
Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Pwride - 2007/11/29 11:32

So it doesn't help much next year, but BYU has just agreed to play the Army Black Knights (1 for 1) in '11 and '12.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by craigscarson - 2007/11/29 11:34

Solid scheduling, can't hurt us and still gets attention when you play the academies....Better than 90% of Hawaii's schedule this year.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by snoscythe - 2007/11/29 11:37

As I stated in another thread this is a disappointing agreement. When Tom Holmoe announced that we were in negotiations with a "big-name program in the East who we had never played before," most of us were thinking/expecting an Alabama or Auburn type matchup.

Given the initial hype his negotiations generated, small wonder Holmoe didn't bother to put out a press release or anything about the contract.

Fans were expecting a lot more than they got with this arrangement.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by etyotx - 2007/11/29 11:39

Maybe he's in negotiations with another east coast team.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by SanAntonioBlue - 2007/11/29 11:39

Army?! Wow. What a powerhouse.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by sapper.forward - 2007/11/29 11:42

snoscythe wrote:

As I stated in another thread this is a disappointing agreement. When Tom Holmoe announced that we were in negotiations with a "big-name program in the East who we had never played before," most of us were thinking/expecting an Alabama or Auburn type matchup.

Given the initial hype his negotiations generated, small wonder Holmoe didn't bother to put out a press release or anything about the contract.

Fans were expecting a lot more than they got with this arrangement.

We have played Alabama before, a one time deal in '98 (could have been '99)

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by snoscythe - 2007/11/29 11:44

etyotx wrote:

Maybe he's in negotiations with another east coast team.

From talking to people around the football office, this is the arrangement to which Holmoe was referring last year.

The hold up in getting the deal done was finding two consecutive years where the deal would work. As an independent, Army's early schedule fills up fast, where BYU is looking to schedule all OOC games early on. 2011-12 was the soonest the two could get together, and that was possible only after some wrangling to move Yale's 2011 game to 2012. While no firm dates have been set yet, the contract does stipulate a window in which the game must take place, presumably before the 2nd week in October.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by sapper.forward - 2007/11/29 11:45

Playing Army looks better than playing Eastern Washington, and we get the same result(a win). Personally I would not mind playing Army and Navy each year and then scheduling 2 non conference games which are top 25 teams. I think that with a non conference schedule like that we could get up in the BCS every year with no problem.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by draider - 2007/11/29 11:47

2008

9-6 @ Washington
9-13 UCLA
TBA Nevada (canceled)
TBA @ Utah State

2009

9-12 @ Arizona State
9-19 Florida State
TBA Utah State

2010

9-18 @ Florida State
TBA Washington
TBA @ Utah State

2011

TBA @ Washington
TBA Arizona State
TBA Utah State
TBA @ Army

2012

TBA Washington
TBA Utah State

TBA Army

We have some good games set and we had 4 in a row against Notre Dame but for some reason they got terminated and i dont know why.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by snoscythe - 2007/11/29 11:47

I should clarify that this agreement is only disappointing when contrasted with the expectations Tom Holmoe generated with his vague announcement.

Otherwise I find Army to be a respectable opponent and I think we will have some interesting battles. I for one look forward to a trip East to West Point.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by sapper.forward - 2007/11/29 11:52

snoscythe wrote:

I should clarify that this agreement is only disappointing when contrasted with the expectations Tom Holmoe generated with his vague announcement.

Otherwise I find Army to be a respectable opponent and I think we will have some interesting battles. I for one look forward to a trip East to West Point.

Understood. It will be great to hang out with my West Point comrades when my Cougs hang 70 on them.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by KYCoug - 2007/11/29 11:54

Maybe if we are lucky this is a prelude to us going independent and dumping the MWC.

One can only wish!!

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by OLB - 2007/11/29 12:00

draider wrote:

We have some good games set and we had 4 in a row against Notre Dame but for some reason they got terminated and i dont know why.

The reason that BYU isn't playing Notre Dame is that Tom Holmoe didn't get it done, and it doesn't appear that Holmoe ever intended to schedule a 4 game series with Notre Dame.

There are others that can elaborate more on this. But Holmoe did a radio interview back in August (I think) where he said that there was no intention to schedule Notre Dame. I think this is a big mistake for the program.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penncougar - 2007/11/29 12:01

Maybe I feel alone in this, but I see no benefit in playing Utah State every year. I'm an out of state fan now, but we would be better off playing a really good D1AA school, then a bottom dweller who should be in that league. I would love to see us cancel some of those games and schedule any other school even if we were traveling across the country to play somewhere tough.

