
Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/26 12:06

With the awesome win over the Utes on Saturday, and the #19 BCS ranking, I have been doing a little thinking about a playoff scenario and this is what I've come up with. I know a lot of this isn't new, but I haven't read all that's been written either.

Please feel free to offer ideas, criticism, etc.

I would propose a 16 team playoff system. I would propose two BYE weeks during the season so that most teams would stay at about 11 or 12 games a year. This also doesn't extend it further than it already is.

Here are my main points:

- 1) Each conference champion (11) receives an automatic berth. Seeds 1-11 based on ranking.
- 2) The top ranked Independent school gets an automatic berth (provided they have a winning record).
- 3) Four or five at-large bids (must have a winning record). These are seeds 13-16. If the Power Conferences are so powerful and so superior, they won't have trouble dispatching a higher seeded team from a "lower" conference. These at-large teams would be chosen by an NCAA committee - not a consortium of powerful, anti-trust Power Conference commissioners. Each conference has one seat on the committee. This 11 person committee would guarantee that a tie would never occur if any voting every took place.
- 4) First Round Bowls: Alamo, Poinsetta, Gator, Capitol One, Houston, Chick Fil-A, Insight, and Outback. Four of these games would be played on Dec 14 or 15, and the other four on Dec. 15 or 16.
- 5) Second Round: Holiday, Sugar, Cotton, and Las Vegas (played around Dec. 21)
- 6) Third Round: Fiesta and Orange (played around Dec. 28)
- 7) National Championship game: Rose (played around Jan 4)

* I would propose that the Sugar, Fiesta, Orange, and Rose rotate yearly.

Leave the other bowls intact (as second tier bowls)

By doing this several things happen.

- a) The current bowls don't die.
- b) Substantially more money is generated than currently is.
- c) Every Div-1A team in America has a chance to play for the National Championship.
- d) Fairness, opportunity, and equity is brought back into the picture.
- e) Teams would have no longer of a season and the NC would only play 14 games.

I am sure that this needs to be tweaked, and if I had a PDF compiler I would put my brackets in .pdf format for attachment, but I don't.

Anyway, I would love to hear thoughts, suggestions, ideas. I love the creativity and the knowledge that is on this board!

Go Cougs! :)

Jeff Ray
Lehi, Utah

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/11/26 12:21

Good idea. My issue is giving automatic bids to conference winners. It should be the top 16 teams, end of story. Do you really believe the Sun Belt or C-USA conference deserves automatic bids? Look at teams that will not (or potentially will not) be conference winners: Georgia/LSU/Florida/Tennessee, Missouri/Kansas/Oklahoma, USC/Arizona State, Boston/College/VT, or even other non-BCS schools. I really don't think that weak mid-major conferences should have an

automatic bid. If the MWC does not have a top 16 team they do not deserve a bid, just like the ACC did not deserve an automatic bid when Florida State, who had 4 losses, played in the Orange Bowl in 2005.

Remember 1994? BYU, Utah, and CSU were all top 16 and I don't think it would be fair to have kept any of the 3 out of the playoffs. It should be top 16.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by domanater - 2007/11/26 12:22

Personally I think a playoff should only be 8 teams- especially to start out. There are a lot of arguments about students and how they'd be playing etc.

An 8 team playoff only = 3 more games than normal and only 4 teams would be playing an extra week with 2 of those playing 2 extra weeks.

If that works out, there will be less reluctance to go to a 16 game or we might find that 8 really is enough.

This year I'd like to see:

1. Missouri
2. West Virginia
3. Ohio State
4. Georgia
5. Va tech
6. USC
7. LSU
8. Hawaii (if they beat Washington)

1 v 8

Missouri v Hawaii

2 v 7

WVU v LSU

3 v 6

OSU v USC

5 v 4

Ga v Va Tech

I think whoever won this would put to bed who the best team in the country was, there'd be no more "well we lost 2 in triple overtime" or "they played a weak schedule"

I love BYU and bleed blue, but we can't lose to UCLA and Tulsa and expect to be deserving of BCS love this year. We didn't earn it.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/26 12:39

I appreciate the comments, and they are all valid points. My main reason for giving automatic bids to conference champs is to eliminate (as much as possible), the reliance on biased human polls. If a system could be worked out that was less opinion based, I would be all for that.

Thanks again for the comments. It is a fun topic to banter around.

