Ranking Law Schools with LSATs, Employment Outcomes, and Law Review Citations

Alfred L. Brophy
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, abrophy@email.unc.edu

Recommended Citation

JEROME HALL LAW LIBRARY
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Maurer School of Law
Bloomington

Ranking Law Schools with LSATs, Employment Outcomes, and Law Review Citations

ALFRED L. BROPHY[*]

This Article offers an alternative to the much-discussed U.S. News & World Report rankings. Where U.S. News rankings are affected by a wide variety of factors —some of which are criticized as irrelevant to what prospective students care about or should care about—this Article looks to three variables: the median LSAT score of entering students, which seeks to capture the quality of the student body; the percentage of the graduating students who are employed at nine months following graduation at full-time, permanent, JD-required jobs (a separate analysis excludes school-funded positions and solo practitioners from this variable); and the number of citations to each school's main law review, which seeks to capture a school's recent reputation. It rank-orders each of those variables, averages those ranks to obtain a new ranking, and then compares those new rankings to those of the 147 schools analyzed in U.S. News & World Report in March 2014. It identifies the schools that improve and decline the most with the new ranking. This Article provides ranks for all 194 American Bar Association accredited law schools that U.S. News included in its rankings released in 2014, including the forty-seven schools that U.S. News put in its "unranked" category.

INTRODUCTION

The economic downturn and long-term changes in the market for and delivery of legal services have occurred at a time when law schools, the students they serve, and the bar are rethinking a great many things. Prospective students are increasingly focused on employment prospects. Similarly, students, faculty, and administrators are all focusing attention on affordability of legal education and many are questioning the value of law school in relation to other career options. Moreover, as the job crisis has become worse for entry-level lawyers,[1] students want competitive edges whenever possible, including attending highly ranked law schools. The way that law schools are evaluated and the costs associated with law school[2] are being rethought.

---

[1] See David Groshoff, *Creatively Financed Legal Education in a Marketized Environment: How Faculty Leveraged Buyouts Can Maximize Law Schools' Stakeholder Values*, 17 FORDHAM J. CORP. & FIN. L. 387 (2012); Lucille A. Jewel, *I Can Has Lawyer? The Conflict Between the Participatory Culture of the Internet and the Legal Profession*, 33 HASTINGS COMM. & ENT L.J. 341 (2011); Lucille A. Jewel, *You're Doing it Wrong: How the Anti-law School Scam Blogging Movement Can Shape the Legal Profession*, 12 MINN. J.L. SCI. & TECH. 239 (2011); Kyle P. McEntee & Patrick J. Lynch, *A Way Forward: Transparency at American Law Schools*, 32 PACE L. REV. 1 (2012); Joel F. Murray, *Professional Dishonesty: Do U.S. Law Schools That Report False or Misleading Employment Statistics Violate Consumer Protection Laws?*, 15 J. CONSUMER & COM. L. 97 (2012).

[2] David C. Yamada, *Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the Practice of Legal Scholarship*, 41 U. MEM. L. REV. 121 (2010).

The *U.S. News & World Report* rankings rely on a number of variables. *U.S. News* weights peer and lawyer/judge assessment especially heavily. Additionally, it also includes student quality as measured by LSAT scores of entering students; student selectivity as measured by percentage of applicants accepted; spending per pupil; bar pass rate; and job outcome data.[3] Moreover, in response to the increasingly detailed job data that the ABA is collecting, *U.S. News* includes employment outcomes.[4]

While *U.S. News'* rankings include a lot of variables, there is reason to focus intense attention on student quality and student outcome. The quality of student is an important factor and of concern to students because so much of the law school experience relates to interactions that students have with each other. This Article uses the median LSAT scores of students entering in fall 2013, as reported by schools to the ABA, as its measure of student quality. The median LSAT tells about the revealed preferences of applicants; it also tells a great deal about the quality of the educational experience.

Employment outcome is of primary concern to prospective students and should be central to the choice of a law school. There is extensive literature on how to measure student outcomes;[5] some of the questions relate to whether it is appropriate to include school-funded jobs and whether to include so-called "JD-advantaged" jobs. In its initial analysis this Article uses the percentage of the class of 2013 employed in full-time, permanent, bar passage required (here referred to as JD-required) jobs at nine months after graduation. This includes those who are in school-funded positions and excludes the "JD-advantaged" positions. The rationale is that the JD-required jobs are those most prospective students would want. The intitial analysis in this Article (provided in tables 1 and 4) includes school-funded positions on the principle that school-funded positions may help students to transition to desirable jobs and, thus, schools should be rewarded for providing these positions. Nevertheless, there is a good rationale for excluding those positions, because they may not reflect the kinds of desirable jobs that are on par with full-time, JD-required jobs with law firms and government employers. Therefore, this Article subsequently excludes the school-funded positions and solo practitioners, re-ranks schools based on that modified employment rank, and compares school ranks on those two different employment measures in table 11. For most schools there is little change; for a small number of schools that have employed a significant percentage of their graduates, the ranks are noticeably lower

---

[3] Sam Flanigan & Robert Morse, *Methodology: 2016 Best Law Schools Rankings*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., (March 9, 2015), http://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/articles/law-schools-methodology.

[4] Bob Morse, *Recent Law School News Focuses on Rankings*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., (JULY 5, 2012, 9:30 AM), http://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/college-rankings-blog/2012/07/05/recent-law-school-news-focuses-on-rankings. *U.S. News* weights graduates employed at graduation .04 and employed at nine months .14, but it is unclear how it measures placement success. *See* Flanigan & Morse, *supra* note 3. They report only that "placement success was calculated by assigning various weights to the number of grads employed in 43 of these different types of post-J.D. jobs, employment statuses, and durations." *Id.*

[5] *See, e.g.*, Bernard A. Burk, *What's New About the New Normal: The Evolving Market for New Lawyers in the 21st Century*, 41 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 541–608 (2014) (discussing measures of employment outcomes, including "JD-advantaged" positions).

using that modified employment measure.[6]

The third and final variable used in this Article is citations to a law school's main law review from 2006 to 2013. This is designed to tell something about the intellectual orientation and culture of the school and to reveal something about the school's standing in the legal education community.[7] *U.S. News* heavily weights reputation of law schools among other law faculty and among judges and lawyers.[8] In place of those notoriously static and proprietary variables, this Article turns to citations to each school's main law review as a proxy for academic reputation. Previous research has shown that there is a high correlation between the *U.S. News* peer assessment scores and citations to schools' main law reviews. While some will criticize the inclusion of the scholarly output of a law school as a significant factor in ranking, citations offer one gauge that reflects the academic productivity and aspirations of a school. Moreover, that is not as proprietary as *U.S. News'* peer and lawyer/judge assessment scores are, and citations are also not as susceptible to manipulation. Citations, moreover, are one popular tool for rankings—often, as in the work of Brian Leiter[9] and Greg Sisk,[10] the citations are to the work of law faculty members.[11] This Article focuses on citations to recent issues of schools' main law reviews as a measure of school quality, which some scholars have also considered in the past as part of a rankings scheme.[12]

---

[6] For example, Law School Transparency's website provides extended discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of various measures of outcome. *Methodology*, LAW SCHOOL TRANSPARENCY (April 3, 2013), http://www.lstscorereports.com/guides/Methodology/. Law School Transparency's "employment score" measure is similar to one employed here, except that it excludes solo practitioners. *Id.* Law School Transparency also has a separate underemployment measure. *Id.*

[7] *See* Alfred L. Brophy, *The Emerging Importance of Law Review Rankings for Law School Rankings, 2003-2007*, 78 U. COLO. L. REV. 35 (2007).

