
Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Pwride - 2007/11/29 13:20

<http://sports.espn.go.com/ncf/news/story?id=3132578>

Long story short: BCS coordinator (who is the SEC Commissioner as well) says that this topsy turvy season isn't getting us any closer to play-offs. He says they are still "drilling-down" into that concept.

Let me call him out on a few points:

1) Plus one won't happen any time soon. If it did, they would have to redo the auto-bid format to allow a non-BCS team in to avoid Congressional investigations. You can bet the BCS conferences will never make it even easier (while making harder for themselves) for a mid-major to get into a BCS bowl.

His reasons for sticking to BCS:

2)"One is protect the regular season. It might be trite to say there's a playoff every weekend, but there is."

Bologna, and he knows it. Tell me how its a play-off when Hawaii/Boise State/Auburn go undefeated and don't finish #1. As long as voters determine the champion, there will never be a true champion.

3)"Secondly, we value the Bowl system. It gives a lot of student athletes an opportunity to compete for additional championships." Bowl system? You mean the ones that sprout up and disappear just as quickly? Tradition is dead aside from a handful of bowls. Most play-off supporters just want the bowls to host the games of the playoffs. Bowls went from 8 in 1940 to 15 in 1980 and 32 in 2006. That is ridiculous. It is very hard to argue most of these bowls have tradition of any sort. I'll bet my life earnings that Mr. SEC Commissioner can't name all 32. Heck, I bet he can't name 16. Tradition is a craptacular reason to keep it.

4)"And thirdly, there's an academic component. I know there are cynics about that, but there's an academic component, and we are going to keep football as a one-semester sport."

Does he think we are stupid? The national championship game last year had Ohio State miss a full week of classes and that was after a 50+ day lay off. To say we couldn't fit in a playoffs is stupid.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Uncle Iroh - 2007/11/29 13:22

We all know the reasons he gives are bunk. The only reason any of these guys can think of is
\$

End of story.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by j2b03 - 2007/11/29 13:34

I agree with the above post, \$\$\$ is what is the main factor. I don't even read anything related to the BCS and playoffs anymore, it is all the same thing over and over and non of those who matter about changing the system ever pay attention as long as the sound of cash is drowning out that noise. It will take an act of congress to get it changed because no one on the inside can or will do anything about it. Remember last year some big coach was all for a play-off and then went to a meeting and came out saying "oh the BCS is the best option" So no amount of press or savvy playoff scenarios by the media is going to change a thing. We just need to remember, When in Rome...
Sad but true.:(

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Pwride - 2007/11/29 13:46

That was this past spring. Florida's AD (former Utah AD) went into the meeting to talk about play-offs and came out "convinced" that BCS was the best. Right....

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Cosmo9798 - 2007/11/29 13:55

Here is a great article on a playoff that is getting a ton of play:

http://sports.yahoo.com/ncaaf/news;_ylt=ArAJWNt2J7SHz68g.stSAdvtxLsF?slug=dw-playoff112707&prov=yhoo&type=lgns

The vast majority of fans are screaming for this, once the coaches are University Presidents are on board this could really happen.

What a joke it would be to have 2-loss LSU play for the national championship while Hawaii is laughed out of the room. Or what about 1-loss Ohio state? There best win was Michigan, it was also App State's best win. If this season doesn't get people fired up, nothing will.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by THEmmb - 2007/11/29 15:01

I think even a lot of coaches are starting to push more and more for a playoff system. (I personally would hope for an 8 team). Pete Carroll, probably the biggest name coach in college football, was on with Collin Cowherd this morning saying that a playoff is exactly what he wants. He said to keep the current bowl system, and just call the additional games additional bowls, and still have the "lesser" bowls for all the teams not invited to the "big dance"

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by mormonrasta - 2007/11/29 15:01

Pwride wrote:

1) Plus one won't happen any time soon. If it did, they would have to redo the auto-bid format to allow a non-BCS team in to avoid Congressional investigations. You can bet the BCS conferences will never make it even easier (while making harder for themselves) for a mid-major to get into a BCS bowl.

What right does Congress have in telling the bowls which teams should qualify? They are individual corporations designed to put together the best matchups possible for the communities they serve. They can make contracts with whoever they want.

