

# INCENTIVES, CULTURE, AND CHANGE IN AMERICAN LEGAL EDUCATION

*Caleb N. Griffin*

## ABSTRACT

*In theory, law school rankings merely describe law schools as they are, providing basic details about each school that may be relevant to prospective law students. In practice, however, law school rankings have a tremendous influence on law students and the legal profession. For better or for worse, the rank of a given student's school will often have a substantial impact on the arc of his or her legal career.*

*Rankings also have a tremendous influence on law schools themselves. One source of this influence is that a high ranking draws strong candidates, and strong candidates reinforce the high ranking. This phenomenon of self-reinforcement has the effect of cementing law schools in a relatively static position and obscuring important changes relevant to prospective students and legal employers.*

*But is this a problem? The status quo might be acceptable if law school rankings were based solely on objective data that measured factors in a way that was truly reflective of the needs of students, legal employers, and society at large. Such an ideal ranking would provide a useful service for prospective students, and it would incentivize law schools to engage in socially beneficial behavior.*

*This Article sets out to explore what factors ought to be used in an ideal ranking system. It considers how various factors could be used to incentivize law schools to better serve the needs of law students and society at large. It argues that ranking systems can and should be used to serve the interests of law students and society and to propel legal education towards positive change.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

*“When we measure something we are forcing an undetermined, undefined world to assume an experimental value. We are not ‘measuring’ the world, we are creating it.” - Niels Bohr*

There is great power in measurement. When we measure or quantify something, the effects often go beyond the merely descriptive. Measuring the world gives it context and meaning, and it facilitates judgments about comparative value. Importantly, however, what is being measured often does not remain static. Instead, measurement may also change the very nature of that which is being measured. It is in this way that measurement and quantification transcend simply describing the world as it exists and instead create a new reality.

At first blush, a ranking of law schools may seem like a modest effort to outline some basic characteristics about particular schools. Certainly, many rankings of law schools perform this function. Prospective students can see information such as average class sizes, student-faculty ratios, an institution’s particular specialties, and a wealth of demographic data. Such data plays an important role in the market for legal education by educating market participants and relieving problems of asymmetric information.<sup>1</sup> This is especially important given the high cost of legal education, in the form of tuition and fees, opportunity cost due to time that could be spent working, and the high transaction costs that accompany transferring to a different law school.

However, rankings designed to measure law schools *as they are* may in fact change the very things they set out to measure. Because ranking systems by their nature reflect a limited set of criteria, they encourage law schools to invest in the measured criteria at the expense of factors that are not measured.<sup>2</sup> For example, relying upon expenditures as a measure of a law school’s investment in its students may encourage law schools to spend excessively, even if such expenditures do not measurably add to the quality of the educational program and even if they unnecessarily inflate tuition prices.<sup>3</sup> In this way, rankings reward those who excel on the measurements included in the rankings and motivate law schools to

---

1. Mitchell R. Berger, *Why the U.S. News & World Report Law School Rankings Are Both Useful and Important*, 51 J. LEGAL EDUC. 487, 497 (2001).

2. Jeffrey Evans Stake, *The Interplay Between Law School Rankings, Reputations, and Resource Allocation: Ways Rankings Misperceive*, 81 IND. L.J. 229, 245 (2006). See also AM. BAR ASS’N TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUC., REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS 10 (Jan. 2014), [https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional\\_responsibility/report\\_and\\_recommendations\\_of\\_aba\\_task\\_force.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/report_and_recommendations_of_aba_task_force.authcheckdam.pdf).

3. *Id.* at 10.

prioritize the features captured by the metrics themselves.

The way rankings shape reality presents both problems and opportunities. Rankings prove problematic when they heavily weight features that differ significantly from the features of an ideal law school. Additionally, rankings may cause stagnation in the legal field when they fail to reflect positive innovations or unfairly advantage schools with historically strong programs. Rankings prove useful, however, when they steer law schools towards the programming, investments, and curricular decisions that serve the needs of law students and society at large.

Much has been written of late about the need for transformation in the legal education system.<sup>4</sup> There has been a dramatic decrease in the employability of law graduates, and legal employers are facing significant and unprecedented economic pressures due to rapid change in the legal marketplace.<sup>5</sup> The surplus of law graduates relative to available employment has, in turn, put pressure on law schools to make changes to legal education that increase the employability of graduates.<sup>6</sup> The sharp declines in law school enrollment, increased applicant concern about and attention to their employment prospects, and increased attention to the professionalism and competence of law graduates all increase the need for and desirability of change.<sup>7</sup> Problematically, however, due to the decentralized nature of legal education, “no person or organization is in a position to alone drive rapid change,” and “collective action for the common good can be difficult to achieve, despite general knowledge of its benefits.”<sup>8</sup> Thus, as it stands, there is a growing consensus that legal education needs to change coupled with uncertainty regarding how to achieve such change.

One option to promote change in legal academia is an organic, bottom-up approach in which law schools are incentivized to change themselves. By encouraging law schools to promote certain features, improved rankings could serve as one potential route to foster positive change in legal education.<sup>9</sup> An enhanced ranking system would not only improve the metrics used, but also serve to articulate an aspirational ideal. In so doing, such rankings could motivate law schools to invest in the areas that best serve both students and society. The chosen metrics would engender real change by incentivizing law schools to promote certain features and

---

4. *Id.* at 21.

5. Neil Hamilton, *Law Firm Competency Models & Student Professional Success: Building on a Foundation of Professional Formation/Professionalism*, 11 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 6, 29 (2013).

6. *Id.*

7. *Id.* at 6-7.

8. AM. BAR ASS'N TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUC., REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, *supra* note 2, at 21.

9. Andrew P. Morriss & William D. Henderson, *Measuring Outcomes: Post-Graduation Measures of Success in the U.S. News & World Report Law School Rankings*, 83 IND. L.J. 791, 792 (2008).

by disincentivizing law schools from investing in other features. This Article sets out to explore how a ranking system could be structured to advance the interests of two key constituencies: law students and society at large.

## II. CONTEXT ON LAW SCHOOL RANKINGS

In its report on legal education, the American Bar Association Task Force on the Future of Legal Education remarked, “[r]ankings of law schools strongly influence the behavior of applicants, law schools, and employers.”<sup>10</sup> Despite the recognized power of rankings, legal academia has largely outsourced responsibility for ranking law schools to U.S. News & World Report, a for-profit media company, which provides what is widely viewed as the most influential ranking of law schools.<sup>11</sup>

U.S. News & World Report has the power to select the criteria used in its ranking system and to weight those factors as it chooses. This means that U.S. News & World Report is playing an active role in shaping the behavior of law applicants, law schools, and legal employers, altering the features of legal education these institutions prioritize.

Towards what ends does U.S. News & World Report shape legal academia? The U.S. News rankings feature eleven criteria, including peer assessment score (.25 weight), assessment score by lawyers and judges (.15 weight), median LSAT and GRE score (.125 weight), median undergraduate GPA (0.10 weight), acceptance rate (0.025 weight), employment rates at graduation (0.04 weight), employment rates at 10 months after graduation (0.14 weight), relative bar passage rate (0.02), expenditures per student (0.1125 weight), student-faculty ratio (0.03 weight), and library resources (0.0075).<sup>12</sup>

Do we, and should we, really value these features at these weights? Is employability really only half as valuable as peer assessment score? Do expenditures per student merit nearly equal attention as median LSAT and GRE score? Is the relative bar passage rate really less important to students than the student-faculty ratio at their law school? Rather than outsourcing these important value judgments, it is imperative for legal academia to promote a ranking system that values these features. This Article thus examines the features of an ideal law school and how law school rankings can be used to incentivize law schools towards positive

---

10. AM. BAR ASS'N TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUC., REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS, *supra* note 2, at 10.

11. See Darren Bush & Jessica Peterson, *Jukin' the Stats: The Gaming of Law School Rankings and How to Stop It*, 45 CONN. L. REV. 1235, 1237 (2013).

12. Robert Morse & Kenneth Hines, *Methodology: 2019 Best Law Schools Rankings*, U.S. News & World Report (Mar. 19, 2018), <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/articles/law-schools-methodology>.

change.

### III. IDENTIFYING THE CRITERIA OF AN IDEAL RANKING

#### *Cui Bono?*

In an ideal ranking system, the criteria used to evaluate law schools would emphasize the features of legal education that are the most beneficial. This begs an important threshold question: most beneficial to whom? Who should law school rankings be designed to serve? This Part explores some of the constituencies with a vested interest in the future of legal education and the factors most relevant to these constituencies.

One option is to design a ranking system to serve the public at large. This ranking would have as its goal the creation of lawyers that would best serve the interests of society. Society benefits by having ethical lawyers who are skilled in both legal theory and practice. There is much to commend about a ranking system designed with these ends in mind, but there are also certain shortcomings. Chiefly, an interest purely in the effects on society at large could obscure the system's impact on individual students. For instance, imagine that Student A and Student B have roughly equal competence and both take the bar examination. It may not matter much to "the public" whether (1) Student A passes and Student B fails or (2) Student B passes and Student A fails. This is because either outcome produces one new, competent lawyer for society. However, the differing distributional effects of these outcomes likely matter a great deal to the students themselves. Similarly, "the public" does not care a great deal about *who* fills important roles in civil society, so long as they are filled. To the extent that such a system treats students as interchangeable cogs in a vast economic machine, it could risk sacrificing the interests of certain students for the perceived general welfare.

Another option is to design a ranking system that serves the interests of legal academia. This model envisions legal academics and law schools acting in their rational self-interest. If high rankings yield benefits for academic institutions, schools that have a high ranking would be incentivized to support the status quo. Such a ranking might feature a heavy peer assessment component, giving law school deans and other academics significant influence on the ranking system. Such a ranking system has the benefit of giving a strong voice to some of the most important stakeholders (i.e. law schools themselves) in the rankings process. Additionally, legal academics interact with students daily, and as a result, they may do a good job of accurately representing the interests of current and prospective students. Alternatively, legal academics may favor qualities not necessarily in the interests of law students and the

public at large, such as higher faculty salaries, impressive facilities, or greater administrative spending.

A third option is to design the ranking system to serve the interests of prospective law students. This system would have as its goal the facilitation of optimal decision making by prospective law students. Such a ranking system would heavily weight the factors that matter most to prospective law students, including job prospects and the quality of education received. It would strive to help potential law students make an informed decision about where to attend law school, and it would incentivize law schools to invest in the features that would promote the academic achievement, professional success, and fulfillment of its graduates.

This Article takes the view that best way to design a ranking system is for the twin benefit of society and prospective law students. On the one hand, “the training of lawyers provides public value,” given the “centrality of lawyers in the effective functioning of ordered society.”<sup>13</sup> Capable, professional, and well-trained lawyers add value to society, while incompetent, unethical, and unprepared lawyers disserve society and undermine the integrity of the legal system. On the other hand, law schools also provide private value. Law students are willing to invest time and money in the pursuit of a legal education on the grounds that such an education will give them the skills and knowledge necessary to obtain a fulfilling career.<sup>14</sup> Law students stand to gain from a ranking system that considers their interests and incentivizes law schools to provide a high-quality educational program that prepares students for high-quality employment. This Article sets out to explore how rankings can incentivize law schools to better serve the interests of these two key constituencies.

*What Do the General Public and Law Students Value in a System of  
Legal Education?*

If an “ideal” law school ought to serve both the general public and prospective law students, then the question becomes what features best serve their interests?

For its part, society has a vested interest in ensuring that law schools produce law graduates that are competent.<sup>15</sup> A well-ordered society depends upon lawyers to ensure effective functioning and preserve order.<sup>16</sup> Thus, from a public-value perspective, it is important for lawyers

---

13. AM. BAR ASS'N TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUC., REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, *supra* note 2, at 6-7.