[8] *U.S. News* weights peer assessment as 25% of its ranking and lawyer/judge assessment as 15%, for a total of 40% for what it calls the "quality assessment" scores. Flanigan & Morse, *supra* note 3.

[9] *See* Brian Leiter, *How to Rank Law Schools*, 81 IND. L.J. 47 (2006); *Top 25 Law Faculties in Scholarly Impact, 2005–2009 (And Highest Impact Faculty in 13 Areas of Specialization)*, BRIAN LEITER'S LAW SCHOOL RANKINGS, http://www.leiterrankings.com/new/2010_scholarlyimpact.shtml.

[10] *See* Gregory Sisk, Valerie Aggerbeck, Debby Hackerson & Mary Wells, *Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2012: Applying Leiter Scores to Rank the Top Third*, 9 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 838 (2012); GREGORY SISK, DEBBY HACKERSON, Mary Wells & Valerie Aggerbeck, *Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties: Extending the Leiter Rankings to the Top 70* (Univ. of St. Thomas Legal Studies Research Paper No. 10-24, 2010), *available at* http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1674764.

[11] Theodore Eisenberg & Martin T. Wells, *Ranking and Explaining the Scholarly Impact of Law Schools*, 27 J. LEGAL STUD. 373 (1998); Theodore Eisenberg & Martin T. Wells, *Ranking Law Journals and the Limits of Journal Citation Reports* (33 Cornell Legal Studies Research, Working Paper No. 12-30, May 31, 2012), *available at* http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2084169.

[12] *See, e.g.*, Ronen Perry, *The Relative Value of American Law Reviews: A Critical Appraisal of Ranking Methods*, 11 VA J. L. & TECH. 1 (2006); Ronen Perry, *The Relative Value of American Law Reviews: Refinement and Implementation*, 39 CONN. L. REV. 1–41 (2006).

I. DESCRIBING THE VARIABLES;
MEDIAN LSAT, EMPLOYMENT OUTCOME, AND LAW REVIEW CITATIONS

This Article responds to several criticisms of the *U.S. News* law school rankings. First, there is the criticism that *U.S. News* uses too many variables, some of which are irrelevant or distracting. The second criticism is that *U.S. News* focuses insufficient attention on employment outcomes. The third criticism is that *U.S. News* focuses too much on the largely static peer assessments that may poorly reflect the current quality of schools.

In response to these criticisms, this Article turns to three variables. The first is a measure of student quality: median LSAT score of first year students entering in the fall of 2013. This is taken from the data reported to the ABA and posted to its website.[13] This Article also uses a measure of the outcome for graduates: the employment data for the class that graduated in spring 2013 that was also reported to the ABA.[14] It uses the percentage of graduates employed at nine months in full-time, permanent, JD-required jobs.[15] Finally, this Article uses citations to schools' primary law reviews from 2006 to 2013, which is provided by John Doyle of Washington and Lee University School of Law's law library.[16] This Article looks at all 194 ABA-accredited law schools. The schools were ranked from 1 to 194 on each of those three variables; then the ranks were averaged and the schools were re-ranked on the new mean rank.

There is, however, a special focus on the 147 schools that were ranked by *U.S. News* in its March 2014 rankings.[17] For those 147 schools this Article provide the difference between the new rank and the *U.S. News* rank. This Article, thus, compares the new ranking with the 2015 *U.S. News* ranking, which was released in spring 2014. Throughout this Article I refer to the *U.S. News* overall ranks as a benchmark to gauge the new rankings developed here; this is because *U.S. News* is the leading current method for ranking law schools and, therefore, I want to see how the new rankings here compare to the benchmark that most people use. This is not meant as an endorsement of *U.S. News*; in fact, one of my hopes is that this Article will help develop an interest in alternative measures that are easy to

---

[13] ABA-APPROVED LAW SCHOOL 1L ENTERING CLASS DATA: FALL 2013, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (2013), *available at* http://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/statistics.html.

[14] EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY 2013, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (2013), *available at* http://employmentsummary.abaquestionnaire.org/.

[15] In the initial iteration of this Article I used the percentage of a class employed at full-time, permanent, JD-required jobs nine months after graduation. I included both solo practitioners and school-funded positions in this calculation. A number of people suggested excluding both of these groups. The exclusion of those two groups will be relatively unimportant to the rankings, except for a few schools where the exclusion, particularly of school-funded positions, will be quite important. I discuss the changes below at Part 5 and at Tables 10 and 11.

[16] *Law Journals: Submissions and Ranking, 2007-2014*, WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW LAW LIBRARY, *available at* http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/index.aspx. Northeastern University, whose law review began in 2009, was assigned a rank at the median of law reviews for the other 194 schools. *See* http://nulj.org/about.

[17] There were another forty-seven schools that were listed by *U.S. News* as unranked. While those schools are included in this Article, they are excluded from the analysis involving change from *U.S. News* rank to the new rank here.

compute and respond to the needs of consumers of the rankings. I have previously suggested that other factors be added to the *U.S. News* ranking equation, including the percentage of African American students at each law school.[18] I continue to believe that measures including the diversity of students and faculty—and other measures like faculty quality—are important. However, this particular exploration of the possibility of a relatively simple ranking focuses on more limited factors.

II. LSAT AND EMPLOYMENT RANKINGS

One simple way of ranking looks to student quality and employment outcomes. Table 1 ranks schools based on the median LSAT of the class entering in 2013 and the percentage of the 2013 class employed at full-time, permanent, JD-required jobs nine months after graduation. The table averages those two ranks to create a new ranking; a final column subtracts the new rank from the *U.S. News* overall rank. The LSAT and employment rankings correlate closely with *U.S. News'* overall rank (r=.91).[19]

Table 2 lists the schools that improved the most in the LSAT and employment rankings over their *U.S. News* rankings. Those are institutions whose entering students and employment outcomes suggest they are substantially better than their *U.S. News* rankings would indicate. For at least some of the largest outliers this seems to be due to strong job performance. For instance, the University of Montana's placement rank (36) is 78.5 places ahead of its *U.S. News* rank; the University of New Hampshire's placement rank (35) is 61 places ahead; and South Texas' placement rank (46) is 100.5 places ahead.

Table 3, by contrast, lists the schools that declined the most in the LSAT and employment rankings over their *U.S. News* rankings. As with the schools that improved the most, when one looks at the schools that decline the most, employment rank seems to be the cause. For instance, the University of Connecticut's placement rank (163) is 107.5 places behind its *U.S. News* rank; Pennsylvania State's placement rank (147) is 95 places behind; Hastings's placement rank (161) is 105.5 places behind; and American University's placement rank (151) is 76 places behind. These numbers suggest that prospective students should look very carefully at placement outcomes, because following the overall *U.S. News* rankings by themselves may lead students far astray from what they ought to care about in some instances.

III. THE LSAT, EMPLOYMENT, AND LAW REVIEW CITATION RANKINGS

While some maintain that the two key factors are LSAT and employment, there is good reason to add some other measure to gauge reputation of an institution. *U.S. News* does this through their reputation scores, which collectively account for 40% of their ranking. Because those numbers are proprietary, notoriously static, and perhaps subject to some gaming by schools, I have gone searching for another factor that might provide a measure of law school reputation and quality. I have previously written about the possibilities of using recent citations to schools' main

---

[18] Alfred L. Brophy, *African American Student Enrollment and Law School Ranking*, 27 ST. JOHN'S J. C.R. & ECON. DEV. 15 (2013).

