

February 2022

Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2021: Updating the Leiter Score Ranking for the Top Third

Gregory Sisk
gcsisk@stthomas.edu

Nicole Catlin
nicole.catlin@stthomas.edu

Alexandra Anderson

Lauren Gunderson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.stthomas.edu/ustlj>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#), and the [Other Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gregory Sisk, Nicole Catlin, Alexandra Anderson & Lauren Gunderson, *Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2021: Updating the Leiter Score Ranking for the Top Third*, 17 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 1041 (2022). Available at: <https://ir.stthomas.edu/ustlj/vol17/iss4/19>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UST Research Online and the University of St. Thomas Law Journal. For more information, please contact lawjournal@stthomas.edu.

ARTICLE

**SCHOLARLY IMPACT OF LAW SCHOOL
FACULTIES IN 2021: UPDATING THE
LEITER SCORE RANKING FOR THE
TOP THIRD**

GREGORY SISK, NICOLE CATLIN, ALEXANDRA ANDERSON &
LAUREN GUNDERSON

UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS SCHOOL OF LAW (MINNESOTA)

SUMMARY:

This updated 2021 study explores the scholarly impact of law faculties, ranking the top third of ABA-accredited law schools. Refined by Brian Leiter, the “Scholarly Impact Score” for a law faculty is calculated from the mean and the median of total law journal citations over the past five years to the work of tenured faculty members. In addition to a school-by-school ranking, we report the mean, median, and weighted score, along with a list of the tenured law faculty members at each school with the ten highest individual citation counts.

While the law faculty at Yale continues to hold the top ranked position in the 2021 Scholarly Impact Ranking, Chicago has now moved into the second spot, with Harvard at third. NYU and Columbia continue to rank in the fourth and fifth positions respectively. California-Berkeley has moved up into a tie for the sixth position with Stanford. The law faculties at two schools in the top ten have moved up one ranking position, with Pennsylvania now at eight and Vanderbilt at nine. In one of the most striking changes since the 2018 Scholarly Impact Ranking, Virginia has climbed from sixteen to a tie for the ninth position in 2021.

The law schools with the highest rises in the 2021 Scholarly Impact Ranking are American by 18 ordinal levels (to #46), Georgia up 15 positions (to #43), and Brooklyn up 11 positions (to #33).

Several law faculties achieve a Scholarly Impact Ranking in 2021 well above the law school rankings reported by *U.S. News* for 2022:

Vanderbilt (at #9) shows a significant gap with *U.S. News* Ranking (at #16). Among schools close to the top ten for Scholarly Impact, the University of California-Irvine (at #14) has the greatest incongruity with the 2022 *U.S. News* ranking at (#35).

In the Scholarly Impact Top 25, George Washington University rises to #18 in Scholarly Impact, while lagging at #27 for *U.S. News*. Minnesota is also at #18 in Scholarly Impact, but at #22 in *U.S. News*. The University of California-Davis hits #22 in Scholarly Impact, while left well behind by *U.S. News* at #35. George Mason continues to be a Top 25 Scholarly Impact school at #23, while dropping in *U.S. News* to #41. Fordham also ranks at #23 for Scholarly Impact, but down at #35 for *U.S. News*.

The most dramatically under-valued law faculty remains the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota), which continues to rank inside the top 25 (at #23) for Scholarly Impact in 2021, while being relegated by *U.S. News* below the top 100 (at #126)—a difference of 103 ordinal levels.

In addition, we report the results of an experimental survey of *U.S. News* academic voters for a general academic impact ranking. Cass Sunstein, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Erwin Chemerinsky, and Angela Onwuachi-Willig hold the top four positions, with Mark Lemley, Catharine MacKinnon, and Orin Kerr tied for the fifth position. Notably, this subjective survey about individual law faculty reputation correlates tightly with scholarly impact. Even when freely invited to evaluate individual professor impact on any academic basis, the surveyed law professors voted for three of the top four cited professors in our Scholarly Impact Ranking. Six of the seven are in the top 3 percent of all studied faculty for scholarly citations (which is likely closer to the top 1 percent for all law faculties in ABA-accredited law schools). In sum, citation-based scholarly impact is a strong proxy for faculty excellence overall.

Table 1: Summary of Scholarly Impact Ranking of Law Faculties, 2021

Rank	Law School	Weighted Score
1	Yale	1345
2	Chicago	1110
3	Harvard	940
4	NYU	921
5	Columbia	814
6	Stanford	752
6	Cal-Berkeley	749
8	Pennsylvania	663
9	Virginia	646
9	Vanderbilt	644
11	UCLA	605
12	Duke	597
13	Michigan	545
14	Cal-Irvine	537
15	Northwestern	528
15	Cornell	527
17	Georgetown	514
18	George Washington	472
18	Texas	471
18	Minnesota	468
21	Washington U	440
22	Cal-Davis	435
23	George Mason	420
23	Fordham	414
23	Boston U	411
23	U. St. Thomas (MN)	410
27	Arizona	387
27	William & Mary	384
29	USC	382
30	U. San Diego	367
31	Notre Dame	346
31	Illinois	344
33	Cardozo	340
33	Brooklyn	338
33	Colorado	336

Rank	Law School	Weighted Score
36	Utah	326
36	Case Western	325
36	North Carolina	323
36	Emory	317
40	Kansas	311
40	Hastings	305
40	Chicago-Kent	304
43	Ohio State	300
43	Alabama	293
43	Georgia	289
46	American	287
46	Florida State	278
46	Maryland	278
49	Temple	275
49	BYU	268
49	Wake Forest	265
52	Florida	260
52	Arizona State	258
52	Iowa	255
52	Indiana-Bloomington	253
52	Richmond	251
57	Missouri	245
57	San Francisco	244
59	Boston College	230
59	UNLV	229
59	Wisconsin	227
59	Pittsburgh	225
63	Santa Clara	220
63	SMU	221
63	Hofstra	219
63	Northeastern	217
63	Loyola-LA	216
63	Pepperdine	212

SCHOLARLY IMPACT OF LAW SCHOOL FACULTIES IN 2021: UPDATING THE LEITER SCORE RANKING FOR THE TOP THIRD

GREGORY SISK, NICOLE CATLIN, ALEXANDRA ANDERSON & LAUREN GUNDERSON*

I. THE SCHOLARLY IMPACT MOMENT FOR THE LEGAL ACADEMY

We are witnessing something of a Scholarly Impact Moment. Citation-based measures of scholarly impact have long been influential in other academic disciplines. Our triennial Scholarly Impact Ranking of law school faculties by citation counts is hardly new, having been described over the past decade as second only to the *U.S. News* ranking in “prominence,”¹ as “the industry standard for comparing law school faculties based on scholarly impact,”² and bringing ranking updates that are “widely watched.”³ And now attention to citation-based ranking of scholars in the legal academy has accelerated during the past few years.⁴

Between 2019 and 2021, two scholarly symposia have been devoted to scholarly impact and related issues for law schools.⁵ At the January 2020

* Gregory Sisk holds the Laghi Distinguished Chair in Law at the University of St. Thomas School of Law (Minnesota). Nicole Catlin is a Research Librarian in the Schoenecker Law Library at the University of St. Thomas. Alexandra Anderson and Lauren Gunderson, 2022 J.D. Candidates at the University of St. Thomas, were the student captains of the citation count teams and collaborated throughout the process, with Ms. Anderson taking the lead on the impact survey conducted the previous year. We would like to thank Anna Barton, Sarah Carpenter, Ashley Finck, Emily Gootzeit, Nicklaus Johnson, Michelle Lester, Colin Schaeffer, Anna Steinwand, and Hugh Van Scoy, all students at the University of St. Thomas School of Law, for serving on a team of research assistants to conduct the preliminary citation counts for each individual member of each law faculty.

1. Vikram David Amar, *What a Recently Released Study Ranking Law School Faculties by Scholarly Impact Reveals, and Why Both Would-Be Students and Current/Prospective Professors Should Care*, JUSTIA: VERDICT (Aug. 3, 2012), <https://verdict.justia.com/2012/08/03/what-a-recently-released-study-ranking-law-school-faculties-by-scholarly-impact-reveals-and-why-both-would-be-students-and-current-prospective-professors-should-care>.

2. Gary M. Lucas, Jr., *Measuring Scholarly Impact: A Guide for Law School Administrators and Legal Scholars*, 165 U. PA. L. REV. ONLINE 165, 170 (2017).

3. Andrew T. Hayashi & Gregory Mitchell, *Maintaining Scholarly Integrity in the Age of Bibliometrics*, 69 J. LEGAL EDUC. 138, 140 (2019).

4. See Margaret A. Kiel-Morse, *Exploring Citation Count Methods of Measuring Faculty Scholarly Impact*, MAURER L. SCH. LEGAL STUD. RSCH. PAPER SERIES NO. 423 1, 1 (2021) (“[S]crutinizing the various methods of assessing scholarly impact has been a hot topic.”).

5. See Yale Virtual Symposium on Citation and the Law (April 22 and 23, 2021), <https://library.law.yale.edu/virtual-symposium-citation-and-law>; see generally Paul J. Heald & Ted Sichelman, *Ranking the Academic Impact of 100 American Law Schools*, 60 JURIMETRICS J. 1 (2019) (making multiple references to the scholarly publications at these two symposia).

annual meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, multiple panels were devoted to the subject. And, of course, heightened attention was provoked by the announcement in 2019 by *U.S. News* that it would devise its own scholarly impact ranking for law schools,⁶ although that challenging project has now been abandoned by *U.S. News*.

