
Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by blue42 - 2007/10/11 13:21

I was doing some research on all the conferences over the last 10 years and I found something I thought was pretty interesting about the MWC.

In the last 10 years the MWC and the Pac-10 are the only 2 conferences that every team has gone to at least one bowl game in the past decade. This doesn't surprise me about the Pac-10 because they are affiliated with about 75 bowls each year, but it did surprise me about the MWC. Now before people start saying the Big Least has done it as well, I am not counting them because just a few short years ago they kicked out the likes of Temple and others who haven't been to a bowl game in centuries. So the only 2 conferences are the MWC and Pac-10.

I guess this should give a different light on all those who don't give the MWC much credit. Or could it be the lower teams of the conference are so bad and somebody has to go to a bowl game? Remember the MWC hasn't always had the opportunity to go to 4 bowl games a year.

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Hengst - 2007/10/11 13:24

UNLV and Suck-Dog-State have gone to bowl games in the last 10 years? Where was I?

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by blue42 - 2007/10/11 13:25

Hengst wrote:

UNLV and Suck-Dog-State have gone to bowl games in the last 10 years? Where was I?

I know.... I was just as surprised at this as you are.

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by GoCougarPokes - 2007/10/11 13:31

What bowl game has SDSU and UNLV been to? Source? i have hard time believing this...

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Hengst - 2007/10/11 13:33

Apparently unlv played in the 2000 vegas bowl.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UNLV_Rebels_football

and they won! crazy

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/10/11 13:39

Hengst wrote:

Apparently unlv played in the 2000 vegas bowl.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UNLV_Rebels_football

and they won! crazy

Yep, I remember the upset over Arkansas--it was supposed to mark the rise of UNLV football.

SDSU played in the 1998 Vegas Bowl where they lost to North Carolina:
<http://graphics.fansonly.com/schools/sdsu/sports/m-footbl/archive/bowl.pdf>

If Indiana makes a bowl this year, I think everyone in the Big Ten will have gone to a bowl in the past 10 years.

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Hengst - 2007/10/11 13:47

Mingjai wrote:

Hengst wrote:

Apparently unlv played in the 2000 vegas bowl.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UNLV_Rebels_football

and they won! crazy

Yep, I remember the upset over Arkansas--it was supposed to mark the rise of UNLV football.

SDSU played in the 1998 Vegas Bowl where they lost to North Carolina:
<http://graphics.fansonly.com/schools/sdsu/sports/m-footbl/archive/bowl.pdf>

If Indiana makes a bowl this year, I think everyone in the Big Ten will have gone to a bowl in the past 10 years.

The rise of UNLV football :laugh: :laugh: :laugh: :laugh:
wow, that just makes me laugh really hard.

more like the alltime highlight

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by bennyhaha - 2007/10/11 13:58

The other day on the mtn they were playing the UNLV coaches show and did a preview of BYU. They went through the history of the "rivalry" and stated that UNLV biggest win in its history was against BYU when we were only ranked 20th in the nation. I thought that showed the pathetic nature of their program down there.

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Florwood - 2007/10/11 14:00

North Carolina and Arkansas, huh? Dont remember what they were like in 98 and 00, but sound like pretty good opponents compared to the 5th place PAC10 team...

=====

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by KYCoug - 2007/10/11 14:24

Not sure if we should feel good about that like everyone has had an up year in the last 10 or down that there isn't more consistency in the MWC like the big bad BC\$ conferences.:(remove tounge from cheek) I guess anything that

distinguishes us from the BC\$ has got to be a good thing in my book. You know what we say down here in the south...even a blind pig finds an acorn once in awhile!

Go Cougs!
L Hatton
Louisville KY

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by GoCougarPokes - 2007/10/11 14:48

I am always perplexed by the terrible programs at both SDSU and UNLV. Both have definate draws to their respective schools. Vegas has gambling, the strip, and nice weather. San Diego has a history of NFL talent, is beautiful, and is in California (recruiting should be easy). How is it that both of these schools stink year in and year out? They should have good athletes...it has never made sense to me. I would applaud a coach who could make either one of these programs consistant. Speaking of consistancy, the MWC has many teams that are very inconsistant in terms of winning. BYU was a staple for many years, but we have had a few down years. Why is it that the lower tier teams in the conference cannot be good? CSU had a few good years, but sunk. I don't get why the MWC has those types of teams? And if so, does that mean BYU should leave for greener pastures? or is it better to be a small fish in a big pond?