[19] A correlation is a quantitative measure of the strength of a linear relationship between two variables.

law reviews as one measure. Citations to law schools' main law reviews are highly correlated with *U.S. News*' peer assessment scores, so they in some ways provide a freely available close proxy. But there are also independent reasons to suggest that recent citations may provide a good measure: They are citations to work being published recently and thus may reflect the intellectual orientation of the best students at a school. Moreover, because the journals that are perceived as better will likely have a better selection of articles, there is something of a feedback loop in operation, where the reviews that are perceived as best have the opportunity to publish what they believe to be the best work. There are reasons to be skeptical of these assumptions, of course. For one, we know that the journals associated with the most prestigious schools do not always publish the most cited work.[20] But for this preliminary study I have chosen to use citations as a third variable to help bring some other precision related to prestige and intellectual culture of the schools to the ranking process, for citations reveal the success of the law school's academic project.

Table 4 reports the rank of 194 law schools on median LSAT for the class entering in 2013; the percentage of the class of 2013 who had full-time, permanent, JD-required jobs nine months after graduation; and the number of citations to each school's main law review from 2006 to 2013. It also reports the mean of those three ranks for each school, the school's new rank based on that mean, the school's *U.S. News* ranking in spring 2014, and the difference between the new rank and the *U.S. News* rank.

The new rank and the *U.S. News* rank are highly correlated (r=.93). That is, the new rankings are quite similar to the *U.S. News* rankings. The correlations between each of the three variables and the overall *U.S. News* rank are also high, though the *U.S. News* rank and LSAT median rank are correlated most highly of the three (r=.93). The correlation between *U.S. News* rank and full-time, permanent, JD-required jobs rank is .70 and the correlation between *U.S. News* rank and law review citations rank is .76. The correlations appear in Table 5.

Although the overall correlation between the new ranking and the *U.S. News* ranking is high, there are some schools that have a notable difference between their new ranking and the *U.S. News* ranking. Table 6 lists those schools whose new rank improves by at least twenty places over the *U.S. News* ranking. That is, the new ranking suggests that the schools are substantially better than *U.S. News* would indicate. By contrast, Table 7 lists the schools whose new rank is significantly worse than their *U.S. News* ranking. That is, the schools listed in Table 7 perform less well on the new rank than on *U.S. News*. Those schools have relatively poorer job placement, LSAT medians, and/or law review citations than their *U.S. News* rank would predict.

IV. COMPARING THE NEW TWO- AND THREE-VARIABLE RANKINGS

Given the controversy that surrounds the use of citations as a factor in ranking, I want to compare the results of the two-variable ranking (that takes equal measure of LSAT and employment) and the three-variable ranking (that takes equal measure of LSAT, employment, and citations). As an initial matter, the absolute value of the average difference between the *U.S. News* rank and two-variable rank was 13.1,

---

[20] *See, e.g.*, Alfred L. Brophy, *The Signaling Value of Law Reviews: An Exploration of Citations and Prestige*, 36 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 229 (2009).

with a standard deviation of 12.1. That is larger than the absolute value of the average difference between the *U.S. News* rank and the three-variable rank, which was 11.8, with a standard deviation of 9.7. In other words, the three-variable ranks are closer on average to the *U.S. News* ranks than are the two-variable ranks. Perhaps this is not necessarily desirable; given the criticisms of *U.S. News* maybe we should not use it as a benchmark to judge new ranking measures. However, the *U.S. News* ranks provide one popular measure of law schools—it is useful to know that the three-variable measure is slightly closer to the *U.S. News* ranking than the two-variable measure.

Because the third variable that is added is citations, the schools whose law reviews perform well improve on the three-variable rank, while those with poor performing law reviews decline. Table 8 lists the schools that improve the most with the three-variable rank over the two-variable rank (LSAT and employment ranks only). Unsurprisingly, those are well established schools with highly regarded law reviews, such as the *Connecticut Law Review*, *DePaul Law Review*, *American University Law Review*, *Hofstra Law Review*, *Hastings Law Review*, *Michigan State University Law Review, Cardozo Law Review*, and *University of Cincinnati Law Review*. Table 9 lists the schools that declined the most with the three-variable rank over the two-variable rank. They are schools which are doing well in recruiting students and with placement, but for some reason have a law review that is not performing nearly as well. In some instances the schools are newer and thus their law reviews are not yet well established—such as the *Drexel Law Review*, *Florida International Law Review*, and *University of New Hampshire Law Review*. We can expect that to change over time. In other instances, some reviews may have a focus on serving the regional bar and thus one would not expect them to have as many citations as other journals.[21] For those schools, the use of citations as a measure of school quality may be misplaced.

V. RANKINGS EXCLUDING SCHOOL-FUNDED POSITIONS AND SOLO PRACTITIONERS

The first part of this Article used ranks on employment as measured by the percentage of the graduating class of 2013 who obtained long-term, full-time positions requiring bar passage. This included graduates who had school-funded positions and also those who were solo practitioners. A number of people suggested that a better measure is to exclude those two groups of graduates.[22] Table 10 lists the schools with the most number of school-funded and solo positions and reports the percentage of their graduating class of 2013 who have such positions. While there are relatively few of these schools, some have a significant percentage

---

[21] A quick review of some of the journals reveals that many include articles—entirely appropriately—on regional law. *See, e.g.*, Alfred L. Brophy, *The Tulsa Race Riot of 1921 in the Oklahoma Supreme Court*, 54 OKLA. L. REV. 67 (2001); Kathleen R. Guzman, *Where Strict Meets Substantial: Oklahoma Standards for the Execution of a Will*, 66 OKLA. L. REV. 543 (2014); John T. Parry, *Oklahoma's Save Our State Amendment: Two Issues for the Appeal*, 64 OKLA. L. REV. 161 (2012).

[22] *See, e.g.*, JLK, Comment to *Ranking Law Schools Based on LSAT, Employment Outcome, and Citations*, THE FACULTY LOUNGE (June 19, 2014, 10:24 AM), http://www.thefacultylounge.org/2014/06/ranking-law-schools-based-on-lsat-employment-outcome-and-citations.html.

of their class employed in those positions. Thus, for most schools the employment rank does not change appreciably when the school-funded and solo practitioner positions are excluded, but for a few their rank on percentage of the class employed drops rather dramatically. Table 11 then reports the ranks of schools using the modified employment score (omitting school-funded positions and solo practitioners) and compares each school's rank on using the original and the modified employment scores. Thus, those interested in seeing the overall ranking of all 194 schools on the three variable rank, where the employment rank excludes school-funded and solo positions, will want to use Table 11. Those who are interested in the three variable rank including the school-funded and solo positions will want to use Table 4.