14. *Id.*

15. *Id.*

16. *Id.*

to be proficient at their jobs. Additionally, society benefits from having a sufficient number of lawyers to meet the needs of clients.<sup>17</sup> A shortage of lawyers raises the price of legal services to potentially unaffordable levels and leaves needs unmet, while an excess of lawyers potentially yields problems with unemployment in the legal field. Third, society has a deep interest in the ethical values of lawyers.<sup>18</sup> Society stands to gain from a pool of legal graduates with high levels of professionalism, since society benefits when the majority of lawyers have the virtues, attributes, and capacities required by the profession.<sup>19</sup>

For their part, prospective law students have a vested interest in the quality of a given program of legal education.<sup>20</sup> Law students also care about the quality of their peers, as highly-skilled peers enrich the law school classroom, promote a positive reputation for the law school in the legal community, and serve as part of a strong professional network after graduation. Additionally, law students care deeply about their employment prospects upon graduation,<sup>21</sup> both the likelihood that they will find employment and the quality of the job that they do find.

From this diverse set of interests, it is possible to identify a list of five general features which a ranking of law schools could attempt to capture: (1) the quality of a given law school's students, (2) the competence of its graduates, (3) the professionalism of its graduates, (4) the employment prospects for its graduates, and (5) the quality of those employment prospects. The remainder of this Part explores the value of each of these factors from the perspective of students and society at large.

*The Value of Reliance upon Measures of the Quality of Law Students in a Ranking System*

Promoting the admission of high-quality law students serves the interests of both the students themselves and the public at large. Law students benefit when law schools admit only those students with a high probability of academic and professional success, and society benefits from ensuring that law graduates have the capacity for academic success in law school and professional success as lawyers. Law students benefit from being in the classroom with accomplished and intelligent peers, and society benefits in the form of better-trained lawyers when the law school classroom is a dynamic and enriched environment.

---

17. *Id.*

18. AM. BAR ASS'N TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUC., REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, *supra* note 2, at 6-7.

19. *Id.*

20. *Id.* at 7.

21. *Id.*

Reliance upon quality of law students does have some limitations. Any metric used to measure law student quality is necessarily imperfect because many intangible qualities cannot be captured by test scores, undergraduate GPA, and other such measures. Additionally, these metrics may push law schools to be underinclusive, failing to admit some potential law students who could make a valuable contribution to the profession. Overall, however, the benefits of ensuring that law schools admit high-quality applicants, both to the applicants themselves and to society at large, likely outweigh the costs in the form of underinclusivity, particularly given the competitiveness of the legal job market.<sup>22</sup>

Ultimately, reliance upon measures of the quality of law students in a ranking system incentivizes law schools to admit highly-credentialed applicants. It discourages law schools from admitting applicants who might be capable of paying tuition or qualifying for loans but who are ultimately unlikely to succeed in law school, pass the bar, and/or succeed in a legal career.

*The Value of Reliance upon Measures of the Competence of Law  
Graduates in a Ranking System*

Valuing the competence of law graduates in a ranking system serves the interests of both law students and the public at large. Law students benefit from being well-trained in the law and capable of succeeding in their professional endeavors, and they have a vested interest in ensuring that American law schools contribute to their students' legal competence. Additionally, the public at large relies upon competent lawyers and legal professionals to ensure that clients are given proper representation.

However, reliance upon measures of the competence of law graduates has some limitations. Any metric used to measure law student competence is inherently imperfect because many intangible qualities related to competence cannot be easily captured by a test or survey. Additionally, there is a great diversity of careers in the legal field, and the pursuit of overall competence might motivate law schools to focus on teaching students a broad set of basic skills rather than providing particular expertise in students' desired practice areas.

Despite these limitations, future lawyers benefit from a ranking system that gives them some indication of how a particular law school will contribute to their professional competence upon graduation while society benefits from a ranking system that motivates legal educational institutions to produce practice-ready graduates with the skills and knowledge necessary to be effective advocates for their clients. Indeed, reliance upon measures of the competence of graduates incentivizes law

---

22. *Id.* at 2.



schools to admit only those applicants capable of succeeding in a legal career. Reliance upon such measures further incentivizes law schools to structure their curriculum, student services, and institutional resources to emphasize the core competencies necessary to succeed professionally and to provide greater opportunities for practical experience.

*The Value of Reliance upon Measures of the Professionalism of Law Graduates in a Ranking System*

Professionalism, or the traits necessary to serve as effective, ethical, and responsible members of the legal profession, is another important criterion, particularly for society at large.<sup>23</sup> The competencies required for professionalism are the traits clients expect from their lawyer,<sup>24</sup> and data suggests that lawyers with high degrees of professionalism are more effective advocates.<sup>25</sup> Additionally, research suggests that legal employers seek and evaluate potential candidates on their professionalism, meaning that law students themselves have an interest in ensuring their legal education provides professional development training.<sup>26</sup>

Reliance upon the professionalism of graduates does have some limitations. Professionalism is a particularly difficult quality to measure. Indeed, many metrics may only capture an individual's ability to *appear* to have high professionalism rather than their actual behavior on the job. Additionally, some may question the ability of legal educators to exert any significant influence on the ethical compass of adults. However, such concerns are likely unfounded given the evidence supporting the teachability of professionalism.<sup>27</sup>

Despite these limitations, professionalism serves as a useful criterion for a law school ranking system because of its likely impact on the behavior of law schools and legal educators. *Ex ante*, such a criterion encourages law schools to give higher weight to the non-numerical parts of a student's application, such as contributions to community service, values expressed in personal statements, and personality traits gleaned

---

23. Neil Hamilton, *Analyzing Common Themes in Legal Scholarship on Professionalism to Address Current Challenges for Legal Education*, 22 PROF. LAW. 1 (2013).

24. Hamilton, *supra* note 5, at 31–32.

25. Hamilton, Madeleine Coulter, & Marie Coulter, *Professional Formation/Professionalism's Foundation: Engaging Each Student's and Lawyer's Tradition on the Question "What Are My Responsibilities to Others?"*, 12 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 271, 335 (2016).

26. Hamilton, *supra* note 23, at 1, 2.

27. Neil Hamilton & Verna Monson, *Legal Education's Ethical Challenge: Empirical Research on How Most Effectively to Foster Each Student's Professional Formation (Professionalism)*, 9 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 325, 341 (2011).

from interviews, when making admissions decisions. *Ex post*, reliance upon measures of professionalism in a ranking system incentivizes law schools to emphasize not only the information necessary to be a knowledgeable lawyer, but the skills and values necessary to be an ethical lawyer. Further, as professionalism relates to the conduct of practicing lawyers, emphasizing the professionalism of graduates may give law schools an incentive to serve as a resource for graduates encountering ethical challenges in the workplace and to increase their involvement in the cultivation of high-quality continuing education programming.

*The Value of Reliance upon Measures of the Employability of Law Graduates in a Ranking System*

Law students have a particular interest in their employment prospects. The typical student enrolls in law school with the goal of gaining the skills and competencies necessary to obtain a job in the legal profession. Additionally, society benefits when there are neither too few nor too many jobs available for the pool of lawyers in the marketplace.

Though it is difficult for any single metric to capture the employability of a lawyer over his or her entire career, even a snapshot of employability is likely a useful criterion. Reliance upon measures of the employability of law graduates in a ranking system incentivizes law schools to admit highly-credentialed applicants likely to succeed in the legal field. It encourages law schools to emphasize the skills and experiences necessary for positive employment outcomes in their curricula and teaching methodologies. Further, it creates a strong incentive for law schools to provide the resources necessary for students to find and procure employment positions, such as employment advising, interview practice, and networking events.

*The Value of Reliance upon the Quality of Job Placements in a Ranking System*

Of course, neither law graduates nor society are well served when graduates procure employment that does not relate to their legal training, pays an unacceptably low salary, and/or does not prove fulfilling or meaningful. Thus, it is important for a ranking system to emphasize the *quality* of such employment.

Problematically, it is difficult to define quality, as priorities vary significantly between law graduates. Some graduates may have a particular interest in the salary of their job while others may prefer a lower-paying position that allows them increased flexibility to raise a family. Other graduates might prioritize service to an underserved community while still others may seek a prestigious position.

Nonetheless, utilization of some measures of job quality in a ranking system incentivizes law schools to pay attention to the career goals of their candidates, rather than funneling them into jobs that may not be a good fit with their professional goals. Further, it discourages law schools from manipulating measures of employment by providing access to jobs that, while likely better than unemployment, are not high in quality, relevance, or pay. Thus, it is likely that such a criterion serves a useful purpose in a law school ranking system.

#### IV. IDENTIFYING THE METRICS TO BE USED IN AN IDEAL RANKING SYSTEM

Identifying the valued features of an ideal law school is only half the battle. We must also identify the specific metrics to be used in determining whether and to what extent an existing law school possesses these desired features. This Part analyzes metrics that could be used to assess law school quality and considers the benefits and pitfalls of reliance upon these metrics.

##### *Measures of the Quality of Law Students*

###### The Utility of LSAT Score as a Measure of Law Student Quality

LSAT scores provide one useful metric to capture the quality of law students at a given institution. The LSAT “is designed to measure skills that are considered essential for success in law school: the reading and comprehension of complex texts with accuracy and insight; the organization and management of information and the ability to draw reasonable inferences from it; the ability to think critically; and the analysis and evaluation of the reasoning and arguments of others.”<sup>28</sup> Given its focus on the skills necessary for success in law school, the LSAT serves as one useful metric of the quality of law students. Numerous studies have documented the predictive ability of LSAT score on law school grades.<sup>29</sup> These studies likely *understate* the predictive power of the LSAT given that students at any particular institution come from a restricted range of LSAT scores.<sup>30</sup> The fact that the LSAT remains predictive even within this restricted subset of students suggests that it

---

28. *About the LSAT*, Law School Admission Council, <https://www.lsac.org/jd/lsat/about-the-lsat>.

29. See, e.g. Linda Wightman, *Beyond FYA: Analysis of the Utility of LSAT Scores and UGPA for Predicting Academic Success in Law School*, Law School Admission Council Research Report 99-05 (Aug. 2000), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED469178.pdf> (finding that the LSAT predicts performance in law school).

30. Douglas Laycock, *The Broader Case for Affirmative Action: Desegregation, Academic Excellence, and Future Leadership*, 78 TUL. L. REV. 1767, 1841, n.169 (2004).

would have even greater predictive effect on the pool of prospective law students as a whole.<sup>31</sup> The LSAT also predicts an individual's relative performance on the bar examination,<sup>32</sup> which suggests it is a useful measure of both the academic and professional potential of a given law student.

Nonetheless, there has been extensive criticism of the utility of the LSAT and the problems with over-reliance on this metric.<sup>33</sup> Even the entity that administers the LSAT, the Law School Admission Council, counsels against over-reliance on the LSAT: “[t]hose who set admission policies and criteria should always keep in mind the fact that the LSAT does not measure every discipline-related skill necessary for academic work, nor does it measure other factors important to academic success.”<sup>34</sup> Given that the LSAT is a timed test, reliance upon the LSAT in a ranking system might partially select for *faster* law students but not necessarily better law students. It might also bias law schools towards candidates with the resources to invest considerable time and energy in test preparation. Additionally, over-reliance upon LSAT score in any ranking system might incentivize a law school to ignore in its admissions process the intangible qualities essential to success as a lawyer, and it might thereby negatively affect the competence and professionalism of graduates.

#### The Utility of Undergraduate GPA as a Measure of Law Student Quality

Undergraduate GPA provides another useful measure of a student's academic ability. Studies suggest that undergraduate GPA is also predictive of law school performance, and the combination of undergraduate GPA and LSAT score has better predictive ability than either metric alone.<sup>35</sup> Additionally, relative to the LSAT, undergraduate GPA is likely less subject to time pressure and thus better captures how much effort a particular student puts into his or her studies in addition to any inherent aptitude for the particular subject matter. As such, it is likely a useful complement to LSAT score for providing an indication of an individual's likelihood of success in law school, their ability to contribute to the creation of an enriched student body, and their later ability to

---

31. *Id.*

32. Gary S. Rosin, *Unpacking the Bar: Of Cut Scores and Competence*, 32 J. LEGAL PROF. 67 (2008).

33. See, e.g. Phoebe A. Haddon & Deborah W. Post, *Misuse and Abuse of the LSAT: Making the Case for Alternative Evaluative Efforts and A Redefinition of Merit*, 80 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 41, 91–92 (2006) (stating, “law schools cannot continue to verbalize a commitment to excellence, equality and diversity in the legal profession while continuing to utilize the LSAT as the primary gatekeeper”).