His reasons for sticking to BCS:

2)"One is protect the regular season. It might be trite to say there's a playoff every weekend, but there is."

Bologna, and he knows it. Tell me how its a play-off when Hawaii/Boise State/Auburn go undefeated and don't finish #1. As long as voters determine the champion, there will never be a true champion.

I wouldn't go as far to say each week is a playoff, but I do agree that the regular season wouldn't be as good as it is now with an extended playoff. There is a reason that FCS college football has the best regular season in sports.

3)"Secondly, we value the Bowl system. It gives a lot of student athletes an opportunity to compete for additional championships." Bowl system? You mean the ones that sprout up and disappear just as quickly? Tradition is dead aside from a handful of bowls. Most play-off supporters just want the bowls to host the games of the playoffs. Bowls went from 8 in 1940 to 15 in 1980 and 32 in 2006. That is ridiculous. It is very hard to argue most of these bowls have tradition of any sort. I'll bet my life earnings that Mr. SEC Commissioner can't name all 32. Heck, I bet he can't name 16. Tradition is a craptacular reason to keep it.

Not every bowl has tradition, but most carry value. You can't do an extended playoff AND bowls. The time, money, logistics, and expectation that most bowl games have cannot exist in a playoff format.

Yeah, the bowls are generally meaningless in terms of determining a champion. But many bowls are very relevant to the communities that sponsor them. The Rose, Fiesta, Sugar, and Orange all have great traditions. As does the Peach, Holiday, Sun, Cotton and Liberty Bowl. The Gator and Capital One provide great games every year. Why get rid of these great experiences in favor of Ohio State playing Central Michigan in a thrilling first round playoff game?

4)"And thirdly, there's an academic component. I know there are cynics about that, but there's an academic component, and we are going to keep football as a one-semester sport."

Does he think we are stupid? The national championship game last year had Ohio State miss a full week of classes and that was after a 50+ day lay off. To say we couldn't fit in a playoffs is stupid.

I can't defend that. That is stupid.

But I'm not sure a playoff for playoff's sake is the answer. I'm for a +1 model, but I think anything beyond that harms many of the good things of college football. I'd much rather they ban games against 1-AA teams, make Notre Dame join a conference, and extend the regular season, before they start dramatically changing the bowl system that has been a holiday tradition for me in my entire lifetime.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/11/29 15:14

Pwride wrote:

<http://sports.espn.go.com/ncf/news/story?id=3132578>

Long story short: BCS coordinator (who is the SEC Commissioner as well) says that this topsy turvy season isn't getting us any closer to play-offs. He says they are still "drilling-down" into that concept.

Let me call him out on a few points:

1) Plus one won't happen any time soon. If it did, they would have to redo the auto-bid format to allow a non-BCS team in to avoid Congressional investigations. You can bet the BCS conferences will never make it even easier (while making harder for themselves) for a mid-major to get into a BCS bowl.

His reasons for sticking to BCS:

2)"One is protect the regular season. It might be trite to say there's a playoff every weekend, but there is."

Bologna, and he knows it. Tell me how its a play-off when Hawaii/Boise State/Auburn go undefeated and don't finish #1. As long as voters determine the champion, there will never be a true champion.

3)"Secondly, we value the Bowl system. It gives a lot of student athletes an opportunity to compete for additional championships." Bowl system? You mean the ones that sprout up and disappear just as quickly? Tradition is dead aside from a handful of bowls. Most play-off supporters just want the bowls to host the games of the playoffs. Bowls went from 8 in 1940 to 15 in 1980 and 32 in 2006. That is ridiculous. It is very hard to argue most of these bowls have tradition of any sort. I'll bet my life earnings that Mr. SEC Commissioner can't name all 32. Heck, I bet he can't name 16. Tradition is a craptacular reason to keep it.

4)"And thirdly, there's an academic component. I know there are cynics about that, but there's an academic component, and we are going to keep football as a one-semester sport."

Does he think we are stupid? The national championship game last year had Ohio State miss a full week of classes and that was after a 50+ day lay off. To say we couldn't fit in a playoffs is stupid.

Giving Pwride Karma for this is the second best use of the Karma system ever. The best was docking Airhead84!