Jeff Ray
Lehi, Utah

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2007/11/26 13:32

ND/BYU wrote:

Good idea. My issue is giving automatic bids to conference winners. It should be the top 16 teams, end of story. Do you really believe the Sun Belt or C-USA conference deserves automatic bids? Look at teams that will not (or potentially will not) be conference winners: Georgia/LSU/Florida/Tennessee, Missouri/Kansas/Oklahoma, USC/Arizona State, Boston/College/VT, or even other non-BCS schools. I really don't think that weak mid-major conferences should have an automatic bid. If the MWC does not have a top 16 team they do not deserve a bid, just like the ACC did not deserve an automatic bid when Florida State, who had 4 losses, played in the Orange Bowl in 2005.

Remember 1994? BYU, Utah, and CSU were all top 16 and I don't think it would be fair to have kept any of the 3 out of the playoffs. It should be top 16.

If you think a playoff is still afar off then you'll think my issue/idea is an eternity away. I would like to see the NCAA add 11 teams and realign the conferences into 8 conferences each with 16 teams with obviously 2 divisions in each. Let the conference championships act as game one of the playoffs. And then take the 8 Champions into a three week playoff after that. Still keep the bowl games for the sake of reward both monetarily, entertainily (Sounds like a James Bates/Todd Christensen word huh?) and as a reward for good teams to get two or three weeks more practice. The other thing I would do is within each conference I would allow for division realignment from year to year based on finish from the previous season so one division never grows significantly more difficult than another within the same conference.

Chances of something like this ever happening...0!

GO Cougs!!!

=====

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jrclone - 2007/11/26 13:49

at this point I would give anything just for a plus one scenario.

=====

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by CAFB_04-12 - 2007/11/26 14:03

My favorite one-liner from BCSfootball.org:

A word about a playoff

The NCAA membership has not proposed the creation of a playoff.

=====

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by choirboy24 - 2007/11/26 16:44

ND/BYU wrote:

Good idea. My issue is giving automatic bids to conference winners. It should be the top 16 teams, end of story. Do you really believe the Sun Belt or C-USA conference deserves automatic bids? Look at teams that will not (or potentially will not) be conference winners: Georgia/LSU/Florida/Tennessee, Missouri/Kansas/Oklahoma, USC/Arizona State, Boston/College/VT, or even other non-BCS schools. I really don't think that weak mid-major conferences should have an automatic bid. If the MWC does not have a top 16 team they do not deserve a bid, just like the ACC did not deserve an automatic bid when Florida State, who had 4 losses, played in the Orange Bowl in 2005.

Remember 1994? BYU, Utah, and CSU were all top 16 and I don't think it would be fair to have kept any of the 3 out of the playoffs. It should be top 16.

How is just giving access to the top 16 teams much different than how it's currently setup? How is that any fairer? Let's

look at it for a second. How are the rankings done? Mostly by human voters, who are biased for the most part in their decisions because they will automatically give the benefit of the doubt to the BCS teams and leave the non-BCS teams out in the cold. While it's true, most of the time the champions of the Sun Belt, Conference USA, or MAC will not be able to compete with the likes of Oklahoma, LSU, and USC, but I heard a very interesting comment recently; teams only get better by stretching themselves and playing other good teams. You don't challenge yourself or get better by maintaining the status quo.

While I don't feel like I have an answer to this problem, either, some type of playoff is a little bit better than how it is right now. I agree that keeping the bowl structure in place is vital to maintaining the tradition and flavor that is unique to college football, but at the same time, giving all of the teams the opportunity to play for a national title is only the right thing to do.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by TechWrCoug - 2007/11/26 16:56

choirboy24 wrote:

ND/BYU wrote:

Good idea. My issue is giving automatic bids to conference winners. It should be the top 16 teams, end of story. Do you really believe the Sun Belt or C-USA conference deserves automatic bids? Look at teams that will not (or potentially will not) be conference winners: Georgia/LSU/Florida/Tennessee, Missouri/Kansas/Oklahoma, USC/Arizona State, Boston/College/VT, or even other non-BCS schools. I really don't think that weak mid-major conferences should have an automatic bid. If the MWC does not have a top 16 team they do not deserve a bid, just like the ACC did not deserve an automatic bid when Florida State, who had 4 losses, played in the Orange Bowl in 2005.

Remember 1994? BYU, Utah, and CSU were all top 16 and I don't think it would be fair to have kept any of the 3 out of the playoffs. It should be top 16.