A primary reason for this enhanced attention to an objective alternative measure of legal scholarly influence is the growing recognition that the *U.S. News* law school ranking system is dominated by a subjective⁷ and largely static peer survey that is disconnected from real-world developments in the legal academy.⁸ The most heavily weighted elements in the *U.S. News* ranking are the surveys of lawyers and judges and of deans and law professors. Those survey results tend to be frozen in place and, indeed, frozen in time. Studies show that the primary predictor for the peer survey results—at a “startling 0.96” correlation⁹—is the prior year’s overall *U.S. News* ranking. In sum, this central feature of the *U.S. News* ranking is nothing more than a feedback loop that provides no meaningful and current information about law faculties.¹⁰

By contrast, two signature virtues for a comparison of law schools based on citations to faculty scholarly works commend themselves to serious consideration. First, a citation-based ranking objectively measures, imperfectly but reliably, something that is real and directly connected to academic quality, that is, the scholarly influence of a law school’s collective faculty. Second, Scholarly Impact Ranking is dynamic, providing a real-time snapshot of contemporary changes among the nation’s law school faculties.¹¹

This 2021 Update to our triennial Scholarly Impact Ranking illustrates the dynamic character of our approach, confirming that additions and departures among law school faculties do indeed change the impact footprint of a school’s faculty. Among the significant movements in ranking this time, we find Chicago moving ahead of Harvard for the second position behind Yale. With the solid strength of scholarly activity at Chicago, and the retirement of several highly cited scholars at Harvard in recent years, this movement reflects the present reality on the ground. Similarly, we find that California-

6. Robert Morse, *U.S. News Considers Evaluating Law School Scholarly Impact*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP. (Feb. 13, 2019, 1:00 PM), <https://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/college-rankings-blog/articles/2019-02-13/us-news-considers-evaluating-law-school-scholarly-impact>.

7. On the multiple problems created by the subjective *U.S. News* survey rating, see generally Hayashi & Mitchell, *supra* note 3, at 139.

8. Gregory C. Sisk, *Measuring Law Faculty Scholarly Impact by Citations: Reliable and Valid for Collective Faculty Ranking*, 60 JURIMETRICS 41, 56–58 (2019).

9. Heald & Sichelman, *supra* note 5, at 32.

10. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 57.

11. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 55–56.

Berkeley has continued momentum by attracting strongly cited lateral hires, moving into a tie for the sixth position with Stanford.

And most remarkably in the Scholarly Impact Top Ten, Virginia has recruited more than half a dozen highly cited lateral scholars in the very recent past and accordingly has climbed several positions from #16 in our 2018 ranking to arrive in the Top Ten for 2021. Indeed, Virginia now shares a tie position for #9 with Vanderbilt, another strongly achieving scholarly institution that has moved up yet another ordinal position in this 2021 update.

Both the virtues and the cautionary limitations of our Scholarly Impact Ranking have been well surveyed and thoroughly analyzed in the growing literature on scholarly impact over the past few years. Rather than repeat at even greater length our explanations of what we see as the considerable virtues of our approach, along with our acknowledgment of imperfections and our responses to the critics, we provide only a general summary below, with citation to previous publications for those who wish to delve further into these questions.

A. *The Virtues of a Scholarly Impact Approach to Evaluating Faculty Scholarly Work*

Over the past two decades, the Scholarly Impact Scores pioneered by Brian Leiter¹² at the University of Chicago and now updated every three years by our team at the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota) have become a prominent means of comparing law schools through citations to faculty scholarship.¹³ At a recent symposium on citations and scholarly impact, a person in the audience asked the panel “what problem was scholarly impact ranking trying to address?” A member of the panel responded that citation rankings were intended to counter the purely subjective and largely immobile peer survey ranking used by *U.S. News*. That answer was correct and responsive to the way the question was asked.

But the defects in the *U.S. News* ranking are not the only reason for the amplified attention to Scholarly Impact Ranking. Beyond addressing a

12. See Brian Leiter, *Measuring the Academic Distinction of Law Faculties*, 29 J. LEGAL STUD. 451, 469 (2000); Brian Leiter, *Top 25 Law Faculties in Scholarly Impact, 2005-2009*, BRIAN LEITER'S LAW SCHOOL RANKINGS, www.leiterrankings.com/faculty/2010_scholarlyimpact.shtml (last visited Oct. 2, 2021) [hereinafter *2010 Top 25*].

13. For prior updates of the Scholarly Impact Ranking, see Gregory C. Sisk, Nicole Catlin, Katherine Veenis & Nicole Zeman, *Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2018: Updating the Leiter Score Ranking for the Top Third*, 15 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 95 (2018) [hereinafter *2018 Scholarly Impact Ranking*]; Gregory C. Sisk, Valerie Aggerbeck, Nick Farris, Megan McNevin & Maria Pitner, *Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2015: Updating the Leiter Score Ranking for the Top Third*, 12 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 100 (2015) [hereinafter *2015 Scholarly Impact Ranking*]; Gregory C. Sisk, Valerie Aggerbeck, Debby Hackerson & Mary Wells, *Scholarly Impact of Law School Faculties in 2012: Applying Leiter Scores to Rank the Top Third*, 9 U. ST. THOMAS L.J. 838 (2013) [hereinafter *2012 Scholarly Impact Ranking*].

“problem” of the sclerotic subjective peer survey that dominates the *U.S. News* conglomerate ranking of law schools, Scholarly Impact Ranking makes an independent contribution to our understanding of faculty scholarly activity within the American legal academy. The ranking makes a declaration, even a celebration, of the meaningful influence of law professor scholarly writing on other legal scholars.

Scholarly Impact is a Valid and Reliable Measurement of Scholarly Influence: While we have always emphasized that there are multiple ways to evaluate the scholarly work of individual law professors,¹⁴ we submit with increasing confidence that a citation count measure is a valid and reliable proxy for scholarly excellence.¹⁵ In contrast with subjective impressions and self-serving anecdotes about scholarly influence, citation counts are “relevant and important because they tend to reflect the level of engagement that one’s scholarship generates.”¹⁶ For a long time in other academic disciplines and for the last two decades in the legal academy, citation counts have become “a well-established—and the most objective—measure of quality” for scholarship.¹⁷ Not surprisingly, as confirmed by our own experimental survey reported below,¹⁸ “scholars who have higher citation counts tend to have better reputations.”¹⁹

For our current purposes in this ranking, a citation-based measure has the distinct advantage of capturing a significant part of faculty scholarly achievements and in a manner that places every law faculty in the same measurement space.

Scholarly Impact Provides a Contemporary View of Dynamic Changes in Law Faculty Scholarly Influence: Because we update the Scholarly Impact Ranking every three years based on citations during the preceding five years, we are measuring the current scholarly impact, with some 60 percent of the citations being newly counted since the previous ranking. In this way, we can highlight genuine changes in the scholarly climate, based on how scholarship is being used today by other legal scholars, rather than making assumptions based on past reputations.

As this 2021 Update amply demonstrates,²⁰ changes in faculty profiles do drive changes in Scholarly Impact Ranking, as we would expect and as

14. Sisk, et al., *2018 Scholarly Impact Ranking*, *supra* note 13, at 104; *see also* Andrew Perlman, *Top Cited Professional Responsibility/Legal Profession Scholars*, LEGAL ETHICS F. (Jan. 5, 2015), <http://www.legalethicsforum.com/blog/2015/01/top-cited-pr-legal-profession-scholars.html> (“[A] citation study is only one measure of a scholar’s contribution to a field.”).

15. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 55–56.

16. Symposium, *Conference on the Ethics of Legal Scholarship*, 101 MARQ. L. REV. 1083, 1100 (2018) (remarks of Eli Wald).

17. *See* Albert H. Yoon, *Editorial Bias in Legal Academia*, 5 J. LEGAL ANALYSIS 309, 314–15 (2013) (citations omitted).

18. *See infra* note 49 and accompanying text.

19. Lucas, *supra* note 2, at 166, 167.

20. *See supra* Part I and *infra* Part IV.A.

should be recognized. In this vital way, a Scholarly Impact Ranking is a contemporary and dynamic measure of comparative scholarly movements and enhancements among law faculties.

Objective Scholarly Impact Measures are More Egalitarian Than Subjective Reputation: Another virtue of an objective citation-based measure over a subjective reputational survey is a more egalitarian picture of faculty scholarly prominence. As Andrew Hayashi and Gregory Mitchell write, “many legal scholars who write excellent scholarship but reside outside the top-ranked law school should welcome impact studies that separates scholarly impact from institutional prominence.”²¹ Moreover, as Dennis Callahan and Neal Devins have found, good quality articles will be cited even if they appear in a low-ranked journal and poor quality articles appearing in top-ranked journals will not be cited.²² Citation imperfectly but robustly follows quality.

As we have articulated in each prior iteration of these rankings:

- A citation to an article authored by a faculty member at a law school ranked in a lower tier and that is published in a secondary journal at another law school of similar lower rank carries the same weight as a citation to an article by a Yale law professor that was published in the *Harvard Law Review*. This is not to deny that an appearance in a leading law journal enhances the likelihood that an article will be cited. Nonetheless, when an article draws a citation, it registers the same, regardless of either the journal of the cited source or the journal of the citing article. Moreover, in an era when computer search tools and databases for relevant legal scholarship are ever more available, inexpensive, and user-friendly, an article that is of value to other scholars is more likely today to be discovered regardless of publication venue.²³
- A citation to an article on wills and trusts contributes to this objective measurement of scholarly impact to the same degree as a citation to an article on constitutional law. To be sure, as Brian Leiter has reminded us quite recently,²⁴ scholars laboring in certain fields, such as constitutional law, are more likely to be cited

21. Hayashi & Mitchell, *supra* note 3, at 143.

22. Dennis J. Callahan & Neal Devins, *Law Review Article Placement: Benefit or Beauty Prize?*, 56 J. LEGAL EDUC. 374, 375 (2006).

23. See Alfred L. Brophy, *Law [Review]’s Empire: The Assessment of Law Reviews and Trends in Legal Scholarship*, 39 CONN. L. REV. 101, 106 (2006) (describing “the democratization of legal knowledge through dissemination” on the various electronic databases, resulting in wider and easier distribution of legal scholarship and easy access to pertinent text by computer search terms).