CONCLUSIONS

There are several conclusions from this initial exploration. First, one can largely replicate the *U.S. News* rankings with a small number of easily available data. While *U.S. News* has received extraordinary attention, their rankings are quite similar to a simple compilation of a few key variables—basic LSAT data, basic employment data, and basic citation data. However, and second, there are some schools that are rather significantly either under-ranked or over-ranked when we focus on several critical factors. That is, when we focus on student quality, employment outcome, and citations to a school's law review, without focusing on other factors, some schools appear to be significantly better (and in some cases significantly worse) than their *U.S. News* ranking. This suggests that prospective students should look closely at the attributes of schools that matter to them, rather than just focusing on the overall *U.S. News* ranking.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Law Schools Ranked by Mean Ranks of LSAT and Employment

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	USN - New rank
Columbia	3.5	2	2.75	1	4.5	3.5
NYU	5.5	3	4.25	2	6	4
Virginia	8	1	4.5	3	8	5
Chicago	5.5	4	4.75	4.5	4.5	0
Harvard	1.5	8	4.75	4.5	2	-2.5
Stanford	3.5	7	5.25	6	3	-3
Pennsylvania	8	5	6.5	7	7	0
Yale	1.5	16	8.75	8	1	-7
Duke	8	11	9.5	9	10.5	1.5
Cornell	14.5	6	10.25	10	13.5	3.5
UC-Berkeley	14.5	9	11.75	11	9	-2
Georgetown	11	13	12	12	13.5	1.5
Vanderbilt	14.5	10	12.25	13	16.5	3.5
Michigan	11	14	12.5	14	10.5	-3.5
Northwestern	11	15	13	15	12	-3
Emory	21	12	16.5	16	19	3
Texas	18	17	17.5	17	15	-2
UCLA	14.5	21	17.75	18	16.5	-1.5
G. Washington	21	18	19.5	19	21	2
William & Mary	25.5	20	22.75	20	24.5	4.5
Alabama	25.5	27	26.25	21	23	2
Notre Dame	30	26	28	22	26	4
Minnesota	25.5	31	28.25	23	21	-2
Iowa	41	19	30	24	27.5	3.5
Wash. Univ.	18	43	30.5	25	18	-7
SMU	34.5	29	31.75	26	42	16
UC-Davis	34.5	30	32.25	27	37.5	10.5
Boston Univ.	21	44	32.5	28	27.5	-0.5
Wash.-Seattle	25.5	41	33.25	29	24.5	-4.5
Colorado	34.5	33	33.75	30	43.5	13.5
Georgia	30	39	34.5	31	29.5	-1.5
Illinois	49.5	24	36.75	32	40.5	8.5
North Carolina	41	34	37.5	33.5	33	-0.5
USC	18	57	37.5	33.5	21	-12.5
Baylor	49.5	28	38.75	35	52	17
Boston College	25.5	60	42.75	36	37.5	1.5
Ind.-Bloomington	34.5	54	44.25	37	29.5	-7.5
Florida State	59	32	45.5	38	45	7
Fordham	30	65	47.5	39	37.5	-1.5
Florida	49.5	49	49.25	40	49.5	9.5
BYU	41	58	49.5	41	37.5	-3.5
Houston	49.5	55	52.25	42.5	59	16.5
Kentucky	82.5	22	52.25	42.5	59	16.5
Arizona State	34.5	77	55.75	44	33	-11

Table 1 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT and Employment

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	USN - New rank
New Hampshire	82.5	35	58.75	45	96	51
Seton Hall	82.5	37	59.75	46	69.5	23.5
Utah	59	64	61.5	47	49.5	2.5
Ohio State	49.5	76	62.75	48	33	-15
Wisconsin	41	85	63	49	33	-16
Washington & Lee	25.5	101	63.25	50	43.5	-6.5
Georgia State	59	69	64	51	65.5	14.5
Wake Forest	34.5	96	65.25	52	33	-19
Nevada	69.5	63	66.25	53.5	84.5	31
Oklahoma	82.5	50	66.25	53.5	59	5.5
LSU	92.5	42	67.25	55	75	20
Rutgers-Camden	69.5	66	67.75	56.5	81.5	25
Tennessee	82.5	53	67.75	56.5	75	18.5
New Mexico	113.5	23	68.25	58	75	17
Temple	49.5	89	69.25	59	62	3
Richmond	41	98	69.5	60.5	52	-8.5
South Carolina	101	38	69.5	60.5	96	35.5
Nebraska	92.5	51	71.75	62	55.5	-6.5
Arizona	49.5	95	72.25	63	40.5	-22.5
Case Western	59	87	73	64	65.5	1.5
Montana	113.5	36	74.75	65	124.5	59.5
Kansas	92.5	59	75.75	66	69.5	3.5
Arkansas-Fayetteville	113.5	40	76.75	67	62	-5
Louisville	101	56	78.5	68	89.5	21.5
Miami	82.5	78	80.25	69	62	-7
Brooklyn	59	102	80.5	70	84.5	14.5
Missouri-Columbia	82.5	80	81.25	71	65.5	-5.5
Cardozo	49.5	114	81.75	72	65.5	-6.5
Mississippi	101	67	84	73	105	32
Lewis & Clark	69.5	100	84.75	74	75	1
Pepperdine	49.5	122	85.75	75	55.5	-19.5
Chicago-Kent	69.5	103	86.25	76	75	-1
George Mason	41	132	86.5	77	47	-30
Florida International	92.5	81	86.75	78	101.5	23.5
Denver	69.5	105	87.25	79.5	69.5	-10
Gonzaga	113.5	61	87.25	79.5	109.5	30
Tulane	49.5	126	87.75	81	47	-34
Pittsburgh	69.5	107	88.25	82	81.5	-0.5
San Diego	59	121	90	83	79.5	-3.5
Cincinnati	69.5	113	91.25	84	79.5	-4.5
Southern Illinois	158.5	25	91.75	85		
Maryland	59	125	92	86	47	-39
SUNY-Buffalo	113.5	71	92.25	87	101.5	14.5
Stetson	113.5	72	92.75	88	96	8

Table 1 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT and Employment

School	*LSAT rank*	*Employ rank*	*Mean rank*	*New rank*	*USN rank*	*USN - New rank*
Mercer	135.5	52	93.75	89	105	16
Rutgers-Newark	82.5	106	94.25	90	84.5	-5.5
Tulsa	101	88	94.5	91	75	-16
Northeastern	41	150	95.5	92	96	4
Loyola-Los Angeles	59	133	96	93	89.5	-3.5
Texas Tech	101	92	96.5	95	109.5	14.5
Washburn	125	68	96.5	95	116	21
Wyoming	148	45	96.5	95	131.5	36.5
South Texas	148	46	97	97	146.5	49.5
St. John's	92.5	104	98.25	98	109.5	11.5
Hawaii	82.5	116.5	99.5	99	101.5	2.5
Villanova	82.5	118	100.25	100	96	-4
Wayne State	82.5	119	100.75	101	89.5	-11.5
Loyola-Chicago	69.5	134	101.75	102	69.5	-32.5
Memphis	125	79	102	103	142	39
Oregon	69.5	135	102.25	104	101.5	-2.5
Idaho	135.5	70	102.75	105.5	119	13.5
Ohio Northern	158.5	47	102.75	105.5		
William Mitchell	113.5	93	103.25	107	137	30
Albany	125	82	103.5	108	119	11
St. Louis	101	109	105	109	96	-13
Drake	125	86	105.5	110	113.5	3.5
Syracuse	101	111	106	111	109.5	-1.5
Marquette	101	115	108	112	96	-16
Oklahoma City	168.5	48	108.25	113.5		
Penn State	69.5	147	108.25	113.5	52	-61.5
UC-Hastings	59	161	110	115	55.5	-59.5
Regent	125	97	111	116.5		
St. Mary's	148	74	111	116.5		
Willamette	148	75	111.5	118	124.5	6.5
West Virginia	125	99	112	119	84.5	-34.5
Connecticut	69.5	163	116.25	120	55.5	-64.5
American	82.5	151	116.75	121	75	-46
Dayton	176.5	62	119.25	122.5		
Drexel	101	137.5	119.25	122.5	131.5	9
Santa Clara	82.5	158	120.25	124	109.5	-14.5
Indiana-Indianapolis	113.5	128	120.75	125	89.5	-35.5
Samford	158.5	84	121.25	126	137	11
Campbell	135.5	108	121.75	127.5	124.5	-3
Chapman	69.5	174	121.75	127.5	142	14.5
Creighton	135.5	110	122.75	129	116	-13
Nova Southeastern	168.5	83	125.75	130.5		
Seattle	92.5	159	125.75	130.5	89.5	-41
South Dakota	180	73	126.5	132	145	13

