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Overview of the JEDx Initiative

What is JEDx?

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation (Chamber Foundation) and the T3 Innovation Network (T3 Network) launched the Jobs and Employment Data Exchange (JEDx) initiative in 2021 to develop a public-private approach for collecting and using standards-based jobs and employment data.

Phases

April – June 2021: Planning Phase
Explored the need for a more public-private approach to data standardization and sharing, including a roadmap for how to design and test JEDx and four demonstration projects.

November 2021 – October 2022: Design Phase
The JEDx Partnership was launched with national and state partners, including public and private organizations from Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Texas.

November 2022 – March 2023: Bridge Phase
The Chamber Foundation will work with public and private organizations to prepare to demonstrate the JEDx value proposition, including the data collection and their use by prototype applications.

Starting 2023: Pilot Phase

Source: https://www.uschamberfoundation.org/JEDx
Overview of the JEDx Value Proposition Research

**Objectives**

The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) was engaged to assess employer perceptions of the JEDx value proposition, with the following research objectives in mind:
- Explore reactions to the JEDx value proposition.
- Assess interest levels for the JEDx initiative.
- Understand drivers and barriers of interest in the JEDx initiative, including views on cost and additional value generated by applications.

**Methodology**

Quantitative: A 15-minute online survey conducted among HR professionals or those who oversee HR professionals from October 5 to November 15, 2022. Responses were collected using a third-party online vendor as well as the SHRM Voice of Work Research Panel.

The sample consisted of 8 subgroups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 National*</th>
<th>Group 2 CA</th>
<th>Group 3 NJ</th>
<th>Group 4 KY</th>
<th>Group 5 TX</th>
<th>Group 6 FL</th>
<th>Group 7 AR</th>
<th>Group 8 CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=1,613</td>
<td>n=510</td>
<td>n=155</td>
<td>n=81</td>
<td>n=396</td>
<td>n=269</td>
<td>n=64</td>
<td>n=123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Soft quotas were set for the National group so the regional breakdown mirrors the HR population benchmarks for the census region.

**Screening Criteria**

- Ages 21+
- U.S. resident
- Working for an organization or self-employed with at least 2 or more employees
- HR professional or oversee HR professionals
- Familiar with governmental requirements for reporting jobs & employment data
- Groups 2 – 8: organization headquarters in qualifying states (CA, NJ, KY, TX, FL, AR, CO)
**KEY FINDINGS (1 OF 2)**

1. **First impressions are overwhelmingly positive, although a few have some reservations.**
   - Many see the value of streamlined processes and enhanced efficiency. However, some are skeptical or unsure about implementation and would like to see more detailed information.

2. **The ideas communicated in the JEDx Value Proposition pique interest, with about 63% indicating they are ‘extremely’ or ‘very’ interested in learning more about the initiative.**
   - Those who are extremely familiar with the reporting requirements express higher interest, as well as those employed in Finance, Information Services, Hospitality, Construction industries, and those employed in large organizations (500 or more employees).
   - Time and cost savings matter greatly among those who express significant interest.
   - On the other hand, those with softer levels of interest want more information on implementation, timing, and costs. A few are concerned with having more regulations in place, lack of applicability, and data privacy.

3. **Overall, improving the protection of employer and worker data is the number one benefit that speaks to many.**
   - Greater transparency and reducing costs also resonate. However, improving how others use the data to better address employer needs falls short in terms of importance, likely because respondents are unsure about use cases or concerned about data privacy.
When asked about incurring initial costs, about 40% indicate that they are ‘extremely’ or ‘very’ concerned. However, some concerns can be addressed.

- To many, the initial costs are considered unbudgeted and superfluous (especially for HR initiatives or software/technology-related items) given the economy. Others want more clarity on time/cost requirements for implementation beyond the initial phase and ROI to justify investments. A few voice concerns about how this initiative can truly be streamlined across different organizations and around data privacy.

When initial costs are put into a context of longer-term benefits, about half say they are not concerned if longer-term benefits outweigh short-term costs.

- However, approximately 40% admit they are still concerned with initial costs regardless of longer-term benefits.
## IMPLICATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

### Streamlined reporting and reduced costs are valued.
- First impressions are positive, as many say this initiative solves key pain points in reporting data to the government.

### Certain benefits would likely need to be communicated with caution, as they can be polarizing.
- Improving protection of employer/worker data was ranked as the most important benefit, while improving how the government and others use the data was ranked as the least important benefit. Consider framing this benefit in a way that ensures data protection while making required reporting easier.

### Organization leaders and HR professionals may need more convincing.
- While time-saving aspects are compelling, there is some concern about this initiative coming across as HR/administrative tasks. As C-Level Executives may be the final decision makers, providing clarity on benefits and ROI can help address some concerns.
- Consider identifying what metrics can be measured pre- and post- implementation and share actual stats from the pilot phase to highlight ROI.

