



Fall 2017

A Revealed Preferences Approach to Ranking Law Schools

Brian L. Frye

University of Kentucky College of Law, brianlfrye@uky.edu

Christopher J. Ryan Jr.

Vanderbilt University, christopher.j.ryan@vanderbilt.edu

Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/law_facpub



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Frye, Brian L. and Ryan, Christopher J. Jr., "A Revealed Preferences Approach to Ranking Law Schools" (2017). *Law Faculty Scholarly Articles*. 616.

https://uknowledge.uky.edu/law_facpub/616

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Faculty Publications at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Law Faculty Scholarly Articles by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

A REVEALED-PREFERENCES RANKING OF LAW SCHOOLS

Christopher J. Ryan, Jr. & Brian L. Frye^{*}

| | |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT..... | 496 |
| INTRODUCTION | 497 |
| I. LAW SCHOOL RANKINGS..... | 499 |
| A. <i>The U.S. News Rankings</i> | 500 |
| B. <i>Alternative Rankings</i> | 501 |
| II. A CONSUMER’S PREFERENCE APPROACH..... | 502 |
| III. THE DATA | 503 |
| IV. THE REVEALED-PREFERENCES RANKINGS..... | 504 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 506 |

^{*} Christopher J. Ryan, Jr., American Bar Foundation & AccessLex Institute Doctoral Fellow at the American Bar Foundation; Ph.D. Candidate, Vanderbilt University; J.D., University of Kentucky College of Law, 2013; M.Ed., University of Notre Dame, 2010; A.B., Dartmouth College, 2008.

Brian L. Frye, Spears-Gilbert Associate Professor of Law, University of Kentucky College of Law; J.D., New York University School of Law, 2005; M.F.A., San Francisco Art Institute, 1997; B.A., University of California, Berkeley, 1995.

ABSTRACT

The U.S. News & World Report (U.S. News) “Best Law Schools Rankings” defines the market for legal education. Law schools compete to improve their standing in the U.S. News rankings and fear any decline. But the U.S. News rankings are controversial, at least in part because they rely on factors that are poor proxies for quality, like peer reputation and expenditures per student. While many alternative law school rankings exist, none have challenged the market dominance of the U.S. News rankings. Presumably the U.S. News rankings benefit from a first-mover advantage, other rankings fail to provide a clearly superior alternative, or some combination of the two.

In theory, the purpose of ranking law schools is to provide useful information to prospective law students. Rankings can provide different kinds of information for different purposes. Existing law school rankings seek to provide information that will help prospective law students decide where to matriculate. However, objective rankings can provide useful information only if they measure factors that are salient to prospective law students, and different factors are salient to different students.

This Article provides the first subjective ranking of law schools. It describes a method of ranking law schools based on the revealed preferences of matriculating students. Law school admission depends almost entirely on an applicant’s Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) score and undergraduate grade point average (GPA), and law schools compete to matriculate students with the highest possible combined scores. Our method of ranking law schools assumes that the “best” law schools are the most successful at matriculating the most desirable students. Accordingly, this Article provides a “best law schools ranking” based exclusively on the LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs of matriculating students. In contrast to objective rankings of law schools, which attempt to tell prospective law students which law school they should attend, this Article provides a subjective ranking of law schools by asking which law schools prospective law students actually choose to attend. This “revealed-preferences” method of ranking law schools may help identify which factors are actually salient to prospective law students.

INTRODUCTION

In 1987, *U.S. News* created its “Best Law Schools Rankings” and transformed the market for legal education.¹ Law schools almost immediately began competing to improve their position in the *U.S. News* rankings, which soon became the de facto measure of institutional success.² In fact, changes to standing in the *U.S. News* rankings can carry reward or punishment for law schools and their leaders. If a law school rises in the *U.S. News* rankings, the dean gets a raise; if it falls, the dean gets fired.³

As demand for legal education steadily grew throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, law schools increasingly competed with each other by trying to influence the factors considered by the *U.S. News* rankings, especially their “peer assessment score” and “expenditures per student.”⁴ But the late 2000s saw a dramatic decline in law school applications and enrollment.⁵ Today, even elite law schools receive far fewer applicants than in their

1. See Bernard S. Black & Paul L. Caron, *Ranking Law Schools: Using SSRN to Measure Scholarly Performance*, 81 IND. L.J. 83, 84–85 (2006); Paul L. Caron & Rafael Gely, *What Law Schools Can Learn from Billy Beane and the Oakland Athletics*, 82 TEX. L. REV. 1483, 1510 (2004).

2. See Ronald G. Ehrenberg, *Reaching for the Brass Ring: The U.S. News & World Report Rankings and Competition*, 26 REV. HIGHER EDUC. 145, 146–47 (2002).

3. See, e.g., Elie Mystal, *Some Students Want Their Deans Fired after Poor Showing in the U.S. News Rankings (And One Head That’s Already Rolled)*, ABOVE THE LAW (Mar. 14, 2013, 11:20 AM), <http://abovethelaw.com/2013/03/some-students-want-their-deans-fired-after-poor-showing-in-the-u-s-news-rankings-and-one-head-thats-already-rolled/> (“Every year, deans and assistant deans find themselves ‘pushed out’ of a job thanks to the U.S. News rankings. Law schools and university presidents rarely say outright that changes are being made in response to the magazine . . .”).

4. For example, many law schools try to increase their peer assessment score by sending promotional materials or “law porn” to members of the legal academy. See Brian Leiter, *The Law School Observer*, 4 GREEN BAG 2d 310, 310–11 (2001). And many law schools increase their expenditures per student by increasing nominal tuition and then offering “scholarships,” which are characterized as expenditures. See, e.g., MICHAEL S. MCPHERSON & MORTON O. SCHAPIRO, *THE STUDENT AID GAME: MEETING NEED AND REWARDING TALENT IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION* 35 (1998); William D. Henderson & Rachel M. Zahorsky, *The Law School Bubble: Federal Loans Inflate College Budgets, But How Long Will That Last If Law Grads Can’t Pay Their Bills?*, 98 A.B.A. J. 30, 34 (2012); Jerome M. Organ, *Reflections on the Decreasing Affordability of Legal Education*, 41 WASH. U. J.L. & POL’Y 33–56 (2013); John A. Seibert, *The Cost and Financing of Legal Education*, 52 J. LEGAL EDUC. 516–27 (2002); Marilyn Yarbrough, *Financing Legal Education*, 51 J. LEGAL EDUC. 457, 457–58 (2001). Law schools can also influence many of the other factors considered by the *U.S. News* rankings, but a school’s peer assessment score and expenditures per student are the factors most susceptible to manipulation. See, e.g., Olufunmilayo B. Arewa, Andrew P. Morriss & William D. Henderson, *Enduring Hierarchies in American Legal Education*, 89 IND. L.J. 941, 1006 (2014); Robert L. Jones, *A Longitudinal Analysis of the U.S. News Law School Academic Reputation Scores Between 1998 and 2013*, 40 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 721, 724 (2013); Robert Morse & Kenneth Hines, *Methodology: 2018 Best Law School Rankings*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP. (Mar. 13, 2017, 9:30 PM), <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/articles/law-schools-methodology>.

5. See Margaret Loftus, *Drop in Applications Spurs Changes at Law Schools*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP. (Mar. 11, 2015, 9:00 AM), <http://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/top-law-schools/articles/2015/03/11/drop-in-applications-spurs-changes-at-law-schools>.

heyday, and total law school enrollment is at a fifty-year low.⁶ A low *U.S. News* ranking is no longer just embarrassing. It can indicate and even precipitate an institution's failure. This dramatic collapse in demand for legal education has prompted a renewed conversation about the purpose of ranking law schools, the accuracy of the information conveyed by the *U.S. News* rankings, and how prospective law students use rankings.

