SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2025-2026 Regular Session

AB 7 (Bryan)
Version: July 3, 2025
Hearing Date: July 15, 2025
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AWM

SUBJECT

Postsecondary education: admissions preference: descendants of slavery

DIGEST

This bill permits the California State University (CSU), University of California (UC), independent institutions of higher education, and private postsecondary educational institutions to consider providing a preference in admissions to an applicant who is a descendant of slavery, as defined.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2020, the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed, SB 3121 (Weber, Ch. 319, Stats. 2020), which established the first-in-the nation Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans, with a Special Consideration for African Americans Who are Descendants of Persons Enslaved in the United States (Task Force) to study and develop reparations proposals for California's role in accommodating and facilitating slavery, perpetuating the vestiges of enslavement, enforcing state-sanctioned discrimination, and permitting pervasive, systematic structures of discrimination against African Americans. The Task Force completed its work and issued its final report in 2023. The report contains a number of recommended remedies the state could implement in order to atone for its decades of state-sanctioned white supremacy.

This bill is intended to further the Task Force's goals by specifying that the CSU, the UC, independent institutions of higher education, as defined, and private postsecondary educational institutions, as defined, may consider providing an admissions preference to an applicant who is a descendant of a person who was subjected to chattel slavery in America. While it is not clear that this bill is strictly necessary—the bill does not require the schools to adopt or apply any preference, and schools generally do not need guidance from the state on how to handle admissions—the bill affirms that institutions of higher education can decide for themselves whether

to engage in reparatory admissions practices. The bill also provides that it may be implemented only to the extent that it is consistent with federal law.

This bill is sponsored by the author and is supported by over 20 private organizations and public entities, as well as 15 individuals. This bill is opposed by the Carlsbad Citizens for Community Oversight. The Senate Education Committee passed this bill with a vote of 5-2.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing constitutional law:

1) Provides that the U.S. Constitution, and the Laws of the United States, are the supreme law of the land. (U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2.)

2) Provides for equal protection under the law as follows:
    a) Under the United States Constitution, provides that no state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. (U.S. Const., 14th Amend., § 1.)
    b) Under the California Constitution, provides that a person may not be denied the equal protection of the laws, and that a citizen or class of citizens may not be granted privileges or immunities not granted on the same terms to all citizens. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 7.)

3) Provides that the State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 31, added by initiative, Gen Elec. (Nov. 5, 1996) (Proposition 209).)

Existing state law:

1) Provides that it is the policy of this state to afford all persons in public schools equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of this state, regardless of their actual or perceived disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, immigration status, or association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics. (Ed. Code, §§ 200, 210.2.)

2) Defines the following relevant terms:
    a) "Independent institutions of higher education" means those nonprofit higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in this state and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education. (Ed. Code, § 66010.)

b) "Postsecondary education" means a formal institutional education program whose instruction is designed primarily for students who have completed or terminated their secondary education or are beyond the compulsory age of secondary education, including programs whose purpose is academic, vocational, or continuing professional education. (Ed. Code, § 94857.)
c) "Private postsecondary educational institution" means a private entity with a physical presence in this state that offers postsecondary education to the public for an institutional charge. (Ed. Code, § 94858.)

3) Provides that it is the policy of this state to afford all persons, regardless of disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and immigration status, equal rights and opportunities in the postsecondary educational institutions of the state. (Ed. Code, § 66251.)

4) Establishes the Equity in Higher Education Act, which provides that all students have the right to participate fully in the educational process, free from discrimination and harassment, in any program or activity conducted by any postsecondary educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls students who receive state student financial aid. (Ed. Code, tit. 3, div. 5, pt. 40, ch. 4.5, §§ 66250 et seq.)

5) Provides that no person in the State of California shall, on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, ethnic group identification, age, mental disability, physical disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, or sexual orientation, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the state or by any state agency, is funded directly by the state, or receives any financial assistance from the state, including the CSU.

Former state law established the Task Force to develop reparations proposals for African Americans, with special consideration for African Americans who are descended from persons enslaved in the United States, and provided that the Task Force statutes would remain in effect until July 1, 2023, and as of that date be repealed. (former Gov. Code, §§ 8301-8301.7, repealed by Gov. Code § 8301.7.)

