From Prestige to Performance: Evaluating Law School Outcomes Using Value-Added Modeling

Jason Scott, Andrea Pals, and Dominique Monserrat

Abstract

Bar passage and employment rates are widely used to evaluate law school performance, yet these raw outcomes often reflect student selection rather than institutional performance. This study applies a value-added modeling (VAM) framework to assess the contributions of law schools to student success, controlling for prior achievement and contextual factors. Using a 10-year panel dataset of 189 ABA-accredited law schools, we estimate fixed-effects models to isolate the impact of the law school learning environment on first-time bar passage and law-related employment. Our findings reveal that schools traditionally viewed as underperforming often exceed expectations when student background is accounted for, challenging the validity of prevailing rankings. These results have implications for accreditation, accountability, and equity in legal education, particularly for mission-driven institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. By centering institutional contributions rather than student inputs, this study advances the use of VAM in postsecondary evaluation and offers a more equitable framework for assessing educational quality.

Keywords

Value-added modeling, legal education, law school outcomes, institutional outcomes, bar passage, student outcomes, educational equity, accreditation

Introduction

In legal education, a law school's bar passage and employment rates play a sizable role in accreditation decisions and rankings of the "best" law schools, both of which bear high stakes for applicants, students, faculty, staff, and administrators. This is problematic. A focus solely on outcomes ignores how these data were generated, particularly differences in the credentials of the individuals who schools admit. Indeed, legal education research consistently finds positive relationships, of varying magnitudes, between a law school's bar passage rate and the entering credentials of its students (e.g., Bahadur & Ruth, 2021; Marks & Moss, 2016; Pals et al., 2024; Taylor et al., 2021). Importantly, overreliance on these credentials in the admissions process perpetuates racial inequities (Anglade, 2014; Hartocollis, 2022; Taylor, 2019). When these outcomes are used to evaluate school performance without accounting for factors such as the entering credentials of a school's students, the definition of quality shifts away from an institution's ability to mold and develop the students it admits to one that rewards (or penalizes) non-pedagogical factors, such as the entering credentials of its students, its prestige or reputation, or the reputation of its faculty. Consequently, the role of the formative law school experience is

ignored when determining which schools are effectively preparing their students to pass the bar exam and attain gainful employment or assigning placement in a ranking system like the *U.S. News and World Report* Best Law School Rankings. We propose a value-added modeling (VAM) approach as an alternative measure, one that accounts for the credentials of a school's students and several other factors. This approach generates an estimate of quality that focuses on what should be the central purpose of a law school: nurturing students' skills, knowledge, and abilities needed to be an effective lawyer. VAM enables law schools to quantify their impact on students' outcomes and benchmark progress, offering a framework that rewards their graduates' performance while contextualizing that information against the backdrop of the students they admit.

The law school experience is formative: three years of intensive study focused on legal theory, case analysis, and the development of practical skills such as legal writing, advocacy, and ethics. Beginning with a heavy emphasis on doctrinal subjects such as Contracts, Torts, Civil Procedure, and Constitutional Law, the law school curriculum gradually expands to include electives and experiential learning opportunities that reflect students' own interests and career goals. For the vast majority of students, this experience culminates in two critical outcomes: bar admission, typically by examination, and gainful employment. Student grades, course selection, and engagement are well-documented, important predictors of bar exam performance and job attainment (e.g., Farley et al., 2019; Graham et al., 2025; Taylor et al., 2021).

Unsurprisingly then, a law school's bar passage and employment rates bear considerable weight in accreditation standards and in methods used to generate rankings of the "best" or "top" schools. For a new school to attain American Bar Association (ABA) accreditation or a current school to remain in good standing, "at least 75 percent of a law school's graduates in a calendar year who sat for a bar examination must have passed a bar examination administered within two years of their date of graduation" (ABA, 2022, pp. 27, 33).

Bar passage and employment rates are also weighted heavily in the methodologies currently employed by two prominent rankings lists, the *U.S. News and World Report* Best Law School Rankings and *Above the Law* Top 50 Law School Rankings, collectively accounting for 58% and 40% of a school's rank, respectively (Above the Law, 2024; Brooks et al., 2025). While recent research suggests prospective law students rely less on *U.S. News* rankings than before (Fyre & Ryan, 2024), their historical influence on prospective students' decision-making as well as law schools' policies demonstrates the appeal of having a consistent method for comparing law schools.

However, these raw outcomes and the rankings utilizing them do not sufficiently reflect the learning environment, which we define as the curriculum, pedagogy, instruction, and supports schools provide to train and prepare the next generation of lawyers. In addition to the learning environment, a school's bar passage and employment rates are influenced by several external factors. Among the most salient of these factors are the entering credentials of the students a law school matriculates (Bahadur & Ruth, 2021; Marks & Moss, 2016). These credentials also impact a school's *U.S News* ranking, which in turn may influence employment outcomes (Fernandez et al., 2022; Rocconi & Boyd, 2022; Smith et al., 2021). This means that raw outcomes and traditional rankings reward or penalize a school for the individuals it admits while

discounting its impact. Consequently, comparing schools on bar passage and employment rates without making any adjustments yields misleading results, as the underlying contexts may differ substantially.

Yet, bar passage and employment rates bear high stakes for both prospective students, who view higher education credentials as an investment in their individual earning potential, and schools, who rely on ratings, rankings, and student outcome measures for recruitment in a competitive market for students, accreditation, donations, and endowments. Given the heavy debt burdens and variable earnings associated with law school (Strohl et al., 2024), applicants face a weighty decision when choosing whether — and where — to attend law school, often turning to rankings and ratings systems for guidance. These ranking systems heavily weight metrics such as Law School Admission Test (LSAT) scores, undergraduate GPA (UGPA), bar passage rates, and employment outcomes, which are factors that both reflect and reinforce perceived institutional quality and prestige. Higher-ranked schools are viewed as more selective, attracting applicants with stronger academic credentials (i.e., higher LSAT scores and UGPAs) and drawing employer interest, leading to more competitive job placements post-graduation, boosting the school's employment rates. This generates a troubling self-fulfilling prophecy wherein law school rankings determine the very outcomes they intend to measure and compare, entrenching their reputational power ever more deeply.

For schools, failing to maintain or advance their bar passage and employment rates can lead to diminished standing in national rankings (Trujillo, 2025). This can result in fewer donations, applications, enrollments, or postgraduate job opportunities, which in turn can decrease the availability of resources for their students, all of which jeopardizes job security for faculty, staff, and administrators (Sag, 2024). Perhaps most importantly, failing to meet Standard 316 of the ABA's Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools may lead to public notice of noncompliance and, ultimately, loss of accreditation.

Bar passage and employment rates alone, as well as rankings utilizing these measures, provide little programmatic insight for schools to benchmark their own performance. Annual bar passage and employment rates fluctuate for any number of reasons, many of which are unrelated to pedagogical practices, law school curriculum, or the learning environment (Scott et al., 2024; Odle et al., 2023; Jian et al., 2019). This year-to-year variation renders it difficult or impossible to disentangle natural variation from that which may be attributable to any curricular change or intervention that a school may implement in a given year.

Furthermore, trying to improve rankings may encourage activities that are counterproductive to instructional improvement. For example, to move up in the *U.S. News World and Report* Best Law School Rankings, law schools might adjust their admissions policies to increase their median LSAT scores and final UGPAs and reduce their acceptance rate, as those metrics account for 10% of the ranking calculation (Brooks et al., 2025). However, such adjustments may be contradictory to the missions of access-driven law schools, as they stand to disproportionately exclude applicants of color due to racial disparities in LSAT scores (Anglade, 2014; Hartocollis, 2022; Taylor, 2019). And, although any of these behaviors might improve net rankings, they do not necessarily reflect positive developments in instruction or curriculum. In fact, they stand to both erode the quality of instruction and the overall campus experience by reducing the diversity

of views and perspectives of students in the classroom. As such, rankings seem to drive policies that provide minimal benefit to the population they ostensibly serve — law students — demonstrating the need for an improved strategy for determining school quality.

We propose a VAM approach to evaluating institutional impact in legal education. Value-added modeling is a method of estimating the effect of a pedagogical experience on student success while controlling for background and prior performance factors of both the student and institution (e.g., Hanushek, 1971; Levy et al., 2019; Meyer & Dokumaci, 2009; Meyer, 1996). In the context of education research, VAM offers an alternative to traditional metrics by evaluating gains in achievement over the course of a learning experience. Further, VAM conditions out systematic student-level differences that may otherwise bias comparisons of raw school-level achievement by comparing students and schools to themselves, and evaluating performance over time (Koedel et al., 2015). By adopting this approach, VAM could improve upon extant law school evaluation metrics by rewarding law schools that more frequently admit non-traditional, disadvantaged, or underrepresented students while delivering better-than-expected outcomes.

This study builds upon the few studies in legal education that have applied VAM to the law school context, all of which unsurprisingly indicate that a ranking based on a school's value-added yields a markedly different order that those attained and reported by *U.S. News and World Report* (Ryan, 2018; Ryan & Muller, 2023; Scott & Jackson, 2022). Ryan (2018) analyzes law school bar passage and employment outcomes as a combined index variable, conditioning on student characteristics. He then fits a regression line to compare the actual and predicted performance index for a school each year. Ryan and Muller (2023) take the same approach and determine that law schools which put special emphasis on bar success initiatives for their students overperform expectations consistently. Similarly, Scott and Jackson (2022) construct a VAM measuring the extent to which ABA-approved law schools over- and underperform their expected first-time bar passage rates as predicted using school and student background characteristics.