Now, more than ever, law schools need a credible way to signal quality to prospective law students, and prospective law students need credible information about which law school to attend.⁷ In theory, law school rankings can provide both. But only if they provide accurate information about quality and prospective law students care about the information they provide. This inevitably raises the question: What factors should a law school rankings system measure?

In theory, the purpose of ranking law schools is to provide useful information to prospective law students. Rankings can provide different kinds of information for different purposes. Existing law school rankings seek to provide information that will help prospective law students decide where to matriculate, but objective rankings can provide useful information only if they measure factors that are salient to prospective law students.⁸ Different factors are salient to different students, and we do not necessarily know which factors are actually salient to prospective law students and why.

By contrast, this Article provides the first subjective ranking of law schools. It describes a method of ranking law schools based entirely on the revealed preferences of matriculating students. Law school admission

6. See *id.*; LAW SCHOOL ADMISSIONS COUNCIL, TOTAL LSATS ADMINISTERED: COUNTS & PERCENT INCREASES BY YEAR (2017), <http://www.lsac.org/lsacresources/data/lsats-administered>; LAW SCHOOL ADMISSIONS COUNCIL, LSAC END-OF-YEAR SUMMARY: LSATS ADMINISTERED & CREDENTIAL ASSEMBLY SERVICE REGISTRATION (2017), <http://www.lsac.org/lsacresources/data/lsac-volume-summary>; see also Aaron N. Taylor, *Diversity as a Law School Survival Strategy*, 59 ST. LOUIS U. L.J. 321 (2015); AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, ENROLLMENT AND DEGREES AWARDED: 1963–2012 (2012), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_education_and_admissions_to_the_bar/statistics/enrollment_degrees_awarded.authcheckdam.pdf; Natalie Kitroeff, *The Best Law Schools Are Attracting Fewer Law Students*, BLOOMBERG (Jan. 26, 2016, 11:18 AM), <https://boi.bna.com/the-best-law-schools-are-attracting-fewer-students/> (noting that among the very top law schools, only three law schools posted gains in applicants, while most saw their application pool shrink by an average of 20% between 2011 and 2015); Laira Martin, *Law Schools Admitting More Minorities to Combat Enrollment Drop*, NAT'L JURIST (Feb. 17., 2015, 1:22 PM), <http://www.nationaljurist.com/content/law-schools-admitting-more-minorities-combat-enrollment-drop> (describing the decline in law student academic credentials including median GPA and LSAT scores).

7. See Taylor, *supra* note 6; see also Christopher J. Ryan, Jr., *Analyzing the Effect of Increasing Financial Aid on Law Student Matriculation* (SSRN Working Paper, 2016), <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2872364> (finding that significant increases in a law school's median financial aid award results in modest increases in matriculant enrollment totals but that the marginal effect of increasing financial aid awards results in decreased matriculant yield rates, using year and peer reviewed rating fixed effects).

8. See Arewa, Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 4, at 1010.

depends almost entirely on an applicant's LSAT score and undergraduate GPA, and law schools compete to matriculate students with the highest possible combined scores.⁹ Our method of ranking law schools assumes that the "best" law schools are the most successful at matriculating the most desirable students. Accordingly, this Article provides a "best law schools ranking" based exclusively on the LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs of matriculating students.

Objective rankings of law schools try to tell prospective law students which law school they should attend. This Article provides a subjective ranking of law schools by asking which law schools prospective law students actually choose to attend. This "revealed-preferences" method of ranking law schools may help identify which factors are actually salient to prospective law students. While it is roughly consistent with the *U.S. News* rankings as well as other rankings systems at the top and bottom, it diverges in many cases, occasionally quite significantly. This suggests that some law schools are better at gaming rankings systems than appealing to students and vice versa. In other words, objective ranking systems do not measure all of the factors that are salient to prospective students.

I. LAW SCHOOL RANKINGS

Ideally, law school rankings provide salient information to prospective law students, employers, and law schools. Prospective law students rely on law school rankings to evaluate the marginal costs and benefits associated with an investment in legal education at a particular institution.¹⁰ Employers rely on law school rankings in directing their investments in human capital.¹¹ Law schools use law school rankings as an external gauge of institutional success.¹² If law school rankings provide inaccurate

9. See Christopher J. Ryan, Jr., *Crunching the Numbers: Peer Reputation and Value Added in the Age of the U.S. News & World Report Law School Rankings* (SSRN Working Paper, 2015), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract_id=2623728 (finding a significant correlation between year-to-year quality assessment ratings of law schools ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*).

10. See Caron & Gely, *supra* note 1; Russell Korobkin, *Harnessing the Positive Power of Rankings: A Response to Posner and Sunstein*, 81 IND. L.J. 35, 40 (2006); Andrew P. Morriss & William D. Henderson, *Measuring Outcomes: Post-Graduation Measures of Success in the U.S. News & World Report Law School Rankings*, 83 IND. L.J. 791, 795 (2008).

11. See 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, 558 (2013); Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 10, at 811–18; Richard E. Redding, "Where Did You Go to Law School?" *Gatekeeping for the Profressariate and Its Implications for Legal Education*, 53 J. LEGAL EDUC. 594, 596 (2003); Jesse Rothstein & Albert H. Yoon, *Affirmative Action in Law School Admissions: What Do Racial Preferences Do?*, 75 U. CHI. L. REV. 649, 661 (2008); Jeffrey Evans Stake, *The Interplay between Law School Rankings, Reputations, and Resource Allocation: Ways Rankings Mislead*, 81 IND. L.J. 229 (2006).

12. See Arewa, Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 4, at 1006–17; Ryan, Jr., *supra* note 9.

information about law school quality, they could decrease the ability of prospective law students, prospective employers, and law schools to make efficient choices.

However, different consumers use law school rankings in different ways. Prospective law students, employers, and law schools assign different weights to different factors. The usefulness of a law school ranking system depends not only on which factors it considers, but also on its intended audience. The intended audience of a rankings system is typically prospective law students.¹³ So, the usefulness of a rankings system depends primarily on whether it provides information about factors that are salient to prospective law students.

A. *The U.S. News Rankings*

The *U.S. News* rankings are based on a composite score of several factors, which the magazine periodically reweights in an effort to improve its rankings.¹⁴ Among other things, the *U.S. News* rankings consider: (1) “quality assessment,” a proxy for reputational quality based on surveys distributed to certain law professors and legal professionals; (2) “selectivity,” or the entrance credentials of matriculants, including median undergraduate GPA and median LSAT scores, as well as acceptance rates; (3) “placement success,” or post-graduation outcomes, such as bar passage and employment rates; and (4) “faculty resources,” or student–faculty ratio, per student expenditures, and library size.¹⁵ In practice, the single most important factor in the *U.S. News* methodology is the quality assessment, or peer-review category, which is the subject of two chief criticisms.¹⁶ First, ratings in this category are highly time-invariant; year-to-year quality assessment ratings are correlated better than 95% with the last five years’ ratings.¹⁷ Because these ratings are not responsive to actual changes in quality at a given law school from year to year, this is an indication that the *U.S. News*’ quality assessment may not be a reliable measurement of what

13. See Arewa, Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 4, at 1006–17; Stake, *supra* note 11, at 244–45.

14. See Ehrenberg, *supra* note 2, at 147; Morse & Hines, *supra* note 4.

15. While the changing *U.S. News* methodology weighting is likely to be an important determinant of a law school’s *U.S. News* rank, a chronicling of these changes is beyond the scope of this study. For a more detailed history of these changes, see Black & Caron, *supra* note 1, at 86–89; Ehrenberg, *supra* note 2, at 147; Brian Leiter, *How to Rank Law Schools*, 81 IND. L.J. 47 (2006); Morse & Hines, *supra* note 4.