24. Brian Leiter, *Citation Counts Vary by Field*, BRIAN LEITER’S LAW SCHOOL REPORTS (Aug. 9, 2021), <https://leiterlawschool.typepad.com/leiter/2021/08/citation-counts-vary-by-field.html>.

than those in other fields.²⁵ However, when a citation study is focused on collective comparisons across law faculties, “field bias becomes less important.”²⁶

- A citation appearing in the lowest ranked law review in the country is recorded with the same numerical value as one in the highest ranked law review. Thus, scholars working in particular fields who find it more difficult to place articles in what are conventionally regarded as the leading law reviews—but who successfully provoke a vigorous exchange in specialized, secondary, or lower-ranked law reviews—receive full credit for those citations to their work.

B. The Limits of a Scholarly Impact Approach and a Response to Critics

No attempt to measure scholarly influence or quality will be perfect, and each approach contains its own unavoidable qualifications. In our view, the inherent limitations for our Scholarly Impact Ranking are not major drawbacks. Indeed, some aspects of our particular approach that are criticized by others should instead be recognized as appropriate and even commendable attributes.

Scholarly Impact for Law Faculties Appropriately Looks to Citations in the Journals of Our Discipline: The Scholarly Impact Ranking reported in this study measures citations by tenured members of law faculties in American law journals. Because we use the Westlaw database for Law Reviews and Journals,²⁷ our universe of sources is set as English-language journals in the legal discipline. We regard this as an appropriate feature, rather than a defect, in our approach.

To begin with, as others have realized when attempting alternative approaches to impact measurement, other datasets for law faculty scholarship come with their own limitations and may not be readily adaptable to a comprehensive study of law faculties across the country. Nor should combinations or supplementations of citations from diverse sources be facilely applied without hesitation. Mixing and matching citations from different datasets further complicates the process, demands significant resources, and potentially introduces distortions by comparing apples and oranges. For example, some have postulated that adding citations to journals in other disciplines—including disciplines in which higher citation rates are the practice—could mean that non-law citations might “swamp” legal cita-

25. See Theodore Eisenberg & Martin T. Wells, *Ranking and Explaining the Scholarly Impact of Law Schools*, 27 J. LEGAL STUD. 373, 375 (1998) (“Writing about constitutional law offers the opportunity for the greatest impact on other scholars, probably because the most people teach and write in this area and because student law reviews may be especially amenable to articles about constitutional law.”).

26. Lucas, *supra* note 2, at 169.

27. See *infra* Part II.C.

tions.²⁸ For our study which involves sifting through nearly half a million citations (480,330 to be precise) for thousands of law professors (3,279 for 2021), the reliability and accuracy of the Westlaw database make possible the large-scale comparisons among dozens of law school faculties that we report here.

By building on citations in the legal scholarly literature, our approach has been criticized as downplaying the value of interdisciplinary scholarly work published in non-law journals.²⁹ But while law school citation rankings based on other datasets may truly exclude interdisciplinary works, our Westlaw-based Scholarly Impact Ranking *does* measure the impact of law faculty interdisciplinary work, *when* that interdisciplinary work is registered in the legal literature. We have not neglected the impact on the legal literature of scholarly works published in the journals of related disciplines, but rather have contextualized that interdisciplinary influence.

The question is *not* whether to account for scholarship published in interdisciplinary venues. Rather, the question is *how* best to account for the role of interdisciplinary work in our legal discipline. To move beyond the established dataset of law reviews and journals (which already include many but not all interdisciplinary venues), we would have to arrive at a definition of interdisciplinary work. In other words, we would have to determine what kinds of scholarly work are genuinely interdisciplinary in nature in the sense of having a meaningful connection to the law. If citations within non-law journals were to be added in evaluating the scholarly impact of law professors, confounding questions would remain about how to do so consistently and in a manner that maintains the primacy of the legal discipline. A faculty member jointly tenured to a law school and another department but who primarily publishes works in science, medical, literary, economic, or other journals that have little or no connection to law might not appropriately be credited for citations garnered only in the journals of those other fields. After all, our purpose here is to evaluate scholarly impact for a *law* faculty. Moreover, non-law scholarly databases may include unpublished working papers, conference presentations that are never committed to publication, etc., thus posing fair questions about whether citations in such works should be counted for scholarly impact in the law.

28. See John R. Beatty, *Citation Databases for Legal Scholarship*, SUNY BUFFALO L. SCH. LEGAL STUD. RSCH. PAPER SERIES NO. 2019-14 1, 6 (2020); Robert Anderson, *Some Preliminary Contrarian Thoughts on the US News Proposal to Rank Based on Scholarly Impact*, WITNESSETH: LAW, DEALS & DATA (Feb. 14, 2019), <https://witnesseth.typepad.com/blog/2019/02/us-news-to-rank-based-on-scholarly-impact.html>.

29. See Hayashi & Mitchell, *supra* note 3, at 144 (saying that “interdisciplinary legal scholars” are “disadvantaged in citation studies using the Hein and Westlaw databases that are usually used in legal citation studies because both omit important interdisciplinary journals”); Bonnie Shucha, *Representing Law Faculty Scholarly Impact: Strategies for Improving Citation Metrics and Promoting Scholarly Visibility*, UNIV. OF WIS. LEGAL STUD. RSCH. PAPER SERIES NO. 1692 1, 2 (2021) (“[T]he exclusion of interdisciplinary scholarship and books would create an incomplete representation of law faculty scholarly impact.”).

For our 2021 Scholarly Impact Ranking, as in the past, we forthrightly submit that focusing on the journals of our own legal discipline to rank the scholarly impact of law faculties is a justifiable choice.³⁰ At the same time, because our approach focuses on citations to named law professors, rather than to specific articles, a law professor's work published in non-legal journals that captures the attention of law professors publishing in the journals of our legal discipline are fully credited. Again, to be clear, our Westlaw-based approach encompasses all citations in the legal journals to a law professor's work, including those citations to books and articles in non-law journals. And we do so in a way that does not require us to make a judgment about whether the cited work is genuinely interdisciplinary, because the very fact the work is cited in the legal literature strongly indicates an interdisciplinary salience. In this meaningful way, our approach does indeed "include some measure of interdisciplinary work."³¹

We also should be careful not to overstate the differences produced by alternative measures of citation counts for law school ranking, especially when looking at faculties collectively by means and medians of citations. A study using HeinOnline to count citations found a remarkable correlation of nearly 90 percent with our longstanding approach using the Westlaw Law Reviews and Journals database.³² Even an alternative approach that incorporated and weighted additional citations from non-law journals³³ only "slightly reshuffled the order" of rankings in our Scholarly Impact approach.³⁴

Moreover, unlike a certain law school ranking that is published annually, we have never claimed that our Scholarly Impact Ranking encompasses everything about every law school. Other rankings on alternative factors add more to our understanding of what is distinctive about law school institutions. Thus, we see ourselves more in agreement than not with the suggestion of J.B. Ruhl, Michael Vandenberg, and Sarah Dunaway to look to citations of works by law professors in non-law journals for what they describe as "an *additional* indication of the influence of legal scholars."³⁵ Our point of departure is that we suggest such an alternative non-law-journal based approach, while an intriguing addendum, "is more judiciously valued as a self-standing study rather than as blended into a general ranking of scholarly impact in the legal field."³⁶

30. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 45.

31. See Kiel-Morse, *supra* note 4, at 1.

32. Heald & Sichelman, *supra* note 5, at 32.

33. J.B. Ruhl, Michael P. Vandenberg & Sarah Dunaway, *Total Scholarly Impact: Law Professor Citations in Non-Law Journals*, VAND. UNIV. L. SCH. LEGAL STUD. RSCH. PAPER SERIES NO. 19-35 (2019).

34. See Beatty, *supra* note 28, at 10. For comparative rankings, see Ruhl, Vandenberg & Dunaway, *supra* note 33, at 24-25.

35. Ruhl, Vandenberg & Dunaway, *supra* note 33, at 2 (emphasis added).

36. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 45.

Gender or Racial Bias in Legal Citations is Contradicted by the Evidence: With reports of gender or racial disparities in citations in other academic disciplines, some understandably ask whether a ranking focus on citations might disadvantage historically unrepresented groups on law school faculties. Fortunately, such biased tendencies do not appear to have infected citations to legal scholarship. Studies with well-specified models for multivariate analysis have found that female law professors are, if anything, cited at a higher rate than male law professors and that persons of color fare well also in citations.³⁷

Moreover, some have speculated that the citation practice of listing only the lead author of multi-authored articles works to downplay the scholarly contributions of female or minority authors or those who are less well known and who thus hypothetically may be folded anonymously into an “et al.” citation. As discussed below,³⁸ our direct examination of the “et al.” citation phenomenon provides no support for that conclusion; indeed, white male professors at the top-ranked law schools prove to be those who suffer the most losses in citation credit.

In any event, as one of us has said elsewhere, “if such a gender or racial disparity were found in recognition of scholarly work, the answer would not be to blind ourselves but rather to lay out the problem concretely for transparent discussion and possible resolution.”³⁹

Survey Shows General Academic Reputation for a Law Professor is Closely Linked to Scholarly Impact: At forums on citation-based ranking, members of the audience sometimes complain that a scholarly impact approach places too much weight on scholarly writing while neglecting the other ways in which law professors may make an academic impact. We heard from law professors who argued for a more holistic evaluation of professor impact that would take into account other elements of an academic interaction with the community, such as prestige and influence with practitioners, national prominence in pedagogy, political advocacy in the halls of government, or pursuit of public interest litigation.

In response to these suggestions, we conducted an experimental survey of law professors during the summer of 2020, which we deliberately framed to be open-ended in how survey respondents would define “impact.” Our working hypothesis was that the undirected intuitions of most law professors as to what constitutes the most effective engagement by an individual faculty member would correlate strongly with scholarly influence as mea-

37. Christopher Anthony Cotropia & Lee Petherbridge, *Gender Disparity in Law Review Citation Rates*, 59 WM. & MARY L. REV. 771, 771 (2018); See Deborah Jones Merritt, *Scholarly Influence in a Diverse Legal Academy: Race, Sex, and Citation Counts*, 29 J. LEGAL STUD. 345, 363 (2000). On how “women and minorities fare” in law citation studies, see generally Hayashi & Mitchell, *supra* note 3, at 152–43 n.20.

