

11-2019

## The 2019 Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools

Christopher J. Ryan Jr.

Brian L. Frye

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.belmont.edu/lawreview>



Part of the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ryan, Christopher J. Jr. and Frye, Brian L. (2019) "The 2019 Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools," *Belmont Law Review*: Vol. 7 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://repository.belmont.edu/lawreview/vol7/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Law at Belmont Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Belmont Law Review by an authorized editor of Belmont Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [repository@belmont.edu](mailto:repository@belmont.edu).

# THE 2019 REVEALED-PREFERENCES RANKING OF LAW SCHOOLS

CHRISTOPHER J. RYAN, JR. & BRIAN L. FRYE\*

INTRODUCTION.....	87
I. RANKING LAW SCHOOLS .....	90
II. AN OBJECTIVE LAW SCHOOL RANKING .....	93
III. RANKINGS DATA.....	94
IV. RANKINGS OBSERVATIONS.....	95
CONCLUSION .....	96
APPENDIX.....	98

*In 2017, we published A Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools, which presented the first (intentionally) objective ranking of law schools. Other law school rankings are subjective because their purpose is to tell prospective law students where to matriculate. Our “revealed-preferences” ranking is objective because its purpose is to ask where prospective law students actually choose to matriculate. In other words, subjective rankings tell students what they should want, but our objective ranking reveals what students actually want. These rankings were originally based on an average of the previous five years of LSAT and GPA quartile and median averages for law schools. We updated these rankings with a 2018 ranking that focused exclusively on the 75th, median, and 25th quartiles of each of these measures for the matriculating class in Fall 2017. We have modified our rankings yet again in 2019. The methodology for our latest Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools considers not only a law*

---

\* Christopher J. Ryan, Jr., Associate Professor of Law, Roger Williams University School of Law; Affiliated Scholar, American Bar Foundation. Ph.D., Vanderbilt University; J.D., University of Kentucky; M.Ed., University of Notre Dame; A.B. Dartmouth College. Brian L. Frye, Spears-Gilbert Associate Professor of Law, University of Kentucky College of Law. J.D., New York University School of Law; M.F.A., San Francisco Art Institute; B.A., University of California, Berkeley. Thanks to Nicole Pottinger for research assistance and to Jerome M. Organ (University of St. Thomas) and D. Gordon Smith (Brigham Young University) for their helpful comments to earlier drafts of this article.

*school's success at enrolling law students with the best entering credentials but also its ability to retain those students.*

*We present our latest rankings, The 2019 Revealed-Preferences Rankings of Law Schools, as an objective measure of the law schools that are most successful at recruiting the best first-year students and then losing the fewest students to the transfer market. Our present rankings cannot be directly compared to our previous rankings because we have changed the methodology each year with which we have produced these rankings. We believe the new methodology reflects the optimal objective ranking of law schools, given the available data on student preferences. Nevertheless, for the convenience of readers, we have included our prior-year revealed-preferences ranking, as well as other subjective ranking systems, in the rankings tables below. Finally, we once again provide regional rankings of law schools based on our 2019 Revealed-Preferences Ranking methodology.*

## INTRODUCTION

In 2017, we published *A Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools*, which presented the first (intentionally) objective ranking of law schools.<sup>1</sup> Other law school rankings are subjective because their purpose is to tell prospective law students where to matriculate. Our “revealed-preferences” ranking is objective because its purpose is to ask where prospective law students actually choose to matriculate. In other words, subjective rankings tell students what they should want, but our objective ranking asks what students actually want.

The theory underlying our revealed-preferences ranking of law schools is simple: consumer choice. We observe that law schools—whether operating under different models, at different scales, and at different price points—all compete for the “best” students, but students choose where to matriculate. We assume that the “best” law school is the one a student actually chooses to attend. And we rank law schools on the basis of how successfully they compete for the “best” students, as well as their capacity to retain the best students, some of whom may choose to leave the law school after their first year of study on the secondary—or transfer—market.

Because legal education is a hyper-competitive market, law schools largely compete for the same students. For better or worse, law school admission depends almost entirely on an applicant's LSAT score and undergraduate grade point average. As such, law schools compete to matriculate students with the highest possible combined scores, in part because the *U.S. News & World Report* methodology privileges not only peer

---

1. Christopher J. Ryan, Jr. & Brian L. Frye, *A Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools*, 69 ALA. L. REV. 495 (2017). Our ranking methodology was originally designed to measure where the best students enroll as objectively as possible, in response to the many other rankings of law school. Other ranking systems arguably include more subjective elements within their rankings methodology, but perhaps this is intentional.

review score but also high entrance credentials of incoming law school classes.<sup>2</sup> Prospective law students typically have the option to matriculate at multiple schools. When students choose to matriculate at a particular school, they express a subjective preference for that school over their other options. After completing their first year of law school, students may choose to transfer to a different law school, if they consider it preferable to the school at which they initially matriculated. Accordingly, the scores of the students in a school's incoming class and the extent to which those students transfer out of the law school reflect that school's appeal to the preferences of prospective and current students more reliably than any other measure of student preference.

In *A Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools*, we presented a law school ranking based exclusively on the combined scores of the students in a school's 2011–2016 incoming classes. The article was well-received. It was SSRN's most-downloaded legal education article of 2017, with more than 8,800 downloads to date, and it was discussed by many prominent commentators.<sup>3</sup> We followed that article with a ranking that was more responsive to the changes in a law school's year-to-year matriculant pool by

---

2. In fact, forty percent of a law school's score in the *U.S. News & World Report* ranking of law schools is attributable to peer reputation and one quarter of a law school's score is attributable to a law school's selectivity, including median LSAT/GRE score (12.5 percent of the overall score), median undergraduate GPA (10 percent of the overall score) and acceptance rate (2.5 percent of the overall score). See Robert Morse, Kenneth Hines & Elizabeth Martin, *Methodology: 2020 Best Law School Rankings*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP. (Mar. 28, 2019, 2:04 PM), <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/articles/law-schools-methodology> [<https://perma.cc/58BM-8TT2>].