We use these studies to inform our work and build upon them by: (1) considering and conditioning on a more comprehensive range of antecedent variables and (2) employing a fixed effects estimation approach for purposes of comparison with and improvement upon earlier findings. As such, we employ VAM to pursue the following research question: To what extent do graduates of each ABA-approved law school outperform their anticipated rates of law-related job placement and bar passage, as predicted using contextual and background information?

Conceptual Framework

We conceptualize institutional impact as the extent to which a given school improves upon its students' baseline bar passage and employment potential through pedagogy, curriculum, instruction, and support. In order to measure this definition of quality, a VAM framework is appropriate, because it attempts to parse out — and quantify — the contributions of various inputs to student achievement over time, resulting in a model of cumulative achievement (Boardman & Murnane, 1979; Hanushek, 1971; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Koedel et al., 2015; Levy et al., 2019; Todd & Wolpin, 2007). As such, we consider it to be a suitable method for approximating institutional performance that reflects the learning within a given institution.

When measuring bar passage rate, we focus on a schools' first-time bar passage rate differential, which is the difference between a law school's first-time bar passage rate and the weighted average first-time pass rate for all graduates in the jurisdictions where its students took the exam. While the first-time bar passage rate differential is less intuitive than a school's average first-time bar passage rate, the differential provides a contextualized measure of performance by accounting for differences in exam difficulty and bar passage rates across states. And, although law school accreditation is regulated by a school's ultimate bar passage rate — the proportion of graduates who pass the bar exam within two years of graduation — first-time bar passage is an outcome with considerable importance to law graduates. For many, bar admission is a requisite for employment. And, since most jurisdictions offer the bar exam only twice per year, failing the first attempt implies substantial opportunity costs for finding employment and, in turn, paying down student loan debt.

We define employment rate as the proportion of a school's graduates attaining full-time, long-term bar passage-required or J.D.-advantage positions within 10 months of graduation. Bar passage-required positions are those where the graduate must be admitted to the bar to secure employment, whereas J.D.-advantage positions are those where employers prefer or require candidates to complete a J.D. but do not require bar admission. These positions can be in the private or public sector. Bar-passage required employment tends to come with higher pay, according to the National Association for Law Placement (NALP, 2023 p. 42), but we include J.D.-advantage positions as well as bar-passage required positions to more fully capture the value of a J.D. in the job market.

Studies point to several factors that we consider elements of the law school experience and that contribute to a school's bar passage or employment rates. We attempt to capture these factors in our estimation of value-added scores. Anglade (2014) suggests that experiential curriculum, which places a greater emphasis on practical skills training (i.e., clinics, simulations, and externships), may better prepare law students to secure employment in the legal field and succeed in that employment. Attempts to test this empirically, however, have produced mixed and null results, and the relationship may vary depending on student academic history (Kuehn & Moss, 2019). In their study of bar passage, Rocconi and Boyd (2022) account for institutional control and school size, suggesting that elements like institutional resources and student-faculty ratio may similarly impact quality. Other research has suggested that targeted, school-sanctioned bar exam preparation courses may improve at-risk students' odds of first-time bar passage when compared to other lower-performing students who take fewer bar preparation classes (Gray, 2011; Kuehn & Moss, 2019; Ruiz, 2020). Relatedly, academic support programming, including structured mentoring, skill workshops, and early intervention initiatives, has also been associated with improved academic and bar passage outcomes, particularly for students with weaker academic backgrounds (Farley, 2019). Law school seminars — typically small, discussion-based courses requiring substantial written work — may contribute to improved student outcomes as well (Columbia Law School, n.d.; Harvard Law School, n.d.; Kissam, 1983). While empirical research specific to law schools is limited, studies in higher education suggest that seminar courses may improve key academic and employment outcomes for undergraduate students (Harrington, 2025; Pittendrigh et al., 2016; Twang, 2022).

Additionally, literature across higher and legal education identifies clear benefits associated with student engagement, which encompasses not only the resources available to a law school's students, but also the degree to which students utilize those resources (McCormick et al., 2013; Kuh, 2008; Rocconi & Boyd, 2022). Student engagement includes items such as levels of acquisition of practice-relevant reasoning skills, frequency of student-faculty interaction, frequency of participation in class, degree of student satisfaction with their law school, and the extent to which students feel challenged by their coursework (Taylor et al., 2021).

Studies also point to factors associated with first-time bar passage or employment rates that we consider external to the law school experience and which we attempt to account for through the inclusion of strategic covariates in our VAM. As we mention above, researchers have identified a relationship between LSAT scores, UGPAs, and bar passage, both at the school and student level (e.g., Bahadur & Ruth, 2021; Marks & Moss, 2016; Pals et al., 2024; Taylor et al., 2021). Additionally, student transfer from one law school to another, as well as institutional policies tied to academic standing and attrition could, in theory, result in changes in cohort composition and therefore affect a school's bar passage rate. Scott et al. (2024), however, tested these relationships and found only weak associations.

Economic conditions, both regional and national, also shape the market for law graduates, with the 2008 recession spawning a nationwide shrinkage in the demand for legal labor that has not completely reversed (Berg, 2016; Strohl et al., 2024). Employers' hiring preferences can also affect any given graduate's chances of employment. Smith et al. (2021) observe that legal employers prefer graduates from higher-ranked law schools. Fernandez et al. (2022) and Rocconi and Boyd (2022) similarly find that law school ranking has a statistically significant association with employment outcomes even when the authors control for socioeconomic background, test scores, and grades.

Additionally, the geography of law schools and law graduates can play a significant role in determining employment opportunities, where those in more remote and rural areas of the country may struggle to find legal positions in these locations with similar earnings to those offered by large law firms in more metropolitan areas (Dinovitzer & Hagan, 2014; Rocconi & Boyd, 2022). Graduate race, ethnicity, and gender have also been found to correlate with employment outcomes (Stohl et al., 2024). And, finally, student loan debt has been identified as relating to first-time bar passage and employment outcomes; past research has indicated that debt may go so far as to influence character and fitness assessments for bar licensure as well as job-seeking behavior of law school graduates (ABA, 2021; Munster, 2014). We consider student loan debt external to the law school learning environment because debt burdens often reflect the ability of students to fund their education without loans. Although, to some extent, debt burden can be offset through scholarships and grants, this depends on a school's available financial capital, often funded through substantial endowments.

Our conceptual framework is also informed by recent research which finds, generally, that college student success predictions may result in higher rates of false negatives for underrepresented students of color. This incorrectly predicts low performance among underrepresented students of color more frequently than for other groups. Gandara et al. (2024, 1) observe that since "predictive algorithms rely on historical data, they capture societal

injustices, including racism," which may cause this underprediction. Furthermore, Clydesdale (2004) finds that "something intrinsic to the structure or process of legal education affects the grades of all minorities" (p. 737). It is therefore important in VAM to control for school racial and ethnic composition and consider the extent to which racial and ethnic composition varies with value-added.

Data

To develop our value-added model estimates, we use publicly available data from Analytix by AccessLex®; data presented in Analytix are collated from several sources, including ABA Standard 509, Bar Passage, and Employment disclosures (AccessLex Institute, n.d.). The Standard 509 reports are annual disclosures by law schools mandated by the ABA as a requirement of accreditation. They capture detailed institutional information across admissions statistics, tuition and fees, enrollment demographics, faculty composition, and academic offerings. Bar Passage and Employment disclosures provide a comprehensive view of law school performance and student outcomes (ABA, n.d.-a).

We supplement our dataset from various sources. We identify state-level unemployment rate and gross domestic product data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Prior to analysis we removed eight schools from our dataset. We removed Indiana Tech Law School and Rutgers University Newark School of Law because they closed and restructured, respectively, during the study period. The University of Wisconsin Law School and Marquette University Law School were also removed because all but a few graduates are admitted to practice law via diploma privilege without sitting for a bar exam. Consequently, only a handful (1%-3%, on average) of the graduates of these two law schools sit for the bar exam annually. We removed the three law schools in Puerto Rico because the Puerto Rico bar exam includes an English proficiency component, which makes it unlike the bar exam in any other jurisdiction. Lastly, we dropped Cooley Law School because part-time students comprise a majority of its student body, rendering it sufficiently dissimilar to other law schools. This results in a sample of 189 law schools.

Our final dataset is structured as a panel, with annual observations of each outcome for each of the 189 law schools over the ten-year study period (graduation years 2014–2023). This dataset also includes annual observations for a host of additional variables that we use to explore our two research questions. These variables, all measured at the school level, include: 25th, 50th (median), and 75th percentile LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs (UGPA); matriculation rate; first-year enrollment by race/ethnicity; first-year enrollment by gender; first-year non-transfer attrition rate; full-time resident tuition; the proportion of students receiving institutional grants; and the number of first-time bar takers. For each school, we also include the unemployment rate and GDP of the state in which the school is located.

Due to changes in ABA reporting requirements during the study period, some variables are not available across all study years. First-year transfer rate was not reported prior to 2014, first-year enrollment by gender was not reported prior to 2017, and the number of part-time students in the first-year class was not reported in 2017.

We lag our antecedent variables where necessary so that the cohort observed by the outcome measure in any given year aligns with the cohort measured by the antecedent variable. We do so by assuming an average three-year course of study, therefore lagging, for example, admission variables by three years. This is an imperfect assumption, as schools enroll varying numbers of part-time students. Nonetheless, this is the duration of the typical student's course of study among the schools in our sample. (As we note above, we removed Cooley Law School because, uniquely, its part-time students comprise a majority of total enrollments.)

