

2007

## Judges' Pay: A Chasm Far Worse Than Realized, and Worsening

Roy A. Schotland  
*Georgetown University Law Center*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj>



Part of the [Judges Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Schotland, Roy A. (2007) "Judges' Pay: A Chasm Far Worse Than Realized, and Worsening," *Indiana Law Journal*: Vol. 82 : Iss. 5 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol82/iss5/10>

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Indiana Law Journal* by an authorized editor of Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. For more information, please contact [rvaughan@indiana.edu](mailto:rvaughan@indiana.edu).



**JEROME HALL LAW LIBRARY**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
Maurer School of Law  
Bloomington

# Judges' Pay: A Chasm Far Worse Than Realized, and Worsening<sup>†</sup>

ROY A. SCHOTLAND<sup>\*</sup>

The level of salaries defines the pool of people willing to consider serving.  
—Chief Justice Randall Shepard<sup>1</sup>

In Chief Justice Roberts's first Report on the Federal Judiciary, he deplored "the failure to raise judges' pay" as a "direct threat to judicial independence."<sup>2</sup>

[J]udges are leaving the bench in greater numbers now than ever before. In the 1960s, only a handful of district and appellate court judges retired or resigned; since 1990, 92 judges have left the bench. Of those, 21 left before reaching retirement age. Fifty-nine of them stepped down to enter the private practice of law. In the past five years alone, 37 judges have left the federal bench—nine of them in the last year.

There will always be a substantial difference in pay between successful government and private sector lawyers. But if that difference remains too large—as it is today—the judiciary will over time cease to be made up of a diverse group of the Nation's very best lawyers. Instead, it will come to be staffed by a combination of the independently wealthy and those following a career path before becoming a judge different from the practicing bar at large. Such a development would dramatically alter the nature of the federal judiciary.<sup>3</sup>

We know how federal and state courts compare generally, and the judges' positions are summarized well by Richard Posner: "[T]here is no doubt that the average conditions of employment in state judicial systems are inferior to those in the federal system."<sup>4</sup>

---

† This paper was presented in August 2006 at the Conference of Chief Justices, meeting in Indianapolis. Since that time, significant events have occurred which must be at least noted. First, Chief Justice Roberts in his January 2007 Report on the Federal Judiciary, dealt with only one issue, "the failure to raise judicial pay"; he said it "has now reached the level of a constitutional crisis that threatens to undermine the strength and independence of the federal judiciary." JOHN ROBERTS, 2006 YEAR-END REPORT ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY 1 (2007), available at <http://supremecourtus.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2006year-endreport.pdf>. Second, New York's Chief Judge Kaye and other Chief Justices have similarly highlighted judicial pay. Judith S. Kaye, *Free Judges' Pay*, N.Y. TIMES, June 7, 2007, at A35. For a report on New York and for Missouri's major event, see *infra* notes 15 & 25.

\* Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center. Senior Adviser, National Center for State Courts.

1. Kevin Corcoran, *Judicial Salaries Loom as Big Issue; The Resignation of a Supreme Court Justice Spurs a Call for Better Pay for Indiana's Judges*, INDIANAPOLIS STAR, Oct. 11, 1999, at B1.

2. JOHN ROBERTS, 2005 YEAR-END REPORT ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY 3 (2006), available at <http://www.supremecourtus.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2005year-endreport.pdf>.

3. *Id.* at 4.

4. RICHARD A. POSNER, THE FEDERAL COURTS 37 (1996).

Considering the impact that judges have on individuals and the community, what are judges worth? *The Cost of Talent*, Derek Bok's landmark book, opened by quoting Adam Smith about lawyers.<sup>5</sup> Smith would not be surprised that lawyers are well paid, but given what he said about them, one can imagine his reaction to how poorly we pay judges:

[W]e trust our health to the physician, our fortune and sometimes our life and reputation to the lawyer and attorney. Such confidence could not be safely reposed in people of a very mean or low condition. Their reward must be such, therefore, as may give them that rank in society which so important a trust requires.<sup>6</sup>

For our state judges today, let us put aside what might be thought their appropriate "reward" compared to the "reward" for private-sector lawyers.<sup>7</sup> Of course judges earn less than they would in private practice, and of course judges enjoy "rewards" other than salaries. What is surprising is how severe the gap is between the pay for judges and for the private bar—and, strikingly, the gap between the pay for judges and for other public employees. What is deeply disturbing, indeed dangerous, is how the gaps are worsening. Our compensation for judges is so low, that by reducing the caliber and stature of those who are in "the pool . . . willing to serve," this treatment is *the most* widespread, persistent, and damaging attack on judicial independence—as Chief Justice Roberts said.