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by j2b03 - 2007/11/29 15:19

I really liked the article about a playoff system, probably the best one I have seen since I stopped reading them. The only problem I see is that it would seem that the teams in the tough conferences like the Big 12 and PAC 10 would want to come to less tough conferences like the WAC. Like for example or Texas Tech. Texas Tech or Missouri could win the WAC or MAC every year but probably never win the Big 12, so they would never get a shot at the title game but I guess that just shows that they shouldn't be in it. Maybe my logic is wrong but I could see that happening. It would be great for schools like BYU and Boise/HI because they would have a legitimate chance every year whereas it would have to be a dream season for Iowa state or Stanford to win their conference and go to the sweet sixteen of football.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2007/11/29 16:39

mormonrasta wrote:

Pwride wrote:

1) Plus one won't happen any time soon. If it did, they would have to redo the auto-bid format to allow a non-BCS team in to avoid Congressional investigations. You can bet the BCS conferences will never make it even easier (while making harder for themselves) for a mid-major to get into a BCS bowl.

What right does Congress have in telling the bowls which teams should qualify? They are individual corporations designed to put together the best matchups possible for the communities they serve. They can make contracts with whoever they want.

His reasons for sticking to BCS:

Commerce Clause. They are congress and can do whatever they want. Seriously, although the bowls are individual corporations, they colluded together to prevent others from equal access as a monopolistic cartel.

2)"One is protect the regular season. It might be trite to say there's a playoff every weekend, but there is."

Bologna, and he knows it. Tell me how its a play-off when Hawaii/Boise State/Auburn go undefeated and don't finish #1. As long as voters determine the champion, there will never be a true champion.

I wouldn't go as far to say each week is a playoff, but I do agree that the regular season wouldn't be as good as it is now with an extended playoff. There is a reason that FCS college football has the best regular season in sports.

The BCS make the regular season sudden death if a team loses. We know that's a bit of an extreme, but depending upon the time of season, it is very true as it is for all non-cartel schools. Going undefeated in a non-cartel school still won't be considered for the title game unless they are truly exceptional. I think you are talking about the FBS, not the FCS, which does have a playoff system. ;)

I would venture that the regular season, since it is relatively short compared to all other sports, still places a premium on winning each week so that they win their conference. If there are at large teams, then a team's record still is vital to placement and so the regular season will still be just as important as it is now.

3)"Secondly, we value the Bowl system. It gives a lot of student athletes an opportunity to compete for additional championships." Bowl system? You mean the ones that sprout up and disappear just as quickly? Tradition is dead aside from a handful of bowls. Most play-off supporters just want the bowls to host the games of the playoffs. Bowls went from 8 in 1940 to 15 in 1980 and 32 in 2006. That is ridiculous. It is very hard to argue most of these bowls have tradition of any sort. I'll bet my life earnings that Mr. SEC Commissioner can't name all 32. Heck, I bet he can't name 16. Tradition is a captacular reason to keep it.

Not every bowl has tradition, but most carry value. You can't do an extended playoff AND bowls. The time, money, logistics, and expectation that most bowl games have cannot exist in a playoff format.

Yeah, the bowls are generally meaningless in terms of determining a champion. But many bowls are very relevant to the communities that sponsor them. The Rose, Fiesta, Sugar, and Orange all have great traditions. As does the Peach, Holiday, Sun, Cotton and Liberty Bowl. The Gator and Capital One provide great games every year. Why get rid of these great experiences in favor of Ohio State playing Central Michigan in a thrilling first round playoff game?

I think they can do a playoff and include bowl games. They can take out one of the bye weeks they have and have the first round of the playoffs local, rather than at a bowl site. The bowl games will need to be regionally selected to reduce travel for fans, but I am sure there are enough fans to travel each week regardless. Local support for the community will improve because the bowl games set up for playoffs in the second round would have meaning. There will be some loss of pageantry because of the playoffs, but in the semifinal rounds, the pageantry can still be cherished with the finals being the plus one game. The game itself becomes the pageantry like the SuperBowl has become.

So, the first week of playoffs, games are held at the higher seed's town. The second round is four games held at lesser bowls before Christmas. The third round, 2 games, occur New Year's day, with the championship game played the next week. The season doesn't need to be extended and academics and bowl traditions are reasonably preserved.