For analysis, we create LSAT and UGPA indices, each of which is the sum of a school's 25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile values. We also create a variable to measure the proportion of a law school's 1L cohort who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Hispanic of any race, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (hereafter, underrepresented people of color or "uPOC"). Finally, we standardize all continuous variables, including our outcome variables in our VAMs such that each year has an average value of zero and a standard deviation of one. We do not perform this standardization for our exploration of factors that correlate with value-added scores. See Table A.1 for summary statistics of the study variables.

Econometric Models and Estimation Methods

As we note above, we standardize our two outcomes such that each has a mean of zero and standard deviation of one, which results in each being continuous and approximately normally distributed. For both outcomes, we utilize a fixed-effect approach to operationalize each school's value-added. We elect a fixed-effect over a random-effect approach because previous work finds that the former introduces less bias (Tekwe et al., 2004). Through this approach, we attempt to isolate changes in bar passage or employment that are attributable to the school's learning environment from external factors captured in the antecedent variables. We do this by including time-varying covariates in the model to account for as many as possible of the factors identified as external to the law school experience**,** leaving each school's error term, or fixed effect, as our estimate of the school's value-added. This is a common and generally accepted approach in VAM literature (Koedel et al., 2015; Levy et al., 2019; Liu, 2011; Meyer, 1996; Rubin et al., 2003; Ryan, 2018; Tekwe et al., 2004). Although value-added can also be operationalized via model residuals, we opt for the fixed-effect approach for several reasons: (1) this approach does not require us to assume random assignment of students to schools, since it conditions out the indicators that predispose students to attend a given school (Jakubowksi, 2008); and (2) fixed-effects approaches are less vulnerable to omitted variable bias and are, overall, more commonly used in value-added literature.

We use "cohort" to refer to time, and it refers to the year of observation of the outcome variable. To determine the best method for accounting for cohort differences in our models, we compare a model with fixed effects for both law school and cohort to one with fixed effects for law school but random slopes for cohort. Ultimately, based on model fit indices and the satisfaction of regression assumptions, we employ mixed effects models for both outcomes, with school fixed effects and cohort random slopes. By including cohort as random slopes, as opposed to fixed effects, we gain flexibility by allowing the effects of our covariates to vary by cohort within each school.

We use maximum likelihood estimation to generate estimates and include school and cohort clustered standard errors for each model. We measure and report a school's value-added as its fixed-effect coefficient, but do not include standard errors for a school's coefficient because the relevant standard errors in fixed-effects regression are associated with the within-school variables of interest, rather than the law school or year (Huntington-Klein, 2021). This is because the fixed-effects regression approach accounts for between-school and between-year variation arising from unobserved, time-invariant variables. Instead of relying on traditional regression coefficients and their standard errors, this method utilizes school and year effects as relative comparisons.

We create two models for each of our outcomes, one that spans the extent of the 10 years of outcome data in our dataset and one that includes only the three most recent years (2021–2023). As we note above, some of the variables are unavailable across all years in the study period. This affects our bar passage VAM approach. To balance covariate availability, we elected to create a three-year model that includes each of the variables we identified and a nine-year model that includes fewer covariates but provides more years of analysis and therefore more stability in the value-added estimates. For congruity, we adopt the same approach for our employment VAM. We incorporate the previous year's outcome value into each model to account for prior achievement on both the bar exam and employment. This approach allows us to distinguish the variance and momentum of the prior year outcomes from those of other covariates within our analyses (Koedel et al., 2015). Adding the prior year's outcome value necessitates dropping the first year (2014) from the analysis when estimating value-added across the entire 10-year study period; hence, we refer to these as nine-year models.

We model bar passage such that:

$$PassDifferential_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PassDifferential_{i,t-1} + \beta_k{}^{\top} x_{kit} + (\gamma + b_i)t + \alpha_i + \mu_{it}, \quad b_i \sim N(O, \sigma_b^2)$$

Where PassDifferential is school *i*'s first-time bar passage rate differential in year *t*; cohort is a series of dummy variables for each year in the analysis; the term α_i is the school fixed effect (or school-specific error term), containing all school-level factors that do not vary over time and that are otherwise unaccounted for by the included covariates; and μ_{it} is the idiosyncratic error. The $\beta_1 PassDifferential_{i,t-1}$ controls for the prior years' bar passage differential. Gamma (γ) refers to the average linear change per cohort across schools, while school-specific deviation (b_i) allows for random slope deviations and is centered around zero. Our β_k are coefficients associated with each variable, *x*, for school *i* and cohort *t*. In our nine-year model, *x* represents: LSAT index, UGPA index, matriculation rate, uPOC proportion of the 1L cohort, first-year non-transfer and transfer attrition rates, tuition for full-time residential students, proportion of full-time students receiving a grant, and the number of first-time bar takers. Coefficients are determined by examining changes within individual schools over time, accounting for each school's unique baseline and trend. For the three-year model, we also consider the percentage of part-time students and the proportion of students who transferred to another law school per cohort.

And we model employment rate such that:

$$EmployRate_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 EmployRate_{i,t-1} + \beta_k{}^{\top} x_{kit} + (\gamma + b_i)t + \alpha_i + \mu_{it},$$
$$b_i \sim N(O, \sigma_b^2)$$

Where EmployRate is school *i*'s rate of full-time employment in bar passage-required or J.D.-advantage positions in year *t*; cohort is a series of dummy variables for each year in the analysis; the term α_i is the school fixed effect, containing all school-level factors that do not vary over time; and μ_{it} is the idiosyncratic error. The $\beta_1 EmployRate_{i,t-1}$ controls for the prior years' employment rate. The specifications regarding γ and b_i are the same as described in the bar passage model. Our β_k are coefficients associated with each variable, *x*, for school *i* and cohort *t*. In both our three- and nine-year models, *x* represents: LSAT index, UGPA index, matriculation rate, first-year non-transfer attrition rate, the proportion of a class that is part-time, tuition for full-time residential students, proportion of full-time students receiving a grant, number of degrees awarded, and state unemployment and GDP. Coefficients emerge from within-school variation over time, which allows each school to have its own slope.

Results

We show each school's three- and nine-year bar passage and employment value-added scores in Table A.6, juxtaposed with its 2024 *U.S. News and World Report* Best Law Schools ranking and its rank-order based on its 2023 bar passage differential and employment rate value-added scores. We do this to draw attention to the importance of accounting for the entering credentials of a school's graduating class and other non-curricular factors. Value-added scores described here and in Table A.6 can be interpreted as a school's contribution to their students' performance on the bar exam and employment, holding all other variables in the model constant (including students' UGPAs and LSAT scores). Positive value-added scores indicate a favorable contribution from the school, which means that a school overperformed our models' expectations on the bar exam or employment. We provide summary statistics for each of our four value-added scores in Table 1. These statistics provide useful context when interpreting individual value-added scores, as shown in Tables 2 ,3, and A.6. As expected, because the value-added is measured by a school's fixed effect, which represents the school-level error term, the mean for each value-added is effectively zero.

TABLE 1. Descriptive Statistics of the Bar Passage and Employment Value-Added Scores

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Bar Passage Value-Added				
Nine-year	0.00	0.08	-0.22	0.24
Three-year	0.00	0.33	-0.86	1.52
Employment Value-Added				
Nine-year	0.00	0.07	-0.18	0.43
Three-year	0.01	0.30	-0.78	1.64

Looking across a range of schools, as we do in Table 2, we find that value-added scores diverge from a traditional view of law school impact based on *U.S. News* rankings, bar passage, and employment rates. Under the conventional paradigm of measuring law school impact, one might conclude that the school at the top is the "best", with "quality" diminishing further down the list; however, examining the value-added for each of these schools reveals that these determinations are more nuanced. As Table 2 shows, there is remarkable variation in law school impact between schools, with darker orange indicating a more negative value-added and darker blue indicating a more positive value-added. School G in particular attains consistently positive value-added scores, despite having a *U.S. News* ranking below 151, the second lowest ultimate bar passage rate, and the lowest employment rate. Notably, value-added also varies within schools, with some schools attaining a mix of positive and negative scores.

TABLE 2. Comparison of Value-Added Scores Among Schools Within *U.S. News* Law School Ranking Tiers

	U.S. News Ranking Tier (2024)	Ultimate Bar Passage Rate (2024)	Employment Rate (2023)	Bar Passage Value-Added: 9-year	Bar Passage Value-Added: 3-year	Employment Value-Added: 9-year	Employment Value-Added: 3-year
School A *(LSAT 172, UGPA 3.82)*	1-25	97%	96%	−0.06	−0.15	0.09	−0.17
School B *(LSAT 165, UGPA 3.83)*	26-50	96%	89%	−0.08	0.21	−0.06	−0.54
School C *(LSAT 162, UGPA 3.65)*	51-75	91%	88%	−0.01	0.35	0.00	0.15
School D *(LSAT 156, UGPA 3.60)*	76-100	96%	88%	0.05	0.21	−0.08	0.13
School E *(LSAT 154, UGPA 3.40)*	101-125	90%	92%	0.03	−0.03	0.00	0.17
School F *(LSAT 155, UGPA 3.41)*	126-150	78%	78%	0.03	0.15	−0.01	−0.35
School G *(LSAT 151, UGPA 3.37)*	151+	81%	77%	0.08	0.21	0.03	0.33

Note: Colors range from dark blue to dark orange, representing both the direction and magnitude of the scores. Schools were selected alphabetically from each ranking group, and each of the seven schools can be found in Table A.6. We do not identify schools here because the purpose is to illustrate value-added scores in comparison to their ranking and traditional performance metrics. LSAT and UGPA values indicate the median values at matriculation for the graduating cohort of 2023 (ABA, 2020). Ultimate Bar Passage Rates indicate the rate for the graduating cohort of 2021 (ABA, 2023). This table was created with Datawrapper.