Playing Army is a million times better for us than those games against Utah State

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by jhw5 - 2007/11/29 12:01

These future schedules emit a yawn from me. We need to schedule someone a little further east than the Rockies (excluding Army, of course). How about somewhere closer to the Mississippi? There are plenty of Big XII, Big 10 teams that aren't too good and aren't too far away from the Wasatch Mtn range.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penn cougar - 2007/11/29 12:03

jhw5 wrote:

These future schedules emit a yawn from me. We need to schedule someone a little further east than the Rockies (excluding Army, of course). How about somewhere closer to the Mississippi? There are plenty of Big XII, Big 10 teams that aren't too good and aren't too far away from the Wasatch Mtn range.

Agreed 100%

And the plus to playing Notre Dame is.....guaranteed national television broadcast, which would help the program immensely now since we're locked into the MTN deal

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Hengst - 2007/11/29 12:06

penn cougar wrote:

jhw5 wrote:

These future schedules emit a yawn from me. We need to schedule someone a little further east than the Rockies (excluding Army, of course). How about somewhere closer to the Mississippi? There are plenty of Big XII, Big 10 teams that aren't too good and aren't too far away from the Wasatch Mtn range.

Agreed 100%

And the plus to playing Notre Dame is.....guaranteed national television broadcast, which would help the program immensely now since we're locked into the MTN deal

Seriously, at least if we played Navy, we'd be playing a moderately decent team. I'd like to see BYU mix it up with some SEC teams. Auburn would be great, even ol miss would be cool.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Short_Changed - 2007/11/29 12:08

sapper.forward wrote:

snoscythe wrote:

As I stated in another thread this is a disappointing agreement. When Tom Holmoe announced that we were in negotiations with a "big-name program in the East who we had never played before," most of us were thinking/expecting

an Alabama or Auburn type matchup.

Given the initial hype his negotiations generated, small wonder Holmoe didn't bother to put out a press release or anything about the contract.

Fans were expecting a lot more than they got with this arrangement.

We have played Alabama before, a one time deal in '98 (could have been '99)

Yep, and Shawn Alexander went for 5 TD's in Tuscaloosa in that game.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penncougar - 2007/11/29 12:11

Bottom dwellers of BCS conferences are better games for us than games against mid tier competition of non BCS conferences(ex. Nevada)

I don't think I'd like to play all three service academies the same year but there are lots of other east coast schools that would love a matchup with BYU

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by KYCoug - 2007/11/29 12:14

I totally agree with dumping USU aka Logan HS. They do nothing for the program. I've brought this up before and there just seems like there are too many Utah homies that enjoy their meaningless back yard blowout.

L Hatton
Louisville KY

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penncougar - 2007/11/29 12:18

The whole situation makes me wonder if Holmoe is really "fully invested" in getting us the best schedule he can. And it makes me wonder how many of his relatives live in Logan

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by azcavalier - 2007/11/29 12:23

OLB wrote:
draider wrote:

We have some good games set and we had 4 in a row against Notre Dame but for some reason they got terminated and i dont know why.

The reason that BYU isn't playing Notre Dame is that Tom Holmoe didn't get it done, and it doesn't appear that Holmoe ever intended to schedule a 4 game series with Notre Dame.

There are others that can elaborate more on this. But Holmoe did a radio interview back in August (I think) where he said that there was no intention to schedule Notre Dame. I think this is a big mistake for the program.

It's my understanding that Val Hale had intended to do another four-game series with Notre Dame, as a direct result of

the good will that was created when Notre Dame asked us to do some schedule re-arranging so that they could open the season against us in 2004. Remember that headache? Well, shortly thereafter, Hale was "let go" as AD, and I don't believe that Holmoe ever followed up on it, probably by choice. There are still some places out there on the net that show BYU and Notre Dame playing a four-game series starting in 2010, but apparently it's not going to happen.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by OLB - 2007/11/29 12:26

penncougar wrote:

The whole situation makes me wonder if Holmoe is really "fully invested" in getting us the best schedule he can. And it makes me wonder how many of his relatives live in Logan

I doubt that Holmoe has an family in Logan, since he is convert to the Church and grew up in Cali.

I believe that Holmoe may be getting some pressure from old blue hairs who want to see BYU play USU because the game actually meant something 35 years ago. Also, there may be pressure from other sources to play USU so that the Beehive Boot can be in play each season.

I'd rather play USU than a D-IAA team. My worst nightmare, strenght of schedulewise, is that BYU plays USU and a D-IAA team in the same season.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Pwride - 2007/11/29 12:27

KYCOug wrote:

I totally agree with dumping USU aka Logan HS. They do nothing for the program. I've brought this up before and there just seems like there are too many Utah homies that enjoy their meaningless back yard blowout.

