

FREEDOMINDEX.US

LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION



Does Your Legislator Vote for Freedom?

Scan to view Rachel B. Baker's voting history.
freedomindex.us/9630/

View the Freedom Toolbox

Scan to learn more about the Freedom Index, view legislative alerts, and deepen your understanding of the U.S. Constitution and America's founding principles. Visit <https://freedomindex.us/tools/>



Rachel B. Baker

Ohio

State Representative, HD-027 (D)

freedomindex.us/9630/

13

Lifetime
Freedom
Score

2025 OH Legislative Scorecard

✓ Pro-Freedom ✗ Anti-Freedom – Did not Vote

Vote

1. Bans DEI programs and offices, prohibits faculty strikes, bars institutions from taking positions on controversial issues, and requires a civics course for students.



Pro-Freedom: **Yes** · Cast: **No** · SB1 · Passed 59–34 · 03/19/2025

2. Allows employers in Ohio to post certain mandatory labor-law notices online instead of displaying physical posters in the workplace.



Pro-Freedom: **Yes** · Cast: **No** · SB33 · Passed 75–20 · 04/02/2025

3. Alters age and schooling certificate requirements and extends allowable work hours for minors under 16-particularly allowing 14- and 15-year-olds to work until 9 p.m. during the school year.



Pro-Freedom: **Yes** · Cast: **No** · SB50 · Passed 62–30 · 11/05/2025

4. Would have defined and protected healthcare sharing ministries in Ohio law.



Estimated benefit per household: **+\$0.45/year.**

Pro-Freedom: **Yes** · Cast: **No** · HB21 · Passed 65–31 · 11/12/2025

5. Would have created a "microenterprise home kitchen operation" registration program, allowing Ohio residents to legally prepare and sell certain homemade foods from their home kitchens without a full commercial food-processing license.



Pro-Freedom: **Yes** · Cast: **Yes** · HB134 · Passed 88–2 · 11/19/2025

6. Would have established a statewide "Community Energy Program."



Pro-Freedom: **No** · Cast: **Yes** · HB303 · Passed 77–8 · 11/19/2025

Scorecard Votes: 17%

Why do these votes matter?

1. DEI Ban

SB1 bans diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) programs and related offices or trainings, prohibits faculty strikes, requires institutions to avoid taking institutional positions on controversial issues, and mandates a civics education requirement for students. The law also restructures faculty evaluation and workload policies, requires syllabi and course transparency, and calls for program review based on enrollment numbers. Schools that fail to comply with SB1 risk losing state funding.

The Ohio State House of Representatives passed SB1 on March 19, 2025 by a vote of 59 to 34. We have assigned pluses to the ayes because DEI promotes divisive myths and false historical narratives propagated by critical race theorists, feminists, and LGBTQIA+ activists. It is nothing but a modern and subtle outgrowth of efforts by earlier Marxist radicals to alter or destroy the American way of life through a "long march through the institutions." The goal is a complete disruption of our moral, social, and political order so as to impose conformity on citizens and end all opposition to the welfare state.

2. Business Rights

SB33 allows employers in Ohio to post certain mandatory labor-law notices online instead of displaying physical posters in the workplace. Before this bill, employers had to place labor-law notices in a conspicuous location at work; under SB 33, they can make them accessible on the internet to their employees.

The Ohio State House of Representatives passed SB33 on April 2, 2025 by a vote of 75 to 20. We have assigned pluses to the ayes because government mandates requiring businesses to display labor-law posters interfere with private-property rights protected by the Bill of Rights and freedom of contract. Article I, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution protects the obligation of contracts, and employers and employees should be free to negotiate terms without excessive regulatory intrusion. Labor regulations that burden lawful enterprise undermine the free market and impose unnecessary costs and burdens.

3. Child-labor Laws

SB50 changes Ohio's child-labor rules by altering age and schooling certificate requirements and extending allowable work hours for minors under 16—particularly allowing 14- and 15-year-olds to work until 9 p.m. during the school year with parental consent rather than being limited to earlier hours.

The Ohio State House of Representatives passed SB50 on November 5, 2025 by a vote of 62 to 30. We have assigned pluses to the ayes because this bill restores reasonable flexibility for families by allowing parents—not government regulators—to determine whether their children may work extended evening hours. When employment is voluntary, the state should not impose unnecessary restrictions that interfere with a young person's opportunity to gain experience, develop responsibility, and earn income. Parents have the primary authority over the upbringing and supervision of their children, and that authority is protected by the constitutional principles of due process and freedom of association, which are retained under the Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

4. Healthcare Sharing Protection

HB21 would have defined and protected healthcare sharing ministries (HCSMs) in Ohio law—clarifying that these faith-based health-cost-sharing organizations are not considered insurance and are not subject to state insurance regulations.

The Ohio State House of Representatives passed HB21 on November 12, 2025 by a vote of 65 to 31. We have assigned pluses to the ayes because HCSMs are voluntary, faith-based associations protected by the First Amendment's guarantees of religious liberty and freedom of association. These organizations operate through private agreements among members who share medical expenses according to shared religious beliefs—not through state-mandated insurance schemes. Healthcare is not a legitimate responsibility of government, and lawmakers should not burden religious cost-sharing arrangements with regulations designed for commercial insurance corporations.

5. Sale of Home Goods

HB134 would have created a "microenterprise home kitchen operation" registration program, allowing Ohio residents to legally prepare and sell certain homemade foods from their own home kitchens without needing a full commercial food-processing license. It sets up registration, food-safety training, inspection standards, and limits (such as a gross receipts cap for certain products) to help small food entrepreneurs operate safely while protecting consumers.

The Ohio State House of Representatives passed HB134 on November 19, 2025 by a vote of 88 to 2. We have assigned pluses to the ayes because this bill reduces government interference in voluntary exchange and lawful commerce. By lowering regulatory barriers, it empowers individuals to produce and sell directly to willing consumers without being forced into burdensome commercial licensing schemes designed for large-scale operations. Government's proper role is to protect God-given rights, not micromanage enterprise. Interference in entrepreneurship undermines the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

6. Community Energy Program

HB303 would have established a statewide "Community Energy Program" to encourage development of local energy-generation projects—including solar, biomass, natural gas, and other small-scale facilities — and allow residents and businesses to subscribe to. It amends and adds sections to the Ohio Revised Code to set up the program's structure, define how electricity is measured, and let the Public Utilities Commission regulate participating community energy facilities.

The Ohio State House of Representatives passed HB303 on November 19, 2025 by a vote of 77 to 8. We have assigned pluses to the nays because this bill, despite its free-market rhetoric, expands government control over energy production and distribution. By creating a new state-designed program, defining eligible energy sources, and empowering regulators to oversee and shape participation, HB303 moves electricity generation further under centralized oversight rather than leaving it to voluntary market competition. Such state-directed energy planning embraces the United Nations' Agenda 2030, invites regulatory favoritism, distorts price signals, and concentrates greater authority in unelected bureaucracies—undermining property rights and a truly free, competitive energy market.