3. See, e.g., *Alternative Law School Ranking System*, BARCO 3.0: LAW LIBR. REFERENCE (Mar. 20, 2017) <http://barcorefblog.blogspot.com/2017/03/alternative-law-school-ranking-system.html> [<https://perma.cc/7GXB-RTFS>]; David Bernstein, *This Law School Ranking System Is Much Better Than U.S. News*, WASH. POST (Mar. 15, 2017), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/03/15/this-law-school-ranking-system-is-much-better-than-u-s-news/> [<https://perma.cc/8EAQ-9TM2>]; Paul Caron, *Law School Rankings by Student Quality (LSAT and UGPA)*, TAXPROF BLOG (July 25, 2017), [http://taxprof.typepad.com/taxprof\\_blog/2017/07/law-school-rankings-by-student-quality-lsat-and-ugpa.html](http://taxprof.typepad.com/taxprof_blog/2017/07/law-school-rankings-by-student-quality-lsat-and-ugpa.html) [<https://perma.cc/2ASA-BKTF>]; Joe Hodnicki & Mark Giangrande, *Ranking Law Schools by LSAT Scores: The Best and the Worst*, LAW LIBR. BLOG (Mar. 27, 2017), <https://llb2.com/2017/03/27/ranking-law-schools-by-lsat-scores-the-best-and-the-worst/> [<https://perma.cc/PK3B-U7FA>]; David Lat, *An Interesting New Set of Law School Rankings*, ABOVE THE LAW (Mar. 27, 2017, 6:15 PM), <https://abovethelaw.com/2017/03/an-interesting-new-set-of-law-school-rankings/> [<https://perma.cc/2586-UYX2>]; *Law School Rankings*, JANSEN TAX (Mar. 29, 2017), <http://jansentax.com/law-school-rankings/> [<https://perma.cc/82JC-7L5U>]; Kathryn Rubino, *What Are the Most Underrated Law Schools?*, ABOVE THE LAW (Dec. 8, 2017, 1:05 PM), <https://abovethelaw.com/2017/12/what-are-the-most-underrated-law-schools/> [<https://perma.cc/8FGB-D77F>]; *Should Law Schools Be Ranked Based on Student Preferences?: Article Weighs In*, SCHOLASTICA (Apr. 7, 2017), <https://blog.scholasticahq.com/post/should-law-schools-be-ranked-based-on-student-preferences/> [<https://perma.cc/8YMR-4UGM>]; William Vogeler, *Non-Traditional Law School Ranking -- By Student Quality*, FINDLAW (Aug. 1, 2017, 2:00 PM), [http://blogs.findlaw.com/greedy\\_associates/2017/08/non-traditional-law-school-ranking---by-student-quality.html](http://blogs.findlaw.com/greedy_associates/2017/08/non-traditional-law-school-ranking---by-student-quality.html) [<https://perma.cc/ZYF9-77WK>].

focusing the 2018 Revealed-Preferences Ranking only on the six measures of LSAT and undergraduate GPA for the cohort of students who entered law school in Fall 2017. This ranking was also popular, garnering over 2,900 downloads and generating considerable discussion in the media.<sup>4</sup> While the methodologies we employed in the 2017 and 2018 Revealed-Preferences Rankings were different, both used a composite score for law schools on the basis of 75th, median, and 25th quartiles of LSAT and undergraduate GPA for a law school's entering class (or entering classes in the case of the 2017 ranking).

While the 2017 ranking was a more stable measure of a law school's success at matriculating the best students over time, the 2018 ranking was intentionally designed to provide a snapshot of a law school's entering class. Despite the popular interest in our 2017 and 2018 rankings, we felt that looking exclusively at the credentials of a law school's matriculating students did not provide a complete picture of a law school's ability to both attract and retain the best students. Accordingly, we made two important changes to our 2019 ranking methodology. The 2019 Revealed-Preferences Ranking uses the 75th, median, and 25th quartiles of LSAT and undergraduate GPA for a law school's Fall 2018 matriculating class, but instead of weighting each of these measures by one-sixth of a law school's composite score, we statistically standardized each of these measures by assigning the mean of each measure a value of zero and expressing each law school's distance from the mean in terms of standard deviations. The value of the variable for each law school was then weighted by 15 percent, for a total of 90 percent of a law school's score coming from the standardized values of measures of student quality. In addition, we standardized the number of students who transferred from their law school and assigned this variable a weight of 10 percent of a law school's score, attributable to the law school's success, or failure, at retaining first-year students who had chosen to attend that law school in the previous year.<sup>5</sup> In this article, we present the 2019 Revealed-Preferences

---

4. See, e.g., David Bernstein, *The Most Useful Law School Rankings for Prospective Law Students: The 2018 Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools*, INSTAPUNDIT.COM (Apr. 5, 2018, 10:30 AM), <https://pjmedia.com/instapundit/293282/> [<https://perma.cc/3G3Y-R5DT>]; Paul Caron, *Law School Rankings by Student Quality (LSAT and UGPA)*, TAXPROF BLOG (Apr. 2, 2018), [https://taxprof.typepad.com/taxprof\\_blog/2018/04/law-school-rankings-by-student-quality-lsat-and-ugpa.html](https://taxprof.typepad.com/taxprof_blog/2018/04/law-school-rankings-by-student-quality-lsat-and-ugpa.html) [<https://perma.cc/PH43-YB6Z>]; Joe Hodnicki, *The 2018 Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools*, LAW LIBR. BLOG (Apr. 3, 2018), <https://lib2.com/2018/04/03/the-2018-revealed-preferences-ranking-of-law-schools/> [<https://perma.cc/SA4D-G9K3>]; *Pepperdine Law Rankings*, PEPP. L. (2018), <https://law.pepperdine.edu/about/at-a-glance/rankings/> [<https://perma.cc/3PPA-XAG8>].

5. This methodology differs from an earlier working draft of this article in which we assigned statistically standardized measures of students transferring out of and into a law school a weight of 5 percent apiece. We were dissuaded from employing a methodology that includes transfers into a law school in our final iteration of the rankings by comments from our colleague, Jerry Organ, whom we thank for his thoughtful considerations about our ranking. Ultimately, we removed data regarding students transferring into a law school from our methodology because: (1) measures of student quality among students who transfer into a

Ranking of law schools, based on the combined scores of the students in a school's Fall 2018 incoming class as well as the rate of transfers from the law school among those students who entered in Fall 2017. We also compare this ranking to our previous rankings, as well as other ranking systems, and provide regional rankings.

## I. RANKING LAW SCHOOLS

Most law school ranking systems are subjective because they try to tell prospective law students which law school will provide the highest quality legal education. An objective ranking system identifies factors correlated with quality and ranks law schools on the basis of those factors. Ideally, objective ranking systems help prospective law students evaluate the relative quality of different law schools by focusing on the decisions of students making choices among law schools. But at the very least, an objective ranking helps identify the actual choices made by actual students.