Table 1 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT and Employment

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	USN – New rank
Akron	125	129	127	133.5	124.5	-9
St. Thomas-Minnesota	101	153	127	133.5	131.5	-2
Hofstra	113.5	141	127.25	135	137	2
CUNY	113.5	142	127.75	136.5	113.5	-23
Michigan State	82.5	173	127.75	136.5	89.5	-47
Duquesne	135.5	124	129.75	138	124.5	-13.5
Vermont	148	112	130	139	131.5	-7.5
Catholic	113.5	148	130.75	140	109.5	-30.5
DePaul	113.5	149	131.25	141.5	124.5	-17
Mississippi College	168.5	94	131.25	141.5		
Maine	101	162	131.5	143	131.5	-11.5
North Dakota	176.5	90	133.25	144	131.5	-12.5
Toledo	135.5	137.5	136.5	145	142	-3
Faulkner	183.5	91	137.25	146		
Northern Illinois	158.5	116.5	137.5	147		
Loyola-New Orleans	148	130	139	148		
Charleston	158.5	120	139.25	149.5		
Missouri-Kansas City	135.5	143	139.25	149.5	105	-44.5
Arkansas-Little Rock	148	131	139.5	151.5	124.5	-27
Hamline	125	154	139.5	151.5	124.5	-27
Cleveland State	135.5	145.5	140.5	153	116	-37
Howard	148	137.5	142.75	154	137	-17
Baltimore	135.5	156	145.75	155	137	-18
McGeorge	113.5	179	146.25	156	146.5	-9.5
John Marshall-Chicago	168.5	127	147.75	157.5		
Texas A&M	135.5	160	147.75	157.5		
Quinnipiac	113.5	185	149.25	159	119	-40
Touro	176.5	123	149.75	160		
Southwestern	135.5	167	151.25	161		
New York Law School	148	155	151.5	162	142	-20
San Francisco	125	180	152.5	163		
Northern Kentucky	135.5	171	153.25	164		
Widener	168.5	140	154.25	165		
Pace	148	165	156.5	166	142	-24
St. Thomas-Florida	180	144	162	167		
Appalachian	187	137.5	162.25	168		
Liberty	148	181	164.5	169		
California Western	148	182	165	170		
Detroit Mercy	148	183	165.5	171		
Roger Williams	168.5	164	166.25	172		
Capital	176.5	157	166.75	173.5		
Western State	158.5	175	166.75	173.5		
New England	168.5	166	167.25	175		
Texas Southern	191	145.5	168.25	176		

Table 1 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT and Employment

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	USN – New rank
John Marshall-Atlanta	168.5	169	168.75	177		
Arizona Summit	191	152	171.5	178		
Elon	158.5	186	172.25	179.5		
Suffolk	168.5	176	172.25	179.5		
Western New England	168.5	178	173.25	181		
Barry	180	168	174	182		
Golden Gate	158.5	193	175.75	183		
Florida A&M	183.5	172	177.75	184		
Whittier	168.5	191	179.75	185		
District of Columbia	168.5	192	180.25	186		
Valparaiso	194	170	182	187		
Ave Maria	183.5	184	183.75	188		
Charlotte	191	177	184	189		
Thomas Jefferson	183.5	188	185.75	190		
Thomas M. Cooley	187	190	188.5	191		
Florida Coastal	191	187	189	192		
Southern University	191	189	190	193		
North Carolina Central	187	194	190.5	194		

Table 2

Schools with Largest Improvement in the LSAT and Employment Rankings over *U.S. News* Ranking

School	Improvement in Rank
Montana	59.5
New Hampshire	51
South Texas	49.5
Memphis	39
Wyoming	36.5
South Carolina	35.5
Nevada	31
William Mitchell	30
Mississippi	32
Gonzaga	30
Rutgers-Camden	25
Florida International	23.5
Seton Hall	23.5
Louisville	21.5
Washburn	21
Louisiana State University	20

Table 3

Schools with Largest Decline in the LSAT and Employment Rankings over *U.S. News* Ranking (twenty ranks or more)

School	Change in Rank
Connecticut	-64.5
Penn State	-61.5
UC-Hastings	-59.5
Michigan State	-47
American	-46
Missouri-Kansas City	-44.5
Seattle	-41
Quinnipiac	-40
Maryland	-39
Cleveland State	-37
Indiana-Indianapolis	-35.5
West Virginia	-34.5
Tulane	-34
Loyola-Chicago	-32.5
George Mason	-30
Catholic	-30.5
Arkansas – Little Rock	-27
Hamline	-27
Pace	-24
Arizona	-22.5
New York Law School	-20

Table 4

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Cites rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	Difference USN - New
Columbia	3.5	2	3	2.83	1	4.5	3.5
Harvard	1.5	8	1	3.5	2	2	0
Stanford	3.5	7	4	4.83	3	3	0
Yale	1.5	16	2	6.5	4	1	-3
Virginia	8	1	11	6.67	5	8	3
Pennsylvania	8	5	8	7	6	7	1
NYU	5.5	3	14	7.5	7	6	-1
Georgetown	11	13	7	10.33	8.5	13.5	5
Michigan	11	14	6	10.33	8.5	10.5	2
Chicago	5.5	4	23	10.83	10.5	4.5	-6
UC-Berkeley	14.5	9	9	10.83	10.5	9	-1.5
Cornell	14.5	6	18	12.83	12	13.5	1.5
Duke	8	11	21	13.33	13	10.5	-2.5
Northwestern	11	15	15	13.67	14	12	-2
Vanderbilt	14.5	10	20	14.83	15	16.5	1.5
UCLA	14.5	21	10	15.17	16	16.5	0.5
Texas	18	17	12	15.67	17	15	-2
Emory	21	12	33	22	18	19	1
William & Mary	25.5	20	22	22.5	19	24.5	5.5
George Washington	21	18	29	22.67	20	21	1
Minnesota	25.5	31	13	23.17	21	21	0
Notre Dame	30	26	16	24	22	26	4
Iowa	41	19	17	25.67	23	27.5	4.5
Boston University	21	44	24	29.67	24	27.5	3.5
UC-Davis	34.5	30	28	30.83	25	37.5	12.5
Washington Univ.	18	43	38	33	26	18	-8
Alabama	25.5	27	47	33.17	27.5	23	-4.5
Illinois	49.5	24	26	33.17	27.5	40.5	13
Fordham	30	65	5	33.33	29.5	37.5	8
North Carolina	41	34	25	33.33	29.5	33	3.5
USC	18	57	36	37	31	21	-10