L Hatton
Louisville KY

Would you rather a win over USU or a win over EWU? Im not from Utah, so I don't have a bias, but I'd take a W against a FBS team any day over FCS.

As to why big teams out east don't schedule us, because they have nothing to gain. You beat BYU, yipee, you beat the MWC champ. You lose, you lost to a mid-major.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2007/11/29 12:30

penncougar wrote:

The whole situation makes me wonder if Holmoe is really "fully invested" in getting us the best schedule he can. And it makes me wonder how many of his relatives live in Logan

Just a thought. It's been shown with Kansas and Hawaii that you don't need a tough schedule to get to a BCS game, just win. In the case of Ohio State and Kansas, if you win out in your conference too, you go to the national title game.

The tide has changed now that scheduling tough OOC games in the past isn't as important anymore. Now it's schedule wins and home games. IE, Ohio State bringing in Youngstown, the first time they have ever played a FCS team. Therefore, scheduling BYU is too risky for going undefeated, especially in the year the game is played in Provo.

BYU is not a BCS school so beating them isn't important, but losing to them is worse. Holmoe is being punished by BYU's success and by the new dynamics of the BCS, namely, don't lose to non BCS schools and the easiest way to do that is to avoid the good programs like BYU and schedule Idahos and Florida Internationals instead.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penncougar - 2007/11/29 12:42

OLB wrote:

penncougar wrote:

The whole situation makes me wonder if Holmoe is really "fully invested" in getting us the best schedule he can. And it makes me wonder how many of his relatives live in Logan

I doubt that Holmoe has an family in Logan, since he is convert to the Church and grew up in Cali.

I believe that Holmoe may be getting some pressure from old blue hairs who want to see BYU play USU because the game actually meant something 35 years ago. Also, there may be pressure from other sources to play USU so that the Beehive Boot can be in play each season.

I'd rather play USU than a D-IAA team. My worst nightmare, strenght of schedulewise, is that BYU plays USU and a D-IAA team in the same season.

I didn't literally mean that he had relatives in Logan (but is his wife from Logan???). What I meant is that there are unfortunate other motives than what's best for BYU football. If its from the old alumni, its unfortunate, but a necessary evil to the people who donate the most to the program.

I'm personally torn between "ethical" scheduling of quality teams and taking the risk you may lose to find out the limits of your team and to help them come together in victory or defeat, or Hawaii scheduling with a bunch of cupcakes to get the undefeated record and the money of the BCS. I see the positives and the negatives of both and just hope next year we get the best of both worlds....we beat some good teams OOC and go undefeated

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/11/29 12:58

azcavalier wrote:

OLB wrote:

draider wrote:

We have some good games set and we had 4 in a row against Notre Dame but for some reason they got terminated and i dont know why.

The reason that BYU isn't playing Notre Dame is that Tom Holmoe didn't get it done, and it doesn't appear that Holmoe ever intended to schedule a 4 game series with Notre Dame.

There are others that can elaborate more on this. But Holmoe did a radio interview back in August (I think) where he said that there was no intention to schedule Notre Dame. I think this is a big mistake for the program.

It's my understanding that Val Hale had intended to do another four-game series with Notre Dame, as a direct result of the good will that was created when Notre Dame asked us to do some schedule re-arranging so that they could open the season against us in 2004. Remember that headache? Well, shortly thereafter, Hale was "let go" as AD, and I don't believe that Holmoe ever followed up on it, probably by choice. There are still some places out there on the net that show BYU and Notre Dame playing a four-game series starting in 2010, but apparently it's not going to happen.

I would not say it is dead by any means. Last I heard from ND's side is that they are still working out details, but it is not done yet. I think there may some sticking points either ND does not like or BYU won't accept. It is far from dead, and look at any ND insider site and you will see BYU on the schedule. I spoke to the AD at ND 6 months or so ago and it still seemed that BYU vs. ND was a real possibility.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by KYCoug - 2007/11/29 13:03

I think EWU was a mistake. I don't know how we can complain about Ohio State and the Big 10 and the Big East when half of our schedule are among the worst in Football. I just think we are getting to a point we can't hold on to small time traditions like USU. If we want to be a big time program we need to schedule nationally not locally.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by snoscythe - 2007/11/29 13:09

ND/BYU wrote:

I would not say it is dead by any means. Last I heard from ND's side is that they are still working out details, but it is not done yet. I think there may some sticking points either ND does not like or BYU won't accept. It is far from dead, and look at any ND insider site and you will see BYU on the schedule. I spoke to the AD at ND 6 months or so ago and it still seemed that BYU vs. ND was a real possibility.