4)"And thirdly, there's an academic component. I know there are cynics about that, but there's an academic component, and we are going to keep football as a one-semester sport."

Does he think we are stupid? The national championship game last year had Ohio State miss a full week of classes and that was after a 50+ day lay off. To say we couldn't fit in a playoffs is stupid.

I can't defend that. That is stupid.

But I'm not sure a playoff for playoff's sake is the answer. I'm for a +1 model, but I think anything beyond that harms many of the good things of college football. I'd much rather they ban games against 1-AA teams, make Notre Dame join a conference, and extend the regular season, before they start dramatically changing the bowl system that has been a holiday tradition for me in my entire lifetime.

Yup, that one is indefensible. Yet, we've talked about conference realignment before and qualifying only just conference champions for the playoffs. I like that idea the best of all.

A playoff system and bowl games can coexist.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Pwide - 2007/11/29 16:46

"The BCS make the regular season sudden death if a team loses. We know that's a bit of an extreme, but depending upon the time of season, it is very true as it is for all non-cartel schools."

I would love to see what happens if Hawaii loses a game. My guess is they drop to unranked.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by blue eyes - 2007/11/29 17:04

j2b03 wrote:

I really liked the article about a playoff system, probably the best one I have seen since I stopped reading them. The only problem I see is that it would seem that the teams in the tough conferences like the Big 12 and PAC 10 would want to come to less tough conferences like the WAC. Like for example or Texas Tech. Texas Tech or Missouri could win the WAC or MAC every year but probably never win the Big 12, so they would never get a shot at the title game but I guess that just shows that they shouldn't be in it. Maybe my logic is wrong but I could see that happening. It would be great for schools like BYU and Boise/HI because they would have a legitimate chance every year whereas it would have to be a dream season for Iowa state or Stanford to win their conference and go to the sweet sixteen of football.

I question whether the conferences would allow these teams in, or if they would take such a step just to have a shot at playoffs. Either way, I don't think that's a huge concern. However, it has been posted on this board that the current BCS has spread money deep into the cartel conferences, resulting in the parity that we see and the crazy season we have before us. I think a playoff would continue that, not as much for the smaller conferences, unfortunately, but I still think we would see more of the traditionally bad schools competing with the old powerhouses to make it one of the best events every year. Not to mention leveling the playing field somewhat with smaller conferences.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by craigscarson - 2007/11/29 17:37

2010 is when the BCS discussion is up for grabs, I see a huge backlash if they don't at bare minimum give college football a +1 system for the NC. Congress will at some point want to get involved....

We won't be much closer to a NC, unless we win out before then and give them something to argue about. In the meantime you have to think the Pac 10 is putting at least some credence into expanding. I can't imagine that BYU isn't in their top 4 for consideration.

The fact that the Big 12 / SEC can have teams from 2 different divisions play each other without having to play the whole league each season, lends to the possibility that you could have multiple teams in consideration for the national championship game. Instead, right now, the Pac 10 has canabilized itself the last couple of years without the benefit of uneven schedules helping the conference out each year. (i.e Kansas didn't play Nebraska, Texas, Oklahoma this year) The last two seasons of football have to have the Pac 10 scratching their heads....

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Hawkwing - 2007/11/29 18:11

j2b03 wrote:

I really liked the article about a playoff system, probably the best one I have seen since I stopped reading them. The only problem I see is that it would seem that the teams in the tough conferences like the Big 12 and PAC 10 would want to come to less tough conferences like the WAC. Like for example or Texas Tech. Texas Tech or Missouri could win the WAC or MAC every year but probably never win the Big 12, so they would never get a shot at the title game but I guess that just shows that they shouldn't be in it. Maybe my logic is wrong but I could see that happening. It would be great for schools like BYU and Boise/HI because they would have a legitimate chance every year whereas it would have to be a dream season for Iowa state or Stanford to win their conference and go to the sweet sixteen of football.

Let them!

Don't you think the Sunbelt Conference would love to have Texas Tech or Missouri join them? Of course they would.

Should they not let teams from the east into the NBA playoffs? I don't think most East teams could compete in college playoffs let alone the NBA.

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by ABYUFAN - 2007/11/30 09:27

Parity doesn't bring us any closer to playoffs...and it doesn't bring us bacon...Why even have parity?