16. See Jones, *supra* note 4, at 723.

17. See, e.g., Ryan, Jr., *supra* note 9 (finding significant correlation between year-to-year quality assessment ratings of law schools ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*); see also Robert Anderson, *Predicting the Future of US News Law School Rankings with Revealed Preferences Rankings?* (Sept. 12, 2017, 8:34 PM), <http://witnesseth.typepad.com/blog/2017/09/predicting-the-future-of-us-news-with-revealed-preference-rankings.html>.

it purports to measure. Second, the category accounts for 40% of a law school's total score,¹⁸ and yet this rating is determined subjectively by academics and lawyers¹⁹ who, in determining their ratings, may not give as much consideration to the factors that are salient to students. Whatever the reason, critics agree that the *U.S. News* methodology's heavy reliance on quality assessment causes stagnation, because quality assessment is remarkably "sticky," causing rankings to "echo" in the following year.²⁰

B. Alternative Rankings

Many scholars have criticized the *U.S. News* law school rankings and proposed alternative rankings systems.²¹ For example, Black and Caron suggested an alternative to the *U.S. News* ranking using a measurement of a law faculty's Social Science Research Network (SSRN) scholarship output to substitute for the law school's peer assessment score, drawing on the literature linking research productivity and perceptions of educational quality.²² While intriguing, their model is more accurately a measure of research quality than of institutional quality.²³

Other studies have examined the reputational peer review scores assigned to law schools and have found indications of ranking stagnation amidst a changing set of categorical weights employed in the *U.S. News* methodology. Principally, these studies offer descriptive insight into peer assessment evaluations in legal education²⁴ and the legal job market facing new law graduates.²⁵ When combined with earlier scholarship on ranking systems, these studies help show what rankings do well and also where rankings can fail. However, no study to date has adequately addressed the alarming decrease in law school applications, which has forced law schools

18. See Arewa, Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 4, at 994.

19. See Morse & Hines, *supra* note 4.

20. See Arewa, Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 4, at 994; Black & Caron, *supra* note 1, at 86–89; Wendy Nelson Espeland & Michael Sauder, *Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds*, 113 AM. J. SOC. 1, 13–14 (2007); Jones, *supra* note 4, at 787–90; Leiter, *supra* note 15, at 51; Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 10, at 820–21; Stake, *supra* note 11, at 254–55.

21. See Caron & Gely, *supra* note 1, at 1517–24; Louis H. Pollak, *Why Trying to Rank Law Schools Numerically Is a Non-Productive Undertaking: An Article on the U.S. News & World Report 2009 List of "The Top 100 Schools"*, 1 DREXEL L. REV. 52, 54 (2009); Nancy B. Rapoport, *Ratings, Not Rankings: Why U.S. News & World Report Shouldn't Want to be Compared to Time and Newsweek—or The New Yorker*, 60 OHIO ST. L.J. 1097, 1101 (1999).

22. See Black & Caron, *supra* note 1; see also David D. Dill & Maarja Soo, *Academic Quality, League Tables, and Public Policy: A Cross-National Analysis of University Ranking Systems*, 49 J. HIGHER EDUC. 495 (2005); Stephen G. Grunig, *Research, Reputation, and Resources: The Effect of Research Activity on Perceptions of Undergraduate Education and Institutional Resource Acquisition*, 68 J. HIGHER EDUC. 17 (1997).

23. See Dill & Soo, *supra* note 22, at 505–06; Ehrenberg, *supra* note 2.

24. See Jones, *supra* note 4, at 726–33.

25. See Burk, *supra* note 11.

to admit students with lower GPAs and LSATs in order to fill their classes.²⁶ As the market for legal education changes, existing law school rankings may become increasingly meaningless, as the factors they measure diverge from the factors that matter to prospective law students.

Other rankings systems are based on outcomes. For example, *Above the Law* has created a popular law school rankings system based primarily on tuition cost and employment.²⁷ It is reasonable to assume that predicted economic outcomes are salient to prospective students.

II. A CONSUMER'S PREFERENCE APPROACH

The shift in the market for legal education from a surplus to a shortage of prospective students suggests a need for a new approach to ranking law schools. Legal education is a buyer's market. Prospective law students have more and better choices, as well as access to more and better information about law schools, both from the schools themselves and from third-party sources. Law schools at every quality level compete to attract the prospective students with the highest stats. Oddly, few empirical studies have examined the revealed preferences of matriculating students.²⁸

The participants in the market for legal education need law school rankings systems to provide a different kind of information and answer a different question than they have in the past: which law schools attract the most competitive students and why? Because law school admissions decisions are based almost exclusively on an applicant's undergraduate GPA and LSAT score,²⁹ students with similar score profiles will have similar choices of potential law schools. In effect, the score is a prospective student's "currency," because it determines which products that student can purchase. By identifying which law schools matriculated the students with the highest scores, we can identify the "best" law schools from the perspective of the consumers of legal education. The law school that matriculates the students with the highest scores is *ipso facto* the "best,"

26. Ry Rivard, *Lowering the Bar: More Law Schools are Admitting Less Qualified Students*, INSIDE HIGHER ED (Jan. 16, 2015), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/16/law-schools-compete-students-many-may-not-have-admitted-past>; AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS: TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL EDUCATION (2014), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/report_and_recommendations_of_aba_task_force.authcheckdam.pdf [hereinafter TASK FORCE].

27. See *Top 50 Law Schools*, ABOVE THE LAW, <http://abovethelaw.com/law-school-rankings/top-law-schools/> (last visited Oct. 10, 2017).

28. See Morriss & Henderson, *supra* note 10, at 827; Jason Solomon, *How to Compare Value Added Across Law Schools*, PRAWFSBLAWG (July 14, 2008, 9:55 AM), <http://prawfsblawg.blogs.com/prawfsblawg/2008/07/last-week-i-mad.html>.

29. See Ryan, Jr., *supra* note 9.

and the law school that matriculates the students with the lowest scores is *ipso facto* the “worst,” with a range in between.

This consumer preference method of ranking law schools measures the subjective preferences of prospective students, rather than predetermined objective factors like other rankings systems. The problem with measuring objective factors is that those factors may not be salient to actual prospective law students. Prospective law students want information about factors that are salient to their preferences, and law schools want information about how to attract students. Law school rankings systems that measure objective factors may provide unhelpful information to prospective students by failing to measure salient factors, and may create an incentive for law schools to compete on factors that are not salient to students. By contrast, a revealed-preferences method of ranking law schools asks only what prospective students actually want, rather than what they should want.

III. THE DATA

To rank law schools based on the underlying “purchasing-power” of their students, this Article employs the American Bar Association (ABA) Rule 509 Required Disclosures, a loose, panel dataset comprising an array of institutional characteristics of law schools, including many of the same characteristics contemplated by the *U.S. News*’ methodology.³⁰ The data are reported annually by the institutions themselves and though not conducive to casual perusal, the dataset is intended to provide consumer and public transparency.³¹ The data used in this study was collected from 2011 through 2016 by each accredited law school in the country as reported to the ABA, the accrediting body for all American law schools.³² The authors accessed this portal and merged available ABA Rule 509 Disclosure data by accredited institution, by year, as well as available aggregate data. Finally, the *U.S. News* and *Above the Law* rankings were hand-coded and mapped onto the existing dataset.

When compiled from the multiple component datasets, the full data set surveys all 204 nationally-accredited and provisionally-accredited law schools (coded as observations by year in the complete data set) and records their institutional responses to over 500 variables relating to key metrics of equal access, student characteristics and outcomes, curriculum,

30. AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, ABA STANDARDS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS (2016), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/misc/legal_education/Standards/2016_2017_aba_standards_and_rules_of_procedure.authcheckdam.pdf [hereinafter ABA STANDARDS]; TASK FORCE, *supra* note 26.

31. *See* ABA STANDARDS, *supra* note 30.