I no longer have the email on my computer, but a few months back I emailed Tom Holmoe and asked him about the discrepancy between the reported BYU schedules and the ND schedules. His succinct reply was that the ND websites (and nationalchamps.net) were erroneous and that there was no agreement for any additional games, and that there were no negotiations. He stated that ND could only work 8 to 10 years in advance, and that BYU could not work on that timeline.

According to Tom Holmoe, the Fred Skousen deal is dead and the ND insider sites are operating on old information that is no longer relevant.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/11/29 13:18

snoscythe wrote:

ND/BYU wrote:

I would not say it is dead by any means. Last I heard from ND's side is that they are still working out details, but it is not done yet. I think there may some sticking points either ND does not like or BYU won't accept. It is far from dead, and look at any ND insider site and you will see BYU on the schedule. I spoke to the AD at ND 6 months or so ago and it still seemed that BYU vs. ND was a real possibility.

I no longer have the email on my computer, but a few months back I emailed Tom Holmoe and asked him about the discrepancy between the reported BYU schedules and the ND schedules. His succinct reply was that the ND websites (and nationalchamps.net) were erroneous and that there was no agreement for any additional games, and that there were no negotiations. He stated that ND could only work 8 to 10 years in advance, and that BYU could not work on that timeline.

According to Tom Holmoe, the Fred Skousen deal is dead and the ND insider sites are operating on old information that is no longer relevant.

That is possible, as mentioned my interaction with the AD at ND was about 6 months ago. Again, it is all ND insider sites not the sites you mentioned above. My guess is BYU and ND agreed to do a 4 year agreement after BYU agreed to switch the date of the 2004 game. From what I have heard (not Kevin White the AD, but other insiders) is that there were sticking points. It is possible ND wants to move BYU out to later, or move part of the agreement out farther...rather then play 4 straight years to do 2 games back to back years and then 8 - 10 years from now to play 2 more games. It is assumed ND does not want 4 straight years (insert the joke) with BYU, that is a long commitment for non-rivals or teams that have a long standing relationship (longer then a 6 games or so). ND wants it this way, and Holmoe will not concede to move part of the schedule further out. This is what I have heard, I would love to see it happen.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by dYrtbYkerYder - 2007/11/29 13:24

It's funny that everyone is complaining right now about the schedule, but when we're making runs at undefeated seasons in those years EVERYONE will be on the bandwagon. The teams that have cracked the BCS have all done so with very

weak schedules.

Don't get me wrong, I would love to see us beating Top-25 teams from BCS conferences every year, but if that comes at the cost of us losing games that cost us the BCS like vs. UCLA this year, I'd take a game against Army any day.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Uncle Iroh - 2007/11/29 13:26

One good thing about this is that ESPN will probably pick up the game. Although it will be on ESPN Classic. I know they have shown Army games on Classic the last few years. So for what it's worth, some possible airtime on ESPN.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by OLB - 2007/11/29 13:27

dYrtbYkerYder wrote:

It's funny that EVERYONE is complaining right now about the schedule, but when we're making runs at undefeated seasons in those years EVERYONE will be on the bandwagon. The teams that have cracked the BCS have all done so with very weak schedules.

Don't get me wrong, I would love to see us beating Top-25 teams from BCS conferences every year, but if that comes at the cost of us losing games that cost us the BCS like vs. UCLA this year, I'd take a game against Army any day.

I don't want to just get to a BCS bowl game. That pony trick has already been done by Utah, BSU, and potentially Hawaii. I want to be able to play for a national championship, and Bronco has said just as much.

Playing for a national title won't happen if we play a Hawaiiesque schedule. The Army game is okay, but I'd rather schedule Louisville or Rutgers.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Slugger - 2007/11/29 13:39

KYCoug wrote:

Maybe if we are lucky this is a prelude to us going independent and dumping the MWC.

One can only wish!!

I thought the same thing. I find the timing to be odd and suspicious. Only weeks after rumors of going Independent and who do we put on a future schedule? An Independent. We'll see, but it should be interesting.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by splitbamboo - 2007/11/29 14:20

Did you hear what Coach Mendenhall said last night about the Army match up? He said he pushed for it. He respects the military and also wants his boys to have the cultural experience of all that is around the Academy.

This coach is a class act.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by SaltLakeCoug - 2007/11/29 20:57

ND/BYU wrote:

I would not say it is dead by any means. Last I heard from ND's side is that they are still working out details, but it is not done yet. I think there may some sticking points either ND does not like or BYU won't accept. It is far from dead, and look at any ND insider site and you will see BYU on the schedule. I spoke to the AD at ND 6 months or so ago and it still seemed that BYU vs. ND was a real possibility.