Table 4 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	*LSAT rank*	*Employ rank*	*Cites rank*	*Mean rank*	*New rank*	*USN rank*	*Difference USN - New*
Washington-Seattle	25.5	41	46	37.5	32	24.5	-7.5
Boston College	25.5	60	30	38.5	33.5	37.5	4
Indiana-Bloomington	34.5	54	27	38.5	33.5	29.5	-4
Colorado	34.5	33	50	39.17	35	43.5	8.5
SMU	34.5	29	57	40.17	36	42	6
Georgia	30	39	56	41.67	37	29.5	-7.5
Florida	49.5	49	34	44.17	38	49.5	11.5
Florida State	59	32	58	49.67	39	45	6
BYU	41	58	53	50.67	40	37.5	-2.5
Houston	49.5	55	48	50.83	41	59	18
Wisconsin	41	85	35	53.67	42	33	-9
Ohio State	49.5	76	43	56.17	43.5	33	-10.5
Washington & Lee	25.5	101	42	56.17	43.5	43.5	0
Wake Forest	34.5	96	41	57.17	45	33	-12
Arizona State	34.5	77	66	59.17	46	33	-13
Arizona	49.5	95	37	60.5	47	40.5	-6.5
Cardozo	49.5	114	19	60.83	48	65.5	17.5
Utah	59	64	62.5	61.83	49	49.5	0.5
Seton Hall	82.5	37	78	65.83	50	69.5	19.5
Baylor	49.5	28	124	67.17	51	52	1
Nevada	69.5	63	72	68.17	52	84.5	32.5
Richmond	41	98	67	68.67	53	52	-1
Lewis & Clark	69.5	100	40	69.83	54	75	21
South Carolina	101	38	73	70.67	55	96	41
Kentucky	82.5	22	113	72.5	56	59	3
Tennessee	82.5	53	84	73.17	57.5	75	17.5
Tulane	49.5	126	44	73.17	57.5	47	-10.5
Missouri-Columbia	82.5	80	59	73.83	59	65.5	6.5
Brooklyn	59	102	62.5	74.5	60.5	84.5	24
Temple	49.5	89	85	74.5	60.5	62	1.5
Cincinnati	69.5	113	45	75.83	62	79.5	17.5

Table 4 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Cites rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	Difference USN - New
George Mason	41	132	55	76	63	47	-16
Nebraska	92.5	51	86	76.5	64	55.5	-8.5
Pepperdine	49.5	122	61	77.5	65	55.5	-9.5
Kansas	92.5	59	82.5	78	66	69.5	3.5
LSU	92.5	42	101	78.5	67.5	75	7.5
Miami	82.5	78	75	78.5	67.5	62	-5.5
Chicago-Kent	69.5	103	65	79.17	69	75	6
Case Western	59	87	92	79.33	70.5	65.5	-5
Maryland	59	125	54	79.33	70.5	47	-23.5
Georgia State	59	69	115	81	72	65.5	-6.5
Denver	69.5	105	69	81.17	73	69.5	-3.5
Rutgers-Camden	69.5	66	109	81.5	74.5	81.5	7
SUNY-Buffalo	113.5	71	60	81.5	74.5	101.5	27
UC-Hastings	59	161	32	84	76	55.5	-20.5
Loyola-Los Angeles	59	133	64	85.33	77.5	89.5	12
San Diego	59	121	76	85.33	77.5	79.5	2
Connecticut	69.5	163	31	87.83	79	55.5	-23.5
Oklahoma	82.5	50	136	89.5	80	59	-21
American	82.5	151	39	90.83	81	75	-6
Mississippi	101	67	106	91.33	82	105	23
Albany	125	82	70	92.33	83	119	36
Louisville	101	56	122	93	84	89.5	5.5
Arkansas-Fayetteville	113.5	40	126	93.17	85	62	-23
St. Louis	101	109	71	93.67	86	96	10
New Mexico	113.5	23	145	93.83	87	75	-12
New Hampshire	82.5	35	169	95.5	88.5	96	7.5
William Mitchell	113.5	93	80	95.5	88.5	137	48.5
Rutgers-Newark	82.5	106	99	95.83	90	84.5	-5.5
Northeastern	41	150	97.5	96.17	91.5	96	4.5
Villanova	82.5	118	88	96.17	91.5	96	4.5

Table 4 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Cites rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	Difference USN - New
Washburn	125	68	96	96.33	93	116	23
St. John's	92.5	104	93	96.5	94	109.5	15.5
Loyola-Chicago	69.5	134	90	97.83	95.5	69.5	-26
Penn State	69.5	147	77	97.83	95.5	52	-43.5
Pittsburgh	69.5	107	120	98.83	97	81.5	-15.5
Oregon	69.5	135	94.5	99.67	98	101.5	3.5
Mercer	135.5	52	117	101.5	99	105	6
Marquette	101	115	89	101.67	100	96	-4
Hofstra	113.5	141	51	101.83	101	137	36
Texas Tech	101	92	114	102.33	102	109.5	7.5
Michigan State	82.5	173	52	102.5	103	89.5	-13.5
Tulsa	101	88	119	102.67	104	75	-29
DePaul	113.5	149	49	103.83	105.5	124.5	19
Gonzaga	113.5	61	137	103.83	105.5	109.5	4
Drake	125	86	104	105	107	113.5	6.5
Santa Clara	82.5	158	79	106.5	108	109.5	1.5
Montana	113.5	36	171	106.83	109	124.5	15.5
Southern Illinois	158.5	25	138	107.17	110		
Akron	125	129	68	107.33	111	124.5	13.5
South Texas	148	46	128.5	107.5	112	146.5	34.5
Seattle	92.5	159	74	108.5	113	89.5	-23.5
Ohio Northern	158.5	47	121	108.83	114.5		
Stetson	113.5	72	141	108.83	114.5	96	-18.5
Syracuse	101	111	116	109.33	116	109.5	-6.5
Indiana-Indianapolis	113.5	128	91	110.83	117.5	89.5	-28
Wayne State	82.5	119	131	110.83	117.5	89.5	-28
West Virginia	125	99	111	111.67	119	84.5	-34.5
Memphis	125	79	132	112	120	142	22
Catholic	113.5	148	82.5	114.67	121	109.5	-11.5
Idaho	135.5	70	142	115.83	122	119	-3
Wyoming	148	45	155	116	123	131.5	8.5
Willamette	148	75	128.5	117.17	124	124.5	0.5

Table 4 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	*LSAT rank*	*Employ rank*	*Cites rank*	*Mean rank*	*New rank*	*USN rank*	*Difference USN - New*
Florida International	92.5	81	184	119.17	125	101.5	-23.5
Vermont	148	112	103	121	126	131.5	5.5
Creighton	135.5	110	118	121.17	127	116	-11
Missouri-Kansas City	135.5	143	87	121.83	128	105	-23
St. Mary's	148	74	151	124.33	129		
Hawaii	82.5	116.5	175	124.67	130	101.5	-28.5
Toledo	135.5	137.5	102	125	131	142	11
Chapman	69.5	174	139	127.5	132	142	10
Regent	125	97	161	127.67	133		
New York Law School	148	155	81	128	134	142	8
St. Thomas-Minnesota	101	153	133	129	135	131.5	-3.5
Cleveland State	135.5	145.5	108	129.67	136	116	-20
Oklahoma City	168.5	48	173	129.83	137		
Maine	101	162	127	130	138	131.5	-6.5
Howard	148	137.5	105	130.17	139	137	-2
Campbell	135.5	108	156	133.17	141	124.5	-16.5
McGeorge	113.5	179	107	133.17	141	146.5	5.5
San Francisco	125	180	94.5	133.17	141		
Dayton	176.5	62	162	133.5	143		
North Dakota	176.5	90	134.5	133.67	144	131.5	-12.5
South Dakota	180	73	149	134	145	145	0
John Marshall-Chicago	168.5	127	110	135.17	146		
Duquesne	135.5	124	147	135.5	147	124.5	-22.5
Samford	158.5	84	165	135.83	148	137	-11
Drexel	101	137.5	178	138.83	149	131.5	-17.5
Loyola-New Orleans	148	130	140	139.33	150		
Nova Southeastern	168.5	83	167	139.5	151		
Hamline	125	154	146	141.67	152.5	124.5	-28
Pace	148	165	112	141.67	152.5	142	-10.5