32. *See id.*

faculty demographics, institutional resources, as well as their *U.S. News* rankings and peer assessments and the *Above the Law* rankings. This study employs a much smaller subset of variables from the full data set that are linked to quality and value against the same number of observations. Because this Article focuses solely on the reported quartile measures of GPA and LSAT as a measure of a law school's matriculant buying power, in total, this data set comprises six variables linked to matriculating students' GPAs and LSATs per year per institution from 2011 through 2016. We acknowledge the limitations of these data, however, in not fully contemplating the transfer market for rising second-year law (2L) students. Given that law schools are not required to report this information,³³ these data are unavailable, and our results should be read as an indicator of the consumer preferences of law students at the time of initial matriculation. We now offer a revealed-preferences approach to ranking law schools on the basis of the GPA and LSAT credentials of the entering law students they matriculate.

IV. THE REVEALED-PREFERENCES RANKINGS

Law schools in our ranking were assigned a scaled desirability index score based on the "purchasing power" of their matriculating students. This index score was summed from six equal parts: a scaled 75th percentile GPA, a scaled median GPA, a scaled 25th percentile GPA, a scaled 75th percentile LSAT, a scaled median LSAT, and a scaled 25th percentile LSAT—each given one-sixth weight to construct the index. The consumer preference rankings we constructed from these index scores, proffered in the appendix below, surprised us because there are consistencies between this ranking system and previous years' peer review ratings, particularly among the top law schools. However, there are several notable exceptions, a few of which are detailed below, and the full rankings are published in the appendix at Table 1.

First, our rankings shake up the perennial contenders outside of the top-10. For example, the "T-14s" (top-14) are disrupted, with Texas falling on the outside of the coveted territory, while Georgetown narrowly scraped back into the top-14. Several public universities in the South tend to perform better in this ranking than their *U.S. News* ranking, such as Alabama, William & Mary, and Georgia, all of which make our top-25. Midwestern bluebloods like Washington University and Iowa, however, both slid outside the top-20, falling to 29 and 31, respectively, while Minnesota crept into the top-20. Boston College tumbled from 26 in the

33. *Id.*

U.S. News rankings to 42 in our rankings, and other traditionally top-30 schools such as Arizona State, Ohio State, and Wisconsin, and newcomer UC-Irvine, were on the outside looking in.

There were some surprising additions to the top-25, such as BYU, and top-35, such as SMU and George Mason, all of which are usually rated in the middle of the top-100 law schools by *U.S. News*. Also, perennial top-40 schools were also impacted, like North Carolina, which fell to 45, and Washington & Lee fell precipitously to 65. Florida State, Utah, and Maryland were also ousted from the top-50. Notable newcomers to the top-50 include Nebraska, Northeastern, and Pepperdine.

There was considerable within-tier movement among the next tier of schools and a few fresh faces. San Diego, Villanova, and Penn State each cracked the top-75, while Seton Hall, Tulane, and Kentucky dropped to the back of or outside the top-75. However, Connecticut and Rutgers nearly fell out of the top-100 in our rankings, despite being rated by *U.S. News* in the top-65. Meanwhile, Florida International, Wayne State, and New Hampshire, which were each ranked at 100 by *U.S. News*, and Belmont, which is not ranked by *U.S. News*, all made their way well into the top-100. While Texas A&M and Quinnipiac made significant strides to check in at 82 and 96, respectively, American slid precipitously back to 87. Notable schools that fell outside the top-100 include Chicago-Kent, Brooklyn, Loyola Chicago, Syracuse, Stetson, Hawaii, West Virginia, Marquette, and Louisville. Several schools rated by *U.S. News* in the top-150 fell below that rating in our rankings, such as: Howard, Baltimore, Willamette, Loyola New Orleans, Vermont, Widener Commonwealth, and Northern Illinois.

Overall, this revealed-preferences ranking system departs from the *U.S. News* and *Above the Law* rankings system at statistically significant levels. Accordingly, it may be a preferable approach to measure law school quality from the perspective of prospective students. It suggests that objective rankings may not measure all of the factors that are salient to prospective law students, including the law school's religious or ideological affiliation. For example, several law schools with a strong religious identity like Brigham Young, Pepperdine, and Liberty significantly outperform their *U.S. News* and *Above the Law* rankings, suggesting that this is a highly salient factor to some students. George Mason's ideological identity may be a very salient factor for other students. Other discrepancies may also reflect the failure of objective rankings to incorporate or accurately measure salient factors for students.

While law is an increasingly global profession, many prospective law students decide which school to attend based on the geographic location of the school, and many law schools compete for law students at the regional level. For instance, law schools like SMU and Texas A&M benefit from being the only accredited law schools in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex,

a factor that may be salient to students wishing to study law in the country's fourth-largest metropolitan area, while other major metropolitan areas—New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago—are saturated with law schools that engage in more vigorous competition for the students who want to study law in those geographical areas. Accordingly, we adapt our revealed preferences to the four U.S. Census Bureau regions—Northeast, Midwest, South, and West—in order to demonstrate the regional ordering of law schools according to a revealed-preferences approach. These results are offered in the appendix at Tables 2–5.

CONCLUSION

Reliable indicators of quality are essential to inform market participants' expectations but should be responsive enough to changes in quality and value that they do not become synonymous with participants' expectations.³⁴ Nearly every ranking system must make tradeoffs between simplicity and accuracy of measurement. We believe this ranking system combines both: its construction from essentially two student-level characteristics is remarkably simple, yet it accurately operationalizes and measures a consumer preference. As our rankings indicate, while there are similarities between the *U.S. News* peer review ratings and the rankings we offer, there are many notable discrepancies. The *U.S. News*' methodology relies heavily on peer review ratings, while our rankings rely instead on a measure of law student choice, a difference which some in the academy have suggested corresponds with lagging and leading indicators of quality, respectively.³⁵ The rankings we proffer below form the basis of a consumer preference model and thus present a fundamentally improved ranking alternative for prospective students, not to mention the public, who wish to see where the best students are choosing to attend law school.

* * *

34. See Rapoport, *supra* note 21, at 1098; Redding, *supra* note 11, at 594; Solomon, *supra* note 28.

35. See, e.g., Anderson, *supra* note 17.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1: THE 2017 REVEALED-PREFERENCES (RP) RANKINGS

| RP RANK (2017) | LAW SCHOOL | INDEX (2017) | US NEWS RANK (2017) | ATL RANK (2016) |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | YALE UNIVERSITY | 0.9650463 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | HARVARD UNIVERSITY | 0.9603704 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 | STANFORD UNIVERSITY | 0.9561574 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9528704 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | NEW YORK UNIVERSITY | 0.9414352 | 6 | 15 |
| 6 | PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9406481 | 7 | 4 |
| 7 | COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY | 0.9371759 | 5 | 11 |
| 8 | VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9357408 | 8 | 6 |
| 9 | DUKE UNIVERSITY | 0.9347685 | 10 | 7 |
| 10 | CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9331945 | 12 | 10 |
| 11 | MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9309722 | 8 | 13 |
| 12 | NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY | 0.9276389 | 10 | 8 |
| 13 | CORNELL UNIVERSITY | 0.9252778 | 13 | 9 |
| 14 | GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY | 0.9251852 | 15 | 21 |
| 15 | CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9223611 | 15 | 19 |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|-----------|----|----|
| 16 | SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9218981 | 19 | NR |
| 17 | VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY | 0.9206018 | 17 | 14 |
| 18 | TEXAS-AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9164352 | 14 | 12 |
| 19 | MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9156944 | 23 | 34 |
| 20 | BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY | 0.9155555 | 46 | 40 |
| 21 | ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9153241 | 26 | 26 |
| 22 | EMORY UNIVERSITY | 0.9122685 | 22 | 38 |
| 23 | BOSTON UNIVERSITY | 0.910787 | 23 | 17 |
| 24 | WILLIAM & MARY, COLLEGE OF | 0.9105555 | 41 | 23 |
| 25 | GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9080555 | 30 | 23 |
| 26 | NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9067593 | 20 | 20 |
| 27 | GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY | 0.9057871 | 30 | 33 |
| 28 | WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.9036574 | 30 | 39 |
| 29 | WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY | 0.9031019 | 18 | 22 |
| 30 | COLORADO-BOULDER, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8983796 | 36 | NR |
| 31 | IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.897037 | 20 | 18 |
| 32 | GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY | 0.8964815 | 51 | NR |
| 33 | ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.895463 | 25 | 50 |
| 34 | INDIANA UNIVERSITY- | 0.8954167 | 30 | 48 |

