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An Executive Summary

This document provides a brief, primarily visual overview of the results of the 2007-2011 Michigan Tourism Strategic Plan evaluation survey. A fuller version of the results including analysis of the hundreds of open-ended comments that were received is contained in the full report that accompanies this executive summary. The report is presented in three parts:

1) A brief description of survey process;
2) A brief description of the respondents;
3) A summary of responses to the survey questions.

About the Survey Process

Online evaluation of the 2007-2011 Michigan Tourism Strategic Plan opened on Tuesday February 21 2012 and closed on Wednesday March 14 2012. Invitations to complete the survey were sent to all recipients of the Pure Michigan Tourism Update. In addition, the executive directors/presidents of all relevant associations and councils* were asked to share the survey with their members.

A total of 127 surveys were completed in full; another 13 respondents completed a sufficient number of questions to justify inclusion in the survey results. A summary of the aggregated results of these 140 responses is presented in this document.

About The Respondents

Respondents were first asked a series of questions about themselves and their role within the tourism industry. Respondents had worked in the tourism industry for an average of 19 years, up to a maximum of 50 years. In terms of the sector(s) in which the respondents work or are involved, the most commonly represented sector was lodging (49% of respondents), followed by restaurants/culinary tourism (36%) and attractions (32%). The three other sectors represented by at least 20% of respondents were festivals/special events (27%), Convention and Visitors Bureau (24%) and golf (20%). Respondents represented 50 (60%) of the state’s 83 counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Culinary</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival/Special event</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter sports</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting/Fishing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV/Camping</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard/Winery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(multiple responses allowed)
The Results

Results are for the most part presented in tabular or graphical form. Each table or chart is headed by the question asked in the survey. Key findings of the charts that start on page five are summarized overleaf. These charts represent the percentages of responses in each answer category.

In your opinion, what has been the Michigan tourism industry’s greatest achievement over the past five years? (answers reported by over 10% of respondents, n = 140)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Pure Michigan campaign</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing funding for Pure Michigan campaign</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased/improved national awareness of the state</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, what is the one most critical need or issue currently facing Michigan’s tourism industry? (answers reported by over 10% of respondents, n = 140)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Securing long term funding for Travel/Pure MI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Prices</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of Michigan as a destination</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The economy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

The percentages below represent the most commonly given response to each item. The full spectrum of responses is illustrated for each question in the charts that follow.

- 50% of respondents think that the current membership of the Michigan Travel Commission is “very representative” of the Michigan tourism industry
- 46% of respondents think that the level of collaboration between Travel MI and other relevant state agencies has “increased somewhat” over the past five years
- 55% of respondents think that the level of collaboration and communications between members of the tourism industry has “increased somewhat” over the past five years
- 59% of respondents think that industry-wide knowledge of best practices in collaboration and partnerships has “increased somewhat” over the past five years
- 48% of respondents think that the annual statewide tourism conference has “improved somewhat” over the past five years and another 48% think it has “improved a lot”
- 58% of respondents think that the status of tourism as a vital component of the state’s economy has been “elevated significantly” in the eyes of state leaders and officials over the past five years
- 44% of respondents think that the level of the tourism industry’s direct engagement in the political process in Michigan has “increased significantly” over the past five years
- 40% of respondents think that access to relevant and timely tourism industry research has “increased somewhat” over the past five years
- 71% of respondents think that the economic impact of tourism within the state has been “partially” established
- 59% of respondents think that the industry’s understanding of current and prospective Michigan travelers has “improved somewhat” over the past five years
- 82% of respondents think that a culture of exceptional customer service “partially” exists throughout the tourism industry in Michigan
- 47% of respondents think that access to hospitality/customer service training opportunities has “improved somewhat” over the past five years
- 75% of respondents think that the image of Michigan as an engaging and memorable vacation destination has “improved significantly” over the past five years
- 61% of respondents think that the funding situation for Michigan tourism has “improved significantly” over the past five years

Note: the findings presented above exclude respondents who indicated either that they “did not know” or they “prefer not to answer.”
To what extent do you think the current membership of the Michigan Travel Commission is representative of the Michigan tourism industry?
(n=110, mean= 2.56*)

*Where 1= not at all representative, 2= somewhat representative, 3= very representative, and 4= extremely representative

To what extent do you feel that the level of collaboration between Travel MI and other relevant state agencies has changed over the past five years?
(n= 102, mean= 4.04*)

*Where 1= decreased significantly, 2= decreased somewhat, 3= neither increased nor decreased, 4= increased somewhat, and 5= increased significantly
To what extent do you feel that the level of collaboration and communications between members of the tourism industry has changed over the past five years?
(n= 111, mean= 4.13*)

To what extent do you feel that industry-wide knowledge of best practices in collaboration and partnerships has changed over the past five years?
(n= 107, mean= 3.88*)

*Where 1= decreased significantly, 2= decreased somewhat, 3= neither increased nor decreased, 4= increased somewhat, and 5= increased significantly
To what extent do you feel that the annual statewide tourism conference has improved over the past five years?
(n= 69, mean= 2.38*)