The prevailing law school ranking system is the *U.S. News & World Report* Best Law Schools ranking, which is consulted—if not necessarily trusted—by most prospective law students and particularly prospective law students with elite entrance credentials.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings are courted—if not necessarily respected—by virtually every accredited law school. The *U.S. News* ranking is the *de facto* benchmark for a law school's performance, with the attendant consequences. When a school's *U.S. News* ranking rises, there's a chicken in every pot, but when it falls, the pickings can be slim, for law students as well as professors.<sup>7</sup> In fact, scholars have regarded the *U.S. News* rankings as a sort of inescapable “echo chamber,” carrying negative consequences for most law schools.<sup>8</sup>

The *U.S. News* ranking is based on a congeries of factors, including quality assessments, student selectivity, placement success, and faculty

---

law school were not widely available; and (2) the reality that not all law schools compete in the transfer market unfairly biased the results in favor of robust players in the transfer market. However, we have retained in our methodology a statistically standardized measure of students transferring out of a law school, and assigned this variable with a weight of 10 percent, as a means of incorporating consumer choice on the transfer market into the methodology.

6. See Christopher J. Ryan, Jr., *Analyzing Law School Choice*, 2020 ILL. L. REV. (forthcoming 2020).

7. See, e.g., Stacy Zaretsky, *Yet Another Troubled Law School to Close Its Doors*, ABOVE THE LAW (Oct. 31, 2018, 10:44 AM), <https://abovethelaw.com/2018/10/yet-another-troubled-law-school-to-close-its-doors/> [<https://perma.cc/PD6F-F87H>].

8. See Christopher J. Ryan, Jr., *A Value-Added Ranking of Law Schools*, 30 U. FLA. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y (forthcoming 2019) (citing Brian Leiter, *How to Rank Law Schools*, 81 IND. L.J. 47, 50–51 (2006)) (describing, empirically, the time-invariance of peer rankings in the *U.S. News* methodology and suggesting a faculty performance ranking of law schools as an alternative to the *U.S. News* rankings).

resources.<sup>9</sup> Some commentators have praised the *U.S. News* ranking for providing useful information to prospective law students.<sup>10</sup> Others have argued that the *U.S. News* ranking is useful, but could be improved.<sup>11</sup> But many commentators have criticized the *U.S. News* ranking methodology, on many different grounds. Some argue that the *U.S. News* ranking is inaccurate because its methodology is based on irrelevant or meaningless factors.<sup>12</sup> Others argue that the *U.S. News* ranking is pernicious because it encourages inefficient, unjust, or unethical behavior.<sup>13</sup>

However, there are many other law school rankings, using many different methodologies. Several rankings focus on the characteristics of a law school. The Black & Caron ranking is based on SSRN postings and downloads.<sup>14</sup> The Legal Services Innovation Index ranking is based on the

---

9. See Morse et al., *supra* note 2.

10. Mitchell Berger, *Why the U.S. News & World Report Law School Rankings Are Both Useful and Important*, 51 J. LEGAL EDUC. 487, 496–500 (2001) (arguing that law school rankings not only provide a “useful and convenient” source of information for applicants, but also help make law schools accountable by providing an objective measurement of their performance); Russell Korobkin, *In Praise of Law School Rankings: Solutions to Coordination and Collective Action Problems*, 77 TEX. L. REV. 403, 405 (1998).

11. Theodore P. Seto, *Understanding the U.S. News Law School Rankings*, 60 SMU L. REV. 493 (2007) (“The Article’s goals are relatively modest: to help prospective students, employers, and other law school stakeholders read the U.S. News rankings more critically and to help law school administrators get a better handle on how to manage their schools’ rankings. In addition, the Article suggests ways in which U.S. News methodology might be improved.”).

12. See, e.g., Ronald A. Cass, *So, Why Do You Want to Be a Lawyer? What the ABA, the AALS, and U.S. News Don’t Know That We Do*, 31 U. TOL. L. REV. 573, 574 (2000) (“The *U.S. News* rankings look at criteria that cannot possibly capture critical aspects of legal education. They do not measure, or even encompass a good proxy for, among other things, the quality of teaching, the scholarly product of a faculty, the mode of instruction, the nature, scope, and organization of the curriculum.”); David A. Thomas, *The Law School Rankings Are Harmful Deceptions: A Response to Those Who Praise the Rankings and Suggestions for a Better Approach to Evaluating Law Schools*, 40 HOUS. L. REV. 419 (2003); David C. Yamada, *Same Old, Same Old: Law School Rankings and the Affirmation of Hierarchy*, 31 SUFFOLK U. L. REV. 249, 254 (1997); Brian Leiter, *An Open Letter to Other Law Bloggers Regarding the U.S. News.com Rankings*, BRIAN LEITER’S L. SCH. REP. (Mar. 13, 2018), <http://leiterlawschool.typepad.com/leiter/2018/03/an-open-letter.html> [<https://perma.cc/XLL7-G64H>]; see also Patrick T. O’Day & George D. Kuh, Comment, *Assessing What Matters in Law School: The Law School Survey of Student Engagement*, 81 IND. L.J. 401 (2006); Richard H. Sander, *A Systematic Analysis of Affirmative Action in American Law Schools*, 57 STAN. L. REV. 367 (2004).

13. See, e.g., Lucille A. Jewel, *Bourdieu and the American Legal Education: How Law Schools Reproduce Social Stratification and Class Hierarchy*, 56 BUFF. L. REV. 1155 (2008); Brent E. Newton, *The Ninety-Five Theses: Systematic Reforms of American Legal Education and Licensure*, 64 S.C. L. REV. 55 (2012) (“The *U.S. News & World Report* ranking system is fundamentally flawed, and its influence on legal education has been malignant.”); Michael Sauder & Wendy Espeland, *Fear of Falling: The Effects of U.S. News & World Report Rankings on U.S. Law Schools*, LAW SCHOOL ADMISSION COUNCIL GRANTS REPORT 07-02 (2007), <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.296.3151&rep=rep1&type=pdf> [<https://perma.cc/9EKX-2SFJ>].