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by etyotx - 2007/10/11 14:49

SDSU is the only MWC school to not make a bowl since the MWC was created.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by buzzard - 2007/10/11 15:40

GoCougarPokes wrote:

I am always perplexed by the terrible programs at both SDSU and UNLV. Both have definate draws to their respective schools. Vegas has gambling, the strip, and nice weather. San Diego has a history of NFL talent, is beautiful, and is in California (recruiting should be easy). How is it that both of these schools stink year in and year out? They should have good athletes...it has never made sense to me. I would applaud a coach who could make either one of these programs consistant. Speaking of consistancy, the MWC has many teams that are very inconsistant in terms of winning. BYU was a staple for many years, but we have had a few down years. Why is it that the lower tier teams in the conference cannot be good? CSU had a few good years, but sunk. I don't get why the MWC has those types of teams? And if so, does that mean BYU should leave for greener pastures? or is it better to be a small fish in a big pond?

That is the big question. Since most years there are only 2-4 decent teams, that means you can pencil in 4-6 automatic wins at the start of every year, so if you are simply not a bad team, you will be bowl eligible. Exhibit A: Yewtah. Would you rather play in the SEC where every game is a firefight and even if you are pretty good, 4-8 may be all you can put together? Would we have gone 11-2 last year in a BCS conference? I don't know the answer, but there would have been a lot fewer 30 point wins.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by KYCoug - 2007/10/11 15:52

I would rather be the big fish in the little pond...I remember for years the PAC-8 was refered to as snow white and the 7 dwarf because the USC coach had white hair and everyone else in the conference stunk. Then you look at a team like Vanderbilt which actually has had some pretty decient teams the last few years that pull off an upset or two but end up getting pounded by the rest of the SEC. I do agree though the rest of the MWC should pony up and get fully invested in making the MWC better. You're right there is no reason SDSU, CSU and UNLV couldn't have top level teams. We can only hope I guess.

Go Cougs!
L Hatton
Louisville KY

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by decloucog - 2007/10/11 16:05

Until we can beat mediocre teams like tulsa and UCLA with consistency, I think the best place for BYU is a conference like the MWC. On the other hand I wonder if the constant increased competition in a conference like the SEC would make BYU a better team and make BYU learn how to beat top tier teams with consistency.

It's really too bad when it feels like your team may have more of a handful with a DII school than their conference DI peers.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by mormonrasta - 2007/10/12 08:36

GoCougarPokes wrote:

I am always perplexed by the terrible programs at both SDSU and UNLV.

Me too. I asked an SDSU grad that I work with about that and he said the big problem is the stadium they play in. It's too big and too far from campus. He said freshmen go to the first couple of games and then they're "over it".

It seems like the best programs in the country (with a few exceptions) have great on campus facilities especially the stadium. Both SDSU and UNLV fall short in that category and will probably continue to fall short in the MWC until that gets rectified.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by MajorCougar - 2007/10/12 09:52

mormonrasta wrote:

GoCougarPokes wrote:

I am always perplexed by the terrible programs at both SDSU and UNLV.

Me too. I asked an SDSU grad that I work with about that and he said the big problem is the stadium they play in. It's too big and too far from campus. He said freshmen go to the first couple of games and then they're "over it".

It seems like the best programs in the country (with a few exceptions) have great on campus facilities especially the stadium. Both SDSU and UNLV fall short in that category and will probably continue to fall short in the MWC until that gets rectified.

Other than \$ (obviously), are there "space" limitations for 'on-campus' facilities?

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by daikini - 2007/10/12 12:00

Me too. I asked an SDSU grad that I work with about that and he said the big problem is the stadium they play in. It's too big and too far from campus. He said freshmen go to the first couple of games and then they're "over it".

So, the stadium is to blame for their inconsistency? hmmm...

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by gordito - 2007/10/12 12:21

daikini wrote:

Me too. I asked an SDSU grad that I work with about that and he said the big problem is the stadium they play in. It's too big and too far from campus. He said freshmen go to the first couple of games and then they're "over it".

So, the stadium is to blame for their inconsistency? hmhhh...

Big-time recruits don't want to play for a school where football is an afterthought and the history of the program is poor. If the school were to pay millions of dollars to put together top-notch facilities, the atmosphere would probably change. Before then, athletes want to go to a place where they are worshiped (like in the South), not ignored.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2007/10/12 13:18

daikini wrote:

Me too. I asked an SDSU grad that I work with about that and he said the big problem is the stadium they play in. It's too big and too far from campus. He said freshmen go to the first couple of games and then they're "over it".

So, the stadium is to blame for their inconsistency? hmhhh...