Having opened above with Chief Justice Roberts and federal judges, note first how the federal judges' pay compares with the state judges' median compensation. Federal district judges earn \$162,100, and federal magistrates earn \$149,132. State supreme court justices' median salary was \$128,018 in 2005. Since 1995, state judges did enjoy an increase larger than the federal judges—32 percent for state Supreme Courts, 21 percent for federal judges. But today, federal judges are overdue for a substantial pay raise, having had no raise (except *some* cost-of-living adjustments) since 1990[!], when district judges' \$89,900 pay was raised to \$125,100. Posner, noting that, points out that state judges' relative position suffers a "sharp deterioration" after a federal pay raise because the federal judges' raises are infrequent but substantial.<sup>8</sup>

---

5. DEREK BOK, *THE COST OF TALENT* 9–11 (1993).

6. ADAM SMITH, *AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS* 118 (Edwin Cannan ed., Modern Library 1937) (1776).

7. In 1981, Second Circuit Judge William Mulligan resigned saying this: "Perhaps you can afford to live on it, but you can't afford to die on it." CORPORATE COMM'N FOR FAIR COMPENSATION OF THE FED. JUDICIARY AND THE AM. COLL. OF TRIAL LAWYERS, *PROMISES MADE, PROMISES STILL UNKEPT: RESTORATION OF INFLATION-INDUCED SALARY CUTS FOR TOP GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, 1986–1987*, at 49 (1986).

8. POSNER, *supra* note 4, at 38, 390 (comparing federal and state judges' pay from 1980 to 1995, noting the impact of 1991's "big federal judicial pay raise").

All judges are falling behind *far* more than realized. Focus on how state judges have fared:

Median pay increases in the legal profession.

As of 2005, median pay increased for	Since 2000 (%)	Since 1995 (%)
States' highest courts	11.5	31.8
All law firms' new associates	17.6	78.6
Fifth-year associates	14.5	75.9
AmLaw 100 firms' average comp. per partner	49.1	121.0

Source: CCJ TASK FORCE ON POLITICS AND JUDICIAL ELECTIONS, FACTS ON JUDGES' PAY, [http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MS5/vB\\_PAGE/20060912173153/facts\\_on\\_judges\\_pay.pdf](http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MS5/vB_PAGE/20060912173153/facts_on_judges_pay.pdf) (last visited Mar. 12, 2007).

NOTE: Later data are not available on most of the above, as of June 2007. However, in 2006, new associates' pay at big firms "soar[ed]."<sup>9</sup>

There is one more comparison, even more surprising: with pay for other public employees. In 2005 and 2006, Iowa enacted substantial pay increases for judges after a report that showed their Supreme Court was earning less than 1070 other state employees.<sup>10</sup> That finding led a task force of the Conference of Chief Justices to begin gathering similar information on other states. Although the data are not yet complete, the message (below) is powerful. But first, an explicit note on how to view this information:

(a) The non-judicial employees are by no means overpaid—their compensation is a rational and appropriate reflection of the value of what they do. When a governor or a dean needs to hire a person, the salary is bound to reflect the market. The governor knows that getting a good administrator, or the dean knows that getting a good professor, will matter to how well their administration fares. But in contrast:

(b) Judges are "hired" by the legislature, which sets pay for a faceless mass of judges on behalf of a faceless public. When it comes to professors and administrators, the legislatures cannot ignore compensation levels being set in the markets: for example, in 2005, at "top" law schools, deans earned "\$400,000 +/-" and senior professors earned "\$350,000 +/-."<sup>11</sup> But for judges, the only market—apart from

9. Leigh Jones, *Big-Firm Associate Pay Soars by \$10K in 2006*, NAT'L L.J., Aug. 9, 2006, at 1; see also Ellen Rosen, *For New Lawyers, the Going Rate Has Gone Up*, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 1, 2006, at C7 (discussing how pay has gone up "startling amounts").