Table 4 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Cites rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	Difference USN - New
Southwestern	135.5	167	125	142.5	154		
Quinnipiac	113.5	185	130	142.83	155	119	-36
Mississippi College	168.5	94	168	143.5	156		
CUNY	113.5	142	180	145.17	157	113.5	-43.5
Charleston	158.5	120	159	145.83	158		
Baltimore	135.5	156	150	147.17	159	137	-22
Arkansas-Little Rock	148	131	163	147.33	160.5	124.5	-36
Suffolk	168.5	176	97.5	147.33	160.5		
Touro	176.5	123	148	149.17	162		
Northern Illinois	158.5	116.5	174	149.67	163		
New England	168.5	166	123	152.5	164		
Northern Kentucky	135.5	171	152	152.83	165		
Valparaiso	194	170	100	154.67	166		
Faulkner	183.5	91	191	155.17	167.5		
Texas A&M	135.5	160	170	155.17	167.5		
Capital	176.5	157	134.5	156	169		
California Western	148	182	144	158	170		
Widener	168.5	140	166	158.17	171		
St. Thomas-Florida	180	144	157	160.33	172		
Detroit Mercy	148	183	154	161.67	173		
Roger Williams	168.5	164	153	161.83	174		
Western New England	168.5	178	143	163.17	175		
Appalachian	187	137.5	179	167.83	176		
Golden Gate	158.5	193	160	170.5	177		
Liberty	148	181	188	172.33	178		
Texas Southern	191	145.5	181	172.5	179.5		
Whittier	168.5	191	158	172.5	179.5		
Western State	158.5	175	185	172.83	181		
Barry	180	168	172	173.33	182		

Table 4 *continued*

Law Schools Ranked by Mean of LSAT, Employment, and Citations Rankings

School	LSAT rank	Employ rank	Cites rank	Mean rank	New rank	USN rank	Difference USN - New
John Marshall-Atlanta	168.5	169	190	175.83	183		
Arizona Summit	191	152	187	176.67	184		
Ave Maria	183.5	184	164	177.17	185		
Elon	158.5	186	194	179.5	186		
Florida A&M	183.5	172	193	182.83	187.5		
Thomas Jefferson	183.5	188	177	182.83	187.5		
District of Columbia	168.5	192	189	183.17	189		
Florida Coastal	191	187	176	184.67	190		
Charlotte	191	177	192	186.67	191.5		
Thomas M. Cooley	187	190	183	186.67	191.5		
Southern University	191	189	182	187.33	193		
North Carolina Central	187	194	186	189	194		

Table 5

Correlations between *U.S. News* Rank, New Rank, LSAT median, Employed at Nine Months, and Citations to Main Law Reviews

	USN rank	New rank	LSAT	Emp FTLT	Emp adjust	Cites rank
USN rank	1.00	.93	-.91	-.70	-.68	.79
New rank	.93	1.00	-.89	-.77	-.74	.86
LSAT	-.91	-.89	1.00	.68	.65	-.79
Emp FTLT	-.70	-.77	.68	1.00	.96	-.48
Emp adjust	-.68	-.74	. 65	.96	1.00	-.45
Cites rank	. 79	. 86	-.79	-.48	-.45	1.00

N = 147 (47 rows not used due to missing values)

Table 6

Schools with Largest Improvement in the New Rankings (twenty or more places)

William Mitchell	48.5
South Carolina	41
Hofstra	36
South Texas	34.5
Albany	36
Nevada	32.5
SUNY-Buffalo	27
Brooklyn	24
Mississippi	23
Washburn	23
Memphis	22
Lewis & Clark	21

Table 7

Schools with the Largest Decline in the New Rankings (twenty or more places)

Penn State	-43.5
CUNY	-43.5
Arkansas-Little Rock	-36
Quinnipiac	-36
West Virginia	-34.5
Tulsa	-29
Indiana-Indianapolis	-28
Wayne State	-28
Loyola-Chicago	-26
Hawaii	-28.5
Hamline	-28
Seattle	-23.5
Connecticut	-23.5
Arkansas-Fayetteville	-23
Missouri-Kansas City	-23
Duquesne	-22.5
Baltimore	-22
Oklahoma	-21
Cleveland State	-20

Table 8

Schools with Greatest Improvement in Three-Variable Rankings Over Two-Variable Rankings (improvement in rank of fifteen or more places)

School	Rank 2 var	Rank 3 var	Difference
Connecticut	116.25	87.83	28.42
DePaul	131.25	103.83	27.42
Valparaiso	182	154.67	27.33
UC-Hastings	110	84	26
American	116.75	90.83	25.92
Hofstra	127.25	101.83	25.42
Michigan State	127.75	102.5	25.25
Suffolk	172.25	147.33	24.92
New York Law School	151.5	128	23.5
Cardozo	81.75	60.83	20.92
Akron	127	107.33	19.67
San Francisco	152.5	133.17	19.33
Missouri-Kansas City	139.25	121.83	17.42
Seattle	125.75	108.5	17.25
Catholic	130.75	114.67	16.08
Cincinnati	91.25	75.83	15.42

Difference between ranks based on two variables (LSAT median and employment) and ranks based on three variables (LSAT median, employment, and citations).

Table 9

Schools with Largest Decline in Three-Variable Rankings
Over Two-Variable Rankings (decline in rank 15 or more places)

School	Rank 2 var	Rank 3 var	Difference
New Hampshire	58.75	95.5	-36.75
Florida International	86.75	119.17	-32.42
Montana	74.75	106.83	-32.08
Baylor	38.75	67.17	-28.42
New Mexico	68.25	93.83	-25.58
Hawaii	99.5	124.67	-25.17
Oklahoma	66.25	89.5	-23.25
Oklahoma City	108.25	129.83	-21.58
Kentucky	52.25	72.5	-20.25
Drexel	119.25	138.83	-19.58
Wyoming	96.5	116	-19.5
Faulkner	137.25	155.17	-17.92
CUNY	127.75	145.17	-17.42
Georgia State	64	81	-17
Regent	111	127.67	-16.67
Gonzaga	87.25	103.83	-16.58
Arkansas-Fayetteville	76.75	93.17	-16.42
Stetson	92.75	108.83	-16.08
Southern Illinois	91.75	107.17	-15.42

Table 10

Schools with Largest Percentages of School-Funded and Solo Practitioners, Class of 2013

School	Emp FTLT	Modified Emp	Effect of correction
Emory	84.2	62.3	21.9
William & Mary	76.5	55.8	20.7
Virginia	95.6	79.7	15.9
GWU	77.8	62.9	14.9
Texas Southern	47.8	33.3	14.5
Lewis & Clark	57.6	45.2	12.4
Georgetown	83.7	72.4	11.3
Faulkner	59.4	48.5	10.9
Oklahoma City	66.5	55.9	10.6
St. Mary's	61.9	51.7	10.1
UCLA	75.9	66.3	9.6
Cornell	89.6	80.3	9.3
Charlotte	36.9	27.7	9.1
Illinois	72.7	63.6	9.1
Vanderbilt	86.4	77.7	8.7
American	45.6	36.9	8.7
Berkeley	86.7	78.1	8.6
Liberty	35.5	26.9	8.6
New York	94	85.8	8.2
Appalachian	50	42	8

Emp FLTL = percentage of class of 2013 employed in full-time, long-term JD-required jobs.

Modified Emp = percentage of class of 2013 employed in full-time, long-term JD-required jobs (excluding those in school-funded positions and solo practitioners).

This Table lists schools with a difference of 8% or more between the two measures of employment.

Table 11

Schools Ranked According to LSAT, Modified Employment, and Citations, Compared to Rank on LSAT, Employment, and Citations

Difference between ranks based on three variables (LSAT median, employment, and citations), where qualifying employment is (A) all full-time, long-term employment or (B) full-time long-term employment that is not school-funded or solo practice. Schools are listed in order of rank according to criterion B.

