

**2012-2017 Michigan Tourism Strategic Plan
Collaboration, Cooperation & Partnerships (CCP) Committee Meeting
Ford Ballroom, Amway Grand Plaza
1:30 – 4:00pm, September 20 2013**

Agenda

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. Review of June 27 Meeting Notes
3. Status of Action Items from June 27 Meeting
 - a. General – MSUE article on CCP
 - b. Obj. 1 – brand use guidelines
 - c. Obj. 1 – partner survey
 - d. Obj. 1 – MI associations
 - i. Invitation(s) to future meetings
 - e. Obj. 2 – CCP LinkedIn page
 - f. Obj. 4 – conference sponsorship kit
 - g. Obj. 4 – conference registration fees
 - h. Obj. 4 – conference attendees
 - i. Obj. 4 – awards submissions
4. Discussion of Funding/Research RFP
5. Next Steps and Next Meeting

**2012-2017 Michigan Tourism Strategic Plan
Collaboration, Cooperation & Partnerships (CCP) Committee Meeting
Ford Ballroom, Amway Grand Plaza
1:30 – 3:30pm, September 20 2013**

Meeting Notes

In Attendance: Julie Sprenger (Co-Chair), Brad Van Dommelen (Co-Chair), Patty Janes, Linda Jones, Manuel Mutimucuo (visiting scholar/guest), Sarah Nicholls, Louise Smith (new student assistant).

Absent: Barb Barden, Mike Busley, Michele Hirschfield, Mark Hitchcock, Dave Lorenz, Gordon Mackay.

Introductions – Made by all.

Review of June 27 Meeting Notes – No changes made.

Status/Discussion of Action Items from June 27 Meeting –

General – MSU Extension article on CCP – Sarah worked with Mark Hitchcock (CCP committee member and MSUE educator) to post a short update on the CCP goal and objectives on the MSUE website. These posts must be short (<500 words) and must be first-authored by an MSUE educator.

- General site: <http://msue.anr.msu.edu/> (tourism is under the 'Business' tab)
- CCP post (the third of five so far on the MTSP):
http://msue.anr.msu.edu/news/the_importance_of_collaboration_cooperation_and_partnerships

Objective One: Grow and strengthen partnership programs and communicate their success to the industry.

Obj. 1 – brand use guidelines – The guidelines regarding use of the Pure Michigan brand were emailed to all CCP members by Amanda Munson on June 27. Discussion ensued regarding the length of time it can take to acquire permission to use the logo (upwards of three weeks). Will entities stop requesting permission, or stop using the logo altogether, if they have to wait too long? Reminder that MEDC owns/controls the brand. This committee can make recommendations regarding its use – in the spirit of being good brand stewards – but cannot expect to 'control' its use or to have much influence on the requirements of the brand guidelines. Committee could also play a role in encouraging industry entities to use

the logo/participate in the partnership program and in explaining to them the reasons for following the brand use guidelines.

Obj. 1 – survey of advertising partners – The survey of the 42 advertising partners was distributed to selected partners on Mon Sept 9 and to all remaining partners on Mon Sept 16. Twenty-three responses received as of Fri Sept 20 (55% response rate). Preliminary results were reviewed. Responses to date very positive – most entities plan to invest the same or more in the program in 2014, most are somewhat or extremely satisfied with the program. Mostly commonly mentioned positive result of participation = increase in industry/community pride. Reminders to non-participants will be sent out in late September, suggested by Brad that he or other CCP committee members make targeted calls to non-respondents after that. A full report will be prepared once all responses have been received; these results will be presented at the next CCP meeting and shared with Travel Michigan. Discussion regarding the name of the program – it is actually a co-op rather than a true partnership program, and the degree of partner control over content and programming is quite low. This can be a source of frustration for participants. Suggestion made that CCP committee could recommend renaming of the program and clarification of its workings to potential ‘partners’ prior to their signing up to participate.