### There are concerns and questions, but some can be addressed.
- Incurring initial costs is not the only concern; many want to understand the “fine print” – detailed information on long-term resource requirements beyond the initial phase.
- Some also point out that organizations have varying needs based on size and industry. Providing more details on how this initiative can truly meet the needs of all organizations can help alleviate some concerns.

### Continue to provide updates throughout the pilot phase as some have doubts about the actual implementation.
- There is strong desire for more detailed information, especially around timing and costs. Providing updates may alleviate fears of complex and expensive implementation.
Evaluation of the JEDx Initiative Value Proposition
First impressions are overwhelmingly positive; the idea of streamlining the process and enhanced efficiency is well-liked, and many expect the JEDx initiative to have a positive impact on their organization.

However, some are skeptical or unsure, mainly driven by the need for more detailed information on implementation, timing and cost.

**Positive Verbatims**

- “Government reporting, or more specifically reports to government, seems like a minefield. The language used is often opaque and the requirements less than obvious. Anything that improves standardization of communication and shows outcomes, would benefit us enormously.”

- “I would be interested in anything that makes our team more productive and saves time. Also, if we could use this data and reporting in a way that benefits our business, that would be wonderful.”

- “It could make procedures for reporting and accessing data more efficient.”

**Negative/Neutral Verbatims**

- “Streamlining always sounds good at first, but I’m somewhat skeptical about the logistics for employers.”

- “Not enough information—I’d like to understand the how.”

- “Seems like a daunting task that may not be realistic. There are so many areas we have to report various employment data. I’m interested, however.”

- “Too much government intervention in the workplace.”
Based on the description of the JEDx initiative, many believe that this initiative will be highly valuable to their organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely valuable</th>
<th>Very valuable</th>
<th>Moderately valuable</th>
<th>Slightly valuable</th>
<th>Not at all valuable</th>
<th>Overall Top 2 Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Highly Valuable” (TOP 2 BOX)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=1,613)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=510)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=155)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=396)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=269)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Top 2 Box: 65%
When asked about the inclination to learn more about the JEDx initiative, many express strong interest. While there is no significant difference across the board, interest in learning more about the initiative is relatively softer in Colorado.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Highly Interested” (TOP 2 BOX)</th>
<th>NATIONAL (n=1,613)</th>
<th>CA (n=510)</th>
<th>NJ (n=155)</th>
<th>KY (n=81)</th>
<th>TX (n=396)</th>
<th>FL (n=269)</th>
<th>AR (n=64)</th>
<th>CO (n=123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely interested</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately interested</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly interested</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Top 2 Box: 63%
SEGMENTS WITH ABOVE AVERAGE INTEREST

Interest is above average among those who are extremely familiar with governmental requirements for reporting data, employed in Finance, Information Services, Hospitality, Construction industries, and those employed in large organizations (500 employees or more).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely familiar with reporting data (n=947)</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance industry (n=297)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services industry (n=179)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality industry (n=49)*</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction industry (n=290)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed at large organization (n=1382)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP and above (n=730)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing industry (n=323)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar with reporting data (n=1273)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade industry (n=61)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR professional (n=2441)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin industry (n=159)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade industry (n=205)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Scientific/Technical Services industry (n=383)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation industry (n=75)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*caution: small base size (<50)
Due to the time and effort-saving aspects of the JEDx initiative, those highly interested in learning more about it believe that both their organization and themselves can benefit from this initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time &amp; effort saving</th>
<th>Could be beneficial for my organization</th>
<th>Need more information</th>
<th>Relevant to my roles and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The amount of time and money spent on reporting is a burden. Gathering information is often difficult across agencies.”</td>
<td>“I want to know what will be available, how I can use it, and what the costs or drawbacks would be.”</td>
<td>“I’m the only executive in our org who understands federal compliance and end up driving this across operations, HR, etc. This would be a massive improvement to this part of my role.”</td>
<td>“We deal with a lot of different companies and types of employees. This would help to navigate the different requirements and laws within those categories.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The time it takes to pull data, then report it back into the government sites takes forever. We have 54 offices and are looking to double that number by next year. The reporting now is so inefficient, and open to errors that we spend lots of time gathering data and hope it all is completed correctly.”</td>
<td>“We’re a multi-state and global non-profit with a workforce that has a lot of reporting requirements.”</td>
<td>“Would like to know more details, what specific types of standardizations are being proposed.”</td>
<td>“Interested to learn more about this initiative to understand if it’d be an opportunity or a match for my organization.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I believe it would allow me to focus my time on other tasks that are more rewarding and beneficial to my company.”</td>
<td>“It would greatly improve the process that our company uses currently.”</td>
<td>“How to best operationalize and utilize; how complicated is it to launch/maintain, and what training is needed to get employees up to speed on how to effectively and efficiently work with the system. Also, curious to understand how other organizations will be using this program.”</td>
<td>“The reporting now is so inefficient, and open to errors that we spend lots of time gathering data and hope it all is completed correctly.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Why are you [INTEREST LEVEL] in learning more about this initiative? [OPEN-END]
VERBATIMS ILLUSTRATING LACK OF INTEREST