38. See *infra* note 49 and accompanying text.

39. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 45–46.

sured by citation impact. Indeed, in the end, our survey results show that generally held impressions about who are the most impactful members of our legal professoriate dovetail rather powerfully with scholarly prominence through published works that are widely cited.

During the Pandemic Summer of 2020, we conducted a survey of a sample of law professors at all law schools accredited by the American Bar Association. We defined our sample as the same set of academic voters who are surveyed for the *U.S. News* peer-ranking process, that is, the dean, the associate dean, the chair of the faculty hiring committee, and the most recently tenured faculty member at each of the accredited law schools. After approval from our university's Institutional Review Board, we submitted the survey by email to 720 law professors, a pool that was 45.8 percent female and 11.8 percent minority. We received responses from 186 law professors, a respectable response rate of just over 25 percent. All responses were kept anonymous.

Our email survey asked one simple question: "Who do you consider the most impactful law professors in the country?" Each participant was invited to submit up to three names (and were directed not to select anyone at their own law school, to avoid institutional nepotism). We deliberately did not dictate parameters for the question, explaining that we recognized that citations to scholarly work are not the only metric for evaluating the academic contributions of law professors. We invited the survey respondent to "use whatever metrics you find most appropriate to select the law professors that, in your opinion, have made the greatest national impact."

The responses to this survey were obviously subjective. Still, the survey respondents presumably were better-informed in choosing the three most impactful legal academics than they are in a response to the annual *U.S. News* survey to evaluate some 200 law schools. While few law professors have sufficient information to provide a reasoned and well-grounded evaluation of large numbers of law schools, each law professor should readily be able to identify a finite number of persons that he or she regards as making the greatest national impact as a legal academic.

As with any reputational survey, especially one as open-ended as this one, the results should be read with caution. Moreover, as shown below, only a small number received more than a single-digit number of votes. Indeed, because the votes fall off rather quickly, we report only the top five, which comes to a total of seven as there was a three-way tie for the fifth position.

EXPERIMENTAL SURVEY OF LAW PROFESSORS ON GENERAL ACADEMIC
IMPACT

Rank	Law Professor	Score / Result
1	Cass Sunstein (Harvard)	32
2	Kimberlé Crenshaw (Columbia, UCLA)	26
3	Erwin Chemerinsky (California-Berkeley)	18
4	Angela Onwuachi-Willig (Boston University)	14
5	Mark Lemley (Stanford)	9
5	Catharine MacKinnon (Michigan)	9
5	Orin Kerr (California-Berkeley)	9

Notably, even when the selection criteria for law professor impact was unrestricted, the persons selected are all accomplished legal scholars and rank highly in our citations-based Scholarly Impact approach. While Cass Sunstein is presently on leave from Harvard in government service, he was on the Harvard roster at the time of the survey and, if he were included for the 2021 ranking, would stand as the most highly cited legal scholar in the nation (with nearly 4,500 citations in the last five years). Erwin Chemerinsky ranks first in our 2021 Scholarly Impact counts, with 2,465 citations, while Mark Lemley ranks third with 1,910 citations.

Thus, three law professors ranked as most impactful by their colleagues in this reputational survey are within the top three most-cited law professors in the country. And the others on this survey list are also among the most highly cited law professors in the country, with all but one coming inside the top 3 percent for citations among the more than 3,000 law professors in our study, and the remaining individual being close to the top 10 percent. And because the ninety-nine schools examined in our 2021 Update to the Scholarly Impact Ranking are already in the top half for impact of the nearly 200 ABA-accredited law schools, some 85 percent of these individuals chosen by the survey as impactful academics likely rank within the top 1 to 2 percent of all law professors in the country for citations to scholarly writings.

So the evident take-away is that national prominence and a leading academic reputation for an individual law professor connects rather directly to being a widely cited legal scholar. This experimental survey provides one more piece of evidence in support of the conclusion that citation-based scholarly impact is a strong, albeit imperfect, proxy for scholarly excellence and academic achievement.

II. THE NATURE AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS SCHOLARLY IMPACT STUDY

Pioneered by Brian Leiter at the University of Chicago⁴⁰ and carried forward by our team at the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota) every three years since 2012,⁴¹ Scholarly Impact Scores measure the collective attention given in American legal journals to the published work of the tenured members of a law faculty. With most updates, we have striven to improve the quality of the study. In 2018, we were able to remove mere acknowledgments in the initial asterisk footnote of an article from our counts. For 2021, we have implemented a substantial correction to the so-called “et al. problem,” by which we now can credit most citations to authors of multi-authored works whose names are hidden behind the “et al.” citation form.

A. *Selecting Law Schools for Study*

To rank law faculties by scholarly impact in 2021, we examined the tenured faculties of ninety-nine law schools. Based on the results of our prior studies of scholarly impact, we included all law schools that previously scored in or near the top seventy for Scholarly Impact Ranking.

Through the law school associate deans’ listserv, we distributed the list of the law faculties that we planned to study, while inviting other law schools to prepare their own Scholarly Impact study and share that data with us. Two other law schools did share information with us this year, and we will continue to encourage this.

B. *Developing Faculty Rosters for Each Law School*

For the Scholarly Impact Score, the key initial step is to develop a roster for each law school of the tenured faculty who have traditional scholarly expectations. Because the Scholarly Impact Score is derived from citations in legal journals, the proper subject of study is the tenured law school faculty member who is expected to contribute to that genre of legal literature. Accordingly, two categories of law faculty would not always be fairly included: (1) faculty with a primary appointment in clinical teaching and (2) faculty with a primary appointment in teaching legal research and writing.⁴² However, several schools have an “integrated” tenure process, in which identical scholarly expectations are applied to all professors whatever their teaching assignment. For those schools, all tenured faculty were included. In addition, it would be premature to include untenured faculty, who typi-

40. Leiter, *supra* note 12.

41. See Sisk et al., *2018 Scholarly Impact Ranking*, *supra* note 13.

42. Further discussion of faculty categories included in the roster and the reasons for not including certain categories may be found in Sisk, et al., *2012 Scholarly Impact Ranking*, *supra* note 13, at 847–53.

cally produce fewer articles during the pre-tenure stage and have not yet had an opportunity to build a portfolio of work that in turn draws significant numbers of citations.

A faculty member was credited to the school where he or she is or will be teaching. Because the study attempts to measure the scholarly impact of a law school's current congregation of scholars, the faculty on which a law professor now sits receives the full benefit of all citations, past and present. By inquiring of each law school in the study, learning from individual faculty members making a move, and searching the leading on-line list of law faculty moves,⁴³ faculty moving from one school to another for the fall with tenure were credited to their new school home.

After preparing preliminary faculty rosters for the law schools in our study, we shared those rosters with the deans' offices at each school, asking for confirmation that the list contained all tenured faculty with standard scholarly obligations.⁴⁴ We received many helpful responses, allowing us to correct errors and confirm proper rosters, with a high response rate of nearly 90 percent (89 of 99 law schools).⁴⁵

C. *Conducting the Citation Counts for Scholarly Impact*

Search Term in Westlaw Law Review Database: Defining "Scholarly Impact" as the citation of a law professor's scholarship in a subsequent work of published legal scholarship, the study measures that "Scholarly Impact" through counts of total citations in law reviews over the past five years. For each tenured faculty member on each law faculty, we searched the "Law Reviews and Journals" database under "Secondary Sources" in

43. See Brian Leiter, *Lateral Hires with Tenure or on Tenure-Track, 2020-21*, BRIAN LEITER L. SCH. REP. (Aug. 13, 2021), <https://leiterlawschool.typepad.com/leiter/2021/08/lateral-hires-with-tenure-or-on-tenure-track-2020-21.html>.

44. Andrew Hayashi and Gregory Mitchell fairly contend for greater transparency in the preparation of these rosters for citation counts, arguing that, to prevent improper manipulation by law schools, "faculty rosters should be made public." Hayashi & Mitchell, *supra* note 3, at 152. We agree that would be ideal and, speaking for ourselves, would have no objection to doing so. Unfortunately, necessary promises of confidentiality in our discussions with law deans prevent us from doing so. First, we are frequently informed about forthcoming changes in faculties, such as retirements, that have not yet been publicly announced. Second, as odd as it may seem, some law deans regard the identification of the tenure status of certain faculty as akin to a state secret, swearing us to secrecy on the matter. That being said, we assure our readers that we never simply accept the rosters as given by a law school dean's office. We begin by independently preparing the roster based on our own research into various sources for identifying the tenured faculty. When a dean's office suggests additions (typically based on tenure decisions from the prior year that we had not discovered) or deletions (typically based on a faculty member from another department holding only a courtesy position in the law school or an impending retirement), we follow up with questions to get specific information for each. Indeed, on one occasion this year, two schools insisted that a professor belonged to their roster, one saying the person was only visiting at another school and the other school saying the person was now a permanent addition to their tenured faculty. We independently confirmed the right answer by contacting the professor herself.

45. For the law school dean's offices that responded to our roster inquiry, we later shared our preliminary citation counts as well, as a soft double-check against obvious errors.

Westlaw. For the first time in 2018, we employed the new Westlaw field search term “TE” which omits the initial asterisk footnote, thus excluding mere acknowledgments of a professor without any accompanying citation to his or her scholarly work.

To focus on the preceding five years and exclude mere acknowledgments, we used the search “TE(firstname /2 lastname) and date(aft 2015) and date(bef 2021)”. When a law school alerted us that a faculty member had used more than one name in professional life or had a name with unusual characteristics, we devised a special search term when appropriate to account for those alternatives.