10. IOWA JUDICIAL COMP. TASK FORCE, RECOMMENDATION FOR IOWA JUDICIAL COMPENSATION 2 (2005). Comparing judges' pay with other public employees is particularly illuminating because in addition to direct compensation, pensions and other benefits obviously matter. However much judges' non-compensation benefits (pensions, health care, etc.) differ from other public employees, such benefits for private attorneys may be even more different and certainly are more varied.

11. Larry D. Thompson, Former Deputy Att'y Gen. of the U.S., *Fair and Independent Courts: A Conference on the State of the Judiciary* (Sept. 29, 2006). See generally Larry D. Thompson & Charles J. Cooper, *The State of the Judiciary: A Corporate Perspective*, 95 GEO. L.J. 1107 (2007).

According to a 2003 ABA Report, "[n]ationwide, the average salary of [all] law school deans for 2002–03 was approximately \$200,000." AM. BAR ASS'N & FED. BAR ASS'N, FEDERAL

private practice and the law schools—is the small though growing realm of “private judging.”<sup>12</sup> Legislators cannot ignore the demands from the executive branch, the universities, and the hospitals, but obviously can turn aside the judicial branch. The low level of judges’ pay reflects an obsolete, damaging exploitation of the fact that there will always be enough people who would like to be judges . . . so long as we don’t worry about their caliber and, thus, how well we protect the rule of law. (Of course wealthy lawyers can seek judgeships whatever the pay, but a wealth-skewed bench brings obvious acute problems.<sup>13</sup>)

Consider these examples of how many public employees out-earn judges:

- In Indiana, 558 employees in public higher education earn more than their Supreme Court Justices.<sup>14</sup>
- In Ohio, the Chief Justice earns less than two-thirds of Ohio State Law School’s professors and deans (their dean earns almost twice the Chief Justice’s pay). Ohio State University’s general counsel earns 50 percent more than the Chief Justice.<sup>15</sup>
- In Missouri—just in St. Louis—the City Councilors and nine other officials earn more than the Supreme Court.
- In Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Port Authority’s General Counsel earns 13 percent more than the Chief Justice.
- In Arizona in recent years, the Chief Justice earns less than the police chiefs of Phoenix and Tuscon; Tuscon’s Fire Chief; and less than the presiding municipal judges in Phoenix, Glendale, and Tempe, who hear misdemeanors and traffic cases.<sup>16</sup>

---

JUDICIAL PAY 18 (2003), available at <http://www.uscourts.gov/newsroom/judgespayaction.pdf>.

At the *U.S. News and World Report*’s top 25 law schools, the deans earned an average of \$301,639, and full professors earned an average base salary of \$209,751, with summer research and teaching supplements typically ranging between \$33,000 and \$80,000. NAT’L COMM’N ON THE PUB. SERV., URGENT BUSINESS FOR AMERICA 22–23 (2003) [hereinafter VOLCKER REPORT], available at <http://www.uscourts.gov/newsroom/VolckerRpt.pdf>.

12. Opportunities to leave the bench have increased with the growth of “private judging”: an increase in arbitration and mediation and also the development of organizations like the Judicial Arbitration and Mediation Services (JAMS), the nation’s largest private provider of alternative dispute resolution services. Data are not available on pay for the dispute resolvers; further, their earnings are highly varied, as the hours worked vary considerably.

13. Unique as is the U.S. Supreme Court and whatever one’s view of “a Supreme Court dominated by seeming millionaires,” the more such dominance spreads, the less effective—and the less trusted—will be our courts. See Tony Mauro, *A Millionaire’s Club*, LEGAL TIMES, Sept. 4, 2006, at 11.

