

## A Reply to Graduate Planning School Study Responses

*Bruce Stiftel, Deden Rukmana, & Bhuiyan Alam*

---

Published responses to the study of faculty quality at U.S. urban and regional planning graduate programs (Stiftel, Rukmana, and Alam 2004) raise issues that deserve clarification and further comment. We begin by correcting misunderstandings about our work, acknowledge where we think the commentators have identified genuine weaknesses, report an error, and then move on to discuss suggestions made for more effective school performance measurement.

Several commentators do not accurately describe what we did to compile the publications and citations data reported. Forsyth (2004) suggests that we tabulated book reviews and other minor journal publications, as well as more traditional articles. We did not. Our protocol was to count "ISI-listed articles" only (Stiftel, Rukmana, and Alam 2004, 8). The Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) database distinguishes thirty-three categories of publications in journals, many of them specific to certain artistic endeavors. We counted only those entries categorized as "articles," excluding book reviews, bibliographies, corrections, editorials, letters, and the remainder of the thirty-three categories. This may omit certain significant scholarly contributions, but it is a more tractable, and we believe more useful, measure than one that mixes the various categories.

Fainstein (2004 [this issue]) believes that the thirty-one journals listed in footnote 4 (p. 21) were the only journals searched for publications and citations. This is not the case. We searched the full ISI database of more than 8,700 journals to prepare the counts of publications and citations reported. These include approximately 5,900 journals indexed by the *Science Citation Index*, 1,700 journals indexed by the *Social Science Citation Index*, and 1,100 journals indexed by the *Arts and Humanities Citation Index*. All bibliometric results reported in our study are based on this full database. Rather than listing all journals searched, footnote 4 was an attempt to assess the completeness of the ISI database with respect to coverage of urban planning journals. In the footnote, we constructed a small sample of journals that we believed to be core planning journals and then reported whether these journals are included in the ISI database. The three journals stated by Professor Fainstein as excluded from our searches, the *Journal of*

*Bruce Stiftel* is a professor of urban and regional planning at Florida State University.

*Deden Rukmana* is a doctoral candidate at Florida State University.

*Bhuiyan Alam* is a doctoral candidate at Florida State University.

*Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24:128-130  
DOI: 10.1177/0739456X04271629  
© 2004 Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning

*Urban Affairs*, *Urban Affairs Review*, and the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, are each, in fact, included in our searches because they are among the 8,700 journals indexed by ISI.

Albrechts (2004) questions the international completeness of the ISI database, suggesting that articles written in languages other than English are not included. His comment reflects a growing concern among planning scholars outside the English-speaking countries that the dominance of English as the language of science internationally has a detrimental effect on the connection of planning scholars to professionals in their own countries. It also remarks on isolation of planning scholarship groups by language. Both of these issues deserve extended discussion not possible in the current setting. We do think it is important to provide information here about the treatment of non-English material by ISI and to attempt to usefully characterize the coverage of non-English urban planning material.

ISI's criteria for selection of journals indexed include publishing standards, international diversity of authorship, incidence of citations to the work in that journal, timeliness of publication, and conformance to international editorial conventions—especially those related to facilitating access to material cited (Testa 2004). They have an explicit objective of achieving international diversity and currently include journals publishing in forty-eight languages. But, they require that, in order to be included, a journal must include English language titles, abstracts and keywords, as well as English references for cited works (Testa 2004). In many fields, the international position of English as a language of scientific communication is such that non-English journals will provide such searchable material in English. Is this true in planning?

In the absence of a comprehensive multilingual list of planning journals, we asked members of the Global Planning Education Association Network (GPEAN), International Editorial Board for suggestions of leading planning journals published in languages other than English. The resulting list consists of twenty-eight titles published in nine languages: seven in French; five in German; four in Portuguese; four in Spanish; three in Italian; two in Norwegian; and one each in Czech, Danish, and Turkish. A cross-check with ISI's journal list led to the striking finding that only one of these non-English planning journals (*EURE: Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbanos Regionales*, published in Chile) is included in the ISI database. The unmistakable conclusion is that Albrechts is right: ISI does not provide anything approaching full multilingual coverage of planning scholarship.