This bill:

1) States that the CSU, the UC, independent institutions of higher education, as defined, and private postsecondary educational institutions, as defined, may consider providing a preference in admissions to an applicant who is a descendant of slavery.

2) Provides that 1) shall be implemented only to the extent that it does not conflict with federal law.

3) Defines "descendant of slavery" for purposes of 1) as an individual who can establish direct lineage to a person who, prior to 1900, was subjected to American chattel slavery and meets at least one of the following criteria:
    a) Was emancipated through legal or extralegal means, including self-purchase, manumission, legislative action, military service, or judicial ruling.
    b) Obtained freedom through gradual abolition statutes or constitutional amendments.
    c) Was classified as a fugitive from bondage under federal or state law.
    d) Was deemed contraband by military authorities.
    e) Rendered military or civic service while subject to legal restrictions based on ancestry historically associated with slavery.

COMMENTS

1. Author's comment

According to the author:

> For decades, universities have given preferential admission treatment to donors and their family members, while ignoring those directly impacted by legacies of harm. We have a moral responsibility to do all we can to right those wrongs.

2. The Task Force's report and recommendations

In 2020, the Legislature enacted AB 3121 (Weber, Ch. 319, Stats. 2020), which created the first-in-the-nation Task Force to explore options for providing reparations to African Americans, and particularly the descendants of enslaved persons, in recognition of California's role in the heinous institution of slavery and the post-abolition perpetuation of racist institutions.[1] The Task Force released an interim report on June 1, 2022, which provided the Task Force's preliminary findings regarding the ongoing and compounding harms caused by federal, state, and local governments from slavery and the " 'badges and incidents of slavery' " that continued to be imposed on African Americans long after slavery was formally abolished.[2] The report notes that, because "the effects of slavery infected every aspect of American society over the last 400

[1] HR 40 (Pressley, 119th Cong., 2025-2026), a federal bill to create a federal commission to study the effects of slavery and discrimination on African Americans and devise reparations proposals, is pending before the House Committee on Judiciary. The bill has been introduced every year since 1989.
[2] California Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans, Interim Report (June 1, 2022), *available at* https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121/reports. All links in this analysis are current as of July 10, 2025.

years…it is nearly impossible to identify every 'badge and incident of slavery,' to include every piece of evidence, or describe every harm done to African Americans."[3]

On June 29, 2023, the Task Force issued its final report to the California Legislature, known as the California Reparations Report.[4] The California Reparations Report incorporates and updates the interim report and recommends appropriate remedies, including compensation, for African Americans as recompense for the State's gross human rights violations against African Americans and their descendants.[5] The California Reparations Report explains:

> [T]he harms inflicted upon African Americans have not been incidental or accidental—they have been by design. They are the result of an all-encompassing web of discriminatory laws, regulations, and policies enacted by government. These laws and policies have enabled government officials and private individuals and entities to perpetuate the legacy of slavery by subjecting African Americans as a group to discrimination, exclusion, neglect, and violence in every facet of American life. And there has been no comprehensive effort to disrupt and dismantle institutionalized racism, stop the harm, and redress the specific injuries caused to descendants and the larger African American community.[6]

The Task Force developed its recommendations for reparations taking into account this willful infliction of harm and applying international standards and principles for the remedy of wrongs and injuries caused by a government.[7] The Task Force made a number of recommendations relating to access to education;[8] according to the author, this bill builds on those recommendations.

3. California's long history of racially discriminatory educational practices

Before slavery was largely abolished in the United States through the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment,[9] California was officially a free state.[10] In practice, however, chattel enslavement was practiced in California.[11] The California Supreme Court upheld the 1852 Fugitive Slave Act, affirming that enslavers who brought enslaved

---

[3] *Id.* at p. 5.
[4] *See generally* California Reparations Report (2023), *available at* https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121/reports.
[5] *Id.* at p. 4.
[6] *Id.* at p. 48.
[7] *Id.* at p. 512.
[8] *Id.* at pp. 715-728.
[9] U.S. Const., 13th amend. The Thirteenth Amendment permits involuntary servitude for persons convicted of crimes; this exception was, and continues to be, used to keep Black Americans in forced labor conditions. (*E.g.*, Blackmon, Slavery by Another Name (2008) pp. 53-54, 63-64.)
[10] *See* Cal. Const. of 1849, art. I, § 18.
[11] *E.g.*, Smith, *Remaking Slavery in a Free State: Masters and Slaves in Gold Rush California* (Feb. 2011) Pac. Historical Review, Vol. 80. No. 1.