Obj. 1 – MI associations – Sarah and Louise have created a list of nearly 80 associations around the state that might be of relevance to the implementation of the MTSP. These associations might be potential partners in terms of lobbying, attendance at the Governor’s Conference, etc. Recommended that each CCP committee member review the list and prioritise each one regarding (i) its relevance to the tourism industry/implementation of the MTSP and (ii) the tourism industry's ability to partner with/influence the association. Sarah will prepare and send out an Excel sheet that asks each CCP member to rate each association on each of these two items. Once the prioritization has been carried out, the committee can discuss the invitation of high priority association representatives to future CCP meetings. These high priority associations might also be a good place to start as far as investigating the economic impact of tourism outside the traditional elements (accommodations, attractions, etc.) of the industry.

Objective Two: Establish an online statewide toolbox or clearinghouse to support collaboration, cooperation and partnerships.

Obj. 2 – CCP LinkedIn page – The MI Tourism Collaboration, Cooperation and Partnerships Toolbox was launched as a group on LinkedIn on September 9. The group has 253 members as of September 20. Sarah has multiple email lists, all of which received an invitation to join – MTSP committee members, CVB directors, association directors, participants in the planning process, recent conference attendees. George also highlighted the site in his Sept 11 Wednesday email. Sarah will send out a second invitation to all of these groups in a few weeks. The challenge will be to maintain the momentum of the site, to keep the content current and the conversations active. PLEASE visit the group often and get involved in the discussions. The entire CCP committee should take responsibility for sustaining conversation on the site. Also send Sarah ideas for her weekly ‘Announcement’ – these are higher profile discussions because every group member receives an email about

the weekly announcement and this topic is highlighted at the very top of the page. The description of the site that is available to potential members and that is sent to all new members is as follows: “The CCP Toolbox is designed to facilitate the development of new, innovative and non-traditional collaboration, cooperation and partnerships that will increase and improve tourism activity throughout the state. Please use this site to share best practices and resources, to seek and offer assistance with current and proposed projects, and to otherwise benefit the tourism industry throughout the state!” As manager, Sarah has the ability to delete inappropriate postings. Postings are automatically ranked by their popularity (numbers of comments and likes); an individual user can switch that ranking to chronological order. If a posting is not inappropriate (e.g., rude or offensive) but is not necessarily very relevant, it should quickly sink to the bottom of the page.

Objective Four: Increase the number and diversity of participants in the annual Governor’s Conference on Tourism and in the associated industry awards programs.

Obj. 4 – conference sponsorship kit – The draft conference sponsorship kit for 2014 was sent to all CCP committee members in an email from Amanda Munson on June 27.

Obj. 4 – conference registration fees – Sarah and Louise prepared a list of all the state tourism conferences (see attached), including website, length, fee and fee/day. Of the 39 states for which 2013 data are currently available, Michigan’s fee is the 16th highest (\$329 in 2013, range across all states = \$50 to \$499) and Michigan’s fee/day is the 7th highest (\$219 per day, range across all states = \$50 to \$297). Given the objective – to increase attendance – the fee is especially relevant to smaller and more distant entities for which the total cost of attending might exceed \$1,000. Discussion of/support for a recommendation to the Conference Planning Committee to consider a discount to first time attendees. This option was preferred to a tiered fee based on entity size.

Obj. 4 – conference attendees – Sarah and Louise compiled conference attendee information (number and affiliations of attendees) for 2009-2013 – see below.

Year	Registrants	including *	Sales Seminar	Exhibitors
2009	432	264 full, 34 student, 65 Stars Dinner	?	32
2010	399	301 full, 35 Stars Dinner	15	39
2011	466	352 full, 32 student, 52 Stars Dinner	41	53
2012	649	438 full, 77 student, 80 Stars Dinner	54	53
2013	619	449 full, 46 student, 97 Stars Dinner	71	50

* there are other kinds of registrations so these do not sum to the total number of registrants

Note: the conference was held at Grand Hotel in 2010, in May, after the semester had ended, hence there were no students in attendance.