14. Bernard S. Black & Paul L. Caron, *Ranking Law Schools: Using SSRN to Measure Scholarly Performance*, 81 IND. L.J. 83 (2006).

adoption of courses with instruction in “legal-service delivery disciplines.”<sup>15</sup> Many rankings combine characteristics of the law school, its students, and their outcomes. The *Above the Law* ranking (the “ATL ranking”) is based on employment outcomes, cost, clerkships, and quality assessments.<sup>16</sup> The Brophy ranking is based on LSAT scores, employment outcomes, and law review citations.<sup>17</sup> The *Vault* ranking is based on acceptance rate, student selectivity, quality of life, and employment outcomes.<sup>18</sup> The Gladwell ranking is based on student-faculty ratio, LSAT scores, faculty publishing, and price.<sup>19</sup> The Cooley ranking is based on student selectivity, faculty-student ratio, bar passage, class size, price, and minority enrollment, among other things, prominently including library size and availability.<sup>20</sup> The Leiter rankings are based on faculty quality, student quality, and job placement, among other things.<sup>21</sup> The Ryan rankings are based on educational value, as measured by a law school’s ability to improve a student’s likelihood of passing the bar and finding a job.<sup>22</sup> And the Posner ranking is based on an average of other rankings.<sup>23</sup>

All of these are “subjective” ranking systems because their ultimate purpose is to tell prospective law students which law school to attend. Each system tries to identify factors correlated with law school quality, value, or both, and uses those factors to rank law schools. Even the Leiter system based on “student quality” uses it as a proxy for school quality.

The problem with subjective ranking systems is that they do not necessarily consider or accurately evaluate all of the factors that are salient to prospective law students.<sup>24</sup> Subjective rankings try to tell students which law school will give them the “best” legal education by identifying factors

---

15. *Law School Innovation Index*, LEGAL SERVS. INNOVATION INDEX, (Nov. 2, 2017), <https://www.legaltechinnovation.com/law-school-index/> [https://perma.cc/K87Q-Y6XJ].

16. *Top Law Schools 2019*, ABOVE THE LAW, <https://abovethelaw.com/law-school-rankings/top-law-schools/> (last visited Aug. 11, 2019) [https://perma.cc/KJT5-WHWD].

17. Alfred L. Brophy, *Ranking Law Schools with LSATs, Employment Outcomes, and Law Review Citations*, 91 IND. L.J. SUPP. 55 (2015).

18. *2017 Best Law Schools*, VAULT, <http://www.vault.com/school-rankings/best-law-schools> (last visited Aug. 11, 2019) [https://perma.cc/Y28G-TJKN].

19. Malcolm Gladwell, *The Order of Things*, NEW YORKER (Feb. 6, 2011), <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/02/14/the-order-of-things> [https://perma.cc/Q3ZM-UJTM].

20. The Cooley ranking was widely derided as intentionally designed to optimize the performance of its creator, Thomas M. Cooley Law School. See, e.g., Elie Mystal, *Latest Cooley Law School Rankings Achieve New Heights of Intellectual Dishonesty*, ABOVE THE LAW (Feb. 8, 2011, 6:23 PM), <https://abovethelaw.com/2011/02/latest-cooley-law-school-rankings-achieve-new-heights-of-intellectual-dishonesty/> [https://perma.cc/PC5V-YB9X]. Unfortunately, the Cooley ranking is no longer available.

21. Brian Leiter, *Newest Rankings*, BRIAN LEITER’S L. SCH. RANKINGS, <http://www.leiterrankings.com/new/index.shtml> (last visited Aug. 11, 2019) [https://perma.cc/B2GL-6B48].

22. Ryan, *supra* note 6, at 7.

23. Richard A. Posner, *Law School Rankings*, 81 IND. L.J. 13 (2006).

24. See Ryan, *supra* note 6, at 33–34.



associated with quality. But “quality” is defined by the creator of the ranking system, not the prospective students it advises. If prospective students value different factors, or value factors differently, subjective rankings will provide inaccurate advice. In other words, subjective ranking systems tell prospective law students which law school they should prefer, but they cannot tell prospective law students which law school they actually prefer.

## II. AN OBJECTIVE LAW SCHOOL RANKING

Our revealed-preferences ranking system is the first objective ranking of law schools, because it asks what prospective law students and current law students actually want, rather than telling them what they should want. Of course, it is hard to know what students actually want, and different students probably want different things.<sup>25</sup> But we can observe the choices made by prospective law students and current law students. In particular, we can identify where they chose to matriculate. Or rather, we can evaluate a law school’s ability to enroll the most desirable students, and its ability to retain those students once they have enrolled.

Legal education is a competitive market. Prospective law students compete for admission to law school, and law schools compete to enroll the “best” students. Law schools admit students primarily on the basis of their combined UGPA and LSAT scores, and compete to enroll the students with the highest combined scores. But prospective law students typically get admission offers from multiple schools, and must choose one. Presumably, students choose to matriculate at the school that best satisfies their preferences, and if not, they could remedy that problem by transferring to another law school which they find more desirable.

Our objective ranking system tries to identify what prospective students want by ranking law schools based on their ability to enroll and retain the “best” students. Because all law schools compete to enroll students with the highest possible combined LSAT and undergraduate GPA scores, the combined scores of the students who choose to matriculate at a school taken together with the lowest number of students transferring out should reflect that school’s ability to appeal to the preferences of prospective students.<sup>26</sup> In other words, whatever students want in a law school is reflected in the choices they actually make via their enrollment.

Of course, our objective ranking system can only identify the choices that matriculating law students actually made. It cannot explain why they made those particular choices. Presumably, some students made good

---

25. *See id.* But see George J. Stigler & Gary S. Becker, *De Gustibus Non Est Disputandum*, 67 AM. ECON. REV. 76 (1977) (“Tastes neither change capriciously nor differ importantly between people. [Tastes] will be there next year, too, and are the same to all men.”).

26. While our premise is straightforward, the mechanics of students transferring from a law school may not be. We are anecdotally aware that some law schools deflate the median first-year GPA or interfere with students’ transfer materials to dampen the transfer market.

choices, and other students made bad ones. But all of those students made choices that reflected their preferences at the time they decided where to matriculate or whether to transfer. Accordingly, our objective ranking system shows how effectively law schools appealed to the preferences of prospective and current law students.

### III. RANKINGS DATA

Our ranking relies on the ABA Standard 509 Information Reports submitted by all ABA-accredited law schools.<sup>27</sup> Among other things, the Reports provide the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile UGPA and LSAT scores of matriculating students. We used the 2018 ABA Standard 509 Disclosure Reports to derive an index score for each reporting law school, using those six data points and giving each equal weight at 15 percent apiece, which we statistically standardized. We then added in a statistically standardized measure of transfers out of the same law schools, at 10 percent, totaling a performance index of 100 percent. That index score reflects a law school's ability to compete for and retain the most desirable matriculants. Again, the theory here is that transfers out of a law school negatively impact a law school's overall performance index on the premise that students choosing to leave a law school—which all law schools must countenance—impacts the overall desirability of a given law school. The higher the score, the stronger the students; the lower the score, the weaker the students. Or, viewed another way, the higher the score, the more effectively the school appeals to prospective law students; the lower the score, the less effectively the school appeals to prospective law students.