As shown in the first five rows of Table 3, when we home in on the five schools with the lowest ultimate bar passage rates in 2024 (hereafter referred to as "at risk"), we find that each attains at

least one positive bar passage value-added — despite what their raw bar passage rates might convey about their performance.

TABLE 3. Comparison of VAs Among Schools With the Lowest and Highest 2024 Ultimate Bar Passage Rates

	Ultimate Bar Passage Rate (2024)	Employment Rate (2023)	Bar Passage Value-Added: 9-year	Bar Passage Value-Added: 3-year	Employment Value-Added: 9-year	Employment Value-Added: 3-year
School One *(LSAT 148, UGPA 3.02)*	75%	64%	0.05	−0.28	−0.05	−0.16
School Two *(LSAT 148, UGPA 3.22)*	76%	81%	0.09	0.35	−0.08	0.06
School Three *(LSAT 144, UGPA 2.98)*	72%	52%	−0.03	0.03	−0.11	−0.38
School Four *(LSAT 150, UGPA 3.23)*	76%	67%	0.04	0.56	−0.04	−0.15
School Five *(LSAT 148, UGPA 3.27)*	76%	73%	0.05	0.90	−0.02	0.64
School Six *(LSAT 173, UGPA 3.88)*	99.7%	92%	−0.03	0.06	−0.13	0.01
School Seven *(LSAT 170, UGPA 3.82)*	99.3%	91%	−0.02	0.07	−0.05	−0.24
School Eight *(LSAT 171, UGPA 3.89)*	99.5%	97%	0.00	−0.02	−0.01	−0.08
School Nine *(LSAT 165, UGPA 3.78)*	99.5%	94%	−0.07	−0.49	0.05	−0.62
School Ten *(LSAT 170, UGPA 3.89)*	99.2%	94%	0.00	0.14	−0.14	−0.21

Note: Colors range from dark blue to dark orange, representing both the direction and magnitude of the scores. Schools were selected based upon their Ultimate Bar Passage Rates, and each of the schools can be found in Table A.6. We do not identify schools here because the purpose is to illustrate value-added scores in comparison to their ranking and traditional performance metrics. LSAT and UGPA values indicate the median values at matriculation for the graduating cohort of 2023 (ABA, 2020). Ultimate Bar Passage Rates indicate the rate for the graduating cohort of 2021 (ABA, 2023). This table was created with Datawrapper.

In Table 3, we include the value-added scores for these five schools, juxtaposed with the five schools that attained the highest ultimate bar passage rates in 2024. Additionally, we include each school's employment rate, median LSAT score, and median undergraduate GPA in 2023. The five at-risk schools attain, on average, more favorable value-added scores than their traditionally higher performing peers. If we compare School Five (the at-risk school with the most positive value-added scores) to School Six, relative to the entering credentials of their law students, School Five adds more value to their graduates' first-time bar passage and job placement. Even where the school has a negative value-added (nine-year employment VAM), that contribution is quantitatively higher than for School Six (-0.02 versus -0.13, respectively).

In general, the five schools in Table 3 with the highest ultimate bar passage and employment rates — and traditionally the top positions in national rankings — attain small value-added scores. This does not mean that these law schools are not contributing to their students' bar passage and employment outcomes. Instead, their value-added scores reflect three phenomena. First, these schools have little room to improve upon their bar passage and employment rates, which exceed 90%. Second, the students they admit enter with the credentials and other characteristics that are associated with greater baseline odds of bar passage. Third, graduation from a "top-tier" law school imparts a level of prestige that appeals to potential employers. Collectively, these factors render it challenging to attain larger, positive value-added scores among schools like those we list at the bottom of Table 3. That said, as Tables 3 and A.2 illustrate, it is possible for these schools to contribute meaningfully to improving upon their students' baseline potential through the law school experience.

Consistent with the literature, our value-added scores are more volatile when looking back at only the past three years. This is represented by the substantially larger standard errors and ranges for the three-year versus the nine-year value-added scores, as shown in Table 1 above. Additionally, as our model outputs in Tables A.2 and A.3 show, the standard errors for each parameter estimate are larger in the three-year models compared to those from the nine-year models. This finding highlights the importance of including multiple years when creating VAMs. That said, there is reliability and consistency in the three-year value-adds: of the 99 schools with a positive three-year bar passage value-add, 59 have positive nine-year value-added scores; among the 94 schools with a positive three-year employment value-added, 55 also have positive nine-year value-added scores.

It is noteworthy that, of the 99 schools with a positive three-year bar passage value-added, 61 also have a positive three-year employment value-added, indicating that the value-added scores are both reliable and consistent. Additionally, it suggests that although we are capturing a similar underlying construct in our estimations, no single item of quantitative information should be used to evaluate a school's performance — another common finding with the extant VAM research (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Jakubowksi, 2008; Levy et al., 2019; Liu, 2011; Koedel et al., 2015; Meyer & Dokumaci, 2009; Meyer, 1996; Ryan, 2018; Ryan & Muller, 2023; Rubin et al., 2003; Scott & Jackson, 2022; Tekwe et al., 2004). This is further supported by the fact that, while our results are relatively robust, with scores generally varying by no more than a hundredth of a point, if rankings were to be drawn from the value-added scores we identify, minor model adjustments would result in substantial changes in ranking position. Therefore, value-adds

should be used for the purposes of quality evaluation and improvement but not as the basis for a new hierarchical rankings system (American Statistical Association, 2014).

To varying degrees, we find that the value-added estimates attained from three of our four models are negatively associated with the uPOC proportion of 1L enrollment, except those attained from our three-year employment rate model, as shown in Table 4. As we note in the Conceptual Framework, based on findings from Clydesdale (2004) and Gandara et al. (2024), it is important to consider the extent to which value-added scores vary by the racial/ethnic composition of the law school's students. Collectively, with extant literature on the topic, this finding that our value-added scores are generally negatively associated with uPOC enrollment means that we may underestimate the contribution of law schools with higher uPOC enrollment, despite the inclusion of this covariate in our models (Gandara et al., 2024). It is important to consider this when interpreting our value-added results for mission-driven institutions and historically Black colleges and universities.

TABLE 4. Partial Correlation Coefficients Between VAs and Enrollment Demographics

	Proportion of uPOC[a]
Bar Passage Value-Added	
Nine-year	-0.25***
Three-year	-0.07
Employment Value-Added	
Nine-year	-0.24***
Three-year	0.10

Note: *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$. Correlation coefficients control for a school's LSAT and UGPA indices, averaged across all years of data for that school. [a] uPOC represents those who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, Hispanic of any race, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

Discussion

Our analyses expand the nascent literature in legal education surrounding the use of VAM to evaluate the impact of law schools and their contributions to student outcomes. Our findings underscore the limitations of using raw bar passage and employment rates to evaluate law school performance. By applying a VAM approach and controlling for contextual factors, we reveal that schools traditionally viewed as "at-risk" or otherwise underperforming on these raw metrics may, in fact, contribute meaningfully to student success. As our findings indicate, all five schools with the lowest ultimate bar passage rates in 2024 demonstrate at least one positive value-added score for bar passage, suggesting that traditional metrics might not capture true institutional

impact. Additionally, our findings highlight the volatility of short-term outcome measures and the importance of longitudinal data in producing stable estimates of institutional impact, as prior VAM literature has suggested.

We see three potential applications of this research to legal education. First, value-added scores offer an empirically rigorous means of assessing institutional quality, one that allows for a fairer comparison of institutional bar passage and job placement outcomes. By advancing value-add as an alternative to using raw outcomes or the most prominent rankings systems to judge law school performance, we likewise demonstrate the limitations of using measures of prestige, financial resources, and entering student credentials to assess institutional impact. Further, we center institutional impact on measures that matter: the curriculum, instruction, and supports law schools provide to train and prepare the next generation of lawyers, given available resources. This means that improvement in value-added cannot be achieved through more selective admissions, which historically have led to the disproportionate exclusion of underrepresented applicants of color (Anglade, 2014; Hartocollis, 2022; Taylor, 2019).

Second, for law schools cited for ABA Standard 316 noncompliance, value-added scores could serve as supporting evidence of their efforts, demonstrating and quantifying their contributions to student learning. While the volatility of value-added suggests that VAM may not be a suitable replacement for rankings, the metrics can provide law schools with a means of measuring and defending their contributions to student achievement on the bar exam (see Table A.4). The enforcement of ABA Standard 316, with its focus on the raw outcome of ultimate bar passage, might miss the mark of ensuring law school quality by not accounting for the many other ways an institution impacts its students' future success.

Third, value-added scores could be incorporated into evaluations of J.D. programs to align with upcoming changes to ABA Standards regarding program-level assessment, which will begin at the start of the 2026–2027 academic year. Value-added scores could serve as one method of a law school's "self-study process that assesses the quality and success of its program of legal education in meeting its mission and objectives," as required by Standard 204 (ABA, n.d.-b). They may also serve useful in performing "ongoing evaluation of the law school's efficacy of its program of legal education" and as a basis on which to "revise its programmatic learning outcomes," as prescribed in revised Standards 315(a) and (b) (ABA, n.d.-b).