The Citation Count Process: Citation counts for each tenured faculty member at each law school were conducted independently by two law student research assistants pursuant to a set of instructions and after a training session that included work on a practice faculty roster. Those independent citation count results were then reconciled, double-checked, and replicated when in conflict. Overall, we counted 480,330 citations to the scholarly work of 3,279 tenured law professors. After applying the new field search term to exclude acknowledgments in the asterisk footnote, verifying the correct identity of the cited scholar including appropriate use of sampling, and supplementing for missing names in “et al.” citations, we recorded the objective citation counts without further adjustment.⁴⁶

Even though our search in the Westlaw law journal database was restricted to publications dated before 2021, Westlaw continues to add further publications with a formal publication date prior to a particular calendar date for some period of time afterward. Thus, even with a date restriction to articles published in 2020 and earlier, a citation count of a law professor that is conducted in, say, August of 2021 may be slightly higher than the citation count for that same person in May of 2021.⁴⁷ Accordingly, we conducted all citation counts within a short period in late May and early June to maintain consistency in counts among all law faculties.

Sampling to Adjust for False Hits: When a faculty member’s name included a name or word that may be common in contemporary usage or draw prominent historical references or when the first set of twenty results in the Westlaw search uncovered false “hits,” we did not rely solely on the

46. Not only would it be impossible to inspect and review the content and nature of every single one of the more than half a million citations counted in this study, but caution is suggested before too readily intervening in the objective count to evaluate a citation for its purported value, lest the study introduce a dubious subjective dimension. See Sisk et al., *2015 Scholarly Impact Ranking*, *supra* note 13, at 113. Although some noise will persist, the source of the citation as by a scholar in a scholarly work that was published in a scholarly journal stands as a general validation of authenticity and quality.

47. Indeed, this accretion of pre-2021 citations with addition of new articles to the Westlaw database is continuing as of the date of this report, so that those seeking to replicate these same results by late-summer or fall citation counts may see them increase as much as 3 to 6 percent, perhaps more for highly cited scholars.

raw search result count. “Instead, we examined the first fifty results (or all results if there were fewer than fifty)” by date order, “compared them to a list of publications by that faculty member (typically through an on-line curriculum vitae), identified which of the first fifty results were to the person under study, and then applied the percentage of correct hits in that first fifty to the full search results.”⁴⁸ Indeed, as we have seen through hard-won experience over the past decade, a failure to use a sampling method would introduce catastrophic error. In multiple instances where an unadjusted count exceeded the adjusted count by a factor of three or more, a failure to adjust for false hits would have changed the ranking of the school itself.

Correcting for the Omission of Names in an “Et Al.” Citation: Instead of being based on article citations directly, our Scholarly Impact approach is based on references to the individual name of a law professor in the Westlaw database for Law Reviews and Journals. “The strength of Westlaw is also sometimes a weakness”—that it is literal.⁴⁹ Using Westlaw as a literal search engine means that if a name is missing in a citation, then our Westlaw search simply will not uncover it. So if a multi-authored article is cited by a reference to the lead author followed by “et al.,” then our searches will uncover a citation only to the lead author.

In the past, we had concluded that there was simply no practical solution to the so-called “et al. problem.” When it comes to methodology, we have to devise a technique that works efficiently in a large-scale study involving thousands of tenured faculty members at a hundred law schools and then implementing that in a manner consistent across-the-board. When we are conducting a search for nearly half-a-million citations for thousands of law professors, we have had to rely mostly on a mechanical counting method. For these reasons, we believed we simply could not integrate a resolution to the “et al. problem” into our methodology. We’d first have to know each individual professor among the thousands that has been an author of an article joined by more than one other co-author. We’d then have to run hundreds of alternative search terms for each person and article variation, trying to determine which are correct hits and not duplicative of other citation counts.

Moreover, because our primary objective is comparison of law faculties, and the “et al.” issue is not isolated to a particular law school’s faculty, and also based on some ad hoc test searches during prior updates, we had concluded that the effect was a relatively small one. In sum, we have assumed that the inability to address the missing citations lost in an “et al.” citation would have a marginal effect on ranking of law schools on collective means and medians in citations.

48. Sisk, et al., *2018 Scholarly Impact Ranking*, *supra* note 13, at 110–12.

49. Sisk, *supra* note 8, at 51.

Fortunately, for 2021, we have been able to implement a substantial “fix” to the “et al. problem,” which is reflected in this year’s scoring and ranking. Through the generosity of Ted Sichelman and HeinOnline, they were able to identify every multi-authored article that was cited in the HeinOnline database over the past five years.

From that list of hundreds of articles, we decided in advance to adopt a manageable approach by focusing on those articles with at least three authors that had drawn at least twenty citations in HeinOnline during that five-year period. (Articles with two authors are never cited with “et al.,” so those did not need further consideration.) Given that the typical law school has more than twenty faculty members on their tenured roster, a loss of citations under twenty would have the *de minimis* effect of a point or less on a school’s mean citations. And because ranking is based on scaling from the highest scored school, a few points difference in a school’s mean will not substantially alter a ranking position.

For the remaining two-hundred-some articles on the HeinOnline multi-author citation list, we had to bring citations for those articles into the Westlaw space so that our approach otherwise remained consistent with how we count citations for all other professors. Moreover, we could not assume that every multi-authored article was always cited with the use of “et al.” rather than listing every author. And, of course, the lead author already would receive full credit for the citation through our ordinary search method. So we painstakingly conducted supplemental Westlaw searches for each of these multi-authored articles for the set time period. First, of course, we identified the lead author for whom further supplementation was unnecessary. Second, we determined how often the article was cited in law journals with “et al.,” as contrasted with listing every author. We found that between one-quarter and one-third of three-author articles were cited in law journal articles with all three names. Third, for those citations that did employ the “et al.” format, we identified each of the non-lead co-authors by name and institution. Quite often, the uncovered authors were not tenured law professors and thus fell outside of our study in any event.

This approach proved remarkably successful, allowing us to add a total of 3,772 citations that would otherwise have been effectively lost inside an “et al.” citation. Still, because our Scholarly Impact Ranking is scored based on means and medians, and given that our 2021 study included 480,330 citations overall, the addition of 3,772 is a very small figure, especially when further divided among multiple law schools.

While our results confirmed our prior intuition that restoration of citations otherwise anonymized inside an “et al.” citation would have only a marginal effect on our ranking, a marginal effect is not the same as no effect. While the only effect was an increase of only one ranking level, five schools did benefit to that limited extent from our “et al. fix.” Vanderbilt is ranked at #9, but would instead have remained at #10 without this adjust-

ment. Cornell moved from #16 to #15. Boston University moved from #26 to #23 (which is still only one ranking level, as there were ties among schools for the #23 position). William & Mary moved up from #28 to #27. And Illinois moved from #32 to #31.

In sum, restoring these lost citations did make a difference on the margins. Still, of thirty-nine law schools for which our “et al. fix” added citations, only five benefitted from any change in ranking and by only one ranking level. While we cannot promise that we will have similar access to the information to make such adjustments in the future, we were pleased to be able to do so for 2021 and to have a more grounded understanding of how the “et al.” matter potentially affects ranking.

Moreover, while the “et al.” effect was marginal for comparisons across law schools collectively, it made a dramatic difference for certain individual law professors. Among the 79 individual faculty who had citations restored, the most notable supplementations were 246 citations for Chris Guthrie at Vanderbilt (for a total of 632 citations), 189 citations for Justin Levinson at Hawaii (for a total of 483 citations), and 169 citations for Devon Carbado at UCLA (for a total of 683 citations).

Commentators have speculated that the omission of all named authors through an “et al.” citation works particularly to undervalue women, minorities, and faculty at lower-ranked law schools. Women, people of color, and faculty at lower-ranked law schools were among those for whom “et al.” references covered citations, and indeed, a person of color and a person at a lower-ranked law school were among the three with the largest individual supplementations. But, now exploring this in a concrete setting, we found that women, minorities, and faculty outside the top 25 ranked were not disproportionately affected.

Male professors received the benefit of 83.5 percent of the restored citations; white professors received 91.6 percent of the restored citations; and faculty at top twenty-five law schools received 73.7 percent of the restored citations. While there are basic fairness and transparency reasons to encourage law journals to begin using the full set of names of authors in citations, speculation that this would have a disproportionately beneficial effect for faculty from historically under-represented groups does not appear to be grounded in the empirical evidence.

D. Calculating the Scholarly Impact Scores and Ranking

Following the same approach as Brian Leiter, “[s]chools are rank-ordered by their weighted score, which is the mean X 2 plus the median (since mean is more probative of overall impact than median, it gets more weight in the final score).”⁵⁰

50. See Leiter, 2010 *Top 25*, *supra* note 12.

In the detailed ranking table below, the ordinal ranking of law schools is accompanied by a reporting of the mean and the median, as well as the weighted score.

Because law schools with only slightly different weighted scores are not meaningfully different in scholarly impact, we scaled scores from the top of the overall ranking. We assigned a scaled score of 100 percent to the law faculty with the first-place position in the ranking, which for 2021 is Yale University with a weighted score of 1345. Every other law school faculty's score was then calculated as a percentage of the 1345 score. Law school faculties that shared the same percentage—with standard rounding rules—were listed together as tied for a particular ordinal rank.

Even with scaling, because the scores of law schools below the top third bunch together, even more than the considerable clustering that appears at several points in the ranking, we did not attempt to rank further.⁵¹ On every occasion that we have updated the ranking, we have discovered that extending further would impose ranking level differences on law schools despite greatly diminishing variation in citation counts and would result in ties at ordinal rank levels that would include increasing numbers of law schools. Accordingly, we again chose to rank approximately the top one-third of law school faculties by scholarly impact.

Even among those schools included in this Scholarly Impact top third ranking and even with scaling, the differences between cohorts of schools ranked close together may be small. As Theodore Eisenberg and Martin Wells warned, “the move from continuous measures to ordinal ranks based on the continuous measures can both exaggerate and understate differences in the underlying information content of the continuous measures.”⁵² Accordingly, in Table 2, we have not only provided for each law faculty (1) a ranking, but also (2) the Scholarly Impact Score, (3) the mean number of citations, and (4) the median number of citations.