34. *Cautionary Policies Concerning LSAT Scores and Related Services*, Law School Admission Council, (Jul 2014) [https://www.lsac.org/docs/default-source/publications-\(lsac-resources\)/cautionarypolicies.pdf](https://www.lsac.org/docs/default-source/publications-(lsac-resources)/cautionarypolicies.pdf).

35. Wightman, *supra* note 29.

succeed professionally.

However, undergraduate GPA itself does not tell the full story, even about a particular student's undergraduate performance. Factors such as "the difficulty of a particular undergraduate institution or course of study, the distribution of grades at the institution, the applicant's approximate rank in that distribution, the applicant's performance from year to year, and the types of courses in which the applicant excelled or did poorly"<sup>36</sup> would all provide greater information than the undergraduate GPA alone. Additionally, this metric might encourage law schools to ignore intangible components of a law candidate's undergraduate experience, such as their contribution to extracurricular activities or the difficulty of their major, as well as other portions of their application, such as their admissions essay.

#### The Utility of Intangible Traits as Measures of Law Student Quality

Potential law students are far more than a set of scores and numbers. Intangible traits of law students vital to their quality and their potential for success can perhaps be captured more fully when factors such as letters of recommendation, personal statements, descriptions of work experience, records of public service, extracurricular activities, and personal interviews are considered.<sup>37</sup> Problematically, however, such information often proves difficult to quantify. The volume of such information, its incommensurable nature, and concerns for student privacy mean that such information is unlikely to be fully reflected by any ranking system. For these reasons, intangible traits prove difficult to accurately capture in a ranking system, and this Article does not rank law schools by intangible traits.

#### *Measures of the Competence of Graduates*

##### The Utility of Absolute Bar Passage Rate as a Measure of Graduate Competence

One potential metric to capture the competence of graduates involves reliance on absolute bar passage rates. Such a metric measures the rate at which each law school's graduates pass the bar regardless of the overall pass rate in the state in which the bar exam is administered. Such a metric is likely a good indicator of the competence of graduates, since the bar exam is designed to ensure the minimum competence of persons admitted

---

36. *Supra* note 34.

37. Haddon & Post, *supra* note 33, at 49-50.

to the practice of law.<sup>38</sup> Recent data confirms the validity of the bar exam as a measure of the competence of law graduates.<sup>39</sup> Law students have a vested interest in the likelihood that they will pass the bar given the fact that most law positions require bar passage. Society also benefits when graduates have the competence necessary to pass the bar, since this prevents the inefficiency of law students investing in legal training they will never directly use. Further, reliance on such a metric incentivizes law schools to adequately prepare law students for the bar examination and to provide them with the resources and training needed to pass the bar.

Some may argue that because bar exam passage rates vary from state to state, it provides an imperfect measure of a law graduate's competence.<sup>40</sup> However, such an argument suggests either that there are some states with bar examinations that admit a significant portion of individuals without the competence to practice law or that there are some states that prevent competent candidates from bar passage. Either critique implies a need to alter bar examinations themselves, but it does not imply that we should obscure this information from the students to whom it may be relevant in law school rankings.

To the extent that bar passage rates relate to the difficulty of the bar exam—and research does suggest that difference in passage rates is in part attributable to differences in difficulty<sup>41</sup>—a law school's location in a state with a higher bar passage rate (or proximity to such a state where it sends a large portion of its graduates) likely benefits the average law student at that institution. The average law student can often more easily find employment in or near the same state where he or she went to law school, since the law school's network and brand is likely stronger near the institution's home jurisdiction. All things being equal, a law student would prefer an easier bar examination and a higher likelihood of passage. An absolute bar passage rate may provide the most accurate answer to a key question prospective students have about a law school: how likely are its graduates to pass the bar?

### The Utility of Relative Bar Passage Rate as a Measure of Law Graduate Competence

Another potential metric to capture the competence of law graduates involves reliance on the relative bar passage rate. Because the bar passage

---

38. Rosin, *supra* note 32.

39. Susan Case, *Summary of the National Conference of Bar Examiners Job Analysis Survey Results*, National Conference of Bar Examiners (Jan. 2013), <http://www.ncbex.org/pdfviewer/?file=%2Fdmsdocument%2F55>.

40. Rosin, *supra* note 32, at 69.

41. *Id.*

rate varies significantly state by state, a measure of the relative bar passage rate compares the performance of a given law school's graduates on the bar exam to the state average.<sup>42</sup> For its part, the U.S. News & World Report uses a relative bar passage rate in its ranking system.<sup>43</sup> Such a rate advantages strong law schools in states with low bar passage rates, since their pass rates often exceed the state average by substantial margins. Conversely, use of a relative rate disadvantages strong law schools in states with a higher bar passage rate, where there is much less room for a law school's graduates to significantly exceed the state average.

The relative bar passage rate can be a useful tool to help law students compare the quality of the bar preparation at the different law schools they may be considering, especially if they wish to attend law school in a particular state. It may also give students a very rough proxy for the overall quality of the academic instruction at a given law school. Highlighting the relative bar passage rate incentivizes law schools to help their law students excel on the bar exam, which serves the interests of both society and law students.

#### The Utility of Per Student Expenditures as a Measure of Law Graduate Competence

A third potential measure of the competence of law graduates is the per-student expenditures at a given law school. Ostensibly, such a metric captures the investment a law school makes in its students. Therefore, it arguably has some relation to the quality of the legal education and the competence of law school graduates. U.S. News & World Report relies upon measures of expenditures per student in its ranking system, collectively giving them a sizable weight of 11.25%.<sup>44</sup>

Problematically, however, expenditures do not necessarily relate to the *quality* of a legal education. Greater expenditures may simply mean that a law school is located in a higher-cost area or that the law school facilities are nicer, rather than signaling that the education itself is superior. Additionally, reliance upon measures of expenditures in a ranking system incentivizes law schools to consistently increase costs, potentially resulting in an increase in tuition or a decrease in academic scholarships and financial aid.<sup>45</sup> Such outcomes are deleterious for law students, who end up with a greater debt burden, potentially limiting employment options. Society too suffers when lawyers are prevented from pursuing

---

42. *Id.*

43. Morse & Hines, *supra* note 12.

44. *Id.*

45. AM. BAR ASS'N TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUC., REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION, *supra* note 2.

public interest employment due to their debt or when law graduates are unable to shoulder the burden of their loans. For these reasons, this Article does not provide a ranking of law schools based on expenditures.

#### The Utility of Peer Assessment Surveys as a Measure of Law Graduate Competence

A final metric to assess the competence of law graduates is some form of a peer assessment score, wherein legal professionals, such as law school faculty, judges, or successful lawyers, would rate the average competence of lawyers from a particular institution. U.S. News & World Report relies upon such metrics for 40% of its overall ranking.<sup>46</sup>

Peer assessment ostensibly captures some difficult-to-measure features of a law school, such as its reputation, the strength of its faculty, its scholarly impact, the quality of its graduates, and the impact of these graduates on the legal profession. However, several notable problems plague reliance on peer assessment. First, many of the individuals surveyed likely graduated from law school decades prior to completing the survey, as did their peers in the legal profession. As such, survey responses may reflect out-of-date information and impressions. Relatedly, the fact that the impressions of legal academics are likely formed over a period of decades under-incentivizes innovation and improvement because it takes considerable time for changes to a law school's curriculum or philosophy to alter the perceptions of legal academics or judges. Second, relying on dated impressions also might penalize newer law schools and favor older law schools. Third, the individuals surveyed might prioritize certain features of a law school, such as the prestige of its faculty, higher than other constituencies. The priorities of legal academics may not merit such a heavy weight. Fourth, due to the availability heuristic, respondents might be unconsciously biased in favor of some schools known for non-legal accomplishments, such as sports success or the general strength of the institution's brand. Larger law schools might rank higher than deserved because their larger pool of graduates might have more influence on the legal profession than smaller law schools, and law schools in major metropolitan areas may be more highly-rated based upon the status of the city in which they reside. Similarly, a law school's name might also undeservedly impact its peer assessment, with schools with similar names getting confused for one another and schools with place names perhaps getting a boost from the familiarity of the city or state used in the name due to the availability heuristic.

Overall, heavily weighting the peer assessment score is problematic if

---

46. Morse & Hines, *supra* note 12.



we desire to reshape legal academia to incentivize innovation and improvement and to avoid bias in the ranking results. Reliance on the peer assessment score likely enshrines established law schools and gives undue power over law school rankings to legal academics. Thus, this Article does not compare law schools by peer assessment score.

### *Measures of the Professionalism of Law Graduates*

#### The Utility of MPRE Results as a Measure of the Professionalism of Law Graduates

One potential measure of the professionalism of law graduates from a given law school is the rate at which those graduates pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination (or MPRE). This exam is a sixty-question multiple-choice test that measures knowledge of the professional codes of conduct in the legal profession.<sup>47</sup> As such, it provides a measure of a law graduate's familiarity with legal professional standards. Reliance upon such a metric gives law schools an incentive to provide instruction in legal ethics and professionalism as well as to prepare their students to pass a test frequently required for bar admission. Society is better served when lawyers have at least a basic familiarity with ethical rules and when law students have professional formation incorporated into their legal training.

Unfortunately, there are several problems with reliance upon this metric. The largest among them is the fact that there is currently no publicly available data reflecting the MPRE results for all law schools. Second, mere knowledge of ethical rules is unlikely to fully capture the professionalism of law graduates since it does not reflect on-the-job conduct or values, making the utility of this data somewhat limited.<sup>48</sup> Due to these limitations, this Article does not rank schools by MPRE results.

#### The Utility of Disbarment Rate as a Measure of the Professionalism of Law Graduates

A second potential measure of the professionalism of law graduates is the disbarment rate for graduates of a given law school. The bar has long held that it has a duty to "the courts, the public and indeed itself to cleanse its ranks of those who show themselves unfit to represent the bar" through

---

47. *Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination*, National Council of Bar Examiners, <http://www.ncbex.org/exams/mpre/>.

48. Andrea A. Curcio, *A Better Bar: Why and How the Existing Bar Exam Should Change*, 81 NEB. L. REV. 363, 380 (2002).

disbarment.<sup>49</sup> Thus, data about the rate at which the graduates of a given law school are disbarred likely reflects to some degree the professionalism of the graduates of a given law school. Reliance upon disbarment rate in a ranking system might incentivize law schools to serve as an ongoing resource for graduates facing ethical issues, and the public and law graduates might be best served by encouraging increased attention to the standards of professional conduct.

However, there is no readily-available data identifying the disbarment rate of the graduates of each law school. Additionally, reliance on this metric might prove too oriented to the past, given that many individuals are disbarred well after graduation. Further, disbarment is an extreme measure that likely captures only the most egregious violators of the standards of professional conduct and thus may be an imperfect measure of the professionalism of law graduates as a whole. Due to these limitations, this Article does not provide data on disbarment rates.

#### *Measures of the Employment Prospects of Law Graduates*

Measures of the employability of law graduates vary based upon when the employability of graduates is considered and what types of jobs are included in employment rates. In terms of the timetable, a metric could assess the employment rate at any point between the graduation date of law students and their eventual retirement. It is likely, however, that the most relevant date to both law graduates and society at large comes shortly after graduation. This Article utilizes employment figures at ten months after graduation. A figure that is much earlier might encourage law schools to push the job search earlier, perhaps distracting law students from their studies or bar preparation efforts. Additionally, rushing the job search might mean that law graduates end up with less than ideal positions because individuals may not spend adequate time identifying the most fulfilling career path for their personality and interests. Conversely, relying upon employment data at a later date brings additional variables into the equation, as some law graduates might choose to take time off from their career to raise a family, care for an ill relative, or pursue an additional degree. Ultimately, although there certainly are benefits to having a job secured at graduation, a measurement at that time may be less reflective of law graduates' long-term employment status.