BLOOMINGTON

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|-----------|----|----|
| 35 | SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY | 0.8951852 | 46 | 29 |
| 36 | FORDHAM UNIVERSITY | 0.8931019 | 36 | NR |
| 37 | NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8930092 | 57 | NR |
| 38 | OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.8919907 | 30 | 27 |
| 39 | CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8910185 | 28 | NR |
| 40 | CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8886574 | 39 | NR |
| 41 | FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8875 | 41 | 30 |
| 42 | BOSTON COLLEGE | 0.8871759 | 26 | 16 |
| 43 | WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY | 0.8864352 | 36 | 47 |
| 44 | WISCONSIN-MADISON, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8861111 | 30 | NR |
| 45 | NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8846296 | 39 | 27 |
| 46 | ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8828241 | 44 | 31 |
| 47 | PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY | 0.8818982 | 72 | NR |
| 48 | NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY | 0.8817593 | 65 | NR |
| 49 | BAYLOR UNIVERSITY | 0.8814815 | 51 | 32 |
| 50 | ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8814352 | 48 | 42 |
| 51 | TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8812037 | 57 | NR |
| 52 | FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.8807408 | 48 | NR |
| 53 | HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8805093 | 54 | 41 |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----|----|
| 54 | TEMPLE UNIVERSITY | 0.8792593 | 53 | 46 |
| 55 | UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8785648 | 44 | NR |
| 56 | RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8784259 | 57 | 48 |
| 57 | YESHIVA UNIVERSITY | 0.8774537 | 65 | NR |
| 58 | ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY | 0.8762037 | 72 | NR |
| 59 | LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY | 0.8758333 | 65 | NR |
| 60 | CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY | 0.8739815 | 62 | NR |
| 61 | MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.873287 | 48 | NR |
| 62 | SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8712963 | 77 | NR |
| 63 | VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY | 0.8709259 | 77 | NR |
| 64 | NEVADA-LAS VEGAS, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8701852 | 62 | NR |
| 65 | WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY | 0.8699074 | 28 | NR |
| 66 | OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8697685 | 72 | NR |
| 67 | CALIFORNIA-HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8686574 | 54 | NR |
| 68 | MISSOURI-COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8681945 | 65 | 42 |
| 69 | FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY | 0.8680556 | 100 | NR |
| 70 | WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.8679166 | 100 | NR |
| 71 | CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8677315 | 72 | NR |
| 72 | SETON HALL UNIVERSITY | 0.8675463 | 57 | 35 |

(Tie)