14. See Table 2, *infra*.

15. This information on Indiana, Ohio, and the following states is from data sent to Chief Justice Thomas Moyer’s Task Force. CCJ TASK FORCE ON POLITICS AND JUDICIAL ELECTIONS, FACTS ON JUDGES’ PAY, [http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MS5/vB\\_PAGE/20060912173153/facts\\_on\\_judges\\_pay.pdf](http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MS5/vB_PAGE/20060912173153/facts_on_judges_pay.pdf) (last visited Mar. 12, 2007).

In May 2007, a full report on the New York scene listed over 3,300 public employees (“including many with less training and seniority”) who are paid more than the trial judges, many of them paid more than the Chief Judge. DAVID B. ROTTMAN, WILLIAM E. RAFTERY & AMY E. SMITH, NAT’L CTR. FOR STATE COURTS, JUDICIAL COMPENSATION IN NEW YORK: A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE 10–11. 2007, available at <http://www.nycourts.gov/publications/pdfs/NCSCJudicialCompReport.pdf>

16. Howard Fischer, *Judges’ Pay Hike Draws Fire; Critics Assail System of How the Raise*

- In California, trial judges (Superior Court) in many counties earn less than the assistant district attorneys who appear in their courts.

To what extent can we settle for paying trial judges as if they are merely processing clerks? To what extent must we retain a reasonable number of judges (at all levels) able enough to handle our ever-more-complex law? For the relatively simple processing, we need more magistrate-like officers. But for judging the more complex matters, we need fair pay.

Several years ago, Indiana's Chief Justice Shepard made the key point: "The level of salaries defines the pool of people willing to consider serving."<sup>17</sup> Shepard said that his colleague Justice Myra C. Selby, mother of a teenage daughter and a three-year old son, cited financial problems as a factor in her decision to resign.<sup>18</sup> "Maltuition"—the problem of paying for children's education—has led judges around the country to voice similar reasons for leaving the bench.<sup>19</sup>

Low salaries and judges leaving the bench does not mean that judicial seats will go unfilled: for example, following Justice Selby's resignation, twenty-five lawyers applied for her seat.<sup>20</sup> But low salaries guarantee a revolving door of judges that will erode the quality of justice. As judges' children grow older, experienced and talented judges will be forced to leave the bench to meet tuition obligations. Therefore, only young judges who view the bench as a stepping stone to other ambitions, and older

*Amounts are Decided*, ARIZ. BUS. GAZETTE, Apr. 20, 2000, at 1.

The Chief Justice currently has a salary of \$129,150, which in January 2007 rises to \$145,924. The police chiefs earn \$168,396 and \$167,856. The municipal judges get, in addition to salaries of (respectively) \$150,200, \$151,000, \$152,035, \$15,000 or more in travel allowances. Also, the Chief Justice earns substantially less than the deans of Arizona law schools and less than junior partners in mid-size to large firms in Phoenix and Tucson. E-mail from Pete Dunn, Counsel, Arizona Judges Association, to Roy A. Schotland, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center (Sept. 17, 2006, 22:23 EST) (on file with author).

17. Corcoran, *supra* note 1. Shepard has worked actively to improve judges' pay (in 2005, Indiana enacted a substantial increase for its judges) and has also produced scholarship on this problem. Randall T. Shepard, *Plu Ça Change: Indiana Judges and Salaries*, 37 IND. L. REV. 885 (2004); see also Michele McNeil, *Daniels to Sign Judicial Pay Raise Bill*, IND. STAR, April 26, 2005, at A6.

18. Corcoran, *supra* note 1.

19. See, e.g., George Flynn, *Private Job Lures Judge From Bench; Chief Justice Will Leave Her Appeals Court Post*, HOUS. CHRON., Dec. 19, 1995, at 21 (reporting that Alice Oliver Parrott, a mother of teenage children, resigned her post on the First Court of Appeals in Houston because of financial considerations); George Flynn, *Judges Sound Warning Over Salary Lag*, HOUS. CHRON., July 7, 1995, at 26 (reporting that Judge Richard Bianchi resigned from the state civil district court for a private-sector job because of his daughter's forthcoming college tuition costs); Reynolds Holding, *Judges Find More Reasons to Leave Bench*, SAN FRAN. CHRON., May 28, 2000, at 3 (discussing her reasons for leaving the bench, a former California Superior Court judge answered, "I love my job, but my judicial salary will not allow me to save enough for my 6-year-old daughter's college tuition.").

The Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court also expressed concern about low judicial salaries; in 1998, several Hawaii judges left the bench, citing pay as the primary factor. Mel Masuda, *Off the Record*, 3 HAW. B.J. 38 (1999). See also William C. Smith, *Bailing From the Bench: Judges Worry Pay Gap May Drive Their Experienced Peers into Private Practice*, A.B.A. J., May 1999, at 22.

20. Corcoran, *supra* note 1.

judges who have independent means, will remain. Obviously, a heterogeneous mix of age, class, and income is essential for diversity of insights into people's problems: the bench can meet its challenges *only* if judges are diverse. With many mid-career lawyers suffering "maltuition" for their children and with the private sector—and other public employment—enlarging the compensation gap, the need to pay judges appropriately becomes ever more pressing. Judges' workloads have risen markedly, but even more important is the growth in law's complexity, requiring abler judges. We need to get and retain better, smarter, and more efficient judges; a drop in quality cannot be tolerated. And a drop in quality means a drop in stature, reducing judicial independence.<sup>21</sup>

Private-sector pay cannot be matched and need not be. But the pay gap must be reduced. State courts must assure equal, effective justice for all—nothing less than that for the great majority who cannot afford to buy into a better system (for example, "private judging"). Effective state courts are also crucial to keeping the federal form of government vibrant.

The best approach was begun by Jimmy Carter: as governor of Georgia, he started a pay comparability commission. Today, twenty-one states have commissions, twelve only advisory, but nine whose recommendations are binding or become law unless disapproved.<sup>22</sup> Other states, while not having judicial compensation commissions, determine salaries in other fixed ways.<sup>23</sup>

The judicial pay gap must be closed and salaries raised at predictable time intervals. First, the bench and bar in every state must present the facts about the judges' worsening pay gap. The National Center for State Courts produces valuable reports semi-annually on judicial pay, but the reports need relevant comparability data.<sup>24</sup>

Second, each state needs a compensation commission positioned like the effective ones. Illinois's Compensation Review Board was created directly by the initiative of

---

21. "Inadequate judicial compensation has the potential to compromise not only judicial quality and diversity, but also judicial independence." Thompson & Cooper, *supra* note 11, at 1112–13.

22. KENNETH PANKEY & KRISTI REMKUS, NAT'L CTR. FOR STATE COURTS, SETTING JUDICIAL COMPENSATION: COMMISSIONS & OTHER MECHANISMS (2003). In Missouri this year, a ballot proposition is before the voters to establish an effective compensation commission.

23. California, Nevada, and South Carolina regulate judicial salaries by statute. South Dakota's salaries are tied to increases for other state employees and Pennsylvania's salaries are increased in relation to the Consumer Price Index. However, the commission structure is more efficient and fair because of its predictability and independence. For example, if a fight erupts over increasing state employee salaries, South Dakota judges would be caught in that controversy. See CAL. CONST. art. III, § 4; CAL. GOV'T CODE §§ 68200–68204 (2006); NEV. REV. STAT. § 3.030 (2005); 65 PA. CONS. STAT. ANN. § 366.2a (2005); S.C. CODE ANN. § 14-5-120 (2006); S.D. CODIFIED LAWS § 3-8-2.1 (2006).

24. The reports include twenty-one lines of comparable data on compensation, such as on engineers (three lines: civil, electrical, and mechanical) as well as on registered nurses and social workers. But there is only one line on lawyers—who are said to earn \$94,115, which is the higher of two figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics national compensation survey mean salary. The NCSC reports have no information on non-judicial public employees. See SURVEY OF JUDICIAL SALARIES, NAT'L CTR. FOR STATE COURTS (2006), available at [http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS\\_JudComJudSal010106Pub.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_JudComJudSal010106Pub.pdf) (figures as of 1/1/06).

the Illinois and Chicago bar associations.<sup>25</sup> The creation of such commissions will ultimately improve the quality of justice in their states. A non-political compensation commission can react quickly to changing market and economic conditions. Further, automatic, predictable, and predetermined judicial salary adjustments will avoid the popular protests that accompany unpredictable and large government salary increases. And putting salary adjustments in the hands of a bipartisan, non-political body will protect the judiciary from having to lobby at the state legislature, hat in hand, for a raise.