How is just giving access to the top 16 teams much different than how it's currently setup? How is that any fairer? Let's look at it for a second. How are the rankings done? Mostly by human voters, who are biased for the most part in their decisions because they will automatically give the benefit of the doubt to the BCS teams and leave the non-BCS teams out in the cold. While it's true, most of the time the champions of the Sun Belt, Conference USA, or MAC will not be able to compete with the likes of Oklahoma, LSU, and USC, but I heard a very interesting comment recently; teams only get better by stretching themselves and playing other good teams. You don't challenge yourself or get better by maintaining the status quo.

While I don't feel like I have an answer to this problem, either, some type of playoff is a little bit better than how it is right now. I agree that keeping the bowl structure in place is vital to maintaining the tradition and flavor that is unique to college football, but at the same time, giving all of the teams the opportunity to play for a national title is only the right thing to do.

Plus, by that argument (lesser conferences don't belong) we'd lose the potential for Cinderellas that makes March Madness as appealing as it is. Including them would make the mid major conference championships relevant again. If the Patriot League didn't send their champion to the NCAA tournament, do you think anyone from that league would get ANY pub outside the local papers? Please. You hear a lot more about the so-called "weaker" conferences when it comes to basketball than you ever do in football.

Also I think there's too much of "well, it's okay that we didn't win our conference. We're still ranked number 11 and we'll get the at large berth. No sweat." And "We won our conference, but we're not ranked so of course we'll go to a bowl that nobody ever watches except for the MCI fans (friends and family only)."

I mean, when push comes to shove, the only reason why people care who wins the SEC or whatever BCS conference has the top teams that year is that's the one who goes to the NC game. Otherwise they don't care because the loser of that game usually goes to a BCS bowl anyway, assuming they're highly ranked.

Okay, so my post was a bit of a ramble but I'm sure you get the idea.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by SanAntonioBlue - 2007/11/26 17:11

Make it a 32 team play off (that's only one extra week) and the system becomes extremely fair. Limiting a playoff to only 16 would exclude too many quality teams. It would just be more of the good'ol boys club.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/26 17:17

San Antonio,

I think that 32 teams could be done as well. We already have up to about 40 teams in the rankings and so it wouldn't be difficult to expand the at large selection to that pool, while, at the same time, maintaining the automatic berths to the conference champions.

If players knew that they had a chance to be in the tournament, it would help the smaller schools slowly get better talent - thus helping to even the playing field.

We already have 32 bowls anyway, so it probably wouldn't be hard to incorporate all of them into the 32 team playoff.

Good points!

Jeff Ray

Lehi

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2007/11/26 17:47

ND/BYU wrote:

I really don't think that weak mid-major conferences should have an automatic bid.

That's the point of a playoff. There won't be biased, limiting labels like "mid-major." There will just be conference champs and a few wild cards. The same happens in professional sports. In the NBA the Western and Eastern Conferences both send the same number of teams to the playoffs even though through the years there has usually been 1 clearly superior conference.....why? Because they honor the division champs, regardless of what the talking heads think about the top 16 teams.

As long as a few conferences are allowed to hoard money and titles, the have-nots will struggle. If a playoff is created we will all see the current "mid-majors" (man I HATE that term) gain a competitive advantage in recruiting and on the field. A conference like the MWC, that is on the cusp of equality with the bcs conferences would have a chance to string together a few years of competitive playoff games and gain some immediate respect. As it is now, the Cougars will be relegated to blowing away another loser PAC-10 team in the LV bowl instead of winning or losing against another conference champ. What a shame.

Any system that completely relies on selecting the subjectively "best" top 16 will be as foolish as the bowl "championship" series. Sometimes I wonder why we even play the games in college football. The national "championship" has no more legitimacy than a fantasy football league. It's all pretend. People just argue about who is best and then slap a trophy down in front of that team.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2007/11/26 17:53

I fully support a 32 team playoff for two reasons:

1) It allows all conference champs plus every single team with any sort of legitimate claim to the national championship to settle things on the field. Almost all subjectivity will be thrown out the window, as it should be.

2) Can you imagine how awesome December through mid-January would be with 5 weeks of incredible college football? Pure heaven.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by mormonrasta - 2007/11/26 19:27

jmrmoney wrote:

4) First Round Bowls: Alamo, Poinsetta, Gator, Capitol One, Houston, Chick Fil-A, Insight, and Outback. Four of these games would be played on Dec 14 or 15, and the other four on Dec. 15 or 16.