On the other hand, those with little to no interest are looking for more details about how this will be implemented and what will be required for implementation. Some also don’t believe that it would be applicable to their organization. A few respondents are concerned about having more regulations that could result in creating more work for HR.

Need more information
› "The outcomes are addressed but it’d be better if provided by industry."
› "Interested in hearing more about how to modernize government data reporting, since the various government agencies have their criteria that are very outdated with regards to demographics, and their specific metrics."
› "It would be interesting to see the value employers receive from employment-related data."
› "Like to see how it would align with our payroll and HR software in reporting the data and see in real-time how I would benefit from the initiative."

May not be applicable to my organization
› "My organization is so small I don’t know if it would bring significant benefits."
› "Certain things are not a one size fits all. So standardized may not exactly work for our organization."
› "We have less than 100 employees, so many of the filing requirements do not apply to us."
› "We are a relatively small and unique organization. Whenever we try to fit ourselves into predetermined classifications, they’re rarely accurate, so the data tied to those classifications aren’t that useful."

Other reasons
› "It creates a layer of work that strains already limited human resources staff."
› "Adding this initiative would be more work than benefit."
› "Because I don’t think businesses need more government."
› "More red tape, more rules and regulations that will cost us more."
› "Appears to be intrusive."

Q. Why are you [INTEREST LEVEL] in learning more about this initiative? [OPEN-END]
**PERCEPTIONS OF JEDX INITIATIVE VALUE PROPOSITION**

Many agree that the description of the JEDx initiative is easy to understand and clear. However, it’s rated relatively lower on credibility and uniqueness, likely because respondents understand that this has not been implemented and would like to see the actual implementation.

**The ideas described are...** % indicates “Strongly/somewhat agree”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy to understand</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Credible</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THEME:**

- **Easy to understand**
- **Clear**
- **Credible**
- **Unique**

**LOCATIONS:**

- **National**
- **CA**
- **NJ**
- **KY**
- **TX**
- **FL**
- **AR**
- **CO**
Perceptions of Potential Benefits and Costs
IMPORTANCE OF POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Improving the protection of employer and worker data is perceived to be the most important benefit across the board. Other top benefits include greater transparency and reduced costs.

**Rank order based on % indicating “Extremely important”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>KY</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving protection of employer/worker data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater transparency in how data will be shared &amp; used</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing costs by consolidating reporting systems &amp; reducing the number of reports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing costs by modernizing government reporting systems using better interfaces</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing costs by standardizing data requirements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving employer access to better data for uses in HR benchmarking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving employer access to better data for uses in other workforce analytics applications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving employer access to better data for uses in workforce planning/labor market analysis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving how government, education and training providers and others use the data to better address employer needs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCERNS ON INITIAL COSTS

Most respondents are concerned about incurring initial costs to some degree, with nearly 40% indicating that they are extremely or very concerned.
REASONS FOR CONCERNS

To many of those who are highly concerned with incurring initial costs, the initial costs are seen as additional costs that have not been budgeted for. Others want more information to justify investments and requirements for implementation as additional resources and efforts may be required to keep their system up to date.

May not be able to afford it

- Seen as additional costs that have not been budgeted.
- Reduced budget due to inflation and economy.
- The notion of "HR administrative tasks."

"Going into a recession and we didn’t budget for additional costs."

“We’re reporting info at no cost using our HR systems. To incur a cost for something that previously cost nothing is difficult to budget for.”

“No extra funding for additional administrative expenses.”

“HR Initiatives are often low priority for my organization.”

“Inflation is high, and employers have tight budgets.”

Need more information

- Need to know the cost.
- Unsure about the actual benefits.
- Need to know how much resources (both time and money) will be required.

“Initial investment without knowing what’s the long-term impact and benefit is always a risk and concern.”

“In current financial climate, would need to understand the ROI for initial startup costs.”

“What will the cost be, how much time will it take (time is $), will additional software/equipment be needed. It seems like there is always a hidden cost or a "catch" to these kind of things.”

“Initial investment without knowing what’s the long-term impact and benefit is always a risk and concern.”

“It’s important to have a clear understanding of the benefits outweighing these initial start up costs.”