School	*A*	*B*	*Difference*
Columbia	1	1	0
Harvard	2	2	0
Stanford	3	3	0
Yale	4	4	0
Pennsylvania	6	5	1
NYU	7	6	1
Michigan	8.5	7	1.5
Virginia	5	8	-3
Chicago	10.5	9	1.5
Duke	13	10	3
UC-Berkeley	10.5	11	-0.5
Georgetown	8.5	12	-3.5
Northwestern	14	13	1
Cornell	12	14	-2
Texas	17	15	2
Vanderbilt	15	16	-1
UCLA	16	17	-1
Notre Dame	22	18	4
Minnesota	21	19	2
Iowa	23	20	3
Fordham	29.5	21	8.5
Washington Univ.	26	22	4
North Carolina	29.5	23	6.5
Alabama	27.5	24	3.5
George Washington	20	25	-5
Boston College	33.5	26	7.5
Boston University	24	27	-3
Emory	18	28	-10
UC-Davis	25	29	-4
Washington-Seattle	32	30	2
Georgia	37	31	6
SMU	36	32	4

Table 11 *continued*

**Schools Ranked According to LSAT, Modified Employment, and
Citations, Compared to Rank on LSAT, Employment, and Citations**

School	A	B	Difference
Indiana-Bloomington	33.5	33	0.5
USC	31	34	-3
Colorado	35	35	0
Illinois	27.5	36	-8.5
Florida	38	37	1
William & Mary	19	38	-19
BYU	40	39	1
Florida State	39	40	-1
Houston	41	41	0
Washington & Lee	43.5	42	1.5
Wisconsin	42	43	-1
Wake Forest	45	44	1
Arizona	47	45	2
Cardozo	48	46	2
Arizona State	46	47.5	-1.5
Ohio State	43.5	47.5	-4
Utah	49	49	0
Seton Hall	50	50	0
Nevada	52	51	1
Richmond	53	52	1
South Carolina	55	53	2
Tulane	57.5	54	3.5
Baylor	51	55	-4
Temple	60.5	56	4.5
Brooklyn	60.5	57	3.5
Kentucky	56	58	-2
Nebraska	64	59	5
Missouri-Columbia	59	60	-1
Cincinnati	62	61.5	0.5
Miami	67.5	61.5	6
Pepperdine	65	63	2
Case Western	70.5	64	6.5
George Mason	63	65	-2
Rutgers-Camden	74.5	66	8.5
LSU	67.5	67	0.5
SUNY-Buffalo	74.5	68	6.5
Chicago-Kent	69	69	0
Kansas	66	70	-4
Georgia State	72	71	1
Denver	73	72	1

Table 11 *continued*

Schools Ranked According to LSAT, Modified Employment, and Citations, Compared to Rank on LSAT, Employment, and Citations

School	A	B	Difference
Tennessee	57.5	73	-15.5
Maryland	70.5	74	-3.5
Loyola-Los Angeles	77.5	75	2.5
UC-Hastings	76	76	0
Lewis & Clark	54	77	-23
San Diego	77.5	78	-0.5
Connecticut	79	79	0
Oklahoma	80	80	0
Albany	83	81	2
Arkansas-Fayetteville	85	82	3
New Mexico	87	83	4
St. John's	94	84	10
Louisville	84	85	-1
Villanova	91.5	86	5.5
William Mitchell	88.5	87	1.5
New Hampshire	88.5	88	0.5
Mississippi	82	89	-7
Northeastern	91.5	90	1.5
Rutgers-Newark	90	91	-1
Washburn	93	92	1
American	81	93	-12
Mercer	99	94	5
Loyola-Chicago	95.5	95.5	0
Penn State	95.5	95.5	0
St. Louis	86	97	-11
Pittsburgh	97	98	-1
Michigan State	103	99	4
Oregon	98	100	-2
Hofstra	101	101	0
DePaul	105.5	102	3.5
Marquette	100	103.5	-3.5
Texas Tech	102	103.5	-1.5
Montana	109	105	4
Gonzaga	105.5	106.5	-1
Stetson	114.5	106.5	8
Tulsa	104	108	-4
Santa Clara	108	109	-1
Syracuse	116	110	6
Southern Illinois	110	111	-1
West Virginia	119	112	7

Table 11 *continued*

Schools Ranked According to LSAT, Modified Employment, and Citations, Compared to Rank on LSAT, Employment, and Citations

School	A	B	Difference
Seattle	113	113	0
Drake	107	114	-7
Akron	111	115	-4
South Texas	112	116	-4
Memphis	120	117	3
Catholic	121	118	3
Wayne State	117.5	119	-1.5
Indiana-Indianapolis	117.5	120	-2.5
Wyoming	123	121	2
Vermont	126	122	4
Ohio Northern	114.5	123	-8.5
Creighton	127	124	3
Missouri-Kansas City	128	125	3
Hawaii	130	126	4
Toledo	131	127	4
Idaho	122	128	-6
Willamette	124	129	-5
New York Law School	134	130	4
Florida International	125	131	-6
North Dakota	144	132	12
Regent	133	133	0
Howard	139	134	5
Chapman	132	135	-3
St. Thomas-Minnesota	135	136	-1
Maine	138	137.5	0.5
South Dakota	145	137.5	7.5
McGeorge	141	139	2
Cleveland State	136	140	-4
San Francisco	141	141	0
Samford	148	142	6
Campbell	141	143.5	-2.5
Duquesne	147	143.5	3.5
John Marshall-Chicago	146	145	1
Nova Southeastern	151	146	5
Loyola-New Orleans	150	147.5	2.5
St. Mary's	129	147.5	-18.5
Drexel	149	149	0
Quinnipiac	155	150	5
Pace	152.5	151	1.5
Dayton	143	152	-9

Table 11 *continued*

Schools Ranked According to LSAT, Modified Employment, and Citations, Compared to Rank on LSAT, Employment, and Citations

School	A	B	Difference
CUNY	157	153	4
Southwestern	154	154	0
Hamline	152.5	155	-2.5
Oklahoma City	137	156	-19
Suffolk	160.5	157	3.5
Baltimore	159	158.5	0.5
Charleston	158	158.5	-0.5
Touro	162	160	2
Mississippi College	156	161	-5
Arkansas-Little Rock	160.5	162	-1.5
Northern Illinois	163	163	0
Northern Kentucky	165	164	1
New England	164	165	-1
Widener	171	166	5
Valparaiso	166	167	-1
Texas A&M	167.5	168	-0.5
Capital	169	169	0
California Western	170	170	0
Roger Williams	174	171	3
Detroit Mercy	173	172	1
St. Thomas-Florida	172	173	-1
Western New England	175	174	1
Faulkner	167.5	175	-7.5
Golden Gate	177	176	1
Whittier	179.5	177	2.5
Appalachian	176	178	-2
Western State	181	179	2
Liberty	178	180	-2
Barry	182	181	1
Ave Maria	185	182.5	2.5
Elon	186	182.5	3.5
John Marshall-Atlanta	183	184	-1
Arizona Summit	184	185	-1
Texas Southern	179.5	186	-6.5
Thomas Jefferson	187.5	187	0.5
Florida A&M	187.5	188	-0.5
District of Columbia	189	189	0
Florida Coastal	190	190	0

Table 11 *continued*

Schools Ranked According to LSAT, Modified Employment, and Citations, Compared to Rank on LSAT, Employment, and Citations

School	A	B	Difference
Thomas M. Cooley	191.5	191	0.5
Southern University	193	192	1
North Carolina Central	194	193	1
Charlotte	191.5	194	-2.5