persons from other states were not affected by the anti-slavery clause in the constitution.[12] After the Civil War, the California Legislature refused to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment (which established birthright citizenship and equal protection under the laws) and the Fifteenth Amendment (which granted the right to vote regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude).[13] In the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, California imposed poll taxes and literacy tests to prevent people of color from voting.[14]

This background is provided as context for a description of the racial inequalities of California's educational system. The United States Supreme Court approved "separate but equal" segregation in *Plessy v. Ferguson*,[15] and while most of the popular images of school segregation come from the American South, California—with its long history of white supremacy—was also an enthusiastic proponent. The California Supreme Court upheld the establishment of separate schools for white children and schools for people of color in 1874;[16] even after the Legislature ostensibly banned racial segregation for African American students in 1880, African American students were still subjected to manifestly unequal treatment, such as when "the Visalia School District built a new two-story school for white students and forced African American students to attend school in a barn."[17] School segregation was also enforced through discriminatory housing practices, such as redlining and racially restrictive housing covenants, and by zoning school districts to deliberately keep students of different races in different schools.[18]

Following *Brown v Board of Education*, which prohibited "separate but equal" public schools,[19] many Californians fought desegregation efforts.[20] In response to various busing plans to alleviate the effects of *de jure* and *de facto* school segregation, Californians in 1979 voted to adopt Proposition 1, which prohibited courts from imposing desegregation plans except to remedy a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment or unless a federal court would be empowered to impose the same order.[21] The law, which was upheld by the United States Supreme

---

[12] *In re Perkins* (1852) 2 Cal. 424, 437-441, 454-457.
[13] Bottoms, An Aristocracy of Color: Race and Reconstruction in California and the West, 1850-1890 (2013) pp. 86, 92-93. California did not ratify the Fourteenth Amendment until 1959 and the Fifteenth Amendment until 1962. (Constitution Annotated, Intro.6.4 Civil War Amendments, https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/intro.6-4/ALDE_00000388/.)
[14] California Reparations Report, *supra*, at p. 191.
[15] (1896) 163 U.S. 537, *overruled by Brown v. Board of Ed. of Topeka* (1954) 347 U.S. 483.
[16] *Ward v. Flood* (1874) 48 Cal. 36.
[17] California Reparations Report *supra*, at p. 265.
[18] *Id.* at p. 266.
[19] *Brown*, *supra*, 347 U.S. at p. 493.
[20] California Reparations Report, *supra*, at p. 266.
[21] *See* Cal. Const., art. I, § 7; School Assignment and Transportation of Pupils, California Proposition1 (1979), available at https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1860&context=ca_ballot_props.

Court,[22] curtailed mandatory busing and limited the state's ability to combat *de facto* segregation.[23] As a result:

> [I]n the vast majority of California school districts, schools either re-segregated or were never integrated, and so segregated schooling persists today. As of 2003, California was one of the four most segregated states for African American students. As of 2014, California was identified as the third-most segregated states for African American students, and a state where African American and Latino students are strongly concentrated in schools that have far lower quality and resources than their white and Asian peers. As of 2020, California remained in the top 10 most segregated states for Black students.[24]

The longstanding racial inequities in education have led to unequal outcomes in higher education for Black students. As explained by the Senate Education Committee's analysis of this bill:

> The Campaign for College Opportunity released a report in February 2019, *State of Higher Education for Black Californians.* The report noted several facts, notably:
> - California high schools graduate Black students at lower rates than all other racial/ethnic groups and have failed to address the significantly lower percentages of Black students who are offered and complete the college preparatory curriculum–a 17-percentage point gap in A-G completion between Black and White students exists.
> - Of the 25,000 Black high school graduates in 2017, only 9,000 completed the coursework necessary to be eligible for California's public four-year universities.
> - CCC transfers only 3% of Black students within two years and only 35% within six years.
> - Sixty-three percent of Black community college students do not earn a degree, certificate, or transfer within six years.
> - Fifty-seven percent of Black freshmen at CSU do not complete a degree within six years, and only 9% do so in four years.
> - Ninety-three percent of Black for-profit college students do not complete a degree within six years.
> - Almost half of all Black students who attended college left without a degree.