In addition to the ranking of law faculties collectively by Scholarly Impact Scores, the study identifies the ten individual tenured law faculty members at each ranked law school with the highest citation counts (although the list is longer than ten in several instances, by reason of rounding ties). Note that the most cited scholars at each school are listed in alphabetical order by last name, not by ordinal rank within that faculty. In some cases, older tenured professors account for a larger share of a faculty's high citation count, which may foreshadow changes in scholarly impact for that

51. The clustering together of schools with scores only slightly apart increased beyond where we ended the ranking at #63 (with a total of 68 law faculties). For example, the law faculties at eight schools fell just short of the ranking: Denver, Hawaii, Houston, Penn State, Rutgers, Tennessee, Texas A&M, and Washington.

52. Theodore Eisenberg & Martin T. Wells, *Ranking Law Journals and the Limits of Journal Citation Reports*, INST. FOR EDUC. LEADERSHIP, PAPER IN COMP. ANALYSIS OF INSTS., ECON. AND LAW No. 12, 1, 17 (Jan. 2013).

school in future years. We have followed Leiter's lead in marking with an asterisk those who turn seventy or older in 2021.

As with any study of this size, involving as it did the painstaking examination of hundreds of thousands of individual citations for thousands of tenured faculty members at nearly one hundred law schools, we undoubtedly have acted on bad information or made errors, despite best efforts and multiple cross-checks. Any errors brought to our attention after the August 2021 announcement of the final ranking will be noted by us for adjustment in future updates.⁵³

E. A Continuing Pattern of Declining Citations in 2021

In recent updates, we have identified a pattern of decline in citations for most (but not all) individual scholars and for law school faculties collectively.

Looking at all of the tenured faculty members in the ranked law schools (69 in 2015 and 68 in 2018 and 2021), the mean for 2015 of 212 citations fell to 184 in 2018 and then dropped further to 175 for 2021.

Given that our 2018 ranking was the first time in which we had excluded acknowledgments to a professor in a law review article's initial asterisk footnote, we had expected a decline in overall citations since 2015 due at least in part to the new methodology. Still, our best estimation in 2018 was that the "asterisk footnote effect" accounted for only a quarter to one-third of the decline from 2015 to 2018.

Now with the same methodology applied in 2021 (and with only a comparatively tiny number of additional citations added in 2021 through our "et al. fix"), we can confirm that the continuing decline is real and not an artifact of measurement changes. Moreover, as we said in 2018, there was always the possibility that the citation decline from 2015 to 2018 was due to random variation over time. The continued downward move into 2021 makes it much harder to dismiss the pattern as anything other than real.

There is, of course, one other possible explanation for a continued decline from 2018 to 2021, which is the COVID-19 Pandemic. But given that we measured citations over a period of five years, and the pandemic lockdown affected only about three-quarters of the final year, the pandemic is unlikely to explain more than a fraction of the decline. It may also be that the pandemic reduced the number of law journal issues published in the

53. The most common type of error brought to our attention after release involve the mistaken addition or subtraction of someone from a law school's roster, typically due to mistaken information given to use as to whether that person was tenured or was on leave for another non-law school position in the university or in government. As in the past, we received a handful of messages after the August release, which ordinarily would not result in a change in a school's ranking in any event. To prevent the ranking from becoming a moving target, we have, as in the past, not adjusted the current ranking but noted those corrections for the future.

latter part of 2020, although again that would likely not account for all of the downward movement in law professor citations.

At this point, we must give more credence to the hypothesis we raised in 2018 that there indeed has been a fall-off in scholarly writing by law professors since the legal recession, which then of course reverberates into reduced citations as well. Shrinking law school budgets after the recession, which then became frozen again with the pandemic, reduced the number of full-time faculty while also demanding greater time to be spent by the remaining faculty on teaching and administrative responsibilities. If fewer scholarly articles are being written and published overall, then the occasions for citation to the work of scholars will also have constricted. And remember, even if the tenured faculty at the highest-ranked schools have not interrupted legal scholarly productivity, abbreviation of scholarly productivity at most other law schools will result in a decline in citations of works across the board.

When we return with another update in three years, we can see again if faculty re-sizing and reduced faculty attention to scholarly writing has become a permanent attribute of the legal academy, at least as measured indirectly by the number of citations in the legal literature to the scholarly work of law professors.

At the same time, we should not overstate the phenomenon. For those law schools that achieve ranking in the top third in our Scholarly Impact Ranking, scholarly citations have maintained at more than 80 percent of what it was six years earlier, before the legal recession and the pandemic. For these schools, then, there may have been some downsizing and re-balancing of activities, but faculty scholarship remains a central part of the law school mission.