Costs will add up

- Hard to estimate what’s ahead after spending initial costs

“The additional costs are one thing and will come out already tight budget and how will this affect the workload, staffing & resources.”

“Costs are likely to be high and uncontrollable in order for the transition process to go smooth and increase when there are inevitable software glitches and issues that need to be corrected.”

Additional concerns/questions:

- Negative connotation associated with government (time consuming, too expensive)

- Concerns with data privacy
- Not my decision
- Will be extremely difficult as there’s no “one size fits all”
What respondents say about initial costs
(In Their Own Words)

“It would be worth it in the long run, and I see the program really taking off.”

“[I think] The benefits, in the long run, will outweigh the cost involved.”

“Won’t be an issue since it will save time in the long run.”

“I am aware of how government initiatives can snowball very quickly.”

“I would want to see this working successfully before needing to spend money to come into alignment with it.”

“At this time of the year, we don’t have the budget for any unplanned programs. Especially with the current state of the economy. The cost and benefits will have to be extremely worth it and provide immediate results.”

“A lot of the new requirements that are put in place start with low prices and gradually add on more cost than what was initially stated.”
COSTS VS. LONG-TERM BENEFITS

Interestingly, about half indicate that they are not concerned with initial costs if longer-term benefits outweigh short-term costs, while about 40% say they are concerned with initial costs regardless of longer-term benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>NATIONAL (n=1,613)</th>
<th>CA (n=510)</th>
<th>NJ (n=155)</th>
<th>KY (n=81)</th>
<th>TX (n=396)</th>
<th>FL (n=269)</th>
<th>AR (n=64)</th>
<th>CO (n=123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a concern regardless of longer-term benefits</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a concern if longer-term benefits exceed short-term costs</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial costs are a concern regardless of longer-term benefits</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONDENT PROFILE (1 OF 2)

**Age (n=3,211)**
- 50+ years: 23%
- 40-49 years: 43%
- 30-39 years: 27%
- 21-29 years: 12%
- 20 years or younger: 12%

**Org Size (n=3,211)**
- Large: 43%
- Midsize: 28%
- Small: 29%
- Other: 1%

**Role (n=3,211)**
- Consider myself to be a HR professional: 76%
- Deal with some HR issues: 18%
- Not a HR professional but oversee HR function: 6%

**Industry (n=3,211)**
- Professional/Scientific/Business/Technical: 12%
- Healthcare: 11%
- Manufacturing: 10%
- Finance, Insurance, or Real Estate: 9%
- Construction: 9%
- Education: 8%
- Retail Trade: 6%
- Information Services: 6%
- Administrative and Support Services: 5%
- Gov’t/Public Administration/Military: 5%
- Food Services: 5%
- Transportation or Warehousing: 3%
- Other Services: 3%
- Wholesale Trade: 3%
- Arts, Entertainment, or Recreation: 3%
- Hospitality: 3%
- Utilities or Energy: 3%
- Agriculture: 3%
- Professional/civic associations, grantmaking, and religious organizations: 1%
- Other industry: 1%
**RESPONDENT PROFILE (2 OF 2)**

### Job Level (n=3,211)

- VP or above: 23%
- Below VP: 77%

### Familiarity with governmental requirements for reporting (n=3,211)

- Extremely familiar: 29%
- Very familiar: 40%
- Moderately familiar: 31%

### Average Time Spent on...

#### Reporting jobs and/or employment data to federal and/or state governments (n=3,211)

- Below 10%: 20%
- 10% - Below 30%: 29%
- 30% - Below 50%: 20%
- 50% or more: 32%

#### Other responsibilities & duties

- Below 10%: 0.3%
- 10% - Below 30%: 4%
- 30% - Below 50%: 15%
- 50% or more: 81%
New Initiative to Streamline Government Reporting, Safeguard Data, and Improve Data Use

The recently launched "Jobs and Employment Data Exchange" (JEDx) initiative seeks to improve the value that employers receive from the jobs and employment data they currently report to federal and state governments.

JEDx initiative seeks to improve employer value by:

1. **Streamlining Reporting and Reducing Costs**
   - Standardizing data requirements across government reporting systems using language that better matches the language used by employers and their HR systems.
   - Consolidating reporting systems and reducing the number of reports submitted by employers.
   - Modernizing government reporting systems using better interfaces with employer HR systems.

2. **Improving How Data Are Used to Address Employer Needs and Priorities**
   - Improving employer access to better data for their own uses such as HR benchmarking (e.g., compensation, retention rates), workforce planning and labor market analysis (e.g., demand and supply analysis), and other HR analytics applications.
   - Improving how government, education and training providers, and others use the data to better address employer needs (e.g., workforce supply).

3. **Safeguarding Data**
   - Improving how government systems protect employer and worker data.
   - Improving transparency in how data will be shared and used.