State judges do an admirable job, in the face of growing dockets and worsening pay, to deliver justice to the people. But there is a point at which the gap between state judges' pay and other opportunities grows intolerably large, and the talented lawyers on whom we depend for the effective administration of justice turn away from service on the bench.<sup>26</sup> We must work to keep public service on the bench as a viable career option for diverse and able women and men.

---

25. The Illinois Compensation Review Board is described in *Jorgensen v. Blagojevich*, 811 N.E.2d 652, 654 (Ill. 2004):

The [Board, created by statute, has] the power to determine the salaries of various government officials, including judges. The Board is required to undertake periodic reevaluations of those salaries . . . . Following its review, which includes public hearings, the Board determines the compensation for each of the covered offices and files a report with the General Assembly . . . . With respect to judges [whose salaries may not, according to the state constitution, be diminished] the Board may either leave salaries unchanged or increase them. After the Board files its report, the General Assembly "may disapprove [it] in whole, or reduce it in whole proportionately." Taking such action, however, requires adoption of a resolution by a majority of the members of [each house within 30 days] after each of those bodies has next convened after the Board files its report. If the General Assembly fails to adopt a resolution regarding the Board's report . . . the salaries specified in the Board's report take effect, and the General Assembly is required to appropriate the funds necessary to pay those salaries.

The American Judicature Society outlined a model statute for Judicial Compensation Commissions in Richard Chernick & Steven S. Lucas, *The Need for Judicial Compensation Commissions*, 78 JUDICATURE 6 (1994).

In Missouri, the Citizens' Commission on Compensation for Elected Officials, established in 1994, sets pay for statewide elected officials, legislators, and state judges. Missouri voters, in November 2006, adopted a constitutional amendment whereby salaries set by the Commission may be overridden only by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly. See William C. Lhotka, *Voters Could OK Easier Pay Hikes for Judges*, ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH, Oct. 30, 2006, at B1.

26. Two arguments against raising judicial pay require mention. First, one Chief Justice—a leader in efforts to raise judges' pay—always notes in opening his comments that America's median family income is below \$50,000, leading many people to view judges as well paid. But the question is whether the judges available for everyone's litigation will be second-class or even weaker, as we downgrade the public's courts, see *supra* note 12, like our downgrading of public schools. "Unless this is revised soon, the American people will pay a high price for the dispensation of justice." VOLCKER REPORT, *supra* note 11, at 23. Second, some people try to defend low pay for judges by saying—rightly—that in rural areas, judges' pay is not low relative to other professionals there. True, and that may be an argument for taking on the difficulties of adjusting pay within a state according to cost of living, but it is no argument for depressing the pay of the great majority of judges who are not in rural areas.



APPENDIX

Table I. Median base salaries of judges, law firm associates, and partners: percent raise in median salary 1995-2005

	2005		2000		1995						
	Salary	Percent rise since	Salary	Percent rise since	Salary	Percent rise since					
State judges (all states)	\$128,018	11.5%				31.8%					
Salary (high court and court) and percent rise since											
Salary (general jurisdiction court) and percent rise since	\$116,100	12.0%				34.2%					
Federal judges (full time)	District court		U.S. magistrate court		Court of appeals		Associate justice		Chief justice		
	2005	1995	2005	2000	1995	2005	2000	1995	2005	2000	1995
Salary and percent rise since	\$162,100	11.7%	\$149,132	11.7%	\$171,800	11.7%	\$199,200	11.7%	\$208,100	11.7%	21.3%

**Table 1 continued.** Median base salaries of judges, law firm associates, and partners: percent raise in median salary 1995-2005