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|-----|----|
| 72 (Tie) | PENN STATE UNIVERSITY- UNIVERSITY PARK | 0.8675463 | 82 | NR |
| 74 | TULANE UNIVERSITY | 0.8671296 | 51 | NR |
| 75 | PENN STATE UNIVERSITY- DICKINSON LAW | 0.8663889 | 65 | NR |
| 76 | GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.8658797 | 65 | 44 |
| 77 | KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8636111 | 57 | NR |
| 78 | OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8618519 | 86 | NR |
| 79 | KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8610648 | 65 | NR |
| 80 | MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.8600926 | 96 | NR |
| 81 | ARKANSAS- FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8598611 | 77 | NR |
| 82 | NEW HAMPSHIRE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8593519 | 100 | NR |
| 82 | TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY | 0.8593519 | 92 | NR |
| 84 | BELMONT UNIVERSITY | 0.8588889 | NR | NR |
| 85 | MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8587037 | 77 | NR |
| 86 | DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8572685 | 76 | NR |
| 87 | AMERICAN UNIVERSITY | 0.8569908 | 86 | NR |
| 88 | NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8567593 | 77 | 36 |
| 89 | PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8565741 | 82 | NR |
| 90 | SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8561111 | 88 | NR |
| 91 | LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE | 0.8558796 | 100 | NR |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|-----|----|
| 92 | CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8550926 | 54 | NR |
| 93 | ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY | 0.8550463 | 88 | NR |
| 94 | RUTGERS UNIVERSITY | 0.8546296 | 62 | NR |
| 95 | MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8544444 | 109 | NR |
| 96 | QUINNIPIAC COLLEGE | 0.8540741 | 127 | NR |
| 97 | STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO | 0.8539352 | 106 | NR |
| 98 | INDIANA UNIVERSITY- INDIANAPOLIS | 0.8538426 | 88 | NR |
| 99 | TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.852037 | 82 | NR |
| 100 | LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.8512963 | 96 | 42 |
| 101 | WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8511574 | 112 | NR |
| 102 | CHICAGO-KENT / ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY | 0.8510648 | 92 | NR |
| 103 | BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL | 0.8505093 | 88 | NR |
| 104 | LOYOLA UNIVERSITY- CHICAGO | 0.8486111 | 82 | NR |
| 105 | SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY | 0.8474537 | 92 | NR |
| 106 | LIBERTY UNIVERSITY | 0.8468981 | NR | NR |
| 107 | ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MN) | 0.8457407 | 120 | NR |
| 108 | DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY | 0.8456482 | 127 | NR |
| 109 | MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8453704 | 120 | NR |
| 110 | SEATTLE UNIVERSITY | 0.8449537 | 120 | NR |
| 111 | STETSON UNIVERSITY | 0.8448611 | 96 | NR |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-----------|-----|----|
| 112 | MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8425463 | 112 | NR |
| 113 | HAWAII-MANOA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8425 | 100 | NR |
| 114 | WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY | 0.8421759 | 96 | NR |
| 115 | REGENT UNIVERSITY | 0.8421296 | NR | NR |
| 116 | DREXEL UNIVERSITY | 0.8402778 | 112 | NR |
| 117 | DRAKE UNIVERSITY | 0.8395833 | 106 | NR |
| 118 | MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY | 0.8394907 | 100 | NR |
| 119 | CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY | 0.83875 | 127 | NR |
| 120 | TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8384722 | 132 | NR |
| 121 | CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA | 0.8379167 | 106 | NR |
| 122 | HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY | 0.8375926 | 118 | NR |
| 123 | PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8375463 | NR | NR |
| 124 | TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY | 0.8371759 | 118 | NR |
| 125 | CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY | 0.8358796 | 134 | NR |
| 126 | CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY | 0.8358333 | NR | NR |
| 127 | AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.835463 | 134 | NR |
| 128 | ALBANY LAW SCHOOL | 0.8337963 | 109 | NR |
| 129 | WASHBURN UNIVERSITY | 0.8334723 | 127 | NR |
| 130 | ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8332871 | 134 | NR |
| 131 | NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL | 0.8326389 | 112 | NR |
| 132 | CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY | 0.8318055 | 120 | NR |
| 133 | SAMFORD UNIVERSITY | 0.8313889 | 147 | NR |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----------|-----|----|
| 134 | SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8306944 | 142 | NR |
| 135 | PACE UNIVERSITY | 0.8306019 | 120 | NR |
| 136 | CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK | 0.8302315 | 127 | NR |
| 137 | LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8286574 | 92 | NR |
| 138 | MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8282871 | 140 | NR |
| 139 | GONZAGA UNIVERSITY | 0.8279167 | 112 | NR |
| 140 | MERCER UNIVERSITY | 0.8274537 | 134 | NR |
| 141 | MITCHELL-HAMLIN | 0.8263426 | NR | NR |
| 142 | PACIFIC, UNIVERSITY OF THE | 0.8255556 | 142 | NR |
| 143 | SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL | 0.8244907 | NR | NR |
| 144 | SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY | 0.8236111 | 132 | NR |
| 145 | DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8231481 | NR | NR |
| 146 | MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8228704 | 139 | NR |
| 147 | IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8224537 | 109 | NR |
| 148 | OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY | 0.8222685 | NR | NR |
| 149 | NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8218055 | 142 | NR |
| 150 | SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY | 0.8207408 | 140 | NR |
| 151 | NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.8203241 | NR | NR |
| 152 | HOWARD UNIVERSITY | 0.8200926 | 120 | NR |
| 153 | BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8181481 | 112 | NR |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----|----|
| 154 | WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY | 0.817037 | 142 | NR |
| 155 | CAPITAL UNIVERSITY | 0.8159722 | NR | NR |
| 156 | NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY | 0.8140278 | NR | NR |
| 157 | ELON UNIVERSITY | 0.8137037 | NR | NR |
| 158 | LOYOLA UNIVERSITY- NEW ORLEANS | 0.8123148 | 142 | NR |
| 159 | NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY | 0.8116667 | NR | NR |
| 160 | VERMONT LAW SCHOOL | 0.8105093 | 134 | NR |
| 161 | DEPAUL UNIVERSITY | 0.810463 | 120 | NR |
| 162 | CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.8076389 | NR | NR |
| 163 | ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY | 0.8058797 | NR | NR |
| 164 | SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW | 0.8044444 | NR | NR |
| 165 | INDIANA TECH | 0.8043056 | NR | NR |
| 166 | DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8037963 | NR | NR |
| 167 | SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.8036111 | NR | NR |
| 168 | NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY | 0.8027315 | NR | NR |
| 169 | WIDENER UNIVERSITY- HARRISBURG | 0.7995833 | 148 | NR |
| 170 | WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY | 0.7981945 | NR | NR |
| 171 | LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY | 0.7975463 | NR | NR |
| 172 | WIDENER UNIVERSITY- WILMINGTON | 0.7965278 | NR | NR |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-----------|-----|----|
| 173 | INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO | 0.7960648 | NR | NR |
| 174 | MASSACHUSETTS- DARTMOUTH, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.7959722 | NR | NR |
| 175 | AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7958333 | NR | NR |
| 176 | ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY | 0.7957407 | NR | NR |
| 177 | JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL-CHICAGO | 0.7956945 | NR | NR |
| 178 | NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY | 0.7923611 | 148 | NR |
| 179 | OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY | 0.7906018 | NR | NR |
| 180 | WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW | 0.7892593 | NR | NR |
| 181 | TOURO COLLEGE | 0.7886111 | NR | NR |
| 182 | MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE OF LAW | 0.7885648 | NR | NR |
| 183 | VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY | 0.7881019 | NR | NR |
| 184 | ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FL) | 0.7875926 | NR | NR |
| 185 | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF THE | 0.7875 | NR | NR |
| 186 | FLORIDA A&M SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7866204 | NR | NR |
| 187 | TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY | 0.7860185 | NR | NR |
| 188 | JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL-ATLANTA | 0.7856944 | NR | NR |
| 189 | BARRY UNIVERSITY | 0.7841204 | NR | NR |
| 190 | CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY | 0.7816204 | NR | NR |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------|----|----|
| 191 | CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7799537 | NR | NR |
| 192 | GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY | 0.7793056 | NR | NR |
| 193 | LA VERNE, UNIVERSITY OF | 0.7757407 | NR | NR |
| 194 | SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY- CARBONDALE | 0.7739352 | NR | NR |
| 195 | FAULKNER UNIVERSITY | 0.7737037 | NR | NR |
| 196 | PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO | 0.7721297 | NR | NR |
| 197 | SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER | 0.7716666 | NR | NR |
| 198 | FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7647685 | NR | NR |
| 199 | ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL | 0.7640741 | NR | NR |
| 200 | WHITTIER LAW SCHOOL | 0.7614815 | NR | NR |
| 201 | THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7598148 | NR | NR |
| 202 | THOMAS M. COOLEY LAW SCHOOL | 0.7559722 | NR | NR |
| 203 | APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7518982 | NR | NR |
| 204 | CHARLOTTE SCHOOL OF LAW | 0.7480093 | NR | NR |

TABLE 2: 2017 REGIONAL RANKINGS (NORTHEAST REGION)

| Region Rank | Law School | State | Index | Overall Rank |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1 | YALE UNIVERSITY | Connecticut | 0.9650463 | 1 |
| 2 | HARVARD UNIVERSITY | Massachusetts | 0.9603704 | 2 |
| 3 | NEW YORK UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.9414352 | 5 |
| 4 | PENNSYLVANIA, UNIVERSITY OF | Pennsylvania | 0.9406481 | 6 |
| 5 | COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.9371759 | 7 |
| 6 | CORNELL UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.9252778 | 13 |
| 7 | BOSTON UNIVERSITY | Massachusetts | 0.910787 | 23 |
| 8 | FORDHAM UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.8931019 | 36 |
| 9 | BOSTON COLLEGE | Massachusetts | 0.8871759 | 42 |
| 10 | NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY | Massachusetts | 0.8817593 | 48 |
| 11 | TEMPLE UNIVERSITY | Pennsylvania | 0.8792593 | 54 |
| 12 | YESHIVA UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.8774537 | 57 |
| 13 | ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.8762037 | 58 |
| 14 | VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY | Pennsylvania | 0.8709259 | 63 |
| 15 | SETON HALL UNIVERSITY | New Jersey | 0.8675463 | 72 |
| 16 | PENN STATE | Pennsylvania | 0.8675463 | 72 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|-----------|-----|
| | UNIVERSITY- UNIVERSITY PARK | | | |
| 17 | PENN STATE UNIVERSITY- DICKINSON LAW | Pennsylvania | 0.8663889 | 75 |
| 18 | NEW HAMPSHIRE, UNIVERSITY OF | New Hampshire | 0.8593519 | 82 |
| 19 | PITTSBURGH, UNIVERSITY OF | Pennsylvania | 0.8565741 | 89 |
| 20 | CONNECTICUT, UNIVERSITY OF | Connecticut | 0.8550926 | 92 |
| 21 | RUTGERS UNIVERSITY | New Jersey | 0.8546296 | 94 |
| 22 | QUINNIPIAC COLLEGE | Connecticut | 0.8540741 | 96 |
| 23 | STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO | New York | 0.8539352 | 97 |
| 24 | BROOKLYN LAW SCHOOL | New York | 0.8505093 | 103 |
| 25 | SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.8474537 | 105 |
| 26 | DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY | Pennsylvania | 0.8456482 | 108 |
| 27 | DREXEL UNIVERSITY | Pennsylvania | 0.8402778 | 116 |
| 28 | HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.8375926 | 122 |
| 29 | PUERTO RICO, UNIVERSITY OF | Puerto Rico | 0.8375463 | 123 |
| 30 | ALBANY LAW SCHOOL | New York | 0.8337963 | 128 |
| 31 | NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL | New York | 0.8326389 | 131 |
| 32 | PACE UNIVERSITY | New York | 0.8306019 | 135 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|-----------|-----|
| 33 | CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK | New York | 0.8302315 | 136 |
| 34 | MAINE, UNIVERSITY OF | Maine | 0.8228704 | 146 |
| 35 | SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY | Massachusetts | 0.8207408 | 150 |
| 36 | NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL OF LAW | Massachusetts | 0.8203241 | 151 |
| 37 | VERMONT LAW SCHOOL | Vermont | 0.8105093 | 160 |
| 38 | ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY | Rhode Island | 0.8058797 | 163 |
| 39 | WIDENER UNIVERSITY- HARRISBURG | Pennsylvania | 0.7995833 | 169 |
| 40 | WESTERN NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY | Massachusetts | 0.7981945 | 170 |
| 41 | INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO | Puerto Rico | 0.7960648 | 173 |
| 42 | MASSACHUSETTS- DARTMOUTH, UNIVERSITY OF | Massachusetts | 0.7959722 | 174 |
| 43 | TOURO COLLEGE | New York | 0.7886111 | 181 |
| 44 | PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO | Puerto Rico | 0.7721297 | 196 |