We then ranked all 200 ABA-accredited law schools by index score in decreasing order, creating the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking of law schools. In Table 1, we compare the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking to the 2018 rankings, in order to evaluate the year over year performance of each law school at appealing to prospective law students. We also compare the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking of each school to its 2020 *U.S. News* ranking (which was made available in 2019) and 2019 *ATL* ranking (which was made available in 2019), in order to evaluate how well those objective ranking systems predict the subjective preferences of actual students. Similarities suggest that the objective rankings are strongly predictive; differences suggest that the objective rankings are weakly predictive. And we compare the delta of the 2019 Revealed-Preferences Rankings to the delta of the 2020 *U.S. News* ranking in order to evaluate how salient the factors measured by the *U.S. News* ranking are to prospective law students.

Finally, we provide the 2019 Revealed-Preferences rankings by region, based on U.S. Census Bureau regions, to demonstrate regional ordering among law schools in the same geographic markets. In Table 2, we

---

27. While there were 204 ABA-accredited law schools in 2017, Charlotte Law School closed that year. As such, we only rank the 203 that remained open through December 2017.

provide the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking for the 45 law schools in the Northeast region. In Table 3, we provide the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking for the 43 law schools in the Midwest region. In Table 4, we provide the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking for the 73 law schools in the South region. And in Table 5, we provide the 2019 Revealed-Preferences ranking for the 37 law schools in the West region.

#### IV. RANKINGS OBSERVATIONS

The 2019 Revealed-Preferences Rankings of the top 14 law schools is broadly consistent with the 2020 *U.S. News & World Report* ranking in the sense that the top 14 law schools are the same but place differently. Nevertheless, the Revealed-Preferences Rankings diverge markedly from the *U.S. News* rankings within and outside the top law schools. For example, while the first two law schools are the same as the *U.S. News* ranking—Yale and Harvard, respectively—Columbia gains significant placement over Stanford and Chicago. NYU loses important placement by dropping out of the top 5 law schools, while Duke and Northwestern fall to the back of the top 10 law schools. That said, the nearly time-invariant T-14s of the *U.S. News* rankings remain largely the same. Just outside this group of top 14 law schools are Washington University and Texas, at 16 and 17, respectively. Meanwhile, Boston University, Fordham, BYU, and Boston College do quite well, at 20 through 23, moving within striking distance of the top 20 law schools. Minnesota drops out of the top 20, coming in at 24, while Notre Dame is bumped from the top 25, coming in at 28 in the Revealed-Preferences Rankings. While the University of Washington—and to a lesser extent, Wake Forest—make significant movements into the top 30 law schools in our rankings, Georgia drops out of the top 30 law schools in the Revealed-Preferences rankings.

In the next grouping, Indiana-Bloomington, William & Mary, and George Mason come a good deal closer to the top 30 law schools, at 32 through 34, respectively, while Wisconsin, Iowa, Washington & Lee, and Ohio State are on the outside of the top 35 law schools, looking in. Northeastern, Penn State – Dickinson, Loyola Marymount, and Richmond were among the schools who gained the most in our ranking from their *U.S. News* ranking, all cracking the top 50 law schools, while North Carolina and Arizona dropped the most spots while remaining in the top 50 law schools. Florida, George Washington, Utah, and Florida State all dropped out of the top 50 law schools, as measured by the *U.S. News* rankings. Regional universities, such as Wayne State, Georgia State, Case Western, Cincinnati, and Lewis & Clark significantly outperform in our ranking to fall well within the top 75 law schools, while Villanova, Connecticut, Seton Hall, Tulane, Missouri-Columbia, UNLV, and Tennessee all dropped significantly within the next tier of law schools. In fact, there was considerable within-tier movement among the next tier of schools, with San Diego and Texas A&M

cracking the top 75 law schools, and with Pepperdine, Denver, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Miami falling outside the top 75 law schools.

Drexel, Montana, and Texas Tech are among the law schools who increased their positions most dramatically in the top 75 to top 100 law school range, and Belmont gained the most among all law schools in this range, moving up 46 spots from its *U.S. News* ranking to its position at 92 in our ranking. Meanwhile, Maryland drops significantly to the bottom of the pack at 98, from 52 in the *U.S. News* rankings, while Rutgers fell to 94 in our ranking. However, several schools move out of this range, including Arkansas-Fayetteville, New Mexico, Louisiana State, Tulsa, West Virginia, Syracuse, Marquette, Catholic, and Brooklyn, which fell most precipitously, by as many as 51 spots. While Louisville, Buffalo, and Howard fell several places in the next set of law schools, Washburn, Akron, Liberty, and Pacific increased their position within this grouping of law schools, all well within the 100–125 range of law schools.

Among the next 25 law schools, Willamette and Mitchell/Hamline are the biggest winners, cracking the top 140. Meanwhile, Toledo, South Dakota, and Baltimore fall nearly outside the 150 ranking mark, while Campbell, Detroit-Mercy, St. Mary's, North Texas-Dallas, and Samford climb inside the top 150. American, Hofstra, Pace, Suffolk, Depaul, Northern Kentucky, Vermont, Southwestern, Golden Gate, North Dakota, and Widener-Harrisburg are among those schools that ranked outside the top 150 in our ranking but among the top 150 in the *U.S. News* rankings.

For the third year in a row, our Revealed-Preferences Ranking diverges from the *U.S. News* ranking system at statistically significant levels by identifying which law schools are best at matriculating and retaining the most desirable students. We also acknowledge that the increasing competition for law students at a regional level and the fact that many law students may make decisions about which law school to attend based on the location of the law school necessitates a comparison on the basis of region. Thus, we again adapt our revealed-preferences rankings to the four U.S. Census Bureau regions—Northeast, Midwest, South, and West—to provide a ranking of law schools within a geographic market. These rankings are included in the Appendix at Tables 2–5.

## CONCLUSION

Subjective ranking systems tell prospective law students where they should want to matriculate, but do not necessarily reflect the actual subjective preferences of matriculating law students. The Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools attempts to identify student preferences by asking what choices prospective students actually make when they matriculate or transfer. The difference between the predictions made by subjective ranking systems and the observations made by the objective Revealed-Preferences Ranking system suggest that other ranking systems do not incorporate all of

the factors that are salient to matriculating law students, causing the divergence between the other rankings and the Revealed-Preferences Ranking.

As such, the Revealed Preferences Ranking is the most objective ranking of law schools, because it most centers exclusively on consumer choice—specifically, where the best students choose to enroll, or leave after their first year—and not on other factors that are confounded with the objective factors our methodology considers<sup>28</sup> or nearly impossible to objectively measure, based on publicly-available data.<sup>29</sup> Law schools interested in improving their appeal to prospective law students should consider trying to identify, develop, and promote the factors our rankings measure, regarding consumer choice. And the creators of other ranking systems should consider trying to account for more of the factors that are actually salient to prospective law students.