5) Second Round: Holiday, Sugar, Cotton, and Las Vegas (played around Dec. 21)

6) Third Round: Fiesta and Orange (played around Dec. 28)

7) National Championship game: Rose (played around Jan 4)

* I would propose that the Sugar, Fiesta, Orange, and Rose rotate yearly.

Leave the other bowls intact (as second tier bowls)

By doing this several things happen.

a) The current bowls don't die.

Yeah, the bowls would die. If you are for an extended playoff you kill the bowls.

Bowls need about 10-20k fans from each school to attend each game(depending on the size and payout) to remain financially solvent. Your not going to get ten to twenty thousand fans to go to Tempe for the Inisght Bowl, then to New Orleans for the Sugar Bowl, then to Miami for the Orange, and then Los Angeles for the Rose in successive weeks. Very few people would have that kind of time and money.

Before anybody compares it to college basketball, realize that's a different animal. In college basketball the the venues are much smaller and there are more teams per venue so the fan responsibility to make things work isn't as great.

Additionaly, the major bowls which are largely sponsored by tourist organizations. They expect the teams, families of the team, and many of the fans to stay in their cities for at least a week. The bowls would go out of business with the lost revenue that would take place in the respective communities. I'm not certain that the tv deal (which certainly would be more significant that the current one) would make up the difference in lost revenue that would take place by chaning the system.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by spudman - 2007/11/26 21:50

Gene Wojciechowski is tired of the BCS and for good reason. How long will it take to fix this mess! He is right on in saying that the only reason Mizzou is ranked #1 because someone has to be there. Here's the link.

Someone needs to pull their heads out and make a playoff happen.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by TechWrCoug - 2007/11/27 09:07

spudman wrote:

Gene Wojciechowski is tired of the BCS and for good reason. How long will it take to fix this mess! He is right on in saying that the only reason Mizzou is ranked #1 because someone has to be there. Here's the link.

Someone needs to pull their heads out and make a playoff happen.

As long as the money is there, there's no incentive for that to happen. If the networks started losing money THEN they would have incentive to go to the NCAA and say, in essence, "If you don't have a playoff we're not going to pay the money you're asking."

That's because the only REAL option I can see is if the NCAA does what it did to the NIT in basketball way back. "This is the official championship playoff. Deal with it." If that happened, how long do you think the BCS conferences would stay away? One, maybe two years of teams like BSU and BYU and Hawaii and such competing in the "official NC game." If that. They're smart enough to see the writing on the wall if that happens. After all, at the time the NIT tournament was THE tournament it was only because the NCAA didn't care. Once they decided to care, the NIT was relegated to second class status. Once the NCAA decides to care, we're going to have a playoff faster than you can imagine. They just need incentive because there's going to be an outcry from the spoiled BCS teams that are going to see their \$\$ go away.

As long as the bowls keep paying millions of dollars to the BCS conferences, there's absolutely no, repeat, NO reason for anyone in the BCS to even think of having a playoff.

Just keeping the bowls as is won't work for the reasons stated by mormonrasta. There needs to be more than one game in a city during the earlier rounds for them to get enough revenue. Quite frankly, push come to shove, I really don't care if the bowls live or die. Have 3 or 4 games played in a stadium over a 2 day period and the city will get just enough revenue, thank you. And before you start griping about the condition of the field, keep in mind the field for the Miami/Pittsburgh game was only a mess because there were five games plus a lot of rain. A dome or sunny-climate-city would eliminate the rain/weather and with 7-8 hours between games the field crews can do a lot. Sure, that restricts available cities, but come on. The same thing happens in basketball. They tend to concentrate on specific cities because of the available resources. The only reason anyone cares about the bowls is because of the history and the money.

Well, heck, the polls have history as well and you don't see anyone still wanting to award the NC simply based on ranking anymore, do you?

As for the money, well, I don't have an answer to that. I don't think anyone does and that, more than anything else, is the real reason why the NCAA hasn't stepped in, in my opinion. Once someone comes up with a realistic playoff system that doesn't lose a major % of the money that's available under the current system, that's when you'll see some real momentum hit the idea of a playoff.

Just my \$0.03 (adjusted for inflation).

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/27 10:18

As far as the attendance goes, I really don't see it being too much of an issue. How many BYU fans would love to attend the LV Bowl, but can't because it was sold out already?

I think that the demand is there, and that you would be able to fill the stadiums pretty well. Of course, we'll never know.