TABLE 3: 2017 REGIONAL RANKINGS (MIDWEST REGION)

| Region Rank | Law School | State | Index | Overall Rank |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1 | CHICAGO, UNIVERSITY OF | Illinois | 0.9528704 | 4 |
| 2 | MICHIGAN, UNIVERSITY OF | Michigan | 0.9309722 | 11 |
| 3 | NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY | Illinois | 0.9276389 | 12 |
| 4 | MINNESOTA, UNIVERSITY OF | Minnesota | 0.9156944 | 19 |
| 5 | NOTRE DAME, UNIVERSITY OF | Indiana | 0.9067593 | 26 |
| 6 | WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY | Missouri | 0.9031019 | 29 |
| 7 | IOWA, UNIVERSITY OF | Iowa | 0.897037 | 31 |
| 8 | INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON | Indiana | 0.8954167 | 34 |
| 9 | NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, UNIVERSITY OF | Nebraska | 0.8930092 | 37 |
| 10 | OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY | Ohio | 0.8919907 | 38 |
| 11 | WISCONSIN-MADISON, UNIVERSITY OF | Wisconsin | 0.8861111 | 44 |
| 12 | ILLINOIS, UNIVERSITY OF | Illinois | 0.8828241 | 46 |
| 13 | CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY | Ohio | 0.8739815 | 60 |
| 14 | MISSOURI-COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF | Missouri | 0.8681945 | 68 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| 15 | WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY | Michigan | 0.8679166 | 70 |
| 16 | CINCINNATI, UNIVERSITY OF | Ohio | 0.8677315 | 71 |
| 17 | KANSAS, UNIVERSITY OF | Kansas | 0.8610648 | 79 |
| 18 | MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY | Michigan | 0.8600926 | 80 |
| 19 | ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY | Missouri | 0.8550463 | 93 |
| 20 | INDIANA UNIVERSITY- INDIANAPOLIS | Indiana | 0.8538426 | 98 |
| 21 | CHICAGO-KENT / IIT | Illinois | 0.8510648 | 102 |
| 22 | LOYOLA UNIVERSITY- CHICAGO | Illinois | 0.8486111 | 104 |
| 23 | ST. THOMAS, UNIVERSITY OF (MN) | Minnesota | 0.8457407 | 107 |
| 24 | MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY, UNIVERSITY OF | Missouri | 0.8425463 | 112 |
| 25 | DRAKE UNIVERSITY | Iowa | 0.8395833 | 117 |
| 26 | MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY | Wisconsin | 0.8394907 | 118 |
| 27 | CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY | Ohio | 0.83875 | 119 |
| 28 | TOLEDO, UNIVERSITY OF | Ohio | 0.8384722 | 120 |
| 29 | AKRON, UNIVERSITY OF | Ohio | 0.835463 | 127 |
| 30 | WASHBURN UNIVERSITY | Kansas | 0.8334723 | 129 |
| 31 | CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY | Nebraska | 0.8318055 | 132 |
| 32 | SOUTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF | South Dakota | 0.8306944 | 134 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| 33 | MITCHELL-HAMLIN | Minnesota | 0.8263426 | 141 |
| 34 | DETROIT MERCY, UNIVERSITY OF | Michigan | 0.8231481 | 145 |
| 35 | OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY | Ohio | 0.8222685 | 148 |
| 36 | NORTH DAKOTA, UNIVERSITY OF | North Dakota | 0.8218055 | 149 |
| 37 | CAPITAL UNIVERSITY | Ohio | 0.8159722 | 155 |
| 38 | DEPAUL UNIVERSITY | Illinois | 0.810463 | 161 |
| 39 | INDIANA TECH | Indiana | 0.8043056 | 165 |
| 40 | DAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF | Ohio | 0.8037963 | 166 |
| 41 | JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL-CHICAGO | Illinois | 0.7956945 | 177 |
| 42 | NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY | Illinois | 0.7923611 | 178 |
| 43 | VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY | Indiana | 0.7881019 | 183 |
| 44 | SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY- CARBONDALE | Illinois | 0.7739352 | 194 |
| 45 | THOMAS M. COOLEY LAW SCHOOL | Michigan | 0.7559722 | 202 |

TABLE 4: 2017 REGIONAL RANKINGS (SOUTH REGION)

| Region Rank | Law School | State | Index | Overall Rank |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1 | VIRGINIA, UNIVERSITY OF | Virginia | 0.9357408 | 8 |
| 2 | DUKE UNIVERSITY | North Carolina | 0.9347685 | 9 |
| 3 | GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY | District of Columbia | 0.9251852 | 14 |
| 4 | VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY | Tennessee | 0.9206018 | 17 |
| 5 | TEXAS-AUSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF | Texas | 0.9164352 | 18 |
| 6 | ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY OF | Alabama | 0.9153241 | 21 |
| 7 | EMORY UNIVERSITY | Georgia | 0.9122685 | 22 |
| 8 | WILLIAM & MARY, COLLEGE OF | Virginia | 0.9105555 | 24 |
| 9 | GEORGIA, UNIVERSITY OF | Georgia | 0.9080555 | 25 |
| 10 | GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY | District of Columbia | 0.9057871 | 27 |
| 11 | GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY | Virginia | 0.8964815 | 32 |
| 12 | SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY | Texas | 0.8951852 | 35 |
| 13 | FLORIDA, UNIVERSITY OF | Florida | 0.8875 | 41 |
| 14 | WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY | North Carolina | 0.8864352 | 43 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|-----------|----|
| 15 | NORTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF | North Carolina | 0.8846296 | 45 |
| 16 | BAYLOR UNIVERSITY | Texas | 0.8814815 | 49 |
| 17 | TENNESSEE- KNOXVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF | Tennessee | 0.8812037 | 51 |
| 18 | FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY | Florida | 0.8807408 | 52 |
| 19 | HOUSTON, UNIVERSITY OF | Texas | 0.8805093 | 53 |
| 20 | RICHMOND, UNIVERSITY OF | Virginia | 0.8784259 | 56 |
| 21 | MARYLAND, UNIVERSITY OF | Maryland | 0.873287 | 61 |
| 22 | WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY | Virginia | 0.8699074 | 65 |
| 23 | OKLAHOMA, UNIVERSITY OF | Oklahoma | 0.8697685 | 66 |
| 24 | FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY | Florida | 0.8680556 | 69 |
| 25 | TULANE UNIVERSITY | Louisiana | 0.8671296 | 74 |
| 26 | GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY | Georgia | 0.8658797 | 76 |
| 27 | KENTUCKY, UNIVERSITY OF | Kentucky | 0.8636111 | 77 |
| 28 | ARKANSAS- FAYETTEVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF | Arkansas | 0.8598611 | 81 |
| 29 | TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY | Texas | 0.8593519 | 82 |
| 30 | BELMONT UNIVERSITY | Tennessee | 0.8588889 | 84 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------|-----------|-----|
| 31 | MIAMI, UNIVERSITY OF | Florida | 0.8587037 | 85 |
| 32 | AMERICAN UNIVERSITY | District of Columbia | 0.8569908 | 87 |
| 33 | SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIVERSITY OF | South Carolina | 0.8561111 | 90 |
| 34 | MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY OF | Mississippi | 0.8544444 | 95 |
| 35 | TULSA, UNIVERSITY OF | Oklahoma | 0.852037 | 99 |
| 36 | LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY | Louisiana | 0.8512963 | 100 |
| 37 | LIBERTY UNIVERSITY | Virginia | 0.8468981 | 106 |
| 38 | STETSON UNIVERSITY | Florida | 0.8448611 | 111 |
| 39 | WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY | West Virginia | 0.8421759 | 114 |
| 40 | REGENT UNIVERSITY | Virginia | 0.8421296 | 115 |
| 41 | CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA | District of Columbia | 0.8379167 | 121 |
| 42 | TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY | Texas | 0.8371759 | 124 |
| 43 | CAMPBELL UNIVERSITY | North Carolina | 0.8358333 | 126 |
| 44 | ARKANSAS-LITTLE ROCK, UNIVERSITY OF | Arkansas | 0.8332871 | 130 |
| 45 | SAMFORD UNIVERSITY | Alabama | 0.8313889 | 133 |
| 46 | LOUISVILLE, UNIVERSITY OF | Kentucky | 0.8286574 | 137 |
| 47 | MEMPHIS, UNIVERSITY OF | Tennessee | 0.8282871 | 138 |