---

[22] *Crawford v. Bd. of Educ.* (1982) 458 U.S. 527, 535-536.
[23] California Reparations Report, *supra*, at p. 266.
[24] *Ibid.*

4. This bill provides that California's colleges and universities may consider providing an admissions preference to applicants who are descendants of enslaved persons

This bill provides that the CSU, the UC, independent institutions of higher education, and private postsecondary educational institutions may consider providing a preference in admissions to an applicant who is a descendant of slavery. There is no requirement that they provide such a preference, or even a requirement that they consider granting such a preference; the bill merely puts the option on the table. The bill does not prescribe how an institution of higher education must adopt such a preference, instead giving institutions the discretion to implement a preference based on their specific circumstances and needs.

The bill defines a "descendant" as a person who can establish that they are the direct lineal descendant of a person who, prior to 1900, was subjected to American chattel slavery and meets at least one of the following criteria:

- They were emancipated through legal or extralegal means, including self-purchase, manumission, legislative action, military service, or judicial ruling.
- They obtained freedom through gradual abolition statutes or constitutional amendments.
- They were classified as a fugitive from bondage under federal or state law.
- They were deemed contraband by military authorities.
- They rendered military or civic service while subject to legal restrictions based on ancestry historically associated with slavery.

This definition is consistent with the definition of "descendant" adopted in other pending bills relating to descendant status, including SB 518 (Weber Pierson, 2025).

Finally, the bill provides that its provisions shall be implemented only to the extent that it does not conflict with federal law. This really goes without saying: the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution makes the U.S. Constitution, and federal law, the law of the land, and conflicting state laws are preempted.[25] The possible preemption issues, along with issues raised by the California Constitution, are discussed below.

5. Constitutional issues

In one, very technical, sense, this bill presents no constitutional issues because it does not actually require any action. The bill states only that an institution of higher education "may consider" granting an admissions preference to descendants of a chattel enslaved person in the United States. This dual layer of deference—schools "may" decide to "consider" adopting a new practice in the future—arguably doesn't allow the schools to do anything they can't do already.

[25] *See* U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2.

In a more pragmatic sense, however, the implications of the bill are clear: the state is giving its blessing to an institution of higher education that wishes to give an admissions preference to descendants. Opponents of the bill argue that the bill violates both the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Proposition 209, so it is worth discussing why this is not the case. The shifting Supreme Court precedent on the Equal Protection Clause is relevant to the Proposition 209 analysis.

The Equal Protection Clause provides that no state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.[26] While the text of the clause has not changed since its ratification, the clause's application has shifted dramatically over the past 60 years along with the changing membership of the United States Supreme Court. In the 1960s, race-conscious laws intended to undo the harmful effects of segregation and white supremacy had some support from the federal government and the Supreme Court.[27] By the 1970s, however, the same backlash that led Californians to adopt Proposition 1, discussed above in Comment 3, led to attacks on race-based admissions in colleges and universities. In *Regents of University of California v. Bakke*,[28] however, a fractured Supreme Court approved the use of affirmative actions in admissions but held that express racial quotas violated the Equal Protection Clause.[29] But there was no majority opinion; the nine justices collectively issued six opinions that sharply disagreed on the boundaries of the Equal Protection Clause and federal antidiscrimination law.[30] Race-based admissions practices thus continued in California and elsewhere.