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Mars - 2007/12/04 01:29

LONG RANT ALERT!

1. EVERYTHING brings us closer to a playoff. USC, Oklahoma, and Auburn all finishing undefeated in 2004 brought us closer to a playoff. A Ohio State-Michigan near-rematch brought us closer to a playoff. Undefeated Ohio State and 1-loss Michigan getting stomped by 1-loss Florida and USC brought us closer to a playoff. Boise State going undefeated and beating Big XII Champ Oklahoma brought us closer to a playoff. 1-loss Ohio State back in the Championship game with a worse record and a worse team with a new quarterback after getting trampled the year before brings us closer to a playoff. Georgia -the #2 BCS team after all the losses- getting jumped in the polls brings us closer to a playoff. Virginia

Tech -the #1 team in the BCS computers- being left out of the MNC game brings us closer to a playoff. Missouri and Arizona State getting screwed over for Kansas and Illinois brings us closer to a playoff. And believe it or not, the MWC Champ continually destroying their Las Vegas Bowl opponent will bring us closer to a playoff!

2. We will see a +1 system by 2011 at the latest. And it won't be near enough.
3. Division II and III protect the regular system by using it to determine the playoff participants, like they and we should.
4. If every week were a playoff, Hawaii would be the national champion. Ohio State and LSU both lost 2 weeks ago. At home.
5. We can have a playoff, use the bowl system in it, and keep other one-and-done bowls as well.
6. And if the International Bowl, or the GMAC, or the New Mexico go the way of the dodo, who would honestly care. It's what happened to the Silicon Valley Bowl, as well as countless others before it.
7. It's not about missing class. The men's basketball team misses 3x more class than our football team.
8. It's not about finals or the holidays. Again, just ask Div. II and III, they guys who have things right.
9. A Playoff would provide more money than the BCS, easy.
10. The BCS is an anti-American monopoly. If course Congress can legislate that. Just like they did Microsoft and AT&T.
11. Of course I-AA games shouldn't count, towards wins or stats. They shouldn't be banned, but they shouldn't count either. Ever.
12. Of course 6-6 teams shouldn't be bowl eligible.
13. Of course teams with losing in-conference records shouldn't be bowl eligible.
14. Of course teams shouldn't be allowed to play 8 home games in one season and only 4 on the road.
15. If post-season records should count now, they should count historically as well.
16. 8 teams doesn't go far enough. That leaves conference champs out. The NCAA Basketball Tourny manages to include all 31 conference champs, as they well should. No other system is fair.
17. I think the BCS will adopt a clause against two teams from the same conference playing in the championship game.
18. I think we will see the BCS adopt a clause against non-conference-champions from playing in the national championship game.
19. Who really needs the 4 weeks on non-play before the BCS Bowls? There's plenty of time for a playoff.
20. Yes, a playoff that includes every conference champ ups the motivation for each team to win, each program to improve, the storylines we would follow, the interest in the schools and the sport, and likely parity as well. Great!

PEACE I'm Out! :P

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2007/12/04 04:19

From kickoff to the last second of every Cougar game, college football is the greatest event on Earth.

For the rest of the week college football blows. It's just a popularity contest.

I've had it with the bcs, voters, bias, money. They've ruined a great game.

Since the bcs seems to be so keen on voting, why not put the playoff issue up for a vote? If we did, there'd be a playoff

next year.

We can trust voting for important things, like which 2-loss team is national champ.....but a few suits with fat wallets determine the entire college football post-season.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2007/12/04 04:21

I just vomited a little in my mouth.

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by CAFB_04-12 - 2007/12/04 04:35

Cougy_Monster wrote:
I just vomited a little in my mouth.
:laugh: :laugh: :laugh: :laugh:

=====

Re:Parity doesn't bring us any closer to play-offs

Posted by Pwide - 2007/12/04 10:10

I was talking to my brother about it the other day and this thought came to me:

We have a sport, a game, where we have thousands of rules to let you know how much you score when you kick a field goal, score a touchdown, get a safety, and an allotted amount of time in which to score above mentioned points. At the end of the game, we then declare one the winner and one the loser, no ties.

Then we vote on who is better.

=====