Employment positions also vary in kind, including whether a position is full-time or part-time and short-term or long-term, whether a position requires legal training, whether a position requires bar passage, and whether a law school funds a given position. It is likely that both

---

49. Joseph B. Bugliari, *Disbarment: Non-Professional Conduct Demonstrating Unfitness to Practice*, 43 CORN. L.Q. 489, 490 (1958).

graduates and society are best served by a ranking measuring employment in full-time, long-term positions, as the average law school graduate likely attends law school with the aim of pursuing employment of this nature. Additionally, the typical law student likely desires the type of law position that requires bar passage, such as a clerkship, law firm employment, or legal service work. It is also likely that society is best served when law graduates find employment in the legal field.

Ultimately, this Article provides a measurement of the rate at which the graduates of a given law school find employment in full-time, long-term positions as of 10 months after graduation. This measurement includes two sub-measurements of (1) the percentage of graduates with jobs for which bar passage was required and (2) the percentage of graduates in the following situations: working at a job where a JD provides a significant advantage, working at a job funded by their law school, or successfully pursuing a graduate degree. These measurements are designed to capture the successful placement of law graduates into positions that are most related to obtaining a JD or those who have successfully gained admission to further graduate study.

#### *Measures of the Quality of the Employment Placements of Law Graduates*

##### The Utility of Rate of Large Law Firm Positions as a Measure of the Job Quality of Law Graduates

One way to capture the quality of law graduates' job placements is by measuring the percentage of graduates employed at large law firms. Positions at large firms are generally highly-coveted positions.<sup>50</sup> Not only do these positions tend to provide a large salary, they also often provide the prestige, connections, and training that enable their employees to transition into other highly-coveted positions, including positions as judges, in-house counsel, and legal academics.<sup>51</sup> Reliance upon such a metric likely encourages law schools to aid their students in establishing connections at large law firms, preparing well for interviews, and building a strong resume.

Reliance upon large law firm employment data has a key shortcoming: it is difficult to capture variances in the prestige and competitiveness of these positions, as large size does not perfectly translate to a highly-competitive law firm. Relatedly, any cutoff point for "large" size might exclude some highly-competitive boutique firms and include some less

---

50. David A. Grenardo, *Why Should I Become an Associate at A Large Law Firm? And If I Do, Then What Should I Expect and How Do I Succeed?*, 41 RUTGERS L. REC. 65, 67 (2014).

51. *Id.*

prestigious firms that merely hire a large number of lawyers. However, though it is not a perfect correlation, large size serves as a useful proxy for the compensation and competitiveness of positions at a given law firm, and it is one that is conveniently provided in the disclosures required by the ABA. Thus, this Article compares law schools by the rate at which graduates are employed by large law firms as one approximate measure of job quality.

#### The Utility of Rate of Public Interest Positions as a Measure of the Job Quality of Law Graduates

A second metric to measure the quality of law graduates' job placements is the percentage of graduates employed in public interest positions. Most public interest positions are not particularly well-paid,<sup>52</sup> and some might thus argue against the inclusion of these positions in a measure of job quality. However, to the extent that this work provides modest compensation, it may be an indirect measure of the ability of law school graduates to pursue their desired careers rather than being forced to pursue the types of jobs that enable them to repay their student loans. Additionally, public interest legal work generally commands respect and admiration for its contribution to society as a whole.<sup>53</sup> It is also likely to be fulfilling work for many legal graduates, as public service attorneys experience personal satisfaction from their work and their ability to contribute to society at large.<sup>54</sup>

Inclusion of the rate of public interest employment potentially incentivizes a number of beneficial behaviors on the part of law schools, such as financial and administrative support for students pursuing public interest careers, the cultivation of civic-mindedness amongst students and graduates, and a culture of service at the law school level. Problematically, the ABA does not provide data on the portion of graduates working in public service jobs for which bar passage is required. Instead, it records a broader category of public interest jobs defined as:

[L]egal services positions that are funded by the Legal Services Corporation or a similar funding entity; positions with other organizations that provide indigent or reduced-fee legal services, such as prisoners' legal services and campus legal services; and positions with public interest and non-profit employers, including

---

52. Howard M. Erichson, *Doing Good, Doing Well*, 57 VAND. L. REV. 2087, 2091 (2004) (stating "Among lawyers and law students, public interest law practice connotes low pay").

53. *Id.* at 2110.

54. *Id.*

private non-profit advocacy, religious, social service, fund-raising, community resource, or cause-oriented organizations. Public interest employers also include labor unions, non-profit policy analysis and research organizations, and public and appellate defender positions not funded by the government.<sup>55</sup>

This Article compares law schools by the rate at which graduates find employment in public interest positions so defined. Arguably, this data could be improved were the ABA to require disclosure of the portion of public service jobs requiring bar passage, as that data would better reflect how a law school's graduates specifically contribute to legal service rather than public service writ large.

#### The Utility of Rate of Clerkship Positions as a Measure of the Job Quality of Law Graduates

A third way to capture the quality of law graduates' job placements is the percentage of students who receive a federal clerkship position. These highly prestigious positions are considered by many to provide invaluable legal training, better preparing law graduates for many different types of legal careers, including law firm employment, jobs in legal academia, public service careers, and work in the judiciary.<sup>56</sup> Thus, unlike other potential metrics of job quality, measures of clerkship placements are of interest to a broader portion of law graduates. Relatedly, clerkship positions give graduates "an edge for highly sought-after jobs for young lawyers in a tight legal job market."<sup>57</sup> In this way, clerkship positions are not only desirable jobs in and of themselves but also enable recent law graduates to obtain desirable positions after clerking. Additionally, given that law students rely upon faculty members for support and guidance in the process of applying for clerkship positions, these postings may serve as a proxy of the quality of a law school's support for its students in their job search.<sup>58</sup> Reliance upon such a ranking may incentivize law schools to provide additional support to students in their clerkship and job search processes.

---

55. 2017 *Employment Questionnaire (For 2016 Graduates): Definitions and Instructions*, American Bar Association, 6 (2017), [https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal\\_education\\_and\\_admissions\\_to\\_the\\_bar/Questionnaires/2017\\_eq\\_definitions\\_and\\_instructions.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_education_and_admissions_to_the_bar/Questionnaires/2017_eq_definitions_and_instructions.authcheckdam.pdf).

56. See, e.g., Trenton H. Norris, *The Judicial Clerkship Selection Process: An Applicant's Perspective on Bad Apples, Sour Grapes, and Fruitful Reform*, 81 CAL. L. REV. 765, 768 (1993).

57. Christopher D. Bryan, *The Role of Law Clerks in Reducing Judicial Backlog*, 36 Colo. Law. 91, 92 (May 2007). See also *Courting the Clerkship: Perspectives on the Opportunities and Obstacles for Judicial Clerkships*, 40 JUDGES J. 10 (Spring 2001).

58. See, e.g. Laurie A. Lewis, *Clerkship-Ready: First-Year Law Faculty Are Uniquely Poised to Mentor Stellar Students for Elbow Employment with Judges*, 12 APPALACHIAN J.L. 1, 6 (2012).

Reliance upon clerkship data poses two main limitations. First, it is difficult for the ABA data to capture the many variances in the prestige and competitiveness of clerkships. For this reason, this Article provides a ranking of law schools based on federal clerkship positions, which are generally more competitive and prestigious. This ranking considers all federal clerkships equivalent, although certain clerkships (most notably, Supreme Court clerkships) are much more competitive than others. One obvious limitation of focusing exclusively on federal clerkship data is that it ignores placement in state and local clerkships, which can provide very valuable experience to law school graduates. Additionally, one problem with clerkships in general is that they often pay a far lower salary than other postings, and some individuals with significant debt and without family financial support may be disincentivized from pursuing (or unable to pursue) clerkship employment despite their qualifications for such positions.<sup>59</sup> Despite these limitations, clerkship data serves as a strong indicator of job quality that is less biased towards certain types of careers. Thus, this Article provides a ranking of law schools by the rate at which their graduates obtain placement in federal clerkships.

#### The Utility of Job Satisfaction Survey Data as a Measure of the Job Quality of Law Graduates

A fourth possible measure of job quality would involve the results of a survey of recent law graduates, asking them to reflect upon the quality of their job placement. Such a metric would capture whether law graduates actually find their job to be meaningful, fulfilling, or desirable. This metric would incentivize law schools to invest in helping their students identify the types of positions most likely to be fulfilling, and it would serve the interests of law graduates who likely care more about their own perception of a job's quality than any general proxy for job quality. Further, society is best served when lawyers find their work to be meaningful and engaging. Problematically, such data is currently unavailable. Going forward, it may be useful for the ABA to encourage law schools to administer and release the results of such a survey along with employment data and bar passage rates.

### V. INCENTIVIZING CHANGE AT LAW SCHOOLS

This Part provides data on various factors that have been identified as meaningful and likely should be incorporated into a ranking system, including Law School Admission Test (LSAT) scores, undergraduate grade point average, bar passage rates, and various types of employment

---

59. *Courting the Clerkship*, *supra* note 57, at 13.

data, and it explores the effect that emphasizing these various metrics would have on a law school ranking and on legal academia itself.

The American Bar Association (ABA) requires that certain data be reported and made public on an annual basis under Standard 509 of the Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools.<sup>60</sup> All data used in this ranking is taken directly from the ABA<sup>61</sup> and is publicly available on the ABA's website.<sup>62</sup>

### *LSAT Score*

#### Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by LSAT score. This factor is in turn made up of three separate measurements: the 75th, 50th (median), and 25th percentile LSAT scores as reported to the American Bar Association. The data for each percentile measurement was standardized about its mean and scaled. Each percentile was assigned an equal weight. Inclusion of the 75th, 50th and 25th percentiles helps to capture the academic quality of a broader range of the students at a given law school than median scores alone. For comparison purposes, the table below also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>63</sup>

---

60. *Standard 509(a)*, ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools, (2014-2015), [https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/misc/legal\\_education/Standards/2017-2018ABAStandardsforApprovalofLawSchools/2017\\_2018\\_aba\\_standards\\_rules\\_approval\\_law\\_schools\\_final.authcheckdam.pdf](https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/misc/legal_education/Standards/2017-2018ABAStandardsforApprovalofLawSchools/2017_2018_aba_standards_rules_approval_law_schools_final.authcheckdam.pdf).

61. The fundamental limitation of this data is that it is self-reported by the individual law schools. Thus, there is a possibility that some of the data could be inaccurate. However, a number of factors suggest that the data produced under Standard 509 can be used to reliably compare institutions. The ABA requires that the information is "complete, accurate and not misleading" and that law schools "use due diligence in obtaining and verifying such information." *Id.* Further, the ABA Standards state that "[v]iolations of these obligations may result in sanctions under Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools." In addition to the threat of ABA sanctions, law schools may risk a lawsuit by former students if they report false or misleading employment data. *See Id.* Such plaintiffs may ultimately be unlikely to prevail. *See, e.g.,* Elizabeth Olson, *Law Graduate Gets Her Day in Court, Suing Law School*, *The New York Times* (Mar. 6, 2016), <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/07/business/dealbook/court-to-hear-suit-accusing-law-school-of-inflating-job-data.html>. Nonetheless, the mere threat of such suits, and the substantial negative publicity they likely engender, may deter law schools from reporting misleading data. Together, the threat of sanctions and lawsuits helps provide some assurance that the data reported under Standard 509 is accurate. In the future, the ABA could pursue innovations, such as random audits, to further ensure transparency and accuracy.

62. ABA Required Disclosures: *Standard 509 Reports*, American Bar Association (2017), <http://www.abarequireddisclosures.org/>.