Going to a playoff would not be without its hiccups, but it is a step in the right direction. Very rarely is a change of this magnitude ever taken, but what it needs some tweaking and adjustments later on. I think that the NCAA should just make the decision to form a playoff and tell the likes of Jim Delaney to "take a hike". After all, the NCAA is the governing body for college athletics, not the BCS. We have the tail wagging the dog and if a viable playoff system were put in place, that would eventually change and we would have the NCAA again calling the shots, not the BCS conference commissioners.

Jeff Ray
Lehi

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/27 10:37

I just read an article on ESPN that mirrors a lot of the same points I proposed at the beginning of my thread. Dan Wetzel is just a better writer than I am.

Thought you all might like to read it. Here is is:

http://sports.yahoo.com/ncaaf/news;_ylt=AngoyDydfCLs27_d68fCqhQ5nYcB?slug=dw-playoff112707&prov=yhoo&type=lgns

Jeff Ray
Lehi

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/27 10:38

Oops! Sorry that was Yahoo Sports, not ESPN.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by Reasonable Man - 2007/11/27 10:45

I like that, than all you have to do to win the national title is to win for one year. Don't lose than you're number one. After all, this isn't figure skating. We don't need no stinkin judges.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by Short_Changed - 2007/11/27 11:09

jmrmoney wrote:

I just read an article on ESPN that mirrors a lot of the same points I proposed at the beginning of my thread. Dan Wetzel is just a better writer than I am.

Thought you all might like to read it. Here is is:

http://sports.yahoo.com/ncaaf/news;_ylt=AngoyDydfCLs27_d68fCqhQ5nYcB?slug=dw-playoff112707&prov=yhoo&type=lgns

Jeff Ray
Lehi

I loved the article. I really hope we see something like that soon. Then NCAA football really would be the most watched sport. That playoff system would be incredible.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by Gfunkcougar - 2007/11/27 11:21

jmrmoney wrote:

San Antonio,

I think that 32 teams could be done as well. We already have up to about 40 teams in the rankings and so it wouldn't be difficult to expand the at large selection to that pool, while, at the same time, maintaining the automatic berths to the conference champions.

If players knew that they had a chance to be in the tournament, it would help the smaller schools slowly get better talent -

thus helping to even the playing field.

We already have 32 bowls anyway, so it probably wouldn't be hard to incorporate all of them into the 32 team playoff.

Good points!

Jeff Ray

LehiGreat idea!!!!!!! It would make the crappy bowls actually mean something. Every Bowl would count and it would also bring in more money. I would love that.

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by jmrmoney - 2007/11/27 15:23

All,

I just read another article on Yahoo sports by Terry Bowden. In it he says the following, which is a TOTAL lie and a GROSS misrepresentation:

"I would like every player, every coach, and every fan to truly believe that if they go out and play the game like it's supposed to be played, they have a chance to win it all. They need to believe that if they dream the dream and if they do things that they are supposed to do, then they have a shot to win it all.

A Missouri-West Virginia matchup would guarantee that."

Here is the link to the entire article:

http://sports.yahoo.com/ncaaf/news;_ylt=Av36RTV2cY60gcfPuEuJDFocvrYF?slug=tb-sweet16112707&prov=yhoo&type=lgns

Go Cougars!

Jeff Ray

Lehi

Re:Playoff proposal

Posted by PlayoffDude - 2007/11/27 17:39

jmrmoney wrote:

I appreciate the comments, and they are all valid points. My main reason for giving automatic bids to conference champs is to eliminate (as much as possible), the reliance on biased human polls. If a system could be worked out that was less opinion based, I would be all for that.

Thanks again for the comments. It is a fun topic to banter around.

Jeff Ray

Lehi, Utah

The other major reason to include automatic bids for conference champs is to avoid diminishing the regular season as much as possible. If a playoff had 5 teams from the SEC, you could have a scenario where a team that was 3 or 4 places away from even going to its conference championship game, is playing in the semi-finals. Not cool! Florida's losses to LSU, Georgia, and Auburn would simply be meaningless. Who would care who won the SEC??

You also want to avoid, as much as possible, the scenario where a team such as Georgia or Kansas could not even make it to its conference championship game and simply sweep through the playoff early rounds because that team is hot.

I like the idea of home field games for the first round. But you HAVE to incorporate the New Year's Day Bowl Games into the playoff. Man, that's what college football is all about!

Check out www.pigskinplayoff.com for more ideas!

=====