---

28. Size is one such factor that is confounded with choice. Law schools have competing models and scales of operation, but all law schools still compete for the best students. Moreover, students still ultimately choose where to attend. While a shrinking enrollment may indeed be evidence of consumer choice away from the law school, basing a ranking on this factor alone would yield a ranking of law schools based on an entirely different premise than that for which our ranking was created.

29. Average net tuition is one example of a variable that is incredibly difficult, if not impossible, to measure objectively and calculate from the publicly-available data reported to the American Bar Association. Principally, the issue is that, while the differential tuition that in-state and out-of-state students pay at public law schools is reported in the ABA's Standard 509 Disclosure Reports, the proportion of students paying in-state and out-of-state tuition is not reported. Thus, any assignment of an average net tuition proxy for the more than 80 ABA-accredited public law schools would be subjective if not conjecture. As such, inclusion of average net tuition cannot be included in an objective ranking of law schools based on the data available.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1: The 2019 Revealed-Preferences (RP) Law School Rankings**

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2019 v.			2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
		2018 RP Rank	2018 RP Rank	U.S. News Rank		
1	YALE UNIVERSITY	1	0	1	10	-9
2	HARVARD UNIVERSITY	2	0	3	9	-7
3	COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	8	-5	5	11	-8
4	STANFORD UNIVERSITY	3	1	2	6	-2
5	CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	4	1	4	3	2
6	NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	5	1	6	16	-10
7	PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	6	1	7	7	0
8	MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	9	-1	9	8	0
9	DUKE UNIVERSITY	13	-4	10	2	7
10	NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	11	-1	10	4	6
11	VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	7	4	8	1	10
12	CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	10	2	10	14	-2
13	CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	14	-1	15	28	-15
14	CORNELL UNIVERSITY	12	2	13	5	9
15	GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	15	0	14	18	-3
16	WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	20	-4	18	15	1
17	TEXAS-AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	19	-2	16	28	-11
18	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	16	2	17	48	-30
18	VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	17	1	18	13	5
20	BOSTON UNIVERSITY	23	-3	23	27	-7
21	FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	36	-15	39	32	-11
22	BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	5	17	39	33	-11
23	BOSTON COLLEGE	33	-10	27	31	-8
24	MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	24	0	20	29	-5

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2019 v.				
		2018 RP Rank	2018 RP Rank	U.S. News Rank	2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
25	ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	21	4	25	46	-21
26	EMORY UNIVERSITY	22	4	26	34	-8
27	ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	28	-1	27	.	.
28	NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	25	3	21	20	8
29	WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	41	-12	31	.	.
30	WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	29	1	44	.	.
31	GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	32	-1	27	19	12
32	INDIANA UNIVERSITY - BLOOMINGTON	30	2	34	40	-8
33	WILLIAM & MARY, COLLEGE OF	26	7	39	24	9
34	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	34	0	45	.	.
35	WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	48	-13	34	37	-2
36	IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	43	-7	27	21	15
37	WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY	55	-18	34	22	15
38	OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	31	7	34	26	12
39	NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	40	-1	64	.	.
40	TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	59	-19	48	43	-3
41	PENN STATE UNIVERSITY - DICKINSON LAW	88	-47	71	38	3
42	CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	37	5	23	.	.
43	ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	47	-4	39	25	18
44	LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY	56	-12	62	.	.
45	RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	61	-16	52	.	.
46	NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	50	-4	34	17	29
47	COLORADO-BOULDER, UNIVERSITY OF	42	5	45	50	-3
48	ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	44	4	39	22	26
49	CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	38	11	31	.	.
50	BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	60	-10	48	.	.

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2019 v.		U.S. News Rank	2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
		2018 RP Rank	2018 RP Rank			
51	SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	39	12	52	49	2
52	YESHIVA UNIVERSITY	62	-10	52	.	.
53	FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	35	18	31	30	23
54	HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	52	2	59	39	15
55	GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	27	28	22	.	.
56	UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	49	7	47	.	.
57	FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	46	11	48	47	10
58	CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	75	-17	62	.	.
59	WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	76	-17	91	.	.
60	GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	70	-10	67	42	18
61	CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	66	-5	71	.	.
62	PENN STATE UNIVERSITY - COLLEGE PARK	65	-3	64	.	.
63	ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	58	5	77	.	.
64	VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	53	11	52	45	19
65	CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF	72	-7	52	.	.
66	CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	54	12	83	.	.
67	SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	91	-24	59	35	32
68	TULANE UNIVERSITY	71	-3	52	.	.
69	MISSOURI-COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF	79	-10	64	.	.
70	NEVADA-LAS VEGAS, UNIVERSITY OF	63	7	58	.	.
71	LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE	20	51	104	.	.
72	TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	64	8	59	.	.
73	KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	73	0	67	.	.
74	SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	67	7	86	.	.
75	TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	78	-3	83	.	.



2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2019 v.				
		2018 RP Rank	2018 RP Rank	U.S. News Rank	2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
76	PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	51	25	51	.	.
77	NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, UNIVERSITY OF	45	32	77	36	41
78	DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	85	-7	67	.	.
79	CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	102	-23	132	.	.
80	PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	94	-14	77	.	.
81	OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	57	24	71	44	37
82	NEW HAMPSHIRE, UNIVERSITY OF	86	-4	87	.	.
83	OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	83	0	83	.	.
84	ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY	98	-14	90	.	.
85	SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	110	-25	91	.	.
86	LOYOLA UNIVERSITY - CHICAGO	89	-3	77	.	.
87	FLORIDA INT'L SCHOOL OF LAW	69	18	91	.	.
88	KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	82	6	71	23	65
89	DREXEL UNIVERSITY	103	-14	100	.	.
90	MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	129	-39	115	.	.
91	MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	87	4	67	.	.
92	BELMONT UNIVERSITY	80	12	138	.	.
93	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	74	19	91	.	.
94	RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	104	-10	77	41	53
95	ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	108	-13	87	.	.
96	SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	131	-35	104	.	.
97	TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	100	-3	117	.	.
98	MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	68	30	52	.	.
99	HAWAII-MANOA, UNIVERSITY OF	142	-43	91	.	.
100	STETSON UNIVERSITY	112	-12	104	.	.
101	MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	105	-4	126	.	.