	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		Includes
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Attraction/Event/ Tour Company	42	9.7	26	6.5	42	9.0	53	8.2	44	7.1	attractions, tour providers, retail, sports/recreation, wineries/vineyards
CVB	68	15.7	71	17.8	63	13.5	102	15.7	88	14.2	
Economic Development (Non Profit)	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2	4	0.6	7	1.1	
Education	45	10.4	19	4.8	46	9.9	98	15.1	67	10.8	faculty and students
Food/Beverage	2	0.5	10	2.5	8	1.7	29	4.5	24	3.9	
Industry Suppliers	7	1.6	13	3.3	12	2.6	6	0.9	12	1.9	architecture/design, insurance/finance
Local/County Government	21	4.9	20	5.0	12	2.6	26	4.0	22	3.6	Chamber of Commerce, county/local government
Lodging Provider	134	31.0	111	27.8	165	35.4	194	29.9	217	35.1	
Media	28	6.5	38	9.5	35	7.5	32	4.9	38	6.1	
Sales, Marketing, Advertising, Public Relations	28	6.5	26	6.5	35	7.5	30	4.6	45	7.3	
State Agency	23	5.3	17	4.3	26	5.6	31	4.8	37	6.0	MDARD, MDNR, MDOT, MEDC
Transportation Provider	7	1.6	8	2.0	11	2.4	11	1.7	5	0.8	
Other	27	6.3	40	10.0	10	2.1	32	4.9	12	1.9	

Approximately 1/3rd of conference attendees over the past five years have come from the lodging sector (perhaps a lower proportion than is the common perception). CVBs (14-18%) and education (5-15%) are the next two highest sectors in terms of the proportion of representation.

Obj. 4 – awards submissions – Sarah was able to obtain the number of submissions for MLTA’s Stars of the Industry Awards for the period 2008-2013, but not for TICOM’s Governor’s Awards for Innovative Tourism Collaboration. Stars nominations were as follows: 2008 – 32; 2009 – 50; 2010 – 31; 2011 – unknown; 2012 – 47; 2013 – 67. The expense for employers when an employee wins an award was discussed as a potential disincentive to nominations (lost time at work, travel, etc.). Would be helpful to know what proportion of cost is currently covered by actual award – awards dinner, conference registration, hotel room, etc. Is there any possibility of some kind of scholarship program for winners, to alleviate the cost of winning for the employer and so encourage nominations?

Discussion of Funding/Research RFP – An RFP related to the preliminary research and funding needs of the MTSP implementation committees was distributed on behalf of the Funding and Research/Technical Assistance committees on Sept 15. The RFP encourages the committees to concentrate on the identification and acquisition of data, research and/or technical assistance that specifically relate to (i) the development of metrics for the plan’s objectives and/or (ii) the procurement of baseline data against which progress towards those objectives can be measured. Suggestion to develop a request pertaining to the quantification of the impact of tourism on other sectors such as retail or gas stations; demonstrating the value of tourism to these kinds of segments might help gain their involvement at the Governor’s Conference, in lobbying efforts, etc. In the meantime, Patty offered to develop a bibliography of existing tourism economic impact studies from communities and events around the state. Critical to include information about the methodology in this list, e.g., does the study include locals (it shouldn’t!), does the study include ‘time switchers’ and ‘casuals’ (it shouldn’t!), does the study focus on direct spending or full economic impact; if the latter, what multiplier was applied, etc. Also need to account for leakages back out of the community. Suggested that a second avenue of investigation is the economic impact studies carried out by other sectors that might include the effects of tourism spending in them. Sarah/Louise will work on this.

Next Steps and Next Meeting – Is Jackson the afternoon of November 8 (after the Travel Commission meeting) an option?

Action Items

- General
 - All CCP members will complete prioritization of association list.
 - Patty will prepare bibliography of Michigan tourism economic impact studies.
 - Sarah/Louise will prepare list of other sectors’ economic impact studies.

- Obj. 1 (ad partner survey)
 - Sarah will send reminder to non-respondents on September 26.
 - Brad (and others?) will make personal calls to non-respondents starting October 1.
 - Sarah will provide a full report on the results of the survey at the next CCP meeting.
- Obj. 2 (CCP Toolbox)
 - Sarah will continue to monitor site and make themed 'announcements' once every 1-2 weeks.
 - All CCP committee members are encouraged to join/participate/send Sarah ideas.
- Obj. 4 (conference + awards)
 - Sarah will raise issue of conference registration fee at future CPC meeting. Could there be a discount for first time attendees?