

Topic: Reducing Document Rejection Rates  
 Question by: Sara Steinbeck  
 Jurisdiction: Colorado  
 Date: December 5, 2011

Jurisdiction	Question(s)
	I was wondering if anyone had data on their rejection rates before and after implementing strategies to reduce the rejection rate. If so, please let me know what you implemented (e.g., online filing, redeveloping content/instructions, online training, increased customer support) and how your rejection rate changed.
<b>Manitoba</b>	
<b>Corporations Canada</b>	<p>In answer to your questions, after studying the issue of reducing our rates of rejection in June 2006, Corporations Canada succeeded in reducing these rates quite dramatically by 2007-08 (our fiscal finishes in March, here, March 2008). Rejections for all business corporation applications declined from 18.4% in 2005-06 to 10.8% in 2007-08.</p> <p>As you know, it is difficult to determine exactly what factors led to this decline. But the manager responsible for implementing the report is convinced that these factors, most of which were recommended in the 2006 report, played an important role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electronic – Corporations Canada has incorporated businesses online since 1999 and electronic demand for our services continues to increase. The report led us to improve our online prompts for many fields that the filer is required to complete. For example, improvements in these prompts explained to the filer that we required full civic addresses for certain applications. The electronic form was modified to prohibit filers from submitting post-office boxes as their address.</li> <li>• Modification of Forms – Some of our most important forms were simplified by reducing the number of fields that the filer was required to complete. They were also simplified by making their terminology more user-friendly. Other forms were made more specific; for example, offering the filer more choices to guide the filer towards acceptable responses.</li> <li>• Supplementary Staff Efforts – Staff were asked to place 3 to 5 applications per week into their Pending Category rather than rejecting them outright. They would then contact the filers of these applications to ask for further information that might increase the application’s chance of success. For example, if our staff could determine with more specificity the line of business that the applicant company proposed to engage in, this could improve the applicant’s chances of having the proposed corporate name accepted rather than rejected.</li> </ul>
<b>Alabama</b>	
<b>Alaska</b>	

Jurisdiction	Question(s)
	<p>I was wondering if anyone had data on their rejection rates before and after implementing strategies to reduce the rejection rate. If so, please let me know what you implemented (e.g., online filing, redeveloping content/instructions, online training, increased customer support) and how your rejection rate changed.</p>
<p><b>Arizona</b></p>	<p>This is a subject that Arizona is also interested in. Unfortunately we do not have good statistics. I can tell you only that our rejection rate for LLC articles of org is about 14%.</p> <p>In connection with the new computer system that is still in development, we have revised all of our forms with the idea of improving our rejection rate, although we may not have hard statistics on that. Those forms are not yet in use, but we may soon roll out the LLC articles of org even without the new system. As Scott in Nevada mentioned, however, customer education is a challenge when they won't read the instructions.</p>
<p><b>Arkansas</b></p>	
<p><b>California</b></p>	
<p><b>Colorado</b></p>	
<p><b>Connecticut</b></p>	
<p><b>Delaware</b></p>	
<p><b>District of Columbia</b></p>	
<p><b>Florida</b></p>	
<p><b>Georgia</b></p>	
<p><b>Hawaii</b></p>	
<p><b>Idaho</b></p>	
<p><b>Illinois</b></p>	
<p><b>Indiana</b></p>	
<p><b>Iowa</b></p>	
<p><b>Kansas</b></p>	
<p><b>Kentucky</b></p>	
<p><b>Louisiana</b></p>	
<p><b>Maine</b></p>	

Jurisdiction	Question(s)
	<p>I was wondering if anyone had data on their rejection rates before and after implementing strategies to reduce the rejection rate. If so, please let me know what you implemented (e.g., online filing, redeveloping content/instructions, online training, increased customer support) and how your rejection rate changed.</p>
Maryland	
Massachusetts	
Michigan	
Minnesota	
Mississippi	
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	<p>While we generally do not track the volume of rejections, past analyses have shown percentages quite similar to Ohio for paper filing. However, the advent of electronic filings has reduced the over effect of rejections, in that a majority of filings are now processed online by systems designed to collect all statutory information and payments required for filing, therefore, virtually eliminating the rejections of those filings that are now processed electronically. Rejections of paper filings will continue to be an issue of customer education as most rejections are related to improper information or lack of information, or incorrect payment submitted by customers that do not read or understand the forms and instructions. Because of the decrease in rejections due to online filing, I do not see us significantly monitoring rejections.</p>
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	

Jurisdiction	Question(s)
	I was wondering if anyone had data on their rejection rates before and after implementing strategies to reduce the rejection rate. If so, please let me know what you implemented (e.g., online filing, redeveloping content/instructions, online training, increased customer support) and how your rejection rate changed.
<b>Ohio</b>	Unfortunately we don't have the end result yet, but this is something Ohio is also monitoring and looking for ways to improve, so we appreciate your question! Our rejection rates are typically 15-18% each month with paper filings. We are currently revising all paper forms to have clear instructions and clear questions. We are also concluding a 3 month program which involved re-training our employees on customer service skills in general as well as re-training on all relevant topics. Our next plan is to begin accepting corporate filings online and make improvements to our online UCC system. As all of these projects take place we are continuing to monitor the rejection rate and I will be glad to report back to see what has worked.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>South Dakota</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Texas</b>	
<b>Utah</b>	
<b>Vermont</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>West Virginia</b>	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	
<b>Wyoming</b>	

**Additional comments:**

**Full text of email:**

Hi all! I was wondering if anyone had data on their rejection rates before and after implementing strategies to reduce the rejection rate. If so, please let me know what you implemented (e.g., online filing, redeveloping content/instructions, online training, increased customer support) and how your rejection rate changed.

Thank you for your help!

Sarah

Sarah Steinbeck  
Manager, Nonprofit Programs  
Business & Licensing Division  
Colorado Secretary of State  
Voice: 303.894.2200 ext. 6211  
Email: [sarah.steinbeck@sos.state.co.us](mailto:sarah.steinbeck@sos.state.co.us)  
Web site: [www.sos.state.co.us](http://www.sos.state.co.us)