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2019 v.		U.S. News Rank	2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
		2018 RP Rank	2018 RP Rank			
102	REGENT UNIVERSITY	41	61	150	.	.
103	GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	126	-23	117	.	.
104	ARKANSAS-FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	77	27	91	.	.
105	MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	106	-1	108	.	.
106	NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	95	11	91	.	.
107	ALBANY LAW SCHOOL	123	-16	115	.	.
108	ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MN)	93	15	117	.	.
109	DRAKE UNIVERSITY	118	-9	122	.	.
110	CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	136	-26	108	.	.
111	MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	84	27	108	.	.
112	LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	96	16	100	.	.
113	TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	109	4	87	.	.
114	WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	120	-6	100	.	.
115	CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	134	-19	117	.	.
116	SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	116	0	91	.	.
117	WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	147	-30	132	.	.
118	MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	121	-3	91	.	.
119	LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	113	6	108	.	.
120	WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	149	-29	132	.	.
121	AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	148	-27	143	.	.
122	BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	97	25	71	.	.
123	LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	117	6	150	.	.
124	PACIFIC, UNIVERSITY OF THE	160	-36	146	.	.
125	INDIANA UNIVERSITY - INDIANAPOLIS	101	24	108	.	.
126	CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	115	11	126	.	.
127	STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO	81	46	104	.	.

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2018 RP Rank	2019 v.		2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
			2018 RP Rank	U.S. News Rank		
128	DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	92	36	122	.	.
129	SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	128	1	122	.	.
130	HOWARD UNIVERSITY	141	-11	108	.	.
131	QUINNIPIAC COLLEGE	114	17	126	.	.
132	WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	151	-19	146	.	.
133	CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	135	-2	150	.	.
134	DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	159	-25	150	.	.
135	MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	137	-2	138	.	.
136	MERCER UNIVERSITY	138	-2	138	.	.
137	MITCHELL-HAMLIN	157	-20	149	.	.
138	NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	125	13	117	.	.
139	IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	133	6	126	.	.
140	LOYOLA UNIVERSITY - NEW ORLEANS	173	-33	138	.	.
141	ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	171	-30	150	.	.
142	CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	127	15	108	.	.
143	OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	139	4	136	.	.
144	NORTH TEXAS-DALLAS, UNIVERSITY OF	68	76	150	.	.
145	SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	144	1	146	.	.
146	ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	132	14	143	.	.
147	TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	107	40	126	.	.
148	SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	130	18	150	.	.
149	BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	158	-9	126	.	.
150	SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	111	39	138	.	.
151	SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	143	8	143	.	.
152	ELON UNIVERSITY	166	-14	150	.	.
153	NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	152	1	150	.	.

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2018 RP Rank	2019 v.		2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
			2018 RP Rank	U.S. News Rank		
154	DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	154	0	150	.	.
155	HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	124	31	100	.	.
156	PACE UNIVERSITY	145	11	122	.	.
157	SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	146	11	149	.	.
158	AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	99	59	77	.	.
159	SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY - CARBONDALE	182	-23	150	.	.
160	CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	163	-3	150	.	.
161	NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL OF LAW	153	8	150	.	.
162	NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	164	-2	150	.	.
163	JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL - CHICAGO	177	-14	150	.	.
164	CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	162	2	150	.	.
165	SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW	176	-11	150	.	.
166	DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	140	26	132	.	.
167	VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	156	11	136	.	.
168	FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	189	-21	150	.	.
169	AVE MARIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW	168	1	150	.	.
170	MASSACHUSETTS-DARTMOUTH, UNIVERSITY OF	178	-8	150	.	.
171	WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	163	8	150	.	.
172	LA VERNE, UNIVERSITY OF	191	-19	150	.	.
173	WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	161	12	150	.	.
174	NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	167	7	150	.	.
175	LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY	183	-8	150	.	.
176	NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	150	26	149	.	.
177	FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	197	-20	150	.	.
178	CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY	196	-18	150	.	.

2019 RP Rank	Law School Name	2018 RP Rank	2019 v.		2019 ATL Rank	RP v. ATL Rank
			2018 RP Rank	U.S. News Rank		
179	ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FL)	185	-6	150	.	.
180	MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE OF LAW	170	10	150	.	.
181	ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	175	6	150	.	.
182	FLORIDA A&M SCHOOL OF LAW	186	-4	150	.	.
183	GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	184	-1	143	.	.
184	OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	169	15	150	.	.
185	JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL - ATLANTA	187	-2	150	.	.
186	WIDENER UNIVERSITY - HARRISBURG	180	6	149	.	.
187	NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	172	15	150	.	.
188	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF THE	194	-6	150	.	.
189	BARRY UNIVERSITY	190	-1	150	.	.
190	APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	201	-11	150	.	.
191	WIDENER UNIVERSITY - WILMINGTON	165	26	150	.	.
192	CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	193	-1	150	.	.
193	TOURO COLLEGE	188	5	150	.	.
194	PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	122	72	150	.	.
195	TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	195	0	150	.	.
196	THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	202	-6	150	.	.
197	SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER	200	-3	150	.	.
198	THOMAS M. COOLEY LAW SCHOOL	199	-1	150	.	.
199	INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	174	25	150	.	.
200	PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	179	21	150	.	.

**Table 2: 2019 Regional Rankings (Northeast Region)**

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
1	YALE UNIVERSITY	Connecticut
2	HARVARD UNIVERSITY	Massachusetts
3	COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	New York
4	NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	New York
5	PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF	Pennsylvania
6	CORNELL UNIVERSITY	New York
7	BOSTON UNIVERSITY	Massachusetts
8	FORDHAM UNIVERSITY	New York
9	NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	Massachusetts
10	BOSTON COLLEGE	Massachusetts
11	TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	Pennsylvania
12	PENN STATE UNIVERSITY - DICKINSON LAW	Pennsylvania
13	YESHIVA UNIVERSITY	New York
14	PENN STATE UNIVERSITY - COLLEGE PARK	Pennsylvania
15	ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY	New York
16	VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY	Pennsylvania
17	UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	Connecticut
18	SETON HALL UNIVERSITY	New Jersey
19	PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF	Pennsylvania
20	NEW HAMPSHIRE, UNIVERSITY OF	New Hampshire
21	DREXEL UNIVERSITY	Pennsylvania
22	RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	New Jersey
23	MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF	Maine
24	ALBANY LAW SCHOOL	New York
25	CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	New York
26	SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	New York
27	BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL	New York