Seventeen years after *Bakke*, the California voters approved Proposition 209, which added an amendment to the California Constitution prohibiting discrimination, or granting preferential treatment to, "any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting."[31] The proponents of the measure were open about the goal of ending affirmative action programs for historically marginalized individuals, arguing that they amounted to "reverse discrimination."[32] With the adoption of Proposition 209, "the California electorate 'set a different course' from that

---

[26] U.S. Const., 14th amend,

[27] *See, e.g.*, *McDaniel v. Barresi* (1971) 402 U.S. 39, 41-42 (desegregation plan that explicitly took race into account when drawing attendance lines did not violate the Equal Protection Clause); Exec. Order No. 11246, 30 Fed. Reg. 12319 (Sept. 24, 1965), *rescinded by* Exec. Order No. 14172, 90 Fed. Reg. 8633 (Jan. 21, 2025); *see also, e.g.*, *North Carolina State Bd. of Education v. Swann* (1971) 402 U.S. 43, 45-46 (striking down law forbidding the assignment of any student to a school on the basis of race because it would prevent desegregation).

[28] (1978) 438 U.S. 265.

[29] *Id.* at pp. 318-320 (lead opn. of Powell, J.).

[30] *See id.* at p. 324 (conc. & dis. opn. of Brennan, J.); *id.* at p. 379 (conc. opn. of White, J.); *id.* at p. 387 (conc. opn. of Marshall, J.); *id.* at p. 402 (conc. opn. of Blackmun, J.); *id* at p. 408 (conc. & dis. opn. of Stevens, J.).

[31] *See* Cal. Const., art. I, § 31, added by initiative, Gen Elec. (Nov. 5, 1996).

[32] *E.g.*, California 1996 Gen. Elec. Voter Guide, Proposition 209, Argument in Favor of Proposition 209 (signed by Governor Pete Wilson, Ward Connerly, and Pamela Lewis), *available at* https://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1996/general/pamphlet/209yesarg.htm.

chartered by the [federal] courts,"[33] by prohibiting remedial race-conscious programs that were still permitted under federal law.

Since 1996, however, the federal courts have taken a hard right turn, and race-conscious admissions is one of the casualties. In 2003, the Supreme Court held that a public school admissions system that expressly granted a set number of points to applicants of underrepresented racial minorities violated the Equal Protection Clause,[34] but approved of a system in which race was considered as a "plus factor" as part of an individualized assessment of the student as a whole— with a qualifier: "It has been 25 years since Justice Powell first approved the use of race to further an interest in student body diversity in the context of public higher education…We expect that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest approved today."[35] Ten years later, the Court called into question, but did not prohibit, the consideration of race as a "plus factor" in admissions.[36] And ten years after that, in 2023, the Roberts Court held that virtually any consideration of race in school admissions violates the Equal Protection Clause.[37] The Court did, however, leave open the possibility of race-based considerations for "remediating specific, identified instances of past discrimination that violated the Constitution or a statute."[38]

The bill's opponents argue that this bill should be analyzed as a race-based classification subject to Proposition 209 and the Supreme Court's current application of the Equal Protection Clause. This begs the question, though, of whether "descendant" status, as defined in the bill, is tantamount to, or a proxy for, a race-based classification. A closer examination reveals that this is not the case. Race—specifically, Blackness—is neither necessary nor sufficient to qualify as a descendant. Many Black persons living in the United States today are not descended from chattel enslaved persons, but are rather immigrants themselves or are descended from immigrants who came to the United States in the 20th century; they would not qualify as descendants.[39] Second, because race is, fundamentally, a social construct dependent in part on phenotypical generalizations, it is a virtual certainty that multiracial individuals who do not "look Black" will qualify as descendants.[40]

---

[33] *Hi-Voltage Wire Works, Inc. v. City of San Jose* (2000 24 Ca.4th 537, 561.
[34] *Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003) 539 U.S. 244, 270-271.
[35] *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003) 539 U.S. 306, 337, 343.
[36] *Fisher at University of Texas* (2013) 570 U.S. 297, 314-316.
[37] *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. Harvard* (2023) 600 U.S. 181, 213.
[38] *Id.* at p. 207.
[39] For example, immigrants from countries in Africa were not given the right to become naturalized U.S. citizens until 1952. (*See* 66 Stat. 163 (1952) (the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, or the McCarran-Walter Act).)
[40] A substantial portion of the Black people in America have so-called "white" ancestry because their ancestors were enslavers who raped enslaved women with impunity. (California Reparations Report, *supra*, at p. 436.)