I would love to see anouther four games against ND.:)

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by WhatWouldBroncoDo - 2007/11/29 22:44

If we run the table in any of the years to come even with USU and another bottom dweller we still go to a BCS game, even with one loss we still go(look at hawaii), our schedule this year wasnt too hard and should of been harder, with one loss this year we go to BCS game.

Im fine with playing USU every year. it was a rivalry game and should still be one, you dont just stop playing them cause they suck. and i totally disagree that playing a good d1 aa team is better than an USU team

Keep doing what yoyur doing Mr. Holmoe!

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by stuckinbig10country - 2007/11/30 08:15

I think Holmoe is wise in not dealing with ND if they are intent on scheduling 8 to 10 years out. That is a bad deal for BYU. Too much can change during that time. Here are two things that could happen in the next 8-10 years. I am not saying that they are going to happen, or are even likely to happen, but they are things that Holmoe has to think about.

1. Notre Dame does what it should have done a long time ago and join the Big 10 (their schedule will be easier, and makes it more possible for undefeated seasons). The Big 10 will even let them keep their TV deal. Now they are playing 8-9 conference games, and do you think they will cancel their rivalry games against USC, Navy, or BC and give up their games against a bigger name opponent to play BYU. No, the BYU game gets cancelled, then we have to play a FCS team, and the AD gets criticized for scheduling that game. Combine joining the Big 10 with the new scheduling practice that ND is using (7 home games, 1 neutral site game considered a home game, and 4 road games) all their road games would be in conference, or at the very least they would have one road game at USC.

2. The church decides that BYU and BYU-Hawaii stop competing in inter-collegiate sports. Granted, I don't think this is 8-10 years away (more likely 15-20). You all are saying that won't happen, but I had friends taking recruiting trips to Ricks College the year before they decided they were removing the very successful sports programs there. They didn't think it was happening either.

Again, these are some things that would preclude us from scheduling that far in advance. Others include us changing conferences.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/11/30 08:36

stuckinbig10country wrote:

I think Holmoe is wise in not dealing with ND if they are intent on scheduling 8 to 10 years out. That is a bad deal for BYU. Too much can change during that time. Here are two things that could happen in the next 8-10 years. I am not saying that they are going to happen, or are even likely to happen, but they are things that Holmoe has to think about.

1. Notre Dame does what it should have done a long time ago and join the Big 10 (their schedule will be easier, and makes it more possible for undefeated seasons). The Big 10 will even let them keep their TV deal. Now they are playing

8-9 conference games, and do you think they will cancel their rivalry games against USC, Navy, or BC and give up their games against a bigger name opponent to play BYU. No, the BYU game gets cancelled, then we have to play a FCS team, and the AD gets criticized for scheduling that game. Combine joining the Big 10 with the new scheduling practice that ND is using (7 home games, 1 neutral site game considered a home game, and 4 road games) all their road games would be in conference, or at the very least they would have one road game at USC.

2. The church decides that BYU and BYU-Hawaii stop competing in inter-collegiate sports. Granted, I don't think this is 8-10 years away (more likely 15-20). You all are saying that won't happen, but I had friends taking recruiting trips to Ricks College the year before they decided they were removing the very successful sports programs there. They didn't think it was happening either.

Again, these are some things that would preclude us from scheduling that far in advance. Others include us changing conferences.

I do not see ND joining any conference. ND would lose too much \$\$\$ by joining and all the alum's would go crazy if they joined a conference. The schedule would not be any easier because unlike Ohio State, ND would not schedule the Kent State's of the world they would keep rivals on the schedule such as USC....so the non-conference games would be tough. The only scenario that ND joins the Big 10 (there was an SI article on this) is if ND gets to keep their NBC deal and not share the profits, and the Big 10 would take advantage by using ND to get people to sign-up for the Big 10 network so they can see a few of ND's away games.

You never know, but it is highly unlikely ND joins the Big 10...no real advantage and as mentioned the alumni do not want this and other sports are part of the Big East. The only way I see it happening is if they are forced to due to there being a playoff of some sort and teams do not have as many non-conference games and ND has difficulty filling their schedule.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by Pwride - 2007/11/30 09:57

I find it very hard to believe that BYU will ever not compete in sports.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by 1246 - 2007/11/30 10:39

Comparing BYU athletics with BYU-Hawaii and BYU-Idaho is definitely apples to oranges IMO. BYU-I (Ricks) switched from a 2-year to a 4-year school, and to make that feasible and free up the necessary \$ for more buildings and faculty, they pulled the plug on intercollegiate sports. I don't know as much about BYU-H, but it seems that absent a big moneymaker like football - and do they even have basketball? - they could get rid of sports. It's got to be tough to travel so much for every sport without the revenue-making of a football or basketball team.

