

Women in academia suffer from significant pay disparities in the workplace even when they hold the same rank as men. The recent *Ledbetter* decision by the United States Supreme Court holds a number of important lessons for women in academia. The article explores the revealing choices of language used in the majority opinion, written by one of the Court's newest members, Justice Samuel Alito, and the dissent, written by the Court's only remaining woman, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. It concludes that these differences have significance in terms of both outcomes and the importance of gender diversity on the bench. The article evaluates the norms in academia in terms of how women faculty fare with regard to pay equity and the nature of the salary-setting norms. In addition, the article explores how academia can effectuate voluntary change in such norms. Finally, it reviews the pending Congressional legislation that "fixes" the *Ledbetter* decision and concludes that, with such normative change and legislation, women in academia may fare better in terms of pay equity in the future.