III. SCHOLARLY IMPACT RANKINGS FOR TOP THIRD OF LAW FACULTIES, 2021

Table 2: Detailed Scholarly Impact Ranking of Law Faculties, 2021

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
1	Yale	1345	502	341	*Ackerman, B.; Amar, A.; Ayres, I.; Balkin, J.; *Eskridge, W.; Koh, H.; Macey, J.; *Post, R.; Siegel, R.; Tyler, T.
2	Chicago	1110	399	312	Baude, W.; Ben-Shahar, O.; Bradley, C.; Ginsburg, T.; Hemel, D.; Huq, A.; *Nussbaum, M.; Posner, E.; *Stone, G.; Strauss, D.
3	Harvard	940	342	256	Bebchuk, L.; Fallon, R.; Goldsmith, J.; Kaplow, L.; Klarman, M.; *Kraakman, R.; Lessig, L.; Manning, J.; *Shavell, S.; Vermeule, A.
4	NYU	921	327	267	Barkow, R.; Choi, S.; *Epstein, R.; Friedman, B.; Issacharoff, S.; *Miller, A.; *Miller, G.; Pildes, R.; Revesz, R.; Waldron, J.
5	Columbia	814	298	218	Briffault, R.; *Coffee, J.; Crenshaw, K.; Fagan, J.; Gilson, R.; *Gordon, J.; Hamburger, P.; *Merrill, T.; Metzger, G.; Pozen, D.
6	Stanford	752	271	210	*Friedman, L.; *Hensler, D.; Lemley, M.; McConnell, M.; O'Connell, A.; Ouellette, L.; Persily, N.; *Polinsky, A.; Sklansky, D.; Sykes, A.
6	Cal-Berkeley	749	284	181	Chemerinsky, E.; *Cooter, R.; *Farber, D.; Kerr, O.; Menell, P.; Merges, R.; *Samuelson, P.; Schwartz, P.; Solomon, S.; Yoo, J.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
8	Pennsylvania	663	243	177	Baker, T.; *Burbank, S.; Coglianesi, C.; Fisch, J.; Hoffman, D.; *Hovenkamp, H.; Parchomovsky, G.; Roberts, D.; *Robinson, P.; Skeel, D.
9	Virginia	646	241	164	Cahn, N.; Citron, D.; Duffy, J.; Gulati, G.; *Laycock, D.; Nelson, C.; Prakash, S.; *Schauer, F.; Solum, L.; *White, G.
9	Vanderbilt	644	239	166	Bressman, L.; Guthrie, C.; King, N.; Rossi, J.; *Rubin, E.; Ruhl, J.B.; Sherry, S.; *Slobogin, C.; Thomas, R.; *Viscusi, W.
11	UCLA	605	220	165	Bainbridge, S.; Carbado, D.; Crenshaw, K.; Eagly, I.; Kang, J.; Korobkin, R.; Motomura, H.; Raustiala, K.; Volokh, E.; Winkler, A.
12	Duke	597	213	171	Adler, M.; Blocher, J.; *Cox, J.; Garrett, B.; Helfer, L.; Lemos, M.; Rai, A.; *Schwarcz, S.; Siegel, N.; Young, E.
13	Michigan	545	190	165	Avi-Yonah, R.; Bagenstos, S.; Crane, D.; Eisenberg, R.; Litman, J.; *MacKinnon, C.; Primus, R.; Pritchard, A.; Schlanger, M.; *Schneider, C.
14	Cal-Irvine	537	202	133	Burk, D.; Fleischer, V.; Goodwin, M.; Hasen, R.; Leslie, C.; *Menkel-Meadow, C.; Moran, R.; Reese, R.; Shaffer, G.; Simons, K.
15	Northwestern	528	198	132	*Allen, R.; Black, B.; Calabresi, S.; Dana, D.; *Diamond, S.; Kang, M.; Koppelman, A.; McGinnis, J.; Pfander, J.; *Redish, M.; Schwartz, D.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
15	Cornell	527	188	151	Blume, J.; *Clermont, K.; Dorf, M.; Grimmelman, J.; *Hans, V.; Heise, M.; Johnson, S.; Ohlin, J.; Rachlinski, J.; Sherwin, E.; Tebbe, N.
17	Georgetown	514	185	144	Barnett, R.; Butler, P.; Cohen, J.; *Gostin, L.; Katyal, N.; *Langevoort, D.; Levitin, A.; *Luban, D.; Ohm, P.; *Thompson, R.; West, R.
18	George Washington	472	176	120	Abramowicz, M.; Braman, D.; Colby, T.; Glicksman, R.; Kovacic, W.; Lee, C.; Murphy, S.; *Pierce, R.; Rosen, J.; Solove, D.
18	Texas	471	169	133	*Bone, R.; Chesney, R.; Forbath, W.; Golden, J.; *Levinson, S.; *McGarity, T.; *Sager, L.; Spence, D.; Vladeck, S.; Wagner, W.
18	Minnesota	468	163	142	Carbone, J.; Cotter, T.; Hickman, K.; Hill, C.; Klass, A.; *Kritzer, H.; McDonnell, B.; Painter, R.; Schwarcz, D.; *Tonry, M.
21	Washington U	440	163	114	*Appleton, S.; Epstein, L.; Inazu, J.; *Joy, P.; Kim, P.; Kuehn, R.; *Levin, R.; Richards, N.; *Seligman, J.; Tamanaha, B.
22	Cal-Davis	435	165	105	Bhagwat, A.; Chin, G.; Dodge, W.; Horton, D.; Joh, E.; Johnson, K.; Joslin, C.; Lee, P.; Pruitt, L.; Shanske, D.
23	George Mason	420	154	112	Bernstein, D.; Butler, H.; Garoupa, N.; Kobayashi, B.; Kontorovich, E.; Mossoff, A.; *Muris, T.; Somin, I.; Wright, J.; Zywicki, T.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
23	Fordham	414	151	112	*Brudney, J.; Capers, B.; Davidson, N.; Green, B.; Griffith, S.; Huntington, C.; Leib, E.; Pearce, R.; Pfaff, J.; Zipursky, B.
23	Boston U	411	146	119	*Annas, G.; Beermann, J.; Fleming, J.; Gordon, W.; Hylton, K.; Lawson, G.; Maclin, T.; McClain, L.; Meurer, M.; Onwuachi-Willig, A.
23	U. St. Thomas (MN)	410	145	120	Berg, T.; *Hamilton, N.; *Johnson, L.; Kaal, W.; Nichols, J.; Organ, J.; Osler, M.; Paulsen, M.; Sisk, G.; Vischer, R.
27	Arizona	387	130	127	Bambauer, D.; Bambauer, J.; Bublick, E.; Coan, A.; Engel, K.; Massaro, T.; Miller, M.; Orbach, B.; Puig, S.; Tsosie, R.; Williams, R.
27	William & Mary	384	130	124	Bellin, J.; Bruhl, A.; Criddle, E.; Devins, N.; Gershowitz, A.; Ibrahim, D.; Larsen, A.; *Marcus, P.; Oman, N.; Spencer, A.; Zick, T.
29	USC	382	131	120	Barnett, J.; Barry, J.; Craig, R.; Estrich, S.; Guzman, A.; Klerman, D.; McCaffery, E.; Rasmussen, R.; Roithmayr, D.; Simkovic, M.; Simon, D.; Sokol, D.
30	U. San Diego	367	149	69	*Alexander, L.; Bell, A.; Dripps, D.; Hirsch, A.; Lobel, O.; Ramsey, M.; Rappaport, M.; Schapiro, R.; Sichelman, T.; Smith, S.
31	Notre Dame	346	120	106	Alford, R.; Bellia, A.; Bray, S.; Cushman, B.; Garnett, R.; Kozel, R.; Miller, P.; *Newton, N.; O'Connell, M.; Pojanowski, J.; Tidmarsh, J.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
31	Illinois	344	127	90	Amar, V.; *Finkin, M.; Heald, P.; Kesan, J.; Lawless, R.; Mazzone, J.; *Moore, M.; Robbennolt, J.; Thomas, S.; Wilson, R.
33	Cardozo	340	122	96	Buccafusco, C.; Gilles, M.; Herz, M.; Markowitz, P.; Reinert, A.; *Rosenfeld, M.; *Scheck, B.; Sebok, A.; Sterk, S.; *Zelinsky, E.
33	Brooklyn	338	126	86	Araiza, W.; Baer, M.; Bernstein, A.; Gold, A.; Janger, E.; *Karmel, R.; Pasquale, F.; Ristroph, A.; *Schneider, E.; Simonson, J.; Solan, L.
33	Colorado	336	112	112	Anaya, S.; Carpenter, K.; Gerding, E.; Gruber, A.; Huang, P.; Kaminski, M.; Krakoff, S.; *Mueller, C.; Norton, H.; Peppet, S.; Schlag, P.; Schwartz, A.; Surden, H.
36	Utah	326	115	96	Adler, R.; Anghie, A.; Baughman, S.; Cassell, P.; Contreras, J.; *Francis, L.; Jones, R.; *Keiter, R.; Peterson, C.; Tokson, M.; Warner, E.
36	Case Western	325	127	71	Adler, J.; Berg, J.; Hill, B.; Hoffman, S.; Korsmo, C.; Ku, R.; Nard, C.; Perzanowski, A.; Robertson, C.; Scharf, M.
36	North Carolina	323	117	89	Ardia, D.; *Conley, J.; Coyle, J.; Gerhardt, M.; *Hazen, T.; Hessick, C.; Hessick, F.; Jacoby, M.; *Marshall, W.; Nichol, G.; Papandrea, M.
36	Emory	317	114	89	Dudziak, M.; *Fineman, M.; Freer, R.; Holbrook, T.; Hutchinson, D.; Nash, J.; *Perry, M.; Shepherd, J.; Volokh, A.; Witte, J.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
40	Kansas	311	108	95	Bhala, R.; Drahozal, C.; Harper Ho, V.; Hoeflich, M.; Levy, R.; Mulligan, L.; Outka, U.; Stacy, T.; Torrance, A.; Ware, S.; Yung, C.
40	Hastings	305	112	81	Depoorter, B.; Dodson, S.; Faigman, D.; Feldman, R.; *Marcus, R.; Mattei, U.; Owen, D.; Price, Z.; Schiller, R.; Williams, J.
40	Chicago-Kent	304	101	102	Baker, K.; Dinwoodie, G.; Katz, D.; Kim, N.; Krent, H.; Lee, E.; Marder, N.; Reilly, G.; Rosen, M.; Schmidt, C.
43	Ohio State	300	108	84	Akbar, A.; Berman, D.; Chow, D.; Cole, S.; Colker, R.; Davies, L.; Foley, E.; Hernández, C.; Simmons, R.; Walker, C.
43	Alabama	293	116	61	Andreen, W.; Carroll, J.; *Delgado, R.; Elliott, H.; Grove, T.; Hamill, S.; Hill, J.; Horwitz, P.; Krotoszynski, R.; *Stefancic, J.; Steinman, A.
43	Georgia	289	98	93	Barnett, K.; Bruner, C.; Burch, E.; Cade, J.; Chapman, N.; Coenen, D.; Cohen, H.; Leonard, E.; Polsky, G.; Rodrigues, U.; Rutledge, P.; *Wells, M.; West, S.
46	American	287	105	77	Anderson, J.; Daskal, J.; Davis, A.; Fairfax, R.; Ferguson, A.; Franck, S.; Frost, A.; *Robbins, I.; Roberts, J.; Wiley, L.
46	Florida State	278	103	72	Abbott, F.; Bayern, S.; Hsu, S.; Landau, D.; Logan, W.; O'Hara O'Connor, E.; Ryan, E.; Seidenfeld, M.; Stern, N.; Ziegler, M.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
46	Maryland	278	100	78	*Colbert, D.; Ertman, M.; Gifford, D.; Goodmark, L.; Graber, M.; Gray, D.; Percival, R.; Pinard, M.; Ram, N.; Stearns, M.; Steinzor, R.; Tu, K.
49	Temple	275	100	75	Arewa, O.; Burris, S.; Dunoff, J.; Gugliuzza, P.; Hollis, D.; Lin, T.; Lipson, J.; Mandel, G.; Ramji-Nogales, J.; Rogers, B.; Spiro, P.
49	BYU	268	97	74	Asay, C.; Fee, J.; *Fleming, J.; Gedicks, F.; Hurt, C.; Jensen, E.; Nielson, A.; Scharffs, B.; Smith, D.; Sun, L.
49	Wake Forest	265	103	59	Aiken, J.; Chavis, K.; *Green, M.; Hall, M.; Knox, J.; Palmiter, A.; Parks, G.; *Shapiro, S.; Taylor, M.; Wright, R.
52	Florida	260	92	76	Arnou-Richman, R.; Bornstein, S.; Calvert, C.; *Dowd, N.; Fenster, M.; Nance, J.; Noah, L.; *Page, W.; Rhee, R.; Rosenbury, L.; Stinneford, J.; Wolf, M.
52	Arizona State	258	99	60	Bodansky, D.; Fellmeth, A.; Hodge, J.; Luna, E.; Marchant, G.; Miller, R.; Rule, T.; *Saks, M.; Selmi, M.; Weinstein, J.
52	Iowa	255	84	87	Bohannan, C.; Estin, A.; Gallanis, T.; Grewal, A.; Muller, D.; Pettys, T.; Rantanen, J.; Steinitz, M.; VanderVelde, L.; Washburn, K.; Wing, A.; Yockey, J.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
52	Indiana-Bloomington	253	91	71	Dau-Schmidt, K.; Fischman, R.; Fuentes-Rohwer, L.; Gamage, D.; Geyh, C.; Henderson, W.; Janis, M.; Johnsen, D.; Lederman, L.; Nagy, D.; Widiss, D.
52	Richmond	251	90	71	Cotropia, C.; Eisen, J.; Erickson, J.; Gibson, J.; Lain, C.; Lash, K.; Osenga, K.; Perdue, W.; *Tobias, C.; Walsh, K.
57	Missouri	245	91	63	Bowman, F.; Crouch, D.; English, D.; Gely, R.; Lambert, T.; Lidsky, L.; Lietzan, E.; Oliveri, R.; Reuben, R.; Schmitz, A.; Wells, C.
57	San Francisco	244	86	72	Bazelon, L.; Davis, J.; Freiwald, S.; Green, T.; *Hing, B.; Iglesias, T.; Kaswan, A.; Leo, R.; Ontiveros, M.; Travis, M.
59	Boston College	230	80	70	Bilder, M.; Cassidy, R.; Greenfield, K.; Kanstrom, D.; Liu, J.; Madoff, R.; McCoy, P.; Oei, S.; Olson, D.; Repetti, J.; Ring, D.; Yen, A.
59	UNLV	229	85	59	Cooper, F.; Griffin, L.; Kagan, M.; Main, T.; McGinley, A.; Orentlicher, D.; Rapoport, N.; Stanchi, K.; Stempel, J.; Sternlight, J.
59	Wisconsin	227	85	57	Brito, T.; Findley, K.; Huneus, A.; Klingele, C.; Klug, H.; Rogers, J.; Schwartz, D.; Seifter, M.; Tokaji, D.; Yackee, J.

