



Policy roundups on tech and work [January – March 2025]

Policy developments

States

Legislation

This session almost two hundred labor-related AI bills have been introduced so far in state legislatures across the country. While we cannot cover all of them, we have grouped them into key categories and offered examples.

The California Labor Federation introduced a first-in-the-nation package of bills establishing worker rights and employer responsibilities in the use of electronic monitoring ([SB 1331](#) and [SB 1221](#)) and algorithmic management ([SB 7](#)). See statements by Labor Federation president [Lorena Gonzalez](#) and California Senator [Jerry McNerney](#).

Related bills that combine provisions on electronic monitoring and algorithmic management were introduced in [Massachusetts](#), [Vermont](#), [Connecticut](#), and [Washington](#) (see here for a [statement](#) from the AFL-CIO on the Massachusetts bill). A bill in [Illinois](#) would prohibit the use of AI to perform teacher evaluation tasks.

Automation has been a key concern for legislators. A number of bills establish human-in-the-loop provisions, for example in [healthcare](#), [criminal justice](#), and [transportation](#) (autonomous vehicles). Other bills prohibit AI from replacing certain occupations such as [teachers](#), [community college faculty](#), and [journalists](#).

A number of bills focus on the public sector. Some regulate the use of AI by public sector agencies (e.g. [Illinois](#), [Montana](#), and [Rhode Island](#)), while others introduce Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) replicas to their states (e.g. [Illinois](#), [Kentucky](#), and [North Dakota](#)). A bill in [Washington](#) would expand the right to bargain over the use of AI in the workplace for public sector workers.

A whole suite of bills focused on preventing algorithmic discrimination by automated decision systems (ADS) have been introduced in states such as [Virginia](#) (see [statement](#) by EPIC), [New](#)

[Mexico](#), and [Maryland](#). Our partner Matt Scherer at the Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT) can be reached for more details on these bills at mscherer@cdt.org.

Several bills prohibit surveillance pricing and wage setting ([Colorado](#) and [Illinois](#)), while others cover consumer-focused prohibitions on surveillance pricing only, such as [California](#) and [Massachusetts](#) (specifically in grocery stores). See [coverage](#) of these bills in California.

Bills including worker training requirements were introduced in [New Jersey](#), [Virginia](#), and [Maryland](#).

A bill in [California](#) requires companies to document any known copyrighted works used to train an AI system (see statement of [support](#) by SAG-AFTRA), while bills in [Maryland](#) and [Washington](#) require the provision of high-level training data summaries including whether any copyright material was used.

Finally, another group of bills direct state economic development funds to support the promotion of AI infrastructure and businesses (e.g. [New Jersey](#) and [Washington](#)).

Other

In January the UC Berkeley Labor Center worked with key partners in California to host the ‘[Making Tech Work for Workers](#)’ conference – bringing together unions, worker organizations, workers, and civil society members to strategize responses to the use of digital technologies in the workplace.

Earlier this year the California Privacy Protection Agency (CPPA) requested public comment on its proposed regulations. The UC Berkeley Labor Center and over 50 other organizations signed a [joint letter](#) with recommendations on the agency’s rulemaking around automated decision-making systems and risk assessments. The CPPA also [announced](#) Tom Kemp as its new Executive Director.

The California Attorney General’s Office (AGO) [issued](#) two legal advisories. The [first](#) lists existing California laws that apply to all entities who develop, sell, or use AI as well as new laws that went into effect in 2025. The [second](#) focuses on laws that apply to healthcare providers.

The California Civil Rights Council (CRC) voted to adopt new [regulations](#) regarding automated decision systems after publishing its second round of [modifications](#) earlier this year.

The Judicial Council of California is seeking [comments](#) on a proposed model policy for the use of Generative AI in courts until April 17th 2025.

The New Jersey Attorney General's Office (AGO) and the Division on Civil Rights (DCR) issued [guidance](#) clarifying that state anti-discrimination laws apply to AI and other data-driven technologies.

Federal

We clearly cannot summarize everything tech-related that is happening at the federal level under the current administration. For a useful primer we recommend this Tech Policy Press [piece](#).

A few things to highlight are that Biden's 2023 Executive Order (which had significant provisions for workers) was [rescinded](#). Trump released a new [Executive Order](#) calling for the development of a new AI Action Plan. The Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) issued a [Request for Information](#) (RFI) and received over 8.000 [comments](#). The final plan is expected to be announced by July 2025.

Ongoing attempts to reduce the size of the federal workforce are likely to usher in a wave of efforts to automate public services (see pieces by [Brookings](#) and [Tech Policy Press](#)). Unions have filed lawsuits against efforts to curb federal workers' collective bargaining rights (see [here](#)), as well as a range of other actions taken by the administration (see lawsuits led by [NTEU](#), [AFGE](#), and the [AFL-CIO](#)).

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) released an initial [report](#) on findings related to its ongoing investigation of surveillance pricing. The agency is inviting public comments until April 17, 2025.

The US Copyright office released a [report](#) offering guidance on the use of AI in creative works (see [here](#) and [here](#) for coverage).

The ACLU and other civil society groups filed a [complaint](#) with the Colorado Civil Rights Division (CRD) and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) [alleging](#) that AI driven tools used in hiring violated disability, discrimination, and civil rights laws.

International

The European Commission (EC) published two guideline documents related to the EU AI Act – the first on [definitions](#) and the second on [prohibited](#) AI practices (the second was closely [monitored](#) by civil rights groups).

The EC also released a living [repository](#) of exemplary practices that organizations can follow to ensure that workers receive adequate training when an AI system is deployed.

In February France hosted the [Paris AI Summit](#) convening a diverse array of actors including world leaders, members of civil society, unions, and the academy to discuss [international cooperation](#) around AI and the future of the EU's regulatory [approach](#) (hear allies reflecting on the convening [here](#)).

The EU has released the third [draft](#) of its Code of Practice for General Purpose AI (GPAI). Several groups have voiced concern over the draft (see statements by a [coalition](#) of creative workers and [CDT](#)).

The EU AI Liability Directive was [withdrawn](#) from consideration by the EC.

The UK Intellectual Property Office (IPO) released an open [consultation](#) for input on new copyright and artificial intelligence regulations (see [response](#) from media groups).

The UK Procurement Act of 2023 came into force this February, which includes new [guidance](#) on public sector procurement of AI.

In December the Welsh government released new [guidance](#) on the use of AI across public sector workplaces. This guidance was created in collaboration with TUC Cymru and other members of civil society who issued a [report](#) on worker experiences with AI.