BYU, on the other hand, is a complete four-year university (that also includes graduate programs) with a renowned and respected athletic program that has won numerous national titles. In addition, it's my understanding that the athletic program is largely self-sufficient and even generates its own revenue (operating in the black) (not an accounting guy, so I apologize if I'm butchering the terminology).

So what reason would BYU(Provo) have for jettisoning its athletic programs? I can't think of anything. With BYU-I and BYU-H there are factors you can point to and say, "Well, that makes it obvious." The only obvious factors with BYU(Provo) are ones in support of keeping its athletic programs.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by mormonrasta - 2007/11/30 11:40

ND/BYU wrote:

if ND gets to keep their NBC deal and not share the profits, and the Big 10 would take advantage by using ND to get people to sign-up for the Big 10 network so they can see a few of ND's away games.

You never know, but it is highly unlikely ND joins the Big 10...no real advantage and as mentioned the alumni do not want this and other sports are part of the Big East. The only way I see it happening is if they are forced to due to there being a playoff of some sort and teams do not have as many non-conference games and ND has difficulty filling their schedule.

I think it is plausible for the bolded reason. I think the Big 10 could agree to such a deal because it would increase the value of their network. It would create a conference championship game which would likely bring more revenue.

I think it would be beneficial for Notre Dame, because they won't have to share their basketball revenue 16 different ways like their current Big East Deal. The Big 10 also features better "minor" bowl options than Notre Dame has access to right now. The Big 10 is generally on par academically with Notre Dame. ND also regularly plays Big 10 teams and by joining the conference they could still keep their yearly rivalries (USC and Navy) while still being able to schedule 2 other opponents each year.

I think it is a win/win. Let ND keep NBC, and put them in the Big 10.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by choirboy24 - 2007/11/30 12:49

stuckinbig10country wrote:

I think Holmoe is wise in not dealing with ND if they are intent on scheduling 8 to 10 years out. That is a bad deal for BYU. Too much can change during that time. Here are two things that could happen in the next 8-10 years. I am not saying that they are going to happen, or are even likely to happen, but they are things that Holmoe has to think about.

1. Notre Dame does what it should have done a long time ago and join the Big 10 (their schedule will be easier, and makes it more possible for undefeated seasons). The Big 10 will even let them keep their TV deal. Now they are playing 8-9 conference games, and do you think they will cancel their rivalry games against USC, Navy, or BC and give up their games against a bigger name opponent to play BYU. No, the BYU game gets cancelled, then we have to play a FCS team, and the AD gets criticized for scheduling that game. Combine joining the Big 10 with the new scheduling practice that ND is using (7 home games, 1 neutral site game considered a home game, and 4 road games) all their road games would be in conference, or at the very least they would have one road game at USC.

2. The church decides that BYU and BYU-Hawaii stop competing in inter-collegiate sports. Granted, I don't think this is 8-10 years away (more likely 15-20). You all are saying that won't happen, but I had friends taking recruiting trips to Ricks College the year before they decided they were removing the very successful sports programs there. They didn't think it was happening either.

Again, these are some things that would preclude us from scheduling that far in advance. Others include us changing conferences.

1. Unless Notre Dame starts stinking it up for the next several years, NBC will never cancel their contract with ND and therefore, ND will never have a need to attach itself to the Big 10 or any other conference for the purposes of TV deals or bowl tie-ins. Despite their record this year, I think they will be back. There is too much tradition and pride at that school for them to be down for long.

2. I think the reasoning for canceling intercollegiate sports at Ricks (BYU-I) was because the school wanted to focus more on teaching and learning as opposed to worrying about an intercollegiate athletics program. That way, all the money devoted to sports could go to other more important activities, or better yet, get sent to BYU-Provo for our program B) Honestly, unless the First Presidency and the Twelve thinks there is harm or bad press coming to the church because of intercollegiate sports at BYU, they will not cancel the program. There are too many good missionary efforts that have come because of the athletic program. Those in charge of the athletic program are too cognisant of bringing in the right types of kids so that they will be a good example for the university and the church. When you think about it, Crowton wasn't forced out JUST because of his poor record '02-'04...it was because of all the off the field problems with players. I don't foresee the administration ever letting that happen again. If it does and gets completely out of hand, then I might see them canceling all intercollegiate sports.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by byuphil - 2007/11/30 13:22

penn cougar wrote:

Maybe I feel alone in this, but I see no benefit in playing Utah State every year. I'm an out of state fan now, but we would be better off playing a really good D1AA school, then a bottom dweller who should be in that league. I would love to see us cancel some of those games and schedule any other school even if we were traveling across the country to play somewhere tough.