*Where 1= not improved at all, 2= improved somewhat, and 3= improved a lot

To what extent do you feel that the status of tourism as a vital component of the state’s economy has been altered in the eyes of state leaders and officials over the past five years?
(n= 125, mean= 4.44*)

*Where 1= declined significantly, 2= declined somewhat, 3= no change, 4= elevated somewhat, and 5= elevated significantly
To what extent do you feel that the level of the tourism industry’s direct engagement in the political process in Michigan has changed over the past five years?
(n=112, mean= 4.25*)

*Where 1= decreased significantly, 2= decreased somewhat, 3= neither increased nor decreased, 4= increased somewhat, and 5= increased significantly

To what extent do you feel that access to relevant and timely tourism industry research has changed over the past five years?
(n=98, mean= 3.40*)

*Where 1= decreased significantly, 2= decreased somewhat, 3= no change, 4= increased somewhat, and 5= increased significantly
To what extent do you feel that the economic impact of tourism within the state has been clearly and credibly established?

(n= 109, mean= 2.15*)

*Where 1= not at all, 2= partially, and 3= completely

To what extent do you feel that the industry’s understanding of current and prospective Michigan travelers has changed over the past five years?

(n= 110, mean= 3.90*)

*Where 1= declined significantly, 2= declined somewhat, 3= no change, and 4= improved somewhat
To what extent do you feel that a culture of exceptional customer service currently exists throughout the tourism industry in Michigan?
(n= 112, mean= 2.28*)

*Where 1= not at all, 2= partially, and 3= completely

To what extent do you feel that access to hospitality/customer service training opportunities has changed over the past five years?
(n= 93, mean= 3.56*)

*Where 1= declined significantly, 2= declined somewhat, 3= no change, 4= improved somewhat, and 5= improved significantly
To what extent do you feel that the image of Michigan as an engaging and memorable vacation destination has changed over the past five years?

(n= 130, mean= 4.71*)

*Where 1= declined significantly, 2= declined somewhat, 3= no change, 4= improved somewhat, and 5= improved significantly

To what extent do you feel that the funding situation for Michigan tourism has changed over the past five years?

(n= 119, mean= 4.47*)

*Where 1= declined significantly, 2= declined somewhat, 3= no change, 4= improved somewhat, and 5= improved significantly
Overall, to what extent do you think that the goals and recommendations of the 2007-11 MTSP have been successfully implemented over the past five years?

(n= 106, mean= 1.94*)

*Where 1= fully implemented, 2= partially implemented, and 3= not implemented

The charts above (pages 5-12) relate to implementation of the 2007-2011 Michigan Tourism Strategic Plan, i.e., looking back over the past five years.

The charts starting on page 13 illustrate responses to the question, “How important a concern do you feel each of these items or issues is for the development of tourism in Michigan over the next five years?,” i.e., looking forward.
How Important a Concern Do You Feel Each of These Items or Issues is for the Development of Tourism in Michigan Over the Next Five Years?

- Reconfiguration/revitalization of conference
- Statewide research entity
- Funding for activities besides Pure MI
- Increased collaboration- TM and other state...
- Establishment of economic impact of tourism
- Increased collaboration/partnerships
- Improved customer service
- Elevated status of tourism
- Improvement of MI’s image
- Funding for Pure MI

*Where 1= not important, 2= somewhat important, 3= very important, and 4= extremely important

Continued Funding for the Pure Michigan Campaign

(n= 132, mean= 3.81*)

*Where 1= not important, 2= somewhat important, 3= very important, and 4= extremely important
*Where 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = very important, and 4 = extremely important*

**Improvement of Michigan's Image as a Vacation Destination**
(n = 132, mean = 3.71*)

**Elevated Status of Tourism in the Eyes of State Leaders and Officials**
(n = 132, mean = 3.64*)

*Where 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = very important, and 4 = extremely important*
Improvement in the Level of Customer Service Throughout the Industry
(n= 132, mean= 3.51*)

*Where 1= not important, 2= somewhat important, 3= very important, and 4= extremely important

Increased Collaboration and Partnerships Within the Industry
(n= 132, mean= 3.49*)

*Where 1= not important, 2= somewhat important, 3= very important, and 4= extremely important
Establishment of the Economic Impact of Tourism Within the State

(n=132, mean=3.38*)

Increased Collaboration Between Travel Michigan and Other State Agencies

(n=132, mean=3.32*)

*Where 1= not important, 2= somewhat important, 3= very important, and 4= extremely important
Establishment of a Statewide Tourism Research Entity

(n= 132, mean= 3.05*)

Procurement of Industry Funding for Activities Besides the Pure Michigan Campaign

(n= 132, mean= 3.11*)

*Where 1= not important, 2= somewhat important, 3= very important, and 4= extremely important
Reconfiguration and Revitalization of the Annual Statewide Tourism Conference
(n= 133, mean= 2.64*)

*Where 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = very important, and 4 = extremely important