No study is without limitations, and ours is no exception. We would have preferred to create one VAM for each outcome, which looked back at the past five or ten years and included each of our covariates of interest. Regrettably, inconsistency in data availability necessitated that we adapt our approach for the bar passage VAM, modeling three- and nine-year durations, with the former being more inclusive of covariates of interest but potentially more volatile, and the latter providing a more stable value-added estimate but with fewer controls. Given the current landscape of publicly available data, we feel this approach is justified and provides a balanced representation of value-added in legal education. As data reporting requirements evolve, these analyses should be updated to reflect changes in variable definitions and what data are collected and reported, particularly because data that are not missing at random can pose a problem for inference in VAMs (Koedel et al., 2015; Rubin et al., 2004).

As the literature suggests and as we discuss in the Conceptual Framework section, a multitude of factors related to the law school learning experience correlate with students' success on the bar exam and securing employment. These include: institutional resources and student-faculty ratio (Rocconi & Boyd, 2022), targeted bar exam preparation courses (Gray, 2011; Kuehn & Moss, 2019; Ruiz, 2020), academic support programming (Farley, 2019), seminar courses (Columbia Law School, n.d.; Harvard Law School, n.d.; Kissam, 1983), and student engagement (McCormick et al., 2013; Kuh, 2008; Rocconi & Boyd, 2022; Taylor et al., 2021). To an extent, each of these factors (and others), both individually and collectively, contribute to a school's value-added. Future research could explore the extent to which value-added relates to each of these specific components of the law school learning experience.

Our findings advance VAM research in the field of legal education by: (1) more fully adopting the approaches used and recommended in K-12 education, including using law school fixed effects rather than model residuals as estimates of value-added; (2) broadening the years of analysis and including the most recently available data; and (3) including a broader and more diverse set of covariates in our models to more accurately isolate the curricular and instructional characteristics of a law school. These findings advantage both law schools and their students by providing a more suitable, statistically robust metric for evaluating the impact of law schools on graduates' bar exam and job placement outcomes.

References

Above the Law. (2024, June 13). *Top Law Schools 2024*. https://abovethelaw.com/top-law-schools-2024/

AccessLex Institute. (2024). *Legal education data deck: key trends on access, affordability, and value*. https://www.accesslex.org/research-and-data-tools-and-resources/legal-education-data-deck

AccessLex Institute. (n.d.). *Analytix by AccessLex*. https://www.accesslex.org/tools-and-resources/analytix-accesslex-0

American Bar Association. (2018). *ABA standards and rules of procedure for approval of law schools 2018–2019*.

American Bar Association. (2022a). *ABA standards and rules of procedure for approval of law schools 2022–2023*. 2022-2023 ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools

American Bar Association. (2024). *Employment Disclosures*. Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. https://abarequireddisclosures.org/EmploymentOutcomes.aspx

American Bar Association (2019). Standard 316 and Reporting of Bar Exam Outcomes – June 2019. https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_education_and_admissions_to_the_bar/governancedocuments/316-guidance-memo-june-2019.pdf

American Bar Association. (2023). *Standard 509 information reports*. Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. https://abarequireddisclosures.org/Disclosure509.aspx

American Bar Association. (2025). *Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools*. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/accreditation/standards/

American Bar Association. (n.d.-a). *Legal education statistics*. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/accreditation/statistics/

American Bar Association. (n.d.-b). *Outcomes and Assessments Committee*. American Bar Association. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/about/committees/outcomes-assessments/about/

American Statistical Association (2014). *ASA statement on using value-added models for educational assessment*. American Statistical Association. https://www.amstat.org/asa/files/pdfs/POL-ASAVAM-Statement.pdf

Amrein-Beardsley, A. (2008). Methodological concerns about the education value-added assessment system. *Educational Researcher 37*(2), 65-75. http://www.jstor.org/stable/30137966?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Anglade, M. M. (2014). Value, rankings, and reform. *Review of Litigation.*

Bahadur, R., & Ruth, K. (2021). *Quantifying the impact of matriculant credentials & academic attrition rates on bar exam success at individual schools*. University of Detroit Mercy Law Review. https://law.udmercy.edu/students/law-review/articles/vol099/Bahadur-Ruth-Matriculant-Credentials.pdf

Berg, B. (2016). Lessons from the law school disruption: Responding to a major market shift. *University Business*.

Boardman, A. E., & Murnane, R. J. (1979). Using Panel Data to Improve Estimates of the Determinants of Educational Achievement. *Sociology of Education*, *52*(2), 113–121. https://doi.org/10.2307/2112449

Brooks, E., Morse, R., Turnbull, O., & Wellington, S. (2025, April 7). Methodology: Best Law Schools Rankings. *U.S. News & World Report*. https://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/articles/law-schools-methodology

Clydesdale, T. T. (2004). A forked river runs through law school: Toward understanding race, gender, age, and related gaps in law school performance and bar passage. *Law & Social Inquiry*, *29*(4), 711-769. https://clydesdale.pages.tcnj.edu/files/2014/05/Clydesdale-2004-LSI-article.pdf

Columbia Law School. (n.d.). *Academic rules and procedures*. Columbia University. https://faculty-resources.law.columbia.edu/content/academic-rules-and-procedures

Curtis, Diane. (2019). The LSAT and the reproduction of hierarchy. *Western New England Law Review, 41*(2), 307-332.

Dinovitzer, R. & Hagan, J. (2014). Hierarchical Structure and Gender Dissimilarity in American Legal Labor Markets. *Social Forces, 92*(3), 929-955.

Education Department. (2023, October). *Financial value transparency and gainful employment*. Federal Register. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/10/10/2023-20385/financial-value-transparency-and-gainful-employment

Farley, A. N., Swoboda, C. M., Chanvisanuruk, J., McKinley, K. M., Boards, A., & Gilday, C. (2019). A deeper look at bar success: The relationship between law student success, academic performance, and student characteristics. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 16*(3), 605–629. https://doi.org/10.1111/jels.12236

Fernandez, F., Ro, H. K., Wilson, M. (2022). The color of law school: Examining gender and race intersectionality in law school admissions. *American Journal of Education 128*(3).

Fyre, B. & Ryan, C. (2024, May 24). The Decline & Fall of the US News Rankings. *Indiana Legal Studies Research Paper.* https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4840704.

Graham, D. N., Swoboda, C. M., & Farley, A. N. (2025). Breaking down bar passage: examining the predictive utility of academic performance and student characteristics on subscale scores of the uniform bar exam a follow-up study. *Journal of Legal Education, 73*(2), 469-490.

Gray, K. (2011). Breaking through the bar: law schools take action to reverse bar failure rates. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, *28*(4), 9.

Hanushek E. (1971). Teacher characteristics and gains in student achievement: Estimation using micro data. *The American Economic Review, 61*(2), 280–288.

Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2010). Using Value-Added Measures of Teacher Quality. Brief 9. *National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509683.pdf

Harrington, C. (2025). Exploring the relationship between first-year seminars and student success outcomes: A narrative literature review. *Journal of Postsecondary Student Success*, *4*(3). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1473908.pdf

Hartocollis, A. (2022, November 16). *Yale and Harvard law schools withdraw from the U.S. News Rankings*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/11/16/us/yale-law-school-us-news-rankings.html

Harvard Law School. (n.d.). *Curriculum overview*. Harvard University. https://hls.harvard.edu/academics/curriculum/

Huntington-Klein, N. (2025). *The effect: An introduction to research design and causality* (2nd ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003448969

Jakubowski, M. (2008). Implementing Value-Added Models of School Assessment. https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/8103/RSCAS_2008_06.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Jiang, H., Curcio, A. A., & D'Haene, K. (2019). A preliminary study looking beyond LSAT and UGPA: Factors during the bar study period that may affect bar exam passage. *AccessLex Institute & Association for Institutional Research*. https://www.airweb.org/docs/default-source/documents-for-pages/accesslex/curcioscholarlypaper-2.pdf

Kissam, P. C. (1983). Seminar papers. *Journal of Legal Education, 33*(3), 339-355. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42893167

Koedel, C., & Rockoff, J. E. (2015). Value-added modeling: A review. *Economics of Education Review*, *47*, 180-195. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=f603387582e1f19e10ec0acbe357148410ce0801

Kuehn, R. R., & Moss, D. R. (2019). A study of the relationship between law school coursework and bar exam outcomes. *Journal of Legal Education, 68*(3), 623–649. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27072337

Kuh, G.D. (2008). High impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Levy, J., Brunner, M., Keller, U., and Fischbach, A. (2019). Methodological issues in value-added modeling: an international review from 26 countries. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability 31*, 257-287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-019-09303-w

Liu, O. L. (2011). Value-added assessment in higher education: A comparison of two methods. *Higher Education*, *61*, 445-461.

Marks, A. B., & Moss, S. A. (2016). What predicts law student success? A longitudinal study correlating law student applicant data and law school outcomes. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 13*(2), 205–265. https://doi.org/10.1111/jels.12136

McCormick, A.C., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R.M. (2013). Student engagement: Bridging research and practice to improve the quality of undergraduate education. In M.B. Paulsen (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 47-92). Springer.