Playing Army is a million times better for us than those games against Utah State

I agree. Back when we were playing Utah State every year, I always said we should dump them and schedule a top 20 team (if possible--as high quality as possible anyways). We were always clamoring for respect (nothing has changed there) and Utah State does absolutely nothing to help garner that respect.

On the other hand, it seems that going undefeated is what matters to the pollsters if you're not one of the cartel (I was very please to see Dan Wetzel use this term. That guy is great in my eyes--he's advocating strongly for a playoff) schools. We need look no further than the example of Hawaii this year.

So, it's hard for me to say now. I think however if I had to take a stand, that in the long term, scheduling tougher opponents (and winning our fair share of them) is the best way to go if we want to earn national respect and recognition. That goes for the rest of the teams in the conference as well. I think the conference has done really well in terms of scheduling in this regard, and we've (the MWC) have had many close ones, ones we coulda, shouda won, but we didn't. We simply have to convert those close losses into wins.

That's my two cents.

Go Coogs!

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by CAFB_04-12 - 2007/11/30 13:26

Army may not be a top 25 team every year but I do think that most sports analysts would respect scheduling them as an opponent. They have a good football tradition (a few national championships in the late 1800s maybe?). I like the idea of playing a service academy besides AF as well. What I don't like is traveling to the east coast. We haven't played well there in the past.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penn cougar - 2007/11/30 13:47

byuphil wrote:

penn cougar wrote:

Maybe I feel alone in this, but I see no benefit in playing Utah State every year. I'm an out of state fan now, but we would be better off playing a really good D1AA school, then a bottom dweller who should be in that league. I would love to see us cancel some of those games and schedule any other school even if we were traveling across the country to play somewhere tough.

Playing Army is a million times better for us than those games against Utah State

I agree. Back when we were playing Utah State every year, I always said we should dump them and schedule a top 20 team (if possible--as high quality as possible anyways). We were always clamoring for respect (nothing has changed there) and Utah State does absolutely nothing to help garner that respect.

On the other hand, it seems that going undefeated is what matters to the pollsters if you're not one of the cartel (I was very please to see Dan Wetzel use this term. That guy is great in my eyes--he's advocating strongly for a playoff) schools. We need look no further than the example of Hawaii this year.

So, it's hard for me to say now. I think however if I had to take a stand, that in the long term, scheduling tougher opponents (and winning our fair share of them) is the best way to go if we want to earn national respect and recognition. That goes for the rest of the teams in the conference as well. I think the conference has done really well in terms of

scheduling in this regard, and we've (the MWC) have had many close ones, ones we coulda, shouda won, but we didn't. We simply have to convert those close losses into wins.

That's my two cents.

Go Coogs!

There are plenty of bottom dweller BCS schools that we could schedule that would be better than DIAA schools or the Logan High Schools of the world. I'll bet we could get a deal with a Baylor or Iowa State done.

We all sit here on our high horse and complain about the BCS and say that we should schedule pussy teams like Hawaii did this year so we can get to a BCS bowl game. I say that is a bunch of crap and I'll bet that if you ask Bronco, he'll tell you its a bunch of crap, but he'll say it nicer. Bronco is building a team that can run the table every year and thats the great thing about BYU football right now.

If we were undefeated right now we could be in the NC game talk because we played tougher teams than Hawaii did this year, especially if UCLA wouldn't have fallen apart. We have the same opportunity next year by playing Pac-10 teams. Washington and their qb will be tough. Every team every year has a chance at a National Championship, no matter what.

Ask yourselves this question:

If Hawaii would have run the table but replaced the two DIAA teams they played with Arizona and UCLA, would they still be struggling to get a BCS bid. HELL NO. They would be in the top ten and, with the way this season has gone, in the National Championship talk

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by SanAntonioBlue - 2007/11/30 14:01

penncougar wrote:

byuphil wrote:

penncougar wrote:

Maybe I feel alone in this, but I see no benefit in playing Utah State every year. I'm an out of state fan now, but we would be better off playing a really good D1AA school, then a bottom dweller who should be in that league. I would love to see us cancel some of those games and schedule any other school even if we were traveling across the country to play somewhere tough.

Playing Army is a million times better for us than those games against Utah State

I agree. Back when we were playing Utah State every year, I always said we should dump them and schedule a top 20 team (if possible--as high quality as possible anyways). We were always clamoring for respect (nothing has changed there) and Utah State does absolutely nothing to help garner that respect.