63. *Best Law Schools*, U.S. News & World Report (2018), <https://www.usnews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-law-schools/law-rankings>.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	1 (tie)	3
YALE UNIVERSITY	1 (tie)	1
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	3	5
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	4	2
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	5	4
DUKE UNIVERSITY	6 (tie)	11
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	6 (tie)	6
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	8	8
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	9 (tie)	7
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	9 (tie)	9
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	11	11
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	12	9
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	13	18
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	14 (tie)	16
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	14 (tie)	13
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	16 (tie)	14
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	16 (tie)	15
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	18	17
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	19	19
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	20	22
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	21	24
BOSTON COLLEGE	22	27
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	23	21
EMORY UNIVERSITY	24	22
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	25	27
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	26	20
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	27	37
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	28	24
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	29 (tie)	37
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	29 (tie)	32
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	31	41



<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	32	37
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	33	27
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	34 (tie)	41
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	34 (tie)	32
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	36 (tie)	45
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	36 (tie)	26
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	38 (tie)	41
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	38 (tie)	37
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	38 (tie)	27
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	38 (tie)	74
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	38 (tie)	32
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	38 (tie)	27
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	44	32
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	45 (tie)	46
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	45 (tie)	41
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	47	59
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	48	50
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	49	32
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	50	47
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	51	Unranked
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	52	50
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	53 (tie)	58
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	53 (tie)	56
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	53 (tie)	56
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	53 (tie)	65
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	57	47
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	58	50
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	59	65
TULANE UNIVERSITY	60 (tie)	54
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	60 (tie)	54

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	62 (tie)	74
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	62 (tie)	95
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	64	65
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	65	50
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	66 (tie)	83
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	66 (tie)	65
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	68 (tie)	95
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	68 (tie)	85
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	70	74
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	71	85
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	72	98
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	73	65
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	74 (tie)	63
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	74 (tie)	65
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	74 (tie)	80
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	77 (tie)	49
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	77 (tie)	65
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	77 (tie)	63
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	77 (tie)	59
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	81 (tie)	83
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	81 (tie)	65
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	83	80
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	84 (tie)	139
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	84 (tie)	65
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	86 (tie)	80
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	86 (tie)	74
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	86 (tie)	74
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	86 (tie)	59
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	90	139
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	91	113
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	92	85

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	93	101
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	94 (tie)	101
STETSON UNIVERSITY	94 (tie)	98
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	96	74
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	97	101
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	98 (tie)	88
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	98 (tie)	88
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	98 (tie)	131
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	101	88
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	102	101
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	103 (tie)	88
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	103 (tie)	88
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	103 (tie)	128
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	106	113
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	107	125
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	108 (tie)	119
REGENT UNIVERSITY	108 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	108 (tie)	88
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	108 (tie)	106
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	112 (tie)	113
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	112 (tie)	101
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	112 (tie)	88
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	115	109
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	116 (tie)	110
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	116 (tie)	98
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	116 (tie)	95
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	119	Rank Not Published
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	120	113
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	121	113

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	122 (tie)	125
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	122 (tie)	133
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	124 (tie)	119
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	124 (tie)	108
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	126 (tie)	106
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	126 (tie)	119
MERCER UNIVERSITY	126 (tie)	128
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	126 (tie)	119
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	126 (tie)	133
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	126 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	132	Rank Not Published
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	133	Rank Not Published
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	134	119
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	135 (tie)	Rank Not Published
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	135 (tie)	128
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	135 (tie)	137
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	138	110
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	139 (tie)	119
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	139 (tie)	137
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	139 (tie)	110
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	142	133
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	143	Rank Not Published
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	144 (tie)	144
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	144 (tie)	133
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	146	141
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	147 (tie)	128

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	147 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	147 (tie)	Rank Not Published
PACE UNIVERSITY	150	127
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	151	144
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	152	Rank Not Published
MITCHELL   HAMLINE	153	Rank Not Published
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	154	Rank Not Published
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	155	Rank Not Published
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	156	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	157	144
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	158 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	158 (tie)	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	160	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	161 (tie)	Unranked
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	163 (tie)	Rank Not Published
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	163 (tie)	141
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	165 (tie)	Unranked
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	165 (tie)	Rank Not Published
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	165 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	165 (tie)	Rank Not Published
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	165 (tie)	Rank Not Published
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	170	Rank Not Published
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	171 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	171 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	171 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	171 (tie)	Rank Not Published
BARRY UNIVERSITY	175 (tie)	Rank Not Published
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	175 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	175 (tie)	Rank Not Published
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	175 (tie)	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	175 (tie)	Rank Not Published
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	180	Rank Not Published
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	181	Rank Not Published
ELON UNIVERSITY	182	Rank Not Published
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	183 (tie)	Unranked
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	183 (tie)	Rank Not Published
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	185 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>LSAT Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
TOURO COLLEGE	185 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	185 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	185 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	189 (tie)	128
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE	189 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	191 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	191 (tie)	Rank Not Published
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	193	Rank Not Published
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	194	Rank Not Published
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	195	Rank Not Published
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	196	Unranked
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	197	Unranked
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	198	Rank Not Published
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	199	Rank Not Published
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	200	Rank Not Published
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	201	Unranked
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	202	Unranked

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by LSAT alone yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 2.1 spots relative to its position on the

U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools that it placed below a ranking of 146.<sup>64</sup> In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, eight of which ranked 146 or above when considering LSAT alone. These schools include the University of Detroit Mercy (143), Campbell University (135), Liberty University (133), Willamette University (132), Southwestern Law School (126), the University of San Francisco (119), Regent University (108), and Pepperdine University (51).

Despite the average decrease, a number of law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, seventeen schools scored more than ten places higher when considering LSAT score alone than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include Drake University (+11), the University of Montana (+11), Loyola University-Chicago (+12), Pennsylvania State-Dickinson (+12), the University of New Hampshire (+14), the University of Oregon (+17), St. John's University (+17), City University of New York (+18), Texas Tech University (+22), Seattle University (+25), Wayne State University (+26), Lewis and Clark College (+27), Santa Clara University (+33), the University of San Diego (+33), Northeastern University (+36), Belmont University (+49), and Chapman University (+55).

Additionally, the average newly-established law school increased 15.1 places.<sup>65</sup> The median increase for newly-established law schools was seven places, and five of the seven new law schools (or 71%) increased their placement in the rankings. These findings suggest that the U.S. News & World Report rankings might disfavor newer institutions. It is possible that respondents to the peer assessment survey questions are less familiar with newer institutions or have an unconscious bias in favor of more established institutions. Overall, a ranking system that weights LSAT score higher than 0.125 would result in increased rankings for the aforementioned schools and the average newly-established law school, all

---

<sup>64</sup> Three schools tied for 144 on the U.S. News & World Report ranking, for a total of 146 ranked schools. *See Id.*

<sup>65</sup> Seven law schools have been established in the past twenty-five years. Belmont University College of Law was established in 2012. *College of Law*, Belmont University, [www.belmont.edu/law/](http://www.belmont.edu/law/). The University of California, Irvine School of Law was established in 2009. *About UCI Law*, UCI Law, <http://www.law.uci.edu/about/>. The Drexel University Thomas R. Kline School of Law opened in 2006. *Facts and Figures*, Drexel University, [drexel.edu/law/about/facts/](http://drexel.edu/law/about/facts/). The Florida International University College of Law was established in 2001. *About FIU Law*, Florida International University, [law.fiu.edu/lawadmit/fiu-law-information/](http://law.fiu.edu/lawadmit/fiu-law-information/). The University of St. Thomas School of Law was established in 1999. *About St. Thomas Law*, University of St. Thomas, <https://www.stthomas.edu/law/about/>. The William S. Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas opened in 1998. *Explore UNLV Law*, UNLV William S. Boyd School of Law, <https://law.unlv.edu/about>. Chapman University's Dale E. Fowler School of Law was established in 1995. *The History of The School of Law*, Chapman University, <https://www.chapman.edu/law/about/learn-about/history.aspx>. The relative difference between the LSAT ranking and the U.S. News Ranking of these law schools is +49, -2, +7, +8, +7, -18, and +55, respectively.



else being equal.

### *Undergraduate GPA*

#### Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by undergraduate GPA. As with LSAT scores above, the undergraduate GPA factor is made up of three separate measurements: the 75th, 50th (median), and 25th percentile undergraduate GPA scores as reported to the American Bar Association. The data for each percentile measurement was standardized about its mean and scaled. Each percentile was assigned an equal weight. Inclusion of the 75th, 50th, and 25th percentile helps to capture the academic quality of a broader range of the students at a given law school. For comparison purposes, the table below also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>66</sup>

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
YALE UNIVERSITY	1	1
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	2	2
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	3	4
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	4	3
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	5	7
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	6	9
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	7	6
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	8	41
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	9	9
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	10	11
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	11	13
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	12	8
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	13	27
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	14	14
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	15	19
EMORY UNIVERSITY	16	22
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	17	16

---

66. Best Law Schools, *supra* note 63.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
DUKE UNIVERSITY	18	11
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	19 (tie)	20
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	19 (tie)	17
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	21	32
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	22	37
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	23	24
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	24	15
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	25	27
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	26	32
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	27	22
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	28	5
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	29	80
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	30	18
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	31	32
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	32	32
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	33	41
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	34	24
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	35	41
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	36	50
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	37	41
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	38	46
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	39	65
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	40	32
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	41	54
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	42	74
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	43	27
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	44	47
BOSTON COLLEGE	45	27
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	46	65
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	47	27
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	48	37

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	49	63
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	50	37
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	51	37
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	52	Unranked
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	53	101
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	54	Unranked
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	55	21
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	56	45
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	57	83
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	58	59
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	59	88
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	60	56
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	61	128
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	62	65
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	63	65
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	64	50
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	65 (tie)	74
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	65 (tie)	106
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	67	74
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	68	88
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	69	101
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	70	26
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	71	50
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	72	49
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	73	47
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	74	56
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	75	119
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	76	95
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	77	65

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	78	139
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	79	65
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	80	65
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	81	50
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	82	98
TULANE UNIVERSITY	83	54
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	84	65
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	85	113
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	86	88
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	87	137
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	88	59
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	89	98
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	90	108
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	91	88
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	92	88
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	93	80
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	94	63
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	95	Rank Not Published
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	96	119
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	97	85
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	98	85
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	99	Unranked
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	100	58
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	101	74
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	102	74
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	103	113
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	104	95
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	105	113
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	106	65
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	107	101

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	108	133
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	109	74
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	110	133
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	111	113
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	112	101
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	113	80
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	114	85
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	115	110
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	116	88
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	117	88
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	118	Rank Not Published
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	119	139
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	120	83
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	121	59
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	122	Rank Not Published
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	123	109
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	124	110
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	125	141
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	126	Unranked
REGENT UNIVERSITY	127	Rank Not Published
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	128	106
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	129	95
STETSON UNIVERSITY	130	98
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	131	110
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	132	Rank Not Published
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	133	119

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	134	125
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	135	113
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	136	119
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	137	137
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	138	128
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	139	144
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	140	Rank Not Published
MERCER UNIVERSITY	141	128
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	142	128
PACE UNIVERSITY	143	127
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	144	128
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	145	125
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	146	133
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	147	Rank Not Published
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	148	144
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	149	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	150	Rank Not Published
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	151	141
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	152	131
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	153	119
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	154	101
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	155	Rank Not Published
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	156	Rank Not Published
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	157	Rank Not Published
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	158	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
MITCHELL   HAMLINE	159	Rank Not Published
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	160	Rank Not Published
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	161	Rank Not Published
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	162	Rank Not Published
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	163	133
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	164	Rank Not Published
ELON UNIVERSITY	165	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	166	144
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	167	Rank Not Published
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	168	Rank Not Published
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	169	119
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	170	Rank Not Published
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	171	Rank Not Published
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	172	Rank Not Published
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	173	Rank Not Published
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	174	Rank Not Published
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	175	Rank Not Published
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE	176	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	177	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	178	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	179	Rank Not Published
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	180	Rank Not Published
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	181	Rank Not Published
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	182	Rank Not Published
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	183	Rank Not Published
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	184	Rank Not Published
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	185	Rank Not Published
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	186	Rank Not Published
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	187	Rank Not Published
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	188	Rank Not Published
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	189	Rank Not Published
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	190	Rank Not Published
TOURO COLLEGE	191	Rank Not Published
BARRY UNIVERSITY	192	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	193	Rank Not Published
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	194	Rank Not Published
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	195	Rank Not Published



<b>Institution</b>	<b>UGPA Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	196	Unranked
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	197	Unranked
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	198	Rank Not Published
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	199	Rank Not Published
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	200	Unranked
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	201	Unranked
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	202	Rank Not Published

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by undergraduate GPA alone yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 4 spots relative to its position on the U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools ranked, according to its calculations, below 146. In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, ten of which ranked 146 or above when considering undergraduate GPA alone. These schools include the Campbell University (140), University of North Dakota (132), Regent University (127), Inter American University of Puerto Rico (126), Ohio Northern University (122), Samford University (118), Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico (99), Liberty University (95), University of Puerto Rico (54), and Pepperdine (52).