Meyer, R. H. (1996). Value-added indicators of school performance. *Improving America's schools: The role of incentives*, 197-223. https://doi.org/10.17226/5143

Meyer, R.H. and Dokumaci, E. (2009). *Value-added models and the next generation of assessments*. Educational Testing Service Center for K-12 Assessment & Performance Management. https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/MeyerDokumaciPresenterSession4.pdf

National Association for Law Placement. (2023). *NALP jobs and JDs class of 2022.*

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *Baccalaureate and beyond: First look at the 2018 employment and educational experiences of 2007–08 college graduates.* U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/datalab

National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *National postsecondary student aid study (NPSAS)*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/datalabNeil, M. (2011, February 4). Villanova says inaccurate LSAT and GPA data were "knowingly reported" to the ABA in prior years. *ABA Journal.* https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/new_villanova_law_dean/

Odle, T. K., Bae, J. Y., & González Canché, M. S. (2023). The effect of the Uniform Bar Examination on admissions, diversity, affordability, and employment across law schools in the United States. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 45*(3), 520–529. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221131803

Pittendrigh, A., Borkowski, J., Swinford, S., & Plumb, C. (2016). Knowledge and community: The effect of a first-year seminar on student persistence. *Journal of General Education*, *65*(1), 48–65. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/jgeneeduc.65.1.0048

Rocconi, L. M. & Boyd, A. T. (2022). Measuring Quality in Legal Education: Examining the Relationship Between Law School Rank and Student Engagement. *Research in Higher Education 63*, 1261-1282

Rubin, D.B., Stuart, E.A., and Zanutto, E.L. (2004). A potential outcomes view of value-added assessment in education. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 29*(1), 103-116. https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986029001103

Ruiz, R. (2020). Leveraging noncognitive skills to foster bar exam success: An analysis of the efficacy of the bar passage program at FIU Law. *Nebraska Law Review*, *99*(1), 141–208

Ryan, C. J., Jr. (2018). A value-added ranking of law schools. *University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy, 29*(3), 285–308.

Ryan, C. J., Jr. (2020). Analyzing Law School Choice. *U. Ill. Rev.* 583-620. AccessLex Institute Research Paper No. 19-01, Roger Williams Univ. Legal Studies Paper No. 186, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3309815

Ryan Jr, C. J., & Muller, D. T. (2023). The secret sauce: Examining law schools that overperform on the bar exam. *Fla. L. Rev.*, *75*, 65.

Sag, M. (2024). *Forward-looking academic impact rankings for U.S. law schools*. *Florida State University Law Review, 51*(3), 763–808. Retrieved from https://www.fsulawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/5.-Sag-Art_pgs-763-808_LRv51n3.pdf [www.fsulawreview.com]

Smith, K. E., Schuhmann, P. W., & Spencer, F. K. (2021). Law firms' preferences and willingness to pay for attributes of law school graduates: results from a choice experiment. *Education Economics, 29*(4), 424-442.

Scott, J., and Jackson, J. (2022). *What is quality? Advancing value-added approaches to assessing law school bar exam performance.* AccessLex Institute. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4273267

Scott, J. M., Jackson, J. L., & Pals, A. M. (2024). Are law schools cream-skimming to bolster their bar exam pass rates? A multilevel regression approach to estimate how attrition and

transfer rates affect bar passage. *AERA Open, 9*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584231214526

Strohl, J., Catherine, M., and Cheah, B. (2024). *A law degree is no sure thing: some law school graduates earn top dollar, but many do not.* Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/cew-roi_law.pdf

Taylor, A.N. (2019). The marginalization of black aspiring lawyers. *FIU Law Review*, *13*(3), 489–512.

Taylor, A. N., Scott, J. M., Jackson, J. L. (2021). It's not where you start, it's how you finish: predicting law school and bar success. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 21*(10) 103-142.

Tekwe, C. D., Carter, R. L., Ma, C. X., Algina, J., Lucas, M. E., Roth, J., ... & Resnick, M. B. (2004). An empirical comparison of statistical models for value-added assessment of school performance. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *29*(1), 11-36.

Todd, P. E., & Wolpin, K. I. (2007). The Production of Cognitive Achievement in Children: Home, School, and Racial Test Score Gaps. *Journal of Human Capital*, *1*(1), 91–136. https://doi.org/10.1086/526401

Trujillo, L. A. (2025). The relationship between law school and the bar exam: A look at assessment and student success. *University of Colorado Law Review*.

Twang, A. H. (2022). High-impact learning experiences and post-graduate outcomes: Exploring the influence on employment, continuing education and salary. *SUNY Journal of the Scholarship of Engagement*, *2*(1). https://digitalcommons.cortland.edu/jose/vol2/iss1/2/

Appendix

Table A.1. Summary Statistics Along Raw Variables of Interest

Variable	Minimum	Median	Mean	Maximum	Standard Deviation
First-Time Bar Passage Differential*	-0.32	0.03	0.01	0.20	0.11
First-Time Bar Takers*	39	156	174.03	664	94.31
Law School Employment Rate	0.52	0.87	0.85	0.99	0.09
LSAT Index	432.73	465.50	468.32	518.90	18.10
UGPA Index	8.62	10.18	10.20	11.72	0.63
Matriculation Rate	0.12	0.30	0.31	0.68	0.09
Proportion Male Students	0.25	0.47	0.47	0.66	0.06
Proportion Underrepresented Students of Color	0.05	0.15	0.19	0.86	0.13
Total Number of Students in 1L Class	0	0	15.28	278	28.98
Number of Part-Time Students in 1L Class	0	0	16.87	278	26.74
1L Section Size	24	55.50	56.66	118	16.79
First-Year Non-Transfer Attrition	0	0.06	0.08	0.35	0.06
First-Year Transfer Attrition	0	0.02	0.03	0.13	0.02
Full-Time Resident Tuition	13,438	42,865	41,340	74,890	15,861
Proportion Full-Time Students Receiving Grants	0.39	0.84	0.81	1	0.14
Degrees Awarded	37	164	182.27	681	99.21
State Unemployment Rate (%)	1.90	3.50	3.62	5.10	0.73
State GDP	43,130	766,919	1,146,756	3,862,171	1,109,123

Note: *Wisconsin schools are excluded from these summary statistics due to diploma privilege; Lincoln Memorial University Duncan School of Law reported 0 underrepresented students of color for the 1L class corresponding to the 2017 graduating cohort; UC Irvine School of Law and UNT Dallas College of the Law each reported 0 degrees awarded in at least one year due to their opening during the study period.

Table A.2. Bar Passage Value-Added Modeling Statistics

	Effect on Predicted Bar Passage Differential (9-year)	**Effect on Predicted Bar Passage Differential (3-year)**
Prior Year's Bar Passage Differential	-0.10	-0.57*
	[-0.21; 0.02]	[-0.74; -0.41]
LSAT Score Index	0.83*	0.27
	[0.59; 1.07]	[-0.30; 0.85]
Final UGPA Index	0.31*	0.15
	[0.19; 0.42]	[-0.15; 0.45]
Matriculation Rate	-0.06	-0.13
	[-0.14; 0.02]	[-0.28; 0.03]
% Underrepresented Students of Color	-0.05	-0.20*
	[-0.16; 0.06]	[-0.39; -0.01]
Cohort Non-transfer Attrition	0.07*	-0.00
	[0.02; 0.12]	[-0.12; 0.11]
Full-Time Resident Tuition	-0.12	-0.16
	[-0.43; 0.19]	[-0.85; 0.53]
% Full-Time Students Receiving Grants	0.00	0.01
	[-0.06; 0.06]	[-0.11; 0.13]
Total Number of First-Time Bar Takers	-0.04	-0.22
	[-0.18; 0.09]	[-0.52; 0.08]
Interaction of Full-Time Tuition and % of Students Receiving Grants	0.03	
	[-0.03; 0.10]	
Number of Part-Time Students in 1L Cohort		0.30
		[-0.12; 0.72]
Cohort Transfer Attrition		-0.05
		[-0.11; 0.01]
Num. obs.	1656	553
Num. groups: School Name	189	188
Num. groups: Cohort	9	3
R^2 (full model)	0.89	0.98
R^2 (proj model)	0.12	0.45
Adj. R^2 (full model)	0.85	0.92
Adj. R^2 (proj model)	0.11	0.41

Note: * $p < 0.05$

Table A.3. Employment Value-Added Modeling Statistics

	Effect on Predicted Employment Rate (9-year)	**Effect on Predicted Bar Employment Rate (3-year)**
Prior Year's Employment Rate	0.11	-3.72*
	[-0.64; 0.86]	[-4.56; -2.89]
LSAT Score Index	0.11	-0.19
	[-0.06; 0.28]	[-0.62; 0.24]
Final UGPA Index	0.14*	0.26*
	[0.05; 0.24]	[0.07; 0.46]
Matriculation Rate	0.00	0.12*
	[-0.04; 0.05]	[0.00; 0.24]
Cohort Non-Transfer Attrition	0.03*	0.00
	[0.00; 0.05]	[-0.06; 0.06]
Number of Part-Time Students in 1L Cohort	0.08*	0.14
	[0.01; 0.15]	[-0.02; 0.30]
% Underrepresented Students of Color	-0.08*	0.03
	[-0.13; -0.03]	[-0.09; 0.15]
% Full-Time Students Receiving Grants	0.00	-0.00
	[-0.04; 0.04]	[-0.10; 0.10]
Full-Time Resident Tuition	-0.10	-0.05
	[-0.33; 0.13]	[-0.32; 0.23]
Number of Degrees Awarded	-0.08*	-0.13
	[-0.15; -0.01]	[-0.37; 0.11]
State Unemployment Rate	-0.03	0.02
	[-0.07; 0.00]	[-0.08; 0.13]
State GDP	0.68	-0.72
	[-0.02; 1.39]	[-3.27; 1.83]
Num. obs.	1468	553
Num. groups: School Name	189	188
Num. groups: Cohort	9	3
Deviance	1451.97	131.44
Log Likelihood	-4359.58	-1376.93
Pseudo R^2	0.96	0.96