On the other hand, it seems that going undefeated is what matters to the pollsters if you're not one of the cartel (I was very please to see Dan Wetzel use this term. That guy is great in my eyes--he's advocating strongly for a playoff) shcools. We need look no further than the example of Hawaii this year.

So, it's hard for me to say now. I think however if I had to take a stand, that in the long term, scheduling tougher opponents (and winning our fair share of them) is the best way to go if we want to earn national respect and recognition. That goes for the rest of the teams in the conference as well. I think the conference has done really well in terms of scheduling in this regard, and we've (the MWC) have had many close ones, ones we coulda, shouda won, but we didn't. We simply have to convert those close losses into wins.

That's my two cents.

Go Coogs!

There are plenty of bottom dweller BCS schools that we could schedule that would be better than DIAA schools or the Logan High Schools of the world. I'll bet we could get a deal with a Baylor or Iowa State done.

We all sit here on our high horse and complain about the BCS and say that we should schedule pussy teams like Hawaii did this year so we can get to a BCS bowl game. I say that is a bunch of crap and I'll bet that if you ask Bronco, he'll tell

you its a bunch of crap, but he'll say it nicer. Bronco is building a team that can run the table every year and thats the great thing about BYU football right now.

If we were undefeated right now we could be in the NC game talk because we played tougher teams than Hawaii did this year, especially if UCLA wouldn't have fallen apart. We have the same opportunity next year by playing Pac-10 teams. Washington and their qb will be tough. Every team every year has a chance at a National Championship, no matter what.

Ask yourselves this question:

If Hawaii would have run the table but replaced the two DIAA teams they played with Arizona and UCLA, would they still be struggling to get a BCS bid. HELL NO. They would be in the top ten and, with the way this season has gone, in the National Championship talk

Right on.

Here's a question for you guys that think we should go with the soft scheduling route. Is that the kind of football that you like to watch? Do you really want to watch mediocre competition the whole season just to get a crack at one good game. Wow I can bet the satellite and cable companies will be scrambling to add the MTN to their lineup with that type of schedule. I'm guessing that the people in this forum who want a cupcake schedule are also complaining about the MTN. The MTN will NEVER go anywhere if the flagship team of the conferences makes a practice of playing nobodys.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by penncougar - 2007/11/30 14:11

SanAntonioBlue wrote:

Right on.

Here's a question for you guys that think we should go with the soft scheduling route. Is that the kind of football that you like to watch? Do you really want to watch mediocre competition the whole season just to get a crack at one good game. Wow I can bet the satellite and cable companies will be scrambling to add the MTN to their lineup with that type of schedule. I'm guessing that the people in this forum who want a cupcake schedule are also complaining about the MTN. The MTN will NEVER go anywhere if the flagship team of the conferences makes a practice of playing nobodys.

If we play cupcakes, no one well ever see it anyway. At least when we have bigger games now they get picked up by VS and CSTV, which are 1000 times better than the MTN. If we start playing no name schools, not only will the rest of our conference suffer because of lack of exposure, our recruiting will suffer. Kids know whats up and they'll see right through a cup cake schedule

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by blue eyes - 2007/11/30 15:05

First, there are probably a lot of reasons not to schedule 8-10 years in advance, but the possibility of not having an athletic program is definitely not one of them. How could you operate a program at all under that assumption?

Second, I don't have a big problem with USU because they will go up and down over the years, but I would love to see us fill our OOC schedule with at least one big school a year and the rest decent teams. The only way the BCS even thinks about an undefeated non-cartel team for the NC game is if every cartel conference team has at least three or more losses. While this has been a crazy year, that essentially means we are not getting a shot until there is some sort of playoff. Therefore, play the good teams; it means we get to see some great football, and the team is ready to play the good teams when/if we ever see a playoff system.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

SanAntonioBlue wrote:

Here's a question for you guys that think we should go with the soft scheduling route. Is that the kind of football that you like to watch? Do you really want to watch mediocre competition the whole season just to get a crack at one good game. Wow I can bet the satellite and cable companies will be scrambling to add the MTN to their lineup with that type of schedule. I'm guessing that the people in this forum who want a cupcake schedule are also complaining about the MTN. The MTN will NEVER go anywhere if the flagship team of the conferences makes a practice of playing nobodys.

To answer a question with a question, would you rather see BYU play Oklahoma, Texas, USC, or Ohio State in September or January?

We watch mediocre competition for at least 2/3rds of the season anyway. Why not the entire season? BYU rarely beats good