Despite the average decrease, several law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, nineteen schools scored twenty or more places higher when considering undergraduate GPA alone than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (+20), Chapman University (+20), Drake University (+23), University of Missouri-Kansas City (+23), Quinnipiac University (+25), University of Cincinnati (+26), St. John's University (+26), University of St. Thomas (Minnesota) (+28), Michigan State University (+29), University of Mississippi (+32), Northeastern University (+32), Brigham Young University (+33), University of Buffalo-SUNY (+41), Duquesne University (+44), Florida International University (+48), University of Toledo (+50), University of Nebraska (+51), Belmont University (+61), and the University of South Dakota (+67).

Additionally, the average newly-established law school increased 16.9 places.<sup>67</sup> The median increase for newly-established law schools was 20 places, and five of the seven new law schools (or 71%) increased their placement in the rankings. These findings suggest that the U.S. News & World Report rankings might disfavor newer institutions. It is possible that respondents to the peer assessment survey questions are less familiar with newer institutions or have an unconscious bias in favor of more established schools. Overall, a ranking system that weights undergraduate GPA higher than 0.10 would result in increased rankings for the aforementioned schools and the average newly-established law school, all else being equal.

### *Overall Employment Rate*

#### Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by the rate of employment of their graduates. This ranking is made up of two components. Half of the weight is given to a measure of the percentage of graduates in bar passage-required jobs, which is calculated by dividing the number of graduates employed in full-time, long-term, bar passage-required jobs by the number of total graduates from that institution. This figure has been standardized about the mean and scaled. The remaining weight is given to a broader employment measure, which, in addition to bar-passage required jobs, also includes the number of graduates employed in other full-time, long-term jobs, including jobs for which a JD provides a significant advantage, jobs that are funded by the graduate's law school, as well as the number of graduates who pursuing an additional graduate degree, as a percentage of total graduates. This figure has also been standardized about the mean and scaled. For comparison purposes, the table below also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>68</sup>

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	1	4

67. See, *supra* note 65. The relative difference between the undergraduate GPA ranking and the U.S. News ranking of the seven newly-established law schools was +61 for Belmont University, -34 for the University of California-Irvine, -6 for Drexel University, +48 for Florida International University, +28 for the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), +1 for the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and +20 for Chapman University.

68. *Supra* note 63.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	2	7
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	3	5
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	4	6
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	5	9
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	6	8
DUKE UNIVERSITY	7	11
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	8	3
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	9	13
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	10	9
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	11	18
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	12	11
YALE UNIVERSITY	13	1
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	14	2
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	15	16
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	16	19
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	17	17
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	18	32
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	19	27
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	20	101
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	21	14
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	22	65
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	23	20
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	24	59
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	25	24
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	26	32
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	27	41

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	28	21
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	29	15
BOSTON COLLEGE	30	27
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	31	56
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	32	50
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	33	37
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	34	32
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	35	47
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	36	27
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	37	37
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	38	63
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	39	27
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	40	26
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	41	109
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	42	54
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	43	80
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	44	59
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	45	88
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	46	65
PACE UNIVERSITY	47	127
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	48	46
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	49	74
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	50	65
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	51	22
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	52	50
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	53	88
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	54	65

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	55	110
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	56	27
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	57	65
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	58	24
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	59	37
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	60	47
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	61	101
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	62	88
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	63	65
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	64	41
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	65	85
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	66	45
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	67	83
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	68	119
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	69	139
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	70	63
EMORY UNIVERSITY	71	22
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	72	74
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	73	83
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	74	119
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	75	74
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	76	74
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	77	88
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	78	41
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	79	106
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	80	65

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	81	101
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	82	50
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	83	88
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	84	113
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	85	32
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	86	88
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	87	37
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	88	113
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	89	65
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	90	95
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	91	Rank Not Published
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	92	59
TULANE UNIVERSITY	93	54
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	94	125
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	95	41
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	96	56
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	97	128
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	98	119
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	99	32
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	100	50
TOURO COLLEGE	101	Rank Not Published
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	102	137
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	103	74
STETSON UNIVERSITY	104	98
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	105	133

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	106	Rank Not Published
MERCER UNIVERSITY	107	128
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	108	74
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	109	101
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	110	Rank Not Published
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	111	88
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	112	113
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	113	Unranked
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	114	125
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	115	119
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	116	80
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	117	144
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	118	128
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	119	85
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	120	49
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	121	133
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	122	101
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	123	Rank Not Published
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	124	113
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	125	Rank Not Published
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	126	Rank Not Published
REGENT UNIVERSITY	127	Rank Not Published
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	128	65

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	129	133
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	130	98
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	131	119
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	132	106
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	133	Rank Not Published
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	134	98
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	135	85
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	136	Unranked
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	137	141
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	138	144
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	139	137
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	140	Rank Not Published
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	141	95
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	142	119
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	143	110
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	144	Rank Not Published
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	145	133
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	146	128
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	147	Rank Not Published
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	148	80
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	149	Rank Not Published
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	150	Rank Not Published
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	151	95
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	152	58



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	153	139
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	154	128
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	155	Rank Not Published
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	156	110
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	157	131
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	158	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	159	Rank Not Published
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	160	Rank Not Published
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	161	Rank Not Published
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	162	Rank Not Published
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	163	144
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	164	113
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	165	108
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	166	141
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	167	Rank Not Published
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY- CARBONDALE	168	Rank Not Published
MITCHELL   HAMLIN	169	Rank Not Published
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	170	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	171	Rank Not Published
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	172	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	173	Rank Not Published
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	174	Rank Not Published
BARRY UNIVERSITY	175	Rank Not Published
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	176	Rank Not Published
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	177	Rank Not Published
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	178	Rank Not Published
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	179	Rank Not Published
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	180	Rank Not Published
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	181	Rank Not Published
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	182	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	183	Rank Not Published
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	184	Rank Not Published
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	185	Unranked
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	186	Rank Not Published
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	187	Rank Not Published
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	188	Rank Not Published
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	189	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Employment Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	190	Rank Not Published
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	191	Rank Not Published
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	192	Unranked
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	193	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	194	Rank Not Published
ELON UNIVERSITY	195	Rank Not Published
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	196	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	197	Rank Not Published
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	198	Rank Not Published
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	199	Unranked
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	200	Unranked
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	201	Unranked
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	202	Unranked

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by the rate of graduates' overall employment yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 3.8 spots relative to its position on the U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools ranked, according to its calculations, below 146. In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, thirteen of which ranked 146 or above when considering overall employment alone. These schools include Texas Southern University (144), St. Mary's University (140), Concordia Law School (136), Willamette University (133), Regent University (127), University of

North Dakota (126), Samford University (125), Campbell University (123), Pepperdine University (113), Oklahoma City University (110), Ohio Northern University (106), Touro College (101), and Lincoln Memorial (91).

Despite the average decrease, several law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, sixteen schools scored thirty or more places higher when considering overall employment than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include Creighton University (+31), the University of South Dakota (+31), Seton Hall University (+35), Saint Louis University (+35), the University of Memphis (+35), the University of Nebraska (+37), Drexel University (+40), the University of Kentucky (+43), Louisiana State University (+43), the University of Montana (+45), the University of Missouri-Kansas City (+51), Hofstra University (+55), West Virginia University (+68), Belmont University (+70), Pace University (+80), and the University of Tulsa (+81).

The average newly-established law school increased 17.9 places when considering only the overall employment rate.<sup>69</sup> The median increase for newly-established law schools was 15 places, and five of the seven new law schools (or 71%) increased their placement in the rankings. The relative increase for new law schools on overall employability suggests that these institutions may be hampered in the U.S. News rankings by their relative newness, which could affect their peer assessment score, despite overall high employment outcomes. This may suggest a weakness in the U.S. News approach.

### *Bar Passage Rate*

#### Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by their graduates' rate of bar passage. As with employment data, these rankings are made up of two components. Half of the weight is given to the *absolute* rate at which a given institution's graduates pass the bar exam. These figures were then standardized about the mean and scaled. The remaining weight is given to the *relative* rate at which a given institution's graduates pass the bar exam. This measurement compares each institution's overall bar passage rate to the average of other bar exam

---

69. See *supra* note 65. The relative difference between overall employment ranking and the U.S. News ranking of the seven newly-established law schools was +70 for Belmont University, -7 for the University of California-Irvine, +40 for Drexel University, +20 for Florida International University, +1 for the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), +15 for the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and -14 for Chapman University.

takers in the same states. These figures were also standardized about the mean and scaled. For comparison purposes, the table below also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>70</sup>

Institution	Bar Passage Rank	USN Rank
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	1	2
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	2	95
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	3	27
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	4	4
DUKE UNIVERSITY	5	11
YALE UNIVERSITY	6	1
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	7	9
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	8	3
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	9	32
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	10	7
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	11	9
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	12	5
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	13	17
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	14	6
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	15	85
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	16	19
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	17	27
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	18	8
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	19	14
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	20	74
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	21	50
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	22	16
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	23	139
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	24	101
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	25	37
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	26	13

70. *Best Law Schools*, *supra* note 63.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	27	32
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	28	24
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	29	11
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	30	15
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	31	63
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	32	45
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	33	88
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	34	24
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	35	46
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	36	37
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	37	Rank Not Published
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	38	80
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	39	37
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	40	32
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	41	26
BOSTON COLLEGE	42	27
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	43	65
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	44	59
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	45	41
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	46	22
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	47	119
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	48	41
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	49	18
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	50	101
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	51	59
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	52	20
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	53	65
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	54	21
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	55	88

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	56	32
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	57	65
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	58	65
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	59	83
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	60	47
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	61	27
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	62	56
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	63	74
REGENT UNIVERSITY	64	Rank Not Published
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	65	113
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	66	50
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	67	65
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	68	54
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	69	125
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	70	88
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	71	88
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	72	Unranked
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	73	47
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	74	Rank Not Published
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	75	95
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	76	74
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	77	56
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	78	32
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	79	131
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	80	88
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	81	37
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	82	65
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	83	65

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	84	74
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	85	119
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	86	27
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	87	59
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	88	80
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	89	88
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	90	109
EMORY UNIVERSITY	91	22
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	92	137
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	93	119
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	94	41
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	95	65
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	96	113
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	97	49
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	98	50
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	99	88
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	100	74
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	101	113
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	102	63
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	103	Rank Not Published
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	104	85
MERCER UNIVERSITY	105	128
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	106	98
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	107	133
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	108	128
TULANE UNIVERSITY	109	54
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	110	41
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	111	95
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	112	74



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	113	Rank Not Published
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	114	108
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	115	141
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	116	113
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	117	65
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	118	110
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	119	85
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	120	Rank Not Published
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	121	119
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	122	128
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	123	133
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	124	144
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	125	Rank Not Published
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	126	50
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	127	83
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	128	101
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	129	137
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	130	Rank Not Published
STETSON UNIVERSITY	131	98
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	132	101
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	133	Rank Not Published
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	134	101
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	135	98
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	136	106
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	137	119
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	138	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	139	Rank Not Published
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	140	119
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	141	Rank Not Published
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	142	Unranked
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	143	125
PACE UNIVERSITY	144	127
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	145	Rank Not Published
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	146	Rank Not Published
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	147	Rank Not Published
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	148	Rank Not Published
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	149	133
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	150	139
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	151	144
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	152	Unranked
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	153	113
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	154	128
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	155	Rank Not Published
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	156	Rank Not Published
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	157	106
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	158	Unranked
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	159	Rank Not Published
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	160	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
MITCHELL   HAMLINE	161	Rank Not Published
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	162	58
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	163	Rank Not Published
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	164	110
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	165	Rank Not Published
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	166	80
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	167	Rank Not Published
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	168	Rank Not Published
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	169	Rank Not Published
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	170	Rank Not Published
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	171	133
BARRY UNIVERSITY	172	Rank Not Published
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	173	Rank Not Published
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	174	144
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	175	Rank Not Published
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE	176	Rank Not Published
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	177	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	178	Rank Not Published
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	179	Rank Not Published
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	180	Rank Not

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
		Published
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	181	Rank Not Published
TOURO COLLEGE	182	Rank Not Published
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	183	Rank Not Published
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	184	141
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	185	110
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	186	Rank Not Published
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	187	Unranked
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	188	Rank Not Published
ELON UNIVERSITY	189	Rank Not Published
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	190	Rank Not Published
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	191	Unranked
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	192	Rank Not Published
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	193	Rank Not Published
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	194	128
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	195	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	196	Rank Not Published
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	197	Rank Not Published
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	198	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	199	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Bar Passage Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	200	Rank Not Published
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	201	Unranked
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	202	Unranked

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by the rate of bar passage alone yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 6.1 spots relative to its position on the U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools ranked, according to its calculations, below 146. In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, sixteen of which ranked 146 or above when considering bar passage alone. These include Samford University (146), the University of North Dakota (145), Pepperdine University (142), Lincoln Memorial (141), the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (139), John Marshall Law School (138), Nova Southeastern University (133), the University of Detroit Mercy (130), Loyola University-New Orleans (125), Willamette University (120), Ohio Northern University (113), St. Mary's University (103), Liberty University (74), Concordia Law School (72), Regent University (64), and Campbell University (37).

