation concerns should be integrated with university efforts to achieve LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification so that potential conflicts with environmental sustainability are addressed and minimized.**

Cultural, historical, and archaeological resources are important resources in the development of healthy, sustainable communities. The LEED program and any future

efforts to upgrade campus energy acquisition, distribution, and consumption should be integrated with historic preservation to the greatest extent possible.

**7. The campus master plan should *reaffirm* its principle to encourage historic preservation, and *assert* a new and more inclusive principle of commitment to actively practicing historic preservation.**

**8. The Offices of Facilities Planning and Facilities Services should take responsibility for seeing that issues of historic preservation are fully and openly considered in its planning activities.**

Doing so will help insure that the historical significance and integrity of buildings, historic sites and archaeological sites, objects and structures are preserved and maintained to every practical extent possible. The task force fully recognizes that difficult choices are involved in building renovations in order to modernize them. The task force is just as convinced that good architects and designers can practice good architecture and good historic preservation. This is demonstrated by numerous examples of historic preservation projects throughout the United States and the Southeast, including efforts on many college and university campuses, including those funded with Getty Foundation, Campus Heritage Grants.



**9. To the greatest extent possible campus buildings, sites, objects and structures that retain sufficient integrity to convey their historic significance should be nominated for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.**

In the absence of a completed survey designed to formally and fully assess which campus buildings or other cultural properties might qualify for the National Register, the task force members, based on their personal experience, believe that there are potentially many such buildings and cultural properties. Almost certainly among them are Ayres Hall and the buildings located on the Hill. Ayres Hall is widely recognized as the single most historically significant building on the campus. The task force is very concerned that renovation of Ayres Hall may go forward with insufficient consideration for its historic integrity and that its historical significance may be effectively lost unless its renovation is fully informed by historic preservation principles.

**10. Historic preservation policies and procedures should be fully integrated into the campus master plan as well as any other internally or externally generated planning documents.**

Specifically included among these documents should be the university's Site Design Guidelines, assembled by the Campus Planning Advisory Committee.

**11. The university administration should organize training sessions or workshops to better inform all members of the university community, especially**

**those with campus planning responsibilities, about historic preservation planning and preservation law.**

A major obstacle to historic preservation is poor understanding of preservation law and related practices among campus staff, faculty and administrators. Some individuals even have the false impression that historic preservation only creates liabilities for the institution. An important tool for overcoming such misconceptions is to provide opportunities for employees to acquire accurate and relevant information in a regular and convenient manner. Many public agencies with historic preservation responsibilities routinely provide such opportunities on a volunteer basis or mandate that their managers and staff receive training in historic preservation planning and law. The university administration through Employee and Organizational Development offers numerous workshops, seminars, and classes on a wide range of topics aimed at improving the skills and knowledge of its employees. There is no reason why training in historic preservation could not be included among their educational programs. The university administration also holds regular retreats and this may be a vehicle for communicating historic preservation on the campus. Such training will be necessary should the university administration implement the recommendations offered by the task force.

**12. By showing leadership in historic preservation, the university should encourage and support private and public groups to strengthen their efforts to develop and implement historic preservation planning.**

The university has a responsibility to use its resources to foster social and economic development. The university should use its resources and influence to help historic private and public preservation groups, such as Knox Heritage and Knoxville/Knox County governments, to improve, expand, and strengthen their historic preservation programs. The architectural, archaeological, and cultural heritage of the campus is an important and visible element in the heritage of the city, region and state. Everyone would benefit from the university assuming a strong, visible, and active role in the historic preservation community. This role need not be restricted to Knoxville, Knox County or the East Tennessee region.

**13. The university should utilize HABS/HAER standards and recording procedures in the event that a decision is made to demolish any university owned or purchased building or structure.**

The HABS/HAER criteria should be applied in all instances not just those where a building has been determined historically significant, eligible for or placed on the National Register. All structures and buildings are a physical record of the campus' history, and no matter how mundane or insignificant they may appear, it is important to make and maintain a record of their design, construction, and appearance.

## Conclusion

The task force is convinced that the university administration has a moral, ethical, and legal obligation to manage, preserve, and protect the historic fabric of the university campus for present and future generations. University administrators have stewardship for the campus. A measure of their legacy is how well they exercise this stewardship. The task force is further convinced that the university administration can fulfill its responsibilities respecting historic preservation in a manner that does not threaten or curtail in any significant fashion their obligation or ability to construct and renovate buildings, to develop the campus infrastructure including roads, walkways and landscaping, and to do all things necessary for the future growth of the university. The task force is certain that future campus development will only be improved and enhanced if adequate measures are implemented now to address issues of historic preservation in a systematic and thorough fashion.

The task force believes that it is vital that the historical integrity of campus buildings, sites, structures, and objects be preserved and fully integrated into the growth of the campus. The siting of new buildings and facilities should take into consideration their impact on archaeological sites, and the renovation of existing buildings must be sensitive to their historical significance and integrity. Alternatives such as renovation or adaptive reuse should be considered when buildings are proposed for demolition. While some may think of campus historic preservation planning as a burden, it need not be this way so long as historic preservation is regarded as no different from any other activities

that the university now routinely implements when planning new facilities or renovating existing construction. It cannot be overemphasized that so long as historic features are considered early in the process of planning campus construction, renovation, and landscaping, initial costs, potential conflicts, unnecessary delays, poor publicity, and cost overruns can be avoided or managed. The cost of historic preservation cannot be determined if it is excluded from the planning process. When historic preservation issues are ignored or insufficiently considered in initial plans or are considered only after design elements are established, architectural drawings are prepared, contracts are let, or construction begins, it is usually too late and historical significance and integrity are severely compromised or are entirely lost. Maintaining historic properties and implementing good historic preservation planning policies should contribute greatly to establishing and retaining a physical setting that promotes a quality academic life and sense of campus community.

#### Acknowledgements

The task force thanks Candace White and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for approving this undertaking. We also appreciate the assistance and cooperation received from the university administration. The Tennessee Historical Commission and the Division of Archaeology provided valuable help regarding state law respecting historic properties and guidance respecting the nature of federal laws and programs.