| 2017] | A Revealed-Preferences Ranking of Law Schools | | | 527 |
|-------|---|----------------------|-----------|-----|
| 48 | MERCER UNIVERSITY | Georgia | 0.8274537 | 140 |
| 49 | HOWARD UNIVERSITY | District of Columbia | 0.8200926 | 152 |
| 50 | BALTIMORE, UNIVERSITY OF | Maryland | 0.8181481 | 153 |
| 51 | NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY | Kentucky | 0.8140278 | 156 |
| 52 | ELON UNIVERSITY | North Carolina | 0.8137037 | 157 |
| 53 | LOYOLA UNIVERSITY-NEW ORLEANS | Louisiana | 0.8123148 | 158 |
| 54 | NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIV | North Carolina | 0.8116667 | 159 |
| 55 | SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW | Texas | 0.8044444 | 164 |
| 56 | NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY | Florida | 0.8027315 | 168 |
| 57 | LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY | Tennessee | 0.7975463 | 171 |
| 58 | WIDENER UNIVERSITY-WILMINGTON | Delaware | 0.7965278 | 172 |
| 59 | AVE MARIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW | Florida | 0.7958333 | 175 |
| 60 | ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY | Texas | 0.7957407 | 176 |
| 61 | OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY | Oklahoma | 0.7906018 | 179 |
| 62 | MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE OF LAW | Mississippi | 0.7885648 | 182 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------------|-----------|-----|
| 63 | ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY (FL) | Florida | 0.7875926 | 184 |
| 64 | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, UNIVERSITY OF THE | District of Columbia | 0.7875 | 185 |
| 65 | FLORIDA A&M SCHOOL OF LAW | Florida | 0.7866204 | 186 |
| 66 | TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY | Texas | 0.7860185 | 187 |
| 67 | JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL-ATLANTA | Georgia | 0.7856944 | 188 |
| 68 | BARRY UNIVERSITY | Florida | 0.7841204 | 189 |
| 69 | CHARLESTON SCHOOL OF LAW | South Carolina | 0.7799537 | 191 |
| 70 | FAULKNER UNIVERSITY | Alabama | 0.7737037 | 195 |
| 71 | SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER | Louisiana | 0.7716666 | 197 |
| 72 | FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW | Florida | 0.7647685 | 198 |
| 73 | APPALACHIAN SCHOOL OF LAW | Virginia | 0.7518982 | 203 |
| 74 | CHARLOTTE SCHOOL OF LAW | North Carolina | 0.7480093 | 204 |

TABLE 5: 2017 REGIONAL RANKINGS (WEST REGION)

| Region Rank | Law School | State | Index | Overall Rank |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1 | STANFORD UNIVERSITY | California | 0.9561574 | 3 |
| 2 | CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.9331945 | 10 |
| 3 | CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.9223611 | 15 |
| 4 | SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.9218981 | 16 |
| 5 | BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY | Utah | 0.9155555 | 20 |
| 6 | WASHINGTON, UNIVERSITY OF | Washington | 0.9036574 | 28 |
| 7 | COLORADO-BOULDER, UNIVERSITY OF | Colorado | 0.8983796 | 30 |
| 8 | ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY | Arizona | 0.895463 | 33 |
| 9 | CALIFORNIA-IRVINE, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.8910185 | 39 |
| 10 | CALIFORNIA-DAVIS, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.8886574 | 40 |
| 11 | PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY | California | 0.8818982 | 47 |
| 12 | ARIZONA, UNIVERSITY OF | Arizona | 0.8814352 | 50 |
| 13 | UTAH, UNIVERSITY OF | Utah | 0.8785648 | 55 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|-----------|-----|
| 14 | LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY | California | 0.8758333 | 59 |
| 15 | SAN DIEGO, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.8712963 | 62 |
| 16 | NEVADA-LAS VEGAS, UNIVERSITY OF | Nevada | 0.8701852 | 64 |
| 17 | CALIFORNIA- HASTINGS, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.8686574 | 67 |
| 18 | OREGON, UNIVERSITY OF | Oregon | 0.8618519 | 78 |
| 19 | DENVER, UNIVERSITY OF | Colorado | 0.8572685 | 86 |
| 20 | NEW MEXICO, UNIVERSITY OF | New Mexico | 0.8567593 | 88 |
| 21 | LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE | Oregon | 0.8558796 | 91 |
| 22 | WYOMING, UNIVERSITY OF | Wyoming | 0.8511574 | 101 |
| 23 | MONTANA, UNIVERSITY OF | Montana | 0.8453704 | 109 |
| 24 | SEATTLE UNIVERSITY | Washington | 0.8449537 | 110 |
| 25 | HAWAII-MANOA, UNIVERSITY OF | Hawaii | 0.8425 | 113 |
| 26 | CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY | California | 0.8358796 | 125 |
| 27 | GONZAGA UNIVERSITY | Washington | 0.8279167 | 139 |
| 28 | PACIFIC, UNIVERSITY OF THE | California | 0.8255556 | 142 |
| 29 | SOUTHWESTERN LAW SCHOOL | California | 0.8244907 | 143 |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----|
| 30 | SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY | California | 0.8236111 | 144 |
| 31 | IDAHO, UNIVERSITY OF | Idaho | 0.8224537 | 147 |
| 32 | WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY | Oregon | 0.817037 | 154 |
| 33 | CALIFORNIA WESTERN SCHOOL OF LAW | California | 0.8076389 | 162 |
| 34 | SAN FRANCISCO, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.8036111 | 167 |
| 35 | WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF LAW | California | 0.7892593 | 180 |
| 36 | CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY | Idaho | 0.7816204 | 190 |
| 37 | GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY | California | 0.7793056 | 192 |
| 38 | LA VERNE, UNIVERSITY OF | California | 0.7757407 | 193 |
| 39 | ARIZONA SUMMIT LAW SCHOOL | Arizona | 0.7640741 | 199 |
| 40 | WHITTIER LAW SCHOOL | California | 0.7614815 | 200 |
| 41 | THOMAS JEFFERSON SCHOOL OF LAW | California | 0.7598148 | 201 |

* * *