UCLA has a good program, as compared to SDSU, but they play in the Rose Bowl out in Pasadena. It's not close to campus at all. So I think the students would go to the games regardless if the product on the field was worth the effort.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by gordito - 2007/10/12 15:37

It's hard to compare anything against the Rose Bowl though. Otherwise I agree.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/10/12 16:19

UCLA does have relatively weak attendance from the student body compared to midwest and southern schools. I have been to games at the Rose Bowl where the student section is half empty.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/10/12 16:56

ND/BYU wrote:

UCLA does have relatively weak attendance from the student body compared to midwest and southern schools. I have been to games at the Rose Bowl where the student section is half empty.

I was disappointed after going to the UCLA game this year in the lack of atmosphere at the Rose Bowl (though I'm sure I wouldn't be let down by the Rose Bowl game). It felt eerily similar to the Metrodome during University of Minnesota football games--very few casual fans show up. Of course, the UCLA students and fans that do show up like to think of UCLA as a Pac 10 power while Minnesota students and fans at the games freely admit that Minnesota's is lucky to finish in the top half of the Big Ten.

We'll see how the attitude of Minnesota students and fans change when the new on-campus stadium opens, but I

actually do think that having an on campus stadium contributes to the buzz on campus regarding football. Minnesota has long been the only Big Ten school without an on-campus stadium, and in the time period that Minnesota football has been off campus(roughly 1980 on), Minnesota is also one of only two Big Ten schools to not go to the Rose Bowl during that period. Indiana is the other. While the stadium may not be a primary cause, is at least an indicator of factors that may be more direct causes--e.g., poor support from university community, lack of interest in community in general, etc.

As far as UCLA being a good football program, it's all relative. If the Pac 10 is our reference point, then UCLA is an average program by several measurements. If we were talking about the current state of the program, then I'd put UCLA behind USC, Cal, Oregon. If we go by past 20 years, I'd put UCLA behind USC, Washington, Arizona State, Washington State, and maybe Oregon. For a school in Los Angeles, that's unacceptable. You could almost say the with the type of athletes UCLA can recruit, UCLA is the Pac Ten's UNLV/SDSU as far returns from the talent go.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by NebraskaCoug - 2007/10/12 17:01

I think low attendance at the Rose Bowl and "the Q" (Qualcomm Stadium) for college football games (by comparison to the South and the Midwest) have less to do with the facilities, and more to do with the number of other things happening in town. The Huskers are the only thing happening in the whole state of Nebraska in any sports season (except for Creighton in B-ball season and the College World Series). As a result, Memorial Stadium has been sold out for every game for 25 or 30 years-even these past few mediocre years (It doesn't hurt that the Huskers went for 25 years without ever winning fewer than 9 games in a season!). The same thing applies for Oklahoma. What else do you think is happening in Norman, or anywhere else in Oklahoma?

SDSU competes with the Padres and the Chargers this time of year (when the Padres are playing well). UCLA competes with USC, the Lakers, the Clippers, and the Angels (if they are playing well). This is all without taking into account all of the non-sports things to do in SoCal. There will never be major interest in SDSU. If the fans couldn't really get behind Marshall Faulk, who will they get behind. UCLA has enough stellar sports history that some fans are loyal in spite of all the distractions.

Re:Something interesting about the MWC

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/10/12 17:13

NebraskaCoug wrote:

I think low attendance at the Rose Bowl and "the Q" (Qualcomm Stadium) for college football games (by comparison to the South and the Midwest) have less to do with the facilities, and more to do with the number of other things happening in town. The Huskers are the only thing happening in the whole state of Nebraska in any sports season (except for Creighton in B-ball season and the College World Series). As a result, Memorial Stadium has been sold out for every game for 25 or 30 years-even these past few mediocre years (It doesn't hurt that the Huskers went for 25 years without ever winning fewer than 9 games in a season!). The same thing applies for Oklahoma. What else do you think is happening in Norman, or anywhere else in Oklahoma?

SDSU competes with the Padres and the Chargers this time of year (when the Padres are playing well). UCLA competes with USC, the Lakers, the Clippers, and the Angels (if they are playing well). This is all without taking into account all of the non-sports things to do in SoCal. There will never be major interest in SDSU. If the fans couldn't really get behind Marshall Faulk, who will they get behind. UCLA has enough stellar sports history that some fans are loyal in spite of all the distractions.

I think this is spot on. LA has way too many distractions--it can't even support an NFL team!

If you try to name strong college football programs (either by attendance or result) that play in the same city as an NFL team, you're pretty hard pressed to find many.

Washington and Miami are the two that come most quickly to mind. Of those two, only Washington really draws well because they have their own stadium. Miami plays in front of a relatively sparse crowd in the Orange Bowl, which, from what I understand, is dump. ASU did okay sharing the stadium with the Cardinals, but that's because (1) it was ASU's stadium; (2) ASU was well established prior to the Cardinals coming to town, and (3) everyone there was Cowboys fans anyway.