Ranking	Law School	Weighted Score	Mean	Median	Most Cited Scholars (* indicates 70 or older in 2021)
59	Pittsburgh	225	85	55	Brake, D.; Brand, R.; Carter, W.; *Chew, P.; Crossley, M.; Harris, D.; Infanti, A.; *Lobel, J.; Madison, M.; Wildermuth, A.
63	Santa Clara	220	87	46	*Cain, P.; Chien, C.; *Glancy, D.; Goldman, E.; Gulasekaram, P.; Kloppenberg, L.; Love, B.; Oberman, M.; Ochoa, T.; Sloss, D.; Spitko, E.; Yosifon, D.
63	SMU	221	82	57	Carpenter, D.; Colangelo, A.; Coleman, J.; Cortez, N.; Grossman, J.; Hayden, G.; Ryan, M.; *Steinberg, M.; Taylor, D.; Thornburg, E.; Turner, J.
63	Hofstra	219	81	57	Baruch Bush, R.; Burke, A.; Colombo, R.; *Dolgin, J.; Freedman, E.; Greenwood, D.; Ku, J.; Manta, I.; Neumann, R.; *Yaroshefsky, E.
63	Northeastern	217	84	49	*Baker, B.; Davis, M.; Dyal-Chand, R.; Hartzog, W.; *Klare, K.; Medwed, D.; Parmet, W.; Rosenbloom, R.; Waldman, A.; *Williams, P.
63	Loyola-LA	216	77	62	Aprill, E.; Hayden, P.; Hughes, J.; Levenson, L.; Levitt, J.; Miller, E.; Petherbridge, L.; Romano, C.; Willis, L.; Zimmerman, A.
63	Pepperdine	212	77	58	Anderson, R.; Caldwell, H.; Caron, P.; Childress, D.; Han, D.; Helfand, M.; McDonald, B.; McNeal, G.; Pushaw, R.; Stipanowich, T.; Weston, M.

IV. SCHOLARLY IMPACT FINDINGS AND COMPARATIVE RANKING

A. *Summary of Scholarly Impact Ranking and Significant Findings*

Representing about one-third of accredited law schools, sixty-eight law faculties are ranked in this 2021 update of the Scholarly Impact Scores.

As has been true in every scholarly impact ranking, the law faculty at Yale holds the top position. But while Harvard has traditionally followed in second position, the University of Chicago has moved ahead into that second spot, with Harvard now in third position.⁵⁴ New York University continues to be ranked at number four for scholarly impact, with Columbia in the fifth position. California-Berkeley has moved up into a tie for the sixth position with Stanford. Pennsylvania rises one position to number eight, as does Vanderbilt in moving to a tie in ninth place. As the most striking change in scholarly impact among the top ranked schools, Virginia has risen all the way from sixteen in 2018 to a tie for ninth in 2021. This is the first appearance of Virginia in the top ten since we began these updates a decade ago.

The highest rises in the 2021 ranking involve three schools that have moved up in ranking by double digits: American by 18 ordinal levels (to #46), Georgia up 15 positions (to #43), and Brooklyn up 11 positions (to #33). Kansas has risen 8 positions (to #40) and of course Virginia by 7 positions (to #9).

Four schools are appearing in our Scholarly Impact Ranking for the first time in 2021: Wisconsin (at #59), SMU (at #63), Northeastern (at #63), and Pepperdine (at #63).

B. *Scholarly Impact Ranking Compared to U.S. News Rankings*

Based on Scholarly Impact Ranking, several law faculties appear to be significantly under-valued in popular rankings of law schools. The incongruities outlined below illustrate a troubling disconnect between the *U.S. News* ranking and an objective measurement of current law faculty developments.

The faculties at these law schools achieve much higher Scholarly Impact Rankings than the overall ranking assigned by *U.S. News & World Report*:

* Within the top ten for Scholarly Impact, Vanderbilt (at #9) shows a significant gap with *U.S. News* Ranking (at #16). Rising up another level for 2021, Vanderbilt has been a stable presence in the Top Ten since 2015.

54. The switch in positions between Harvard and Chicago is not the product of methodology or a transient change in faculty roster. Even if Cass Sunstein, who has been the most highly cited law professor, were on the Harvard roster this year rather than being away for a government appointment, and even if we foolishly ignored sampling for every Harvard professor and gave credit even for false hits, Chicago would still have edged into second place.

* Among schools close to the top ten for Scholarly Impact, the University of California-Irvine (at #14) shows the greatest incongruity with the 2022 *U.S. News* ranking (at #35). UCLA at #11 for Scholarly Impact, also appears undervalued by *U.S. News* at #14.

* Both in the top 25 of Scholarly Impact and overall, the most dramatically under-valued law school is the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota). The University of St. Thomas ranks inside the top 25 (at #23) for Scholarly Impact, while being relegated by *U.S. News* below the top 100 (at #126)—a difference of 103 ordinal levels.

* A remarkable number of law schools within the top 25 for Scholarly Impact are dropped down multiple levels in *U.S. News*. George Washington University rises to #18 in Scholarly Impact, while lagging at #27 for *U.S. News*. Minnesota is also at #18 in Scholarly Impact, but at #22 in *U.S. News*. The University of California-Davis hits #22 in Scholarly Impact, while left well behind by *U.S. News* at #35. George Mason continues to be a top 25 Scholarly Impact school at #23, while dropping in *U.S. News* to #41. Fordham also ranks at #23 for Scholarly Impact, but at #35 for *U.S. News*.

* In addition to the University of St. Thomas discussed above, five schools show a fifty position or greater disparity between Scholarly Impact Ranking and *U.S. News* ranking. The University of San Diego places #30 in the Scholarly Impact Ranking, but is remarkably under-appreciated when *U.S. News* drops it to #86. Chicago-Kent comes into the Scholarly Impact Ranking at #40, but is at #91 in *U.S. News*. Santa Clara continues in the Scholarly Impact Ranking at #63, while receiving a *U.S. News* placement of #126. Hofstra is ranked for Scholarly Impact at #63, but by *U.S. News* down at #119. And the University of San Francisco ranks #57 for Scholarly Impact, while not ranked at all by *U.S. News*.

* One school shows a greater than forty position gap between Scholarly Impact and *U.S. News* rankings. In its 2022 ranking, *U.S. News* places Brooklyn at #81, while it rises much higher in the Top 50 of Scholarly Impact to #33.

Three schools are at least thirty positions higher in Scholarly Impact than *U.S. News* ranking. Case Western stands at #72 in the *U.S. News* ranking, but climbs to #36 in Scholarly Impact. American ranks at #46 in the Scholarly Impact Ranking, but at #81 in *U.S. News*. And Kansas is at #40 in Scholarly Impact, compared to #70 in *U.S. News*.

The following table lists law faculties in order by Scholarly Impact Ranking for comparison with the schools' 2022 overall ranking in *U.S. News* and the 2022 *U.S. News* academic peer score (based on a survey of

law professors) for the *U.S. News* ranking (the latter of which was arranged and ranked in order by Professor Paul Caron on the TaxProf blog).⁵⁵

55. See Paul Caron, *2022 U.S. News Peer Reputation Rankings (And Overall Rankings)*, TAXPROF BLOG (Mar. 30, 2021), https://taxprof.typepad.com/taxprof_blog/2021/03/2022-us-news-law-school-peer-reputation-rankings-and-overall-rankings.html.

Table 3: Comparison of Faculty Scholarly Impact Ranking (2021) with *U.S. News* Rankings (2022)

Law School	Scholarly Impact Ranking	<i>U.S. News</i> Ranking (Overall)	<i>U.S. News</i> Academic Reputation (Peer Assessment) Ranking
Yale	1	1	1
Chicago	2	4	5
Harvard	3	3	1
NYU	4	6	5
Columbia	5	4	4
Stanford	6	2	1
Cal-Berkeley	6	9	7
Pennsylvania	8	6	8
Virginia	9	8	8
Vanderbilt	9	16	17
UCLA	11	14	15
Duke	12	10	12
Michigan	13	10	8
Cal-Irvine	14	35	19
Northwestern	15	12	12
Cornell	15	13	11
Georgetown	17	15	12
George Washington	18	27	23
Texas	18	16	15
Minnesota	18	22	19
Washington U	21	16	18
Cal-Davis	22	35	23
George Mason	23	41	64
Fordham	23	35	28
Boston U	23	20	23
U. St. Thomas (MN)	23	126	141
Arizona	27	46	40
William & Mary	27	35	28
USC	29	19	19
U. San Diego	30	86	56
Notre Dame	31	22	23
Illinois	31	29	40
Cardozo	33	53	52
Brooklyn	33	81	64

Law School	Scholarly Impact Ranking	U.S. News Ranking (Overall)	U.S. News Academic Reputation (Peer Assessment) Ranking
Colorado	33	48	40
Case Western	36	72	73
Utah	36	43	48
North Carolina	36	24	23
Emory	36	29	19
Kansas	40	70	64
Hastings	40	50	40
Chicago-Kent	40	91	73
Ohio State	43	40	32
Alabama	43	25	32
Georgia	43	27	32
American	46	81	48
Florida State	46	48	45
Maryland	46	50	48
Temple	49	53	56
BYU	49	29	52
Wake Forest	49	41	45
Florida	52	21	32
Arizona State	52	25	32
Iowa	52	29	32
Indiana-Bloomington	52	43	32
Richmond	52	53	56
Missouri	57	60	83
San Francisco	57	Tier 2	127
Boston College	59	29	28
UNLV	59	60	64
Wisconsin	59	29	28
Pittsburgh	59	67	64
Santa Clara	63	126	73
SMU	63	52	64
Hofstra	63	119	107
Northeastern	63	67	73
Loyola-LA	63	72	56
Pepperdine	63	46	64