Note: * $p < 0.05$

TABLE A.4. Law Schools' Value-Adds

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
Albany Law School of Union University	0.00	75	0.92	99	117	0.03	-0.03	0.00	0.17
American University	-0.05	13	0.87	52	98	0.11	-0.62	0.04	-0.01
Appalachian School of Law	-0.13	63	0.74	125	178	0.04	1.52	-0.02	0.85
Arizona State University	0.12	160	0.89	157	36	-0.08	0.21	-0.06	-0.54
Atlanta's John Marshall Law School	-0.13	4	0.60	164	176	0.17	0.38	-0.06	-0.38
Ave Maria School of Law	-0.03	28	0.77	60	161	0.08	0.21	0.03	0.33
Barry University	-0.16	49	0.64	152	178	0.05	-0.28	-0.05	-0.16
Baylor University	0.13	39	0.96	39	46	0.06	0.27	0.05	0.33
Belmont University	0.19	48	0.88	173	91	0.05	0.21	-0.08	0.13
Boston College	0.16	44	0.95	56	28	0.06	0.27	0.03	0.26
Boston University	0.08	117	0.95	26	24	-0.02	-0.23	0.07	0.19
Brigham Young University	0.11	96	0.94	38	28	0.01	-0.24	0.05	0.09
Brooklyn Law School	-0.04	132	0.87	110	114	-0.03	0.16	-0.01	0.36
California Western School of Law	-0.24	187	0.72	156	178	-0.21	-0.58	-0.06	0.23
Campbell University	0.08	162	0.82	41	134	-0.08	-0.25	0.05	-0.30
Capital University	0.01	16	0.75	146	178	0.10	0.01	-0.04	0.33
Cardozo School of Law	0.02	104	0.88	89	61	-0.01	0.35	0.00	0.15

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
Case Western Reserve University	-0.04	131	0.82	116	89	-0.03	-0.07	-0.02	-0.19
Catholic University of America	0.05	3	0.89	34	94	0.18	0.13	0.06	0.29
Chapman University	0.08	88	0.93	6	108	0.01	0.61	0.16	0.23
Charleston School of Law	-0.12	57	0.74	97	178	0.04	0.22	0.00	0.33
Chicago-Kent College of Law-IIT	0.06	77	0.84	77	108	0.03	0.67	0.01	0.03
City University of New York	-0.26	189	0.68	179	150	-0.23	-0.31	-0.10	-0.06
Cleveland State University	-0.11	172	0.82	46	103	-0.11	-0.56	0.04	0.43
Columbia University	0.12	148	0.96	19	8	-0.06	-0.15	0.09	-0.17
Cornell University	0.13	175	0.92	177	14	-0.12	-0.08	-0.10	-0.43
Creighton University	-0.08	59	0.76	174	153	0.04	0.03	-0.09	-0.04
DePaul University	-0.03	70	0.78	108	134	0.03	0.15	-0.01	-0.35
District of Columbia	-0.32	174	0.60	181	178	-0.12	-0.11	-0.11	0.15
Drake University	0.06	18	0.88	75	82	0.10	0.17	0.01	-0.06
Drexel University	0.03	107	0.91	63	75	-0.01	-0.20	0.02	-0.23
Duke University	0.15	110	0.96	94	4	-0.01	-0.04	0.00	-0.31
Duquesne University	0.08	78	0.89	24	94	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.11
Elon University	-0.15	171	0.80	14	148	-0.11	-0.66	0.10	-0.39
Emory University	0.09	79	0.94	117	42	0.02	-0.28	-0.02	0.26
Faulkner University	-0.12	92	0.81	188	176	0.01	-0.22	-0.18	0.18

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
Florida A&M University	-0.30	182	0.66	163	178	-0.15	-0.86	-0.06	0.12
Florida International University	0.19	154	0.86	172	68	-0.07	-0.04	-0.08	-0.14
Florida State University	0.15	126	0.93	113	48	-0.03	0.40	-0.01	0.25
Fordham University	0.05	109	0.93	13	33	-0.01	0.01	0.11	-0.16
George Mason University	0.08	71	0.94	59	28	0.03	-0.18	0.03	0.02
George Washington University	0.05	93	0.94	36	14	0.00	-0.52	0.05	0.09
Georgetown University	0.10	138	0.93	28	41	-0.04	-0.12	0.07	0.10
Georgia State University	0.01	176	0.88	123	75	-0.12	-0.38	-0.02	0.09
Golden Gate University		168		100	178	-0.10	0.84	0.00	0.05
Gonzaga University	-0.11	144	0.81	140	120	-0.05	-0.79	-0.04	-0.67
Harvard University	0.16	125	0.92	184	4	-0.03	0.06	-0.13	0.01
Hofstra University	-0.06	25	0.88	83	130	0.08	0.25	0.01	0.29
Howard University	-0.06	143	0.89	49	130	-0.05	-0.20	0.04	-0.10
Indiana University - Bloomington	0.05	106	0.87	95	42	-0.01	-0.28	0.00	-0.14
Indiana University - Indianapolis	0.02	69	0.85	150	98	0.03	0.13	-0.05	-0.03
Lewis and Clark College	0.04	73	0.80	32	82	0.03	0.42	0.06	-0.36
Liberty University	0.07	84	0.78	64	140	0.01	-0.18	0.02	-0.42

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.13	185	0.69	160	165	-0.17	0.14	-0.06	0.05
Louisiana State University	0.19	34	0.90	131	91	0.07	0.38	-0.03	0.12
Loyola Marymount University-Los Angeles	0.06	150	0.85	98	61	-0.06	-0.12	0.00	-0.16
Loyola University-Chicago	0.06	24	0.91	44	78	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.38
Loyola University-New Orleans	-0.06	136	0.82	20	130	-0.03	0.18	0.08	0.03
McGeorge School of Law	-0.05	153	0.76	106	159	-0.07	-0.32	-0.01	-0.55
Mercer University	-0.01	87	0.90	53	103	0.01	-0.17	0.04	-0.11
Michigan State University	0.06	66	0.78	139	108	0.04	0.30	-0.04	-0.48
Mississippi College	0.02	21	0.81	170	168	0.09	0.35	-0.08	0.06
New England Law | Boston	-0.08	15	0.72	143	159	0.10	-0.15	-0.04	0.00
New York Law School	-0.11	31	0.90	50	127	0.07	-0.04	0.04	0.42
New York University	0.15	120	0.91	154	9	-0.02	0.07	-0.05	-0.24
North Carolina Central University	-0.18	188	0.67	72	178	-0.21	-0.71	0.01	0.77
Northeastern University	0.06	67	0.85	78	68	0.04	0.20	0.01	-0.07
Northern Illinois University	-0.19	180	0.86	135	157	-0.15	-0.61	-0.03	0.09
Northern Kentucky University	0.05	5	0.88	54	150	0.15	-0.02	0.03	0.47

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
Northwestern University	0.13	60	0.94	87	9	0.04	-0.08	0.01	-0.10
Nova Southeastern University	-0.04	167	0.71	178	178	-0.09	0.04	-0.10	-0.06
Ohio Northern University	-0.24	184	0.61	155	153	-0.17	-0.30	-0.06	-0.57
Oklahoma City University	-0.12	20	0.77	158	153	0.09	-0.01	-0.06	-0.50
Pace University	-0.15	133	0.85	134	136	-0.03	-0.44	-0.03	-0.05
Pennsylvania State University-Dickinson School of Law	0.02	8	0.93	112	75	0.14	0.29	-0.01	0.23
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Law	0.11	12	0.91	8	68	0.12	0.25	0.13	0.37
Pepperdine University	0.10	81	0.87	22	52	0.02	0.19	0.08	-0.01
Quinnipiac University	-0.03	122	0.77	151	143	-0.03	0.00	-0.05	0.17
Regent University	0.08	46	0.90	29	108	0.05	0.87	0.07	0.25
Roger Williams University	-0.19	170	0.78	142	172	-0.11	-0.62	-0.04	0.25
Rutgers University	-0.03	72	0.87	2	103	0.03	0.01	0.18	0.09
Saint Louis University	0.04	76	0.88	121	94	0.03	-0.10	-0.02	-0.20
Samford University	-0.01	26	0.88	73	103	0.08	0.31	0.01	0.01
Santa Clara University	-0.11	178	0.71	129	158	-0.14	-0.04	-0.03	0.18
Seattle University	-0.09	89	0.75	65	114	0.01	-0.26	0.02	-0.30
Seton Hall University	0.12	52	0.86	183	61	0.05	-0.02	-0.12	-0.32