6. Arguments in support

According to the University of California Student Association:

> AB 7 is a critical step toward equity and restorative justice, one that acknowledges and seeks to correct historical and systemic barriers that have impacted descendants of slavery, a lineage that has disproportionately hindered college access for African-American communities and Black students across generations due to the legacy of slavery, Jim Crow segregation laws and institutionalized racial discrimination.
>
> For many students, pursuit of a higher education is simply out of reach, oftentimes due to factors out of their control: Lack of access to college advisors, little to no support with A-G completion, dual enrollment or FAFSA, and affordability. Obstacles that threaten students' dreams of their college and career goals are disturbingly more pronounced for Black students, who are enrolled in California's public colleges and universities at disproportionately lower rates due to long-standing inequities in our K-12 and higher education systems…
>
> For years, college admissions have benefited the wealthy and well-connected, as seen in admissions scandals cases at Ivy Leagues and UCLA, while Black student enrollment saw sharp declines after Prop 209 with little to no supports at the K-12 level to equitably support Black student success, resulting in A-G completion rate disparities.
> Failing to provide college access support pushes far too many students from underserved backgrounds away from college—through no fault of their own. This in turn creates economic disparities and contributes to the long-term racial inequities faced by African Americans and Black communities. Despite efforts to expand dual enrollment to underserved school districts, increase A-G and FAFSA completion rates, and support Black college students with targeted recruitment and retention programs, every tool should be leveraged in the fight to pursue racial and socio-economic equity in our state. The institutional failures caused by neglect and racism demands our urgent and bold response.
>
> AB 7 offers that response—By establishing priority admission for descendants of slavery, the bill acknowledges the compounded effects of systemic exclusion and seeks to repair a fraction of the harm through improved access to higher education. California's public colleges and universities have a responsibility to be engines of equity, not perpetrators of disparity. This bill moves us closer to fulfilling that promise.

7. Arguments in opposition

According to Carlsbad Citizens for Community Oversight:

> On behalf of Carlsbad Citizens for Community Oversight, I am writing to express our opposition to AB 7 Postsecondary education: admissions preference: descendants of slavery. This bill will give admissions preference to descendants of enslaved people.
>
> The California Constitution prohibits discrimination against, or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting. We should not start a practice of preferential treatment based on immutable characteristics but return to merit based college admittance

SUPPORT

African American Community Service Agency
Black Leadership Council
Black Lives Matter California
Brotherhood of Elders Network
Cal Voices
California Association of Black Lawyers
California Association of Christian Colleges and Universities
California Black Power Network
California Faculty Association
California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
CFT – A Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
City of Alameda
Community Coalition
Community Housing Development Corporation
Fannie Lou Hamer Institute
Magdalena's Daughters
NAACP California-Hawai'i State Conference
Santa Monica Democratic Club
Sonoma County Black Forum
Students Deserve
University of California Student Association
Western Center on Law & Poverty
15 individuals

OPPOSITION

Carlsbad Citizens for Community Oversight

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending legislation:

SB 518 (Weber Pierson, 2025) establishes the Bureau for Descendants of American Slavery within state government, contingent upon an appropriation by the Legislature, and establishes the Bureau's duties relating to determining an individual's status as a descendant, as defined, and to reviewing and investigating complaints of property taken as a result of racially motivated eminent domain. SB 518 is pending before the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

ACA 7 (Jackson, 2025) creates a ballot measure that deletes Proposition 209's reference to "education" and replaces it with "higher education admissions and enrollment." ACA 7 is pending before the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Prior legislation:

ACA 7 (Jackson, 2024) would have created a ballot measure to limit Proposition 209 to harmful discrimination, as described. ACA 7 was never set for a hearing by the author and died in this Committee.

AB 3121 (Weber, Ch. 319, Stats. 2020) established the Task Force and its mission, with a sunset date of July 1, 2023.

ACA 5 (Weber, Ch. Res. 23, Stats. 2020) created a ballot measure, placed on the ballot in the November 2024 general election, to repeal Proposition 209. ACA 5 was defeated by the voters.

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Education Committee (Ayes 5, Noes 2)
Assembly Floor (Ayes 54, Noes 17)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 3)
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 8, Noes 2)
Assembly Higher Education Committee (Ayes 6, Noes 3)

****