Firm size, number of attorneys	All firms											
	2-25				26-50				51-100			
	2005 (\$)	% current salary rose since		2005 (\$)	% current salary rose since		2005 (\$)	% current salary rose since		2005 (\$)	% current salary rose since	
Associate year		2000	1995		2000	1995		2000	1995		2000	1995
1st year	100,000	17.6	78.6	67,500	12.5	50.0	80,000	27.0	60.0	83,000	18.6	39.5
5th year	122,500	14.5	75.9	91,000	7.1	51.7	93,000	11.4	46.5	95,000	14.1	31.9
8th year	145,000	20.8	71.3	109,000	24.6	49.7	108,000	41.2	42.3	105,554	11.7	25.7
Firm size, number of attorneys	101-250											
Associate year		% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since	
1st year	88,000	17.3	50.4	105,000	5.0	50.0	125,000	13.1	n/a	125,000	13.1	n/a
5th year	101,000	4.1	31.9	125,000	-1.2	51.1	153,225	2.2	n/a	153,225	2.2	n/a
8th year	117,917	15.6	25.7	144,333	6.9	46.5	181,500	10.0	n/a	181,500	10.0	n/a
Firm size, number of attorneys	251-500											
Associate year		% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since	
1st year	88,000	17.3	50.4	105,000	5.0	50.0	125,000	13.1	n/a	125,000	13.1	n/a
5th year	101,000	4.1	31.9	125,000	-1.2	51.1	153,225	2.2	n/a	153,225	2.2	n/a
8th year	117,917	15.6	25.7	144,333	6.9	46.5	181,500	10.0	n/a	181,500	10.0	n/a
Firm size, number of attorneys	500 or more											
Associate year		% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since			% current salary rose since	
1st year	88,000	17.3	50.4	105,000	5.0	50.0	125,000	13.1	n/a	125,000	13.1	n/a
5th year	101,000	4.1	31.9	125,000	-1.2	51.1	153,225	2.2	n/a	153,225	2.2	n/a
8th year	117,917	15.6	25.7	144,333	6.9	46.5	181,500	10.0	n/a	181,500	10.0	n/a

NOTE: Associate salaries do not include bonuses. In 1995, the highest category of firm size was 201 or more.

**Table 1 continued.** Median base salaries of judges, law firm associates, and partners; percent raise in median salary 1995-2005

Partners (AmLaw 100)	101-250		
Median Profits per partner	2005 (\$)	% current profits rose since	
	957,500	2000	1995
		53.8	140.8
Median of average compensation to all partners	2005 (\$)	% current compensation rose since	
	790,000	2000	1995
		49.1	121.0

Source: CCJ TASK FORCE ON POLITICS AND JUDICIAL ELECTIONS, FACTS ON JUDGES' PAY, [http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MSS/vB\\_PAGE/20060912173153/facts\\_on\\_judges\\_pay.pdf](http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MSS/vB_PAGE/20060912173153/facts_on_judges_pay.pdf) (last visited Mar. 12, 2007).

Table 2. Indiana public colleges and universities, faculty and staff earning more than \$100,000 annually, 2005-2006

	Count of faculty/staff with salaries greater than				For all faculty/staff with salaries greater than \$100,000			
	Trial court judges [\$115,282]	Court of appeals judges [\$134,968]	Supreme court judges [\$138,844]	\$100,000	High (\$)	Low (\$)	Mean (\$)	Total (\$)
Ball State University	42	12	10	81	270,000	100,000	121,306	9,825,748
Indiana State University	18	8	7	30	221,000	100,253	128,518	3,855,527
Indiana University	681	385	341	1,056	360,000	100,002	134,697	142,239,876
Ivy Tech State College	16	8	8	31	260,000	100,000	127,252	3,944,805
Purdue University	400	215	190	690	387,550	100,000	131,221	90,542,285
University of Southern Indiana	10	2	1	16	196,650	100,654	122,390	1,958,247
Vincennes University	4	1	1	5	180,000	104,884	133,877	669,386
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,171</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>1,909</b>				<b>253,035,874</b>

Source: CCJ TASK FORCE ON POLITICS AND JUDICIAL ELECTIONS, FACTS ON JUDGES' PAY, [http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MSS5/WB\\_PAGE/20060912173153/facts\\_on\\_judges\\_pay.pdf](http://www.courtsolutions.org/MS/MSS5/WB_PAGE/20060912173153/facts_on_judges_pay.pdf) (last visited Mar. 12, 2007).

NOTE: Salary data only; no fringe benefits are included.