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
South Texas College of Law	0.01	19	0.81	66	150	0.10	0.31	0.02	0.49
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale	-0.13	115	0.68	169	172	-0.02	0.20	-0.07	0.16
Southern Methodist University	0.06	128	0.96	9	42	-0.03	-0.06	0.13	0.49
Southern University	-0.19	137	0.52	180	178	-0.03	0.03	-0.11	-0.38
Southwestern Law School	-0.08	7	0.73	43	145	0.14	-0.66	0.05	-0.15
St. John's University	0.05	83	0.95	30	68	0.02	-0.04	0.06	0.18
St. Mary's University	-0.06	108	0.80	132	153	-0.01	0.16	-0.03	0.23
St. Thomas University (Florida)	-0.09	56	0.67	138	172	0.04	0.56	-0.04	-0.15
Stanford University	0.20	166	0.87	187	1	-0.08	0.15	-0.17	-0.22
Stetson University	0.09	119	0.91	107	98	-0.02	0.13	-0.01	0.04
Suffolk University	-0.01	61	0.83	61	130	0.04	0.03	0.03	-0.07
Syracuse University	-0.06	165	0.83	137	120	-0.08	-0.37	-0.03	-0.16
Temple University	0.10	58	0.93	42	54	0.04	0.29	0.05	0.23
Texas A&M University	0.14	101	0.99	1	26	0.00	-0.14	0.25	0.70
Texas Southern University	-0.16	155	0.73	149	178	-0.07	0.11	-0.05	0.50
Texas Tech University	0.13	90	0.90	47	82	0.01	0.06	0.04	-0.45
The Ohio State University	0.14	127	0.91	130	26	-0.03	0.13	-0.03	-0.47
Touro University	-0.27	94	0.80	136	168	0.00	-0.25	-0.03	0.44
Tulane University	0.04	30	0.88	74	78	0.07	0.10	0.01	0.00

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
UC College of the Law, San Francisco	-0.01	10	0.80	85	82	0.12	-0.33	0.01	-0.05
University of Akron	-0.05	161	0.87	23	136	-0.08	0.39	0.08	0.21
University of Alabama	0.13	118	0.94	92	33	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.10
University of Arizona	0.04	179	0.89	81	55	-0.15	0.19	0.01	-0.06
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville	0.05	54	0.78	189	114	0.05	0.25	-0.18	-0.62
University of Arkansas-Little Rock	-0.02	121	0.75	168	143	-0.03	0.10	-0.07	0.09
University of Baltimore	-0.05	164	0.80	171	140	-0.08	-0.12	-0.08	-0.01
University of Buffalo-SUNY	-0.01	37	0.90	33	108	0.06	0.45	0.06	-0.01
University of California-Berkeley	0.14	169	0.89	176	12	-0.10	-0.01	-0.10	-0.32
University of California-Davis	0.10	141	0.90	55	55	-0.04	0.37	0.03	0.09
University of California-Irvine	0.14	151	0.95	57	42	-0.06	0.14	0.03	0.54
University of California-Los Angeles	0.15	158	0.92	58	13	-0.08	0.06	0.03	-0.15
University of Chicago	0.18	103	0.97	115	3	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	-0.08
University of Cincinnati	0.11	111	0.87	161	78	-0.01	0.18	-0.06	0.13
University of Colorado	0.04	116	0.89	80	48	-0.02	-0.16	0.01	0.36
University of Connecticut	0.10	6	0.90	91	55	0.14	0.47	0.00	0.41

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
University of Dayton	0.11	1	0.89	10	108	0.24	-0.38	0.12	-0.08
University of Denver	0.04	147	0.86	101	89	-0.06	0.21	0.00	-0.05
University of Detroit Mercy	-0.04	36	0.86	4	136	0.06	0.35	0.17	-0.24
University of Florida	0.12	173	0.94	105	28	-0.11	-0.17	-0.01	-0.07
University of Georgia	0.06	152	0.94	37	20	-0.07	-0.49	0.05	-0.62
University of Hawaii	0.00	50	0.83	148	127	0.05	0.13	-0.05	0.11
University of Houston	0.07	42	0.91	127	68	0.06	-0.10	-0.02	0.26
University of Idaho	0.01	38	0.83	159	145	0.06	0.03	-0.06	-0.01
University of Illinois	-0.05	43	0.89	15	36	0.06	0.05	0.10	0.13
University of Illinois Chicago School of Law	-0.19	177	0.73	153	161	-0.14	-0.51	-0.05	-0.09
University of Iowa	0.08	64	0.96	11	36	0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.17
University of Kansas	0.13	41	0.91	25	46	0.06	-0.08	0.07	-0.50
University of Kentucky	-0.02	82	0.95	79	61	0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.05
University of Louisville	-0.01	140	0.84	167	136	-0.04	-0.35	-0.07	-0.76
University of Maine	0.16	22	0.87	69	120	0.09	0.81	0.02	0.52
University of Maryland	0.03	85	0.87	109	55	0.01	-0.26	-0.01	-0.29
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth	-0.19	163	0.76	68	161	-0.08	-0.13	0.02	0.66
University of Memphis	0.02	68	0.76	175	140	0.03	-0.27	-0.09	-0.32

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
University of Miami	0.05	149	0.84	162	382	-0.06	-0.30	-0.06	-0.20
University of Michigan	0.20	112	0.96	86	9	-0.02	0.21	0.01	0.02
University of Minnesota	0.09	9	0.97	5	16	0.14	-0.27	0.16	0.49
University of Mississippi	-0.01	157	0.83	51	120	-0.07	-0.15	0.04	0.07
University of Missouri	0.03	97	0.92	128	61	0.00	0.12	-0.02	-0.17
University of Missouri-Kansas City	-0.06	146	0.89	145	117	-0.06	0.11	-0.04	0.43
University of Montana	0.02	17	0.92	124	103	0.10	-0.43	-0.02	-0.79
University of Nebraska	0.06	129	0.91	114	82	-0.03	-0.03	-0.01	0.06
University of Nevada - Las Vegas	0.06	74	0.89	120	78	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.40
University of New Hampshire	0.03	29	0.75	166	98	0.07	0.00	-0.07	0.00
University of New Mexico	0.01	102	0.79	185	94	0.00	0.03	-0.13	-0.38
University of North Carolina	0.17	114	0.97	3	20	-0.02	0.53	0.17	0.02
University of North Dakota	-0.11	14	0.72	147	168	0.11	-0.30	-0.05	-0.17
University of Notre Dame	0.14	40	0.93	48	20	0.06	0.17	0.04	0.37
University of Oklahoma	0.16	33	0.89	93	55	0.07	0.29	0.00	-0.24
University of Oregon	0.02	23	0.84	31	82	0.09	-0.10	0.06	-0.19
University of Pennsylvania	0.17	100	0.94	186	4	0.00	0.14	-0.14	-0.21

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
University of Pittsburgh	0.10	47	0.90	62	91	0.05	0.32	0.03	0.06
University of Richmond	0.03	62	0.85	122	66	0.04	0.09	-0.02	-0.10
University of San Diego	0.06	130	0.90	27	68	-0.03	0.04	0.07	0.35
University of San Francisco	-0.05	2	0.68	90	165	0.21	-0.07	0.00	-0.13
University of South Carolina	0.05	142	0.91	67	66	-0.05	-0.35	0.02	-0.22
University of South Dakota	-0.11	65	0.91	165	127	0.03	-0.81	-0.07	-0.03
University of Southern California	0.09	183	0.93	18	20	-0.17	-0.25	0.09	-0.32
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)	-0.03	27	0.90	76	98	0.08	-0.01	0.01	0.06
University of Tennessee	0.10	11	0.89	70	52	0.12	-0.16	0.02	-0.11
University of Texas at Austin	0.15	139	0.94	88	16	-0.04	-0.38	0.01	-0.01
University of Toledo	-0.02	55	0.83	96	148	0.04	-0.41	0.00	-0.03
University of Tulsa	-0.01	135	0.91	144	120	-0.03	0.23	-0.04	-0.14
University of Utah	0.06	95	0.92	17	28	0.00	-0.28	0.09	-0.29
University of Virginia	0.17	123	0.97	35	4	-0.03	0.11	0.06	0.28
University of Washington	0.12	99	0.85	118	48	0.00	0.09	-0.02	-0.18
University of Wyoming	0.03	105	0.87	102	120	-0.01	0.12	0.00	-0.15
UNT Dallas College of Law	-0.10	181	0.74	84	172	-0.16	0.16	0.01	0.21
Vanderbilt University	0.19	51	0.95	82	19	0.05	0.16	0.01	0.08

School	Bar Passage Differential (2023)	Bar Passage Differential Rank	Employment Rate (2023)	Employment Rate Rank	*U.S. News* Ranking (2024)	BP 9-Yr VA	BP 3-Yr VA	EMP 9-Yr VA	EMP 3-Yr VA
Vermont Law School	-0.10	98	0.80	141	168	0.00	0.08	-0.04	0.08
Villanova University	0.16	35	0.92	16	48	0.07	0.05	0.09	-0.26
Wake Forest University	0.18	134	0.99	7	25	-0.03	0.20	0.14	0.01
Washburn University	0.06	80	0.87	119	120	0.02	0.72	-0.02	-0.24
Washington and Lee University	0.06	159	0.98	21	33	-0.08	0.02	0.08	0.64
Washington University	0.12	53	0.95	40	16	0.05	0.02	0.05	-0.10
Wayne State University	0.03	124	0.92	12	55	-0.03	-0.36	0.11	-0.41
West Virginia University	-0.04	86	0.87	133	178	0.01	-0.21	-0.03	0.06
Western New England University	-0.06	45	0.73	126	178	0.05	0.90	-0.02	0.43
Western State College of Law	-0.14	156	0.81	45	178	-0.07	0.16	0.04	0.46
Widener Commonwealth	-0.21	186	0.76	111	117	-0.20	-0.37	-0.01	-0.38
Widener University-Delaware	-0.08	113	0.77	104	178	-0.02	0.21	-0.01	0.30
Willamette University	-0.21	91	0.74	103	145	0.01	-0.61	0.00	-0.23
William and Mary Law School	0.15	32	0.89	71	36	0.07	0.11	0.01	0.05
Yale University	0.17	145	0.80	182	1	-0.06	0.00	-0.12	-0.24