We hope that planning journal editors will work to change this: that they will consider including English titles, abstracts, keywords, and references, and that they will seek inclusion of

their journals in the ISI indexes. We hope this, in part, because it will facilitate more comprehensive school performance measurement, but the more important reason to support inclusion of searchable English material in non-English journals is that this will lead to greater international transfer of the results of planning scholarship.

Fainstein (2004) takes issue with the comparability of faculty lists used to compile data reported in our study, pointing out that the school promotional materials we used to construct our faculty census do not always use the same criteria for including faculty. We acknowledge this in our article, saying that "there inevitably remain some differences in the construction of faculty listings among the schools" (p. 9). The problem is not limited to faculty primarily active in allied fields who may be included in the census, as explained by Fainstein, but extends to faculty members who are widely perceived as active planning scholars who are excluded from the census (including, for instance, Reid Ewing and Frederick Steiner). Our conscious decision in the development of the format for reporting results was intended to show such problems rather than mask them, as we are concerned to promote as effective a long-term answer for our field as possible. We believe it is possible to have a better faculty census but that this will require the involvement of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) or a similar organization in the conduct of regular collection of data used for performance measurement.

As a result of reviews undertaken since publication of our original text, we now know that we incorrectly reported the publication count for Arthur C. Nelson. Professor Nelson should have been shown as having published eleven articles in the study period (rather than six), and as a result, the publication data reported for Virginia Tech were inaccurate. Virginia Tech should have been shown as having thirty-three publications in the study period (rather than twenty-eight), a publication density of 1.83 (rather than 1.65), and a Gini coefficient for publications of 0.66 (rather than 0.61).

The most widespread concern about our study, shared by Teitz (2004), Forsyth (2004), and Myers (2004), and anticipated in our original text (pp. 9, 16) is its focus on a few indicators of performance for an activity that is highly diverse. We suggested additional categories that should be included in future studies: teaching, design-based work, outreach, service, and reputation (p. 16). Myers (p. 26) calls for inclusion of book counts and awards, student metrics, professionalism measures, and reputation, and he suggests that the system should be supervised by ACSP. ACSP has indeed begun to examine possible involvement in school performance measurement. This past April, the ACSP Governing Board asked its Committee on the Academy and the Profession to develop a proposal for a program of school performance measurement,

and that proposal is now under development, with the method of faculty census and selection of a broad range of indicators of performance central to the conversation.

Our article was an effort to advance discussion of planning school performance measurement, certainly not a complete assessment. We are heartened by commentators who support the need for planning school performance measurement and who are engaged by thinking through how to carry out such work most effectively.

**Authors' Note:** Address correspondence to Bruce Stiftel, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2280, USA; phone: +1 (850) 644-8522 or +1 (850) 644-4510; fax: +1 (850) 645-4841; e-mail: bruce.stiftel@fsu.edu.

## ► References

- Albrechts, Louis. 2004. A challenge for the global planning community? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (1): 26-27.
- Fainstein, Susan. 2004. Letter to the editor. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (2): 127.
- Forsyth, Ann. 2004. The view from design. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (1): 24-25.
- Myers, Dowell. 2004. How can planning schools be usefully compared? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (1): 25-26.
- Stiftel, Bruce, Deden Rukmana, and Bhuiyan Alam. 2004. Faculty quality at U.S. graduate planning schools: A National Research Council-style study. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24 (1): 6-22.
- Teitz, Michael B. 2004. Assessing the quality of U.S. planning schools: A comment. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24:23-24.
- Testa, James. 2004. *The ISI database: The journal selection process*. Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://www.isinet.com/essays/selectionofmaterialforcoverage/199701>.