Despite the average decrease, a number of law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, thirteen schools scored more than forty places higher when considering bar passage alone than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include the University of Nebraska (+42), the University of Memphis (+45), Texas Tech University (+48), the University of Tulsa (+51), Santa Clara University (+52), Pennsylvania State-University Park (+54), Saint Louis University (+55), City University of New York (+56), the University of New Hampshire (+70), Duquesne University (+72), Florida International University (+77), Marquette University (+93), and Belmont University (+116).

Additionally, the average newly-established law school increased 15.9 places when considering only bar passage rate.<sup>71</sup> However, the median

---

71. See *supra* note 65. The relative difference between bar passage ranking and the U.S. News ranking of the seven newly-established law schools was +116 for Belmont University, -33 for the University of California-Irvine, -27 for Drexel University, +77 for Florida International University, +17 for the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), -28 for the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and -11 for Chapman University.

new law school decreased 11 places on this metric, as only three of the seven schools experienced an increase. Overall, this may suggest a disconnect between bar passage success and success on U.S. News and World Report's ranking system.

*Large Law Firm Employment Rate*

Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by their graduates' rate of employment at large law firms. These rankings reflect the portion of full-time, long-term jobs with large law firms (defined as firms with greater than 500 lawyers) as a percentage of total graduates. For comparison purposes, the table below also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>72</sup>

Institution	Big Law Rank	USN Rank
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	1	5
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	2	4
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	3	9
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	4	7
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	5	6
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	6	13
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	7	11
DUKE UNIVERSITY	8	11
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	9	3
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	10	9
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	11	2
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	12	14
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	13	8
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	14	17
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	15	19
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	16	16
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	17	18

72. *Best Law Schools*, *supra* note 63.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	18	22
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	19	15
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	20	21
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	21	37
YALE UNIVERSITY	22	1
BOSTON COLLEGE	23	27
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	24	24
EMORY UNIVERSITY	25	22
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	26	24
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	27	128
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	28	45
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	29	58
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	30	50
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	31	37
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	32	37
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	33	56
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	34	110
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	35	83
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	36	32
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	37	65
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	38	47
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	39	26
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	40	131
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	41	37
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	42	32
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	43	74
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	44	41
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	45	83
TULANE UNIVERSITY	46	54
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	47	32

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	48	74
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	49	65
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	50	56
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	51	32
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	52	65
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	53	65
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	54	65
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	55	32
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	56	50
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	57	110
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	58	95
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	59	20
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	60	88
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	61	27
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	62	41
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	63	46
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	64	74
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	65	80
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	66	74
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	67	59
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	68	27
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	69	50
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	70	65
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	71	74
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	72	41
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	73	74
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	74	101
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	75	113
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	76	106



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	77	49
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	78	128
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	79	88
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	80	110
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	81	144
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	82	27
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	83	65
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	84	85
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	85	85
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	86	63
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	87	95
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	88	Unranked
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	89	128
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	90	50
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	91	65
PACE UNIVERSITY	92	127
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	93	98
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	94	Rank Not Published
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	95	59
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	96	119
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	97	Rank Not Published
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	98	141
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	99	119
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	100 (tie)	88
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	100 (tie)	Unranked
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	102 (tie)	80
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	102 (tie)	85
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	104	109

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	105	Rank Not Published
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	106	88
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	107 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	107 (tie)	88
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	109	Rank Not Published
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	110	Rank Not Published
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	111 (tie)	113
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	111 (tie)	63
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	113	59
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	114	133
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	115	65
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	116	101
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	117	88
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	118	Rank Not Published
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	119	119
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	120	Rank Not Published
MITCHELL   HAMLINE	121	Rank Not Published
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	122	80
MERCER UNIVERSITY	123	128
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	124	41
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	125	Rank Not Published
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	126	27
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	127	128
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	128	119

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	129	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	130	47
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	131	Rank Not Published
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	132	139
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	133 (tie)	Unranked
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	133 (tie)	Rank Not Published
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	135	133
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	136	Rank Not Published
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	137	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	138	Rank Not Published
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	139	137
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	140	Rank Not Published
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	141	125
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	142	98
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE	143	Rank Not Published
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	144	54
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	145	101
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	146 (tie)	144
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	146 (tie)	141
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	148	113
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	149	133
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	152	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	153	106
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	154	Rank Not Published
BARRY UNIVERSITY	155	Rank Not Published
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	156	Rank Not Published
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	157	95
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	158	Rank Not Published
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	159	113
STETSON UNIVERSITY	160	98
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	139
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	161 (tie)	125
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	161 (tie)	Unranked
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ELON UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	113
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	101
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	119
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	161 (tie)	Unranked
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	108
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	119
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	88
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	144
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	161 (tie)	Unranked
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	Unranked
REGENT UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Big Law Rank</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	161 (tie)	Unranked
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	137
TOURO COLLEGE	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	101
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	161 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	161 (tie)	133

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by the rate of graduates' employment at large law firms alone yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 6.1 spots relative to its position on the U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools ranked, according to its calculations, below 146. In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, twenty-one of which ranked 146 or above when considering large law firm employment alone. These schools include Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (143), Willamette University (140), Northern Kentucky University (138), Golden Gate University (137), North Carolina Central University (136), University of Detroit Mercy (133), Arizona Summit Law School (133), Western State College of Law (131), Samford University (129), California Western School of Law (125), Mitchell | Hamline (121), John Marshall Law School (120), Ohio Northern University (118), University of San Francisco (110), the University of La Verne (109), South Texas College of Law Houston (107), Widener University-Delaware (105), UNT Dallas College of Law (100), Southwestern Law School (97), New England Law | Boston (94),

and Pepperdine (88).

Despite the average decrease, a number of law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, sixteen schools scored thirty or more places higher when considering large law firm employment alone than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include Albany Law School (+30), Hofstra University (+30), Loyola University-Chicago (+31), Pace University (+35), the University of San Diego (+37), Brooklyn Law School (+38), the University of Louisville (+38), Seattle University (+39), the University of Dayton (+43), St. John's University (+48), Depaul University (+50), New York Law School (+53), Suffolk University (+63), Catholic University of America (+76), Santa Clara University (+91), and Howard University (+101).

The average newly-established law school decreased 13 places when considering only placement in large law firms.<sup>73</sup> The median decrease for newly-established law schools was 15 places, and four of the seven new law schools (or 57%) decreased their placement in the rankings. It is possible that this relative decrease for new law schools is because these newer institutions have less established alumni networks or weaker ties to large law firms. Additionally, this relative decrease could also reflect the fact that newer law schools attract a student body less interested in large law firm careers, perhaps because their mission or emphasis differs from more-established law schools or simply that large law firms tend to return to the same schools for on-campus interviews year after year.

### *Public Interest Employment Rate*

#### Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by their graduates' rate of employment in public interest positions. This metric calculates the portion of jobs with public interest employers as a percentage of total graduates. For comparison purposes, the table also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>74</sup>

---

73. See, *supra* note 65. The relative difference between large law firm ranking and the U.S. News ranking of the seven newly-established law schools was -22 for Belmont University, +1 for the University of California-Irvine, +27 for Drexel University, -15 for Florida International University, -35 for the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), -54 for the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and +7 for Chapman University.

74. *Best Law Schools*, *supra* note 63.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	1	125
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	2	74
YALE UNIVERSITY	3	1
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	4	144
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	5	6
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	6	21
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	7	Rank Not Published
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	8	6
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	9	59
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	10	128
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	11	80
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	12	37
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	13	27
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	14	14
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	15	32
REGENT UNIVERSITY	16	Rank Not Published
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	17	Rank Not Published
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	18	83
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	19	3
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	20	137
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	21	80
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	22	9
TOURO COLLEGE	23	Rank Not Published
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	24	Rank Not Published
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	25	46
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	26	106



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	27	32
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	28 (tie)	Rank Not Published
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	28 (tie)	65
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	30	41
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	31	Rank Not Published
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	32	88
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	33	128
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	34	85
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	35	56
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	36	Rank Not Published
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	37	22
PACE UNIVERSITY	38	127
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	39	74
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	40	19
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	41	133
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	42 (tie)	88
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	42 (tie)	109
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	44	32
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	45	133
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	46	8
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	47	95
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	48	58
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	49	Rank Not Published
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	50	5
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	51	74
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	52 (tie)	141

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	52 (tie)	119
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	54	24
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	55	47
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	56	110
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	57	26
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	58	65
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	59	Rank Not Published
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	60	65
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	61	50
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	62	4
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	63	110
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	64	128
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	65 (tie)	65
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	65 (tie)	24
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE	67	Rank Not Published
MITCHELL   HAMLINE	68	Rank Not Published
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	69	Unranked
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	70	45
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	71	2
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	72	32
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	73	7
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	74 (tie)	Rank Not Published
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	74 (tie)	63
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	74 (tie)	85
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	77	95
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	78	27

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
BOSTON COLLEGE	79	27
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	80 (tie)	Rank Not Published
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	80 (tie)	101
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	80 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	83	Rank Not Published
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	84	Rank Not Published
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	85	106
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	86	65
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	87	128
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	88	65
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	89	Unranked
TULANE UNIVERSITY	90	54
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	91	Rank Not Published
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	92	20
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	93	32
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	94	141
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	95	50
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	96	11
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	97	63
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	98	133
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	99	37
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	100	85
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	101	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	102	59

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	103	119
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	104	15
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	105	Rank Not Published
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	106	88
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	107	Rank Not Published
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	108 (tie)	13
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	108 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	110	50
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	111	131
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	112	110
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	113	74
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	114	37
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	115 (tie)	113
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	115 (tie)	83
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	117	41
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	118	18
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	119	88
STETSON UNIVERSITY	120	98
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	121 (tie)	41
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	121 (tie)	137
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	121 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	124	Rank Not Published
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	125	88
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	126 (tie)	139
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	126 (tie)	54

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	128	Rank Not Published
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	129	101
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	130	Rank Not Published
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	131 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	131 (tie)	113
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	133	119
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	134	108
MERCER UNIVERSITY	135	128
EMORY UNIVERSITY	136	22
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	137	74
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	138	65
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	139	101
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	140	41
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	141	27
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	142 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	142 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	144	Rank Not Published
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	145	95
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	146	Rank Not Published
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	147	9
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	148	88
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	149	Rank Not Published
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	150	Unranked

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	151	119
DUKE UNIVERSITY	152	11
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	153	98
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	154	Rank Not Published
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	155	56
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	156	Rank Not Published
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	157	144
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	158	Rank Not Published
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	159	74
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	160 (tie)	80
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	160 (tie)	Rank Not Published
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	162	101
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	163	17
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	164	49
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	165	144
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	166	Rank Not Published
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	167	Rank Not Published
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	168	37
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	169	113
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	170	139
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	171	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	172	101
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	173	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	174	133
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	175	Rank Not Published
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	176	65
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	177	Rank Not Published
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	178	125
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	179	88
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	180	Rank Not Published
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	181	98
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	182	113
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	183	Rank Not Published
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	184	119
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	185	50
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	186	Unranked
BARRY UNIVERSITY	187	Rank Not Published
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	188	Unranked
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	189	59
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	190	113
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	191	27
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	192	47
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	193	Rank Not Published
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	194	Unranked
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	195 (tie)	Rank Not Published
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	195 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Public Interest Empl.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
ELON UNIVERSITY	195 (tie)	Rank Not Published
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	195 (tie)	Rank Not Published
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	195 (tie)	119
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	195 (tie)	Unranked
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	195 (tie)	65
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	195 (tie)	Unranked

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by the rate of graduates' employment in public interest positions yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 20.6 spots relative to its position on the U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools ranked, according to its calculations, below 146. In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, thirty-four of which ranked 146 or above when ranked by rate of public interest employment. These include Charleston School of Law (149), California Western School of Law (146), Florida Coastal School of Law (144), Southwestern Law School (142), John Marshall Law School (142), Mississippi College (131), Ave Maria School of Law (130), St. Mary's University (128), University of San Francisco (124), University of La Verne (121), Western New England University (108), Willamette University (107), McGeorge School of Law (105), University of North Dakota (101), Capital University (91), Thomas Jefferson School of Law (89), Widener University-Delaware (84), Western Michigan University (83), Loyola University New Orleans (80), Atlanta's John Marshall Law School (80), Ohio Northern University (74), Concordia Law School (69), Mitchell | Hamline (68), Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (67), Roger Williams University (59), Oklahoma City University (49), University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (36), Western State College of Law (31), Appalachian School of Law (28), Texas Southern University (24), Touro College (23), District of Columbia (17), Regent University (16), and Liberty University (7).