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
28	STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO	New York
29	DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY	Pennsylvania
30	QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY	Connecticut
31	NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL	New York
32	SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY	Massachusetts
33	HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY	New York
34	PACE UNIVERSITY	New York
35	NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL OF LAW	Massachusetts
36	VERMONT LAW SCHOOL	Vermont
37	MASSACHUSETTS-DARMOOUTH, UNIVERSITY OF	Massachusetts
38	WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY	Massachusetts
39	ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY	Rhode Island
40	WIDENER UNIVERSITY - HARRISBURG	Pennsylvania
41	WIDENER UNIVERSITY - WILMINGTON	Delaware
42	TOURO COLLEGE	New York
43	PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF	Puerto Rico
44	INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	Puerto Rico
45	PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF P.R.	Puerto Rico

**Table 3: 2019 Regional Rankings (Midwest Region)**

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
1	CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF	Illinois
2	MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF	Michigan
3	NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	Illinois
4	WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	Missouri
5	MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	Minnesota

<b>2019 RP</b>		
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
6	NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF	Indiana
7	INDIANA UNIVERSITY - BLOOMINGTON	Indiana
8	WISCONSIN, UNIVERSITY OF	Wisconsin
9	IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF	Iowa
10	OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	Ohio
11	ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF	Illinois
12	WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	Michigan
13	CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY	Ohio
14	CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF	Ohio
15	MISSOURI-COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF	Missouri
16	KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF	Kansas
17	NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, UNIVERSITY OF	Nebraska
18	ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY	Missouri
19	LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-CHICAGO	Illinois
20	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	Michigan
21	ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	Illinois
22	MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF	Missouri
23	ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MN)	Minnesota
24	DRAKE UNIVERSITY	Iowa
25	CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	Nebraska
26	MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY	Wisconsin
27	WASHBURN UNIVERSITY	Kansas
28	AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF	Ohio
29	INDIANA UNIVERSITY-INDIANAPOLIS	Indiana
30	CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY	Ohio
31	DETROIT-MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF	Michigan
32	MITCHELL-HAMLIN	Minnesota
33	OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY	Ohio



<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
34	TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF	Ohio
35	SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	South Dakota
36	DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF	Ohio
37	SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY – CARBONDALE	Illinois
38	NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY	Illinois
39	JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL – CHICAGO	Illinois
40	CAPITAL UNIVERSITY	Ohio
41	DEPAUL UNIVERSITY	Illinois
42	NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF	North Dakota
43	THOMAS M. COOLEY LAW SCHOOL	Michigan

**Table 4: 2019 Regional Rankings (South Region)**

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
1	DUKE UNIVERSITY	North Carolina
2	VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF	Virginia
3	GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	Dist. of Columbia
4	TEXAS-AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF	Texas
5	VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	Tennessee
6	ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF	Alabama
7	EMORY UNIVERSITY	Georgia
8	WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY	North Carolina
9	GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF	Georgia
10	WILLIAM & MARY, COLLEGE OF	Virginia
11	GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY	Virginia
12	GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	Dist. of Columbia
13	WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY	Virginia

<b>2019 RP</b>		
<b>Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
14	RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF	Virginia
15	NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	North Carolina
16	BAYLOR UNIVERSITY	Texas
17	SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY	Texas
18	FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF	Florida
19	HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF	Texas
20	FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY	Florida
21	GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	Georgia
23	TULANE UNIVERSITY	Louisiana
24	TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	Tennessee
25	TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY	Texas
26	OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF	Oklahoma
27	SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF	South Carolina
28	FLORIDA INT'L SCHOOL OF LAW	Florida
29	KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF	Kentucky
30	MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF	Florida
31	BELMONT UNIVERSITY	Tennessee
32	TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY	Texas
33	MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF	Maryland
34	STETSON UNIVERSITY	Florida
35	REGENT UNIVERSITY	Virginia
36	ARKANSAS-FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	Arkansas
37	MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF	Mississippi
38	LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY	Louisiana
39	TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF	Oklahoma
40	WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	West Virginia
41	LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF	Kentucky
42	LIBERTY UNIVERSITY	Virginia

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
43	HOWARD UNIVERSITY	Dist. of Columbia
44	CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY	North Carolina
45	MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF	Tennessee
46	MERCER UNIVERSITY	Georgia
47	LOYOLA UNIVERSITY - NEW ORLEANS	Louisiana
48	ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY	Texas
49	CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA	Dist. of Columbia
50	NORTH TEXAS-DALLAS, UNIVERSITY OF	Texas
51	ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF	Arkansas
52	SAMFORD UNIVERSITY	Alabama
53	BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF	Maryland
54	ELON UNIVERSITY	North Carolina
55	NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY	Kentucky
55	AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	Dist. of Columbia
56	SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW	Texas
57	FAULKNER UNIVERSITY	Alabama
58	AVE MARIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW	Florida
59	NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	Florida
60	LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY	Tennessee
61	FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW	Florida
62	ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FL)	Florida
63	MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE OF LAW	Mississippi
64	FLORIDA A&M SCHOOL OF LAW	Florida
65	OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY	Oklahoma
66	JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL - ATLANTA	Georgia
67	NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY	North Carolina
68	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF THE	Dist. of Columbia
69	BARRY UNIVERSITY	Florida

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
70	APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW	Virginia
71	CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW	South Carolina
72	TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	Texas
73	SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER	Louisiana

**Table 5: 2019 Regional Rankings (West Region)**

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
1	STANFORD UNIVERSITY	California
2	CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF	California
3	CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF	California
4	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF	California
5	BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	Utah
6	ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	Arizona
7	WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF	Washington
8	CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF	California
9	LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY	California
10	COLORADO-Boulder, UNIVERSITY OF	Colorado
11	ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF	Arizona
12	CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF	California
13	UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF	Utah
14	CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF	California
15	NEVADA-LAS VEGAS, UNIVERSITY OF	Nevada
16	LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE	Oregon
17	SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF	California
18	PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY	California
19	DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF	Colorado

---

<b>2019 RP Rank</b>	<b>Law School Name</b>	<b>State</b>
20	CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	California
21	OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF	Oregon
22	MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF	Montana
23	SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY	California
24	HAWAII-MANOA, UNIVERSITY OF	Hawaii
25	GONZAGA UNIVERSITY	Washington
26	NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF	New Mexico
27	WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF	Wyoming
28	PACIFIC, UNIVERSITY OF THE	California
29	SEATTLE UNIVERSITY	Washington
30	WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY	Oregon
31	IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF	Idaho
32	SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF	California
33	SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL	California
34	CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW	California
35	WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW	California
36	LA VERNE, UNIVERSITY OF	California
37	GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY	California
38	CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY	Idaho
39	THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW	California