Despite the average decrease, a number of law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, twenty schools scored more than



fifty places higher when ranked by public interest employment than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include the University of New Hampshire (+51), Hofstra University (+54), Syracuse University (+56), American University (+59), the University of South Dakota (+64), Brooklyn Law School (+65), West Virginia University (+67), the University of Idaho (+67), the University of Nebraska (+69), Northeastern University (+72), University of Buffalo-SUNY (+80), Vermont Law School (+88), Pace University (+89), the University of Dayton (+89), the University of Wyoming (+92), Seattle University (+95), the University of Memphis (+117), Howard University (+118), City University of New York (+124), and Northern Illinois University (+140).

The average newly-established law school decreased 28 places when considering only placement in public interest institutions.<sup>75</sup> The median decrease for newly-established law schools was 31 places, and five of the seven new law schools (or 71%) decrease their placement in the rankings. It is possible that this relative decrease for new law schools is due to the fact that these newer institutions have less established alumni networks or weaker ties to public interest institutions. This decrease may also reflect the role of an institution's reputation in helping graduates secure employment.

### *Federal Clerkship Employment Rate*

#### Data

The table below provides the rankings of all American law schools by their graduates' rate of employment in clerkship positions. The portion of each law school's graduates employed in full-time, long-term (one year or more) federal clerkships was calculated as a percentage of the total graduates. For comparison purposes, the table also includes the respective 2019 rankings from U.S. News & World Report.<sup>76</sup>

---

75. See *supra* note 65. The relative difference between the public interest ranking and the U.S. News ranking of the seven newly-established law schools was +13 for Belmont University, +15 for the University of California-Irvine, -61 for Drexel University, -71 for Florida International University, -18 for the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), -43 for the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and -31 for Chapman University.

76. *Best Law Schools*, *supra* note 63.

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
YALE UNIVERSITY	1	1
STANFORD UNIVERSITY	2	2
CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	3	4
DUKE UNIVERSITY	4	11
HARVARD UNIVERSITY	5	3
MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	6	8
PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	7	7
CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	8	9
MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	9	119
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	10	17
VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	11	9
ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	12	27
TEXAS AT AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	13	15
WILLIAM AND MARY LAW SCHOOL	14	37
CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	15	21
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	16	11
WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	17	133
MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	18	137
NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	19	45
GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	20	32
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	21	109
IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	22	27
ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	23	37
KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	24	65
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	25	50
RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	26	50
TENNESSEE, UNIVERSITY OF	27	65
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	28	6
MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	29	101

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	30	113
BOSTON COLLEGE	31	27
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	32	13
MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	33	20
MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	34	49
ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	35	88
TULANE UNIVERSITY	36	54
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-DICKINSON LAW	37	59
NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	38	24
WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	39	32
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	40	14
WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	41	27
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	42	18
CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	43	65
MISSOURI, UNIVERSITY OF	44	65
ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	45	41
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	46	59
NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	47	88
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	48	47
CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	49	16
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	50	5
HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	51	56
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	52	Rank Not Published
MERCER UNIVERSITY	53	128
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	54	24
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	55	Unranked
EMORY UNIVERSITY	56	22
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY	57	26

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	58	128
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS	59	Rank Not Published
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	60	128
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	61	88
NEBRASKA, UNIVERSITY OF	62 (tie)	80
OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	62 (tie)	85
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	64	19
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	65	88
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	66	110
LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY-LOS ANGELES	67	65
STETSON UNIVERSITY	68	98
REGENT UNIVERSITY	69	Rank Not Published
KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	70	74
BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	71	83
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	72	32
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	73	47
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	74	Rank Not Published
TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	75	101
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	76	32
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	77	74
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	78 (tie)	65
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	78 (tie)	65
CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	80	Rank Not Published
TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	81	113
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	82	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	83	125
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	84	41
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	85	Rank Not Published
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	86	80
FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	87	41
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL OF UNION UNIVERSITY	88	106
CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	89	37
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-CARBONDALE	90	Rank Not Published
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON	91 (tie)	32
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	91 (tie)	50
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY	93	Rank Not Published
NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	94	Rank Not Published
MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	95	65
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	96	Rank Not Published
MCGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW	97	Rank Not Published
CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	98	Rank Not Published
MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	99	119
SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	100	Rank Not Published
CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	101 (tie)	58
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	101 (tie)	144
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	103	74
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	104	88

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	105	Rank Not Published
CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	106	50
DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	107	128
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	108	88
OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	109	63
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	110	65
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW	111	Rank Not Published
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	112	59
COLORADO, UNIVERSITY OF	113 (tie)	46
QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	113 (tie)	133
PACE UNIVERSITY	115	127
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	116	Rank Not Published
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	117	37
ELON UNIVERSITY	118	Rank Not Published
LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE	119 (tie)	95
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	119 (tie)	80
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	121	125
DRAKE UNIVERSITY	122 (tie)	133
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	122 (tie)	74
DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	124 (tie)	141
IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	124 (tie)	119
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	126	27
SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	127	95
NEW ENGLAND LAW   BOSTON	128	Rank Not Published
BOSTON UNIVERSITY	129	22
CHICAGO-KENT COLLEGE OF LAW-IIT	130	85

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-UNIVERSITY PARK	131 (tie)	74
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	131 (tie)	98
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	133 (tie)	113
UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	133 (tie)	54
MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE	135	Rank Not Published
DREXEL UNIVERSITY	136	101
DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	137	119
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	138	41
PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	139	74
JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	140 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	140 (tie)	Rank Not Published
CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW	142	56
ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL	143	Unranked
SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	144	Rank Not Published
SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	145	144
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	146	Rank Not Published
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	147	110
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	148	110
SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW HOUSTON	149	Rank Not Published
AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	144
APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ARKANSAS, LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	141
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	119
BARRY UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
BELMONT UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	139
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	139
CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
CONCORDIA LAW SCHOOL	150 (tie)	Unranked
DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	63
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	101
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	113
HAWAII, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	101
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	150 (tie)	98
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	150 (tie)	Unranked
LINCOLN MEMORIAL	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	108
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	95



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
MITCHELL   HAMLINE	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
NEW HAMPSHIRE UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	85
NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	150 (tie)	Unranked
PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	Unranked
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	88
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	131
SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	128
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	83
ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FLORIDA)	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MINNESOTA)	150 (tie)	113
THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	150 (tie)	Unranked
TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	150 (tie)	137
TOURO COLLEGE	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO-SUNY	150 (tie)	106
UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
UNT DALLAS COLLEGE OF LAW	150 (tie)	Unranked
VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	150 (tie)	133
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	119

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Federal Clerkship Emp.</b>	<b>USN Rank</b>
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WIDENER UNIVERSITY-DELAWARE	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published
WIDENER-COMMONWEALTH	150 (tie)	Rank Not Published

### Analysis

Ranking law schools by the rate of graduates' employment in public interest positions yields notable differences when compared with the U.S. News ranking. Importantly, the average law school decreased its position by 12.9 spots relative to its position on the U.S. News & World Report ranking. This is an artifact of U.S. News & World Report's decision not to publish a ranking for schools ranked, according to its calculations, below 146. In total, U.S. News & World Report did not publish a rank for fifty-six schools, twenty-six of which ranked 146 or above when considering only clerkship positions. These schools include Nova Southeastern University (146), the University of San Francisco (144), Arizona Summit Law School (143), Southwestern Law School (140), John Marshall Law School (140), Mississippi College (135), New England Law | Boston (128), Elon University (118), North Carolina Central University (116), Ave Maria School of Law (111), the University of Detroit Mercy (105), Samford University (100), California Western School of Law (98), McGeorge School of Law (97), St. Mary's University (96), University of North Dakota (94), Valparaiso University (93), Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (90), Ohio Northern University (85), Willamette University (82), Campbell University (80), Texas Southern University (74), Regent University (69), Loyola University New Orleans (59), Pepperdine University (55), and Liberty University (52).

Despite the average decrease, a number of law schools significantly outperformed the average. In particular, fifteen schools scored more than forty places higher when considering only clerkship placement than on the U.S. News ranking system. These include the University of Kentucky

(+41), the University of New Mexico (+41), Creighton University (+42), Northern Illinois University (+43), Catholic University of America (+44), the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville (+53), Howard University (+68), the University of South Dakota (+70), the University of Mississippi (+72), Mercer University (+75), the University of Louisville (+83), West Virginia University (+88), the University of Montana (+110), the University of Wyoming (+116), and the University of Memphis (+119).

The average newly-established law school decreased 17.7 places when considering only placement in clerkships.<sup>77</sup> The median decrease for newly-established law schools was 11 places, and five of the seven new law schools (or 71%) decreased their placement in the rankings. It is possible that this relative decrease for new law schools is due to the fact that these newer institutions have less established alumni networks or weaker ties to judges. This decrease may also reflect the role of an institution's reputation in helping graduates secure clerkship positions.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The central goal of this paper is to harness the power of rankings to incentivize change. Innovators in legal education are often searching for ways to nudge large, ponderous institutions towards greater innovation and experimentation. One prominent method of creating change is through top-down regulatory action. Under this method, institutions such as the ABA or state bars may issues rules with which legal institutions are required to comply. This method has historically been successful in driving change on a number of issues in legal education, and it remains a viable and important method of innovation in legal education.

This Article argues that there is a complementary method to the top-down approach. Such a tactic involves incentivizing institutions to change themselves through carefully calibrated law school rankings. This effort may succeed where others have failed by harnessing the self-interest of law schools in obtaining (or maintaining) a high ranking. The key to changing legal academia could be to simply change what we measure.

To that end, this Article has examined the various features that law students and society at large might seek to promote in an ideal law school, and it has explored the ways to measure a given law school's success at promoting such features. Ideally, such a ranking would encourage law

---

<sup>77</sup> See *supra* note 65. The relative difference between the clerkship ranking and the U.S. News ranking of the seven newly-established law schools was -11 for Belmont University, +6 for the University of California-Irvine, -35 for Drexel University, -49 for Florida International University, -37 for the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), +13 for the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and -11 for Chapman University.

schools to invest in and prioritize these areas in an effort to better serve law students and society.

Going forward, it is incumbent upon the ABA to consider requiring or incentivizing law schools to provide additional data related to the professionalism of its graduates and the quality of their job placements, such as MPRE results, disbarment data, or employment quality surveys. Such data would serve to further enhance a ranking system. Additionally, it would provide an avenue for the ABA to foster professional formation and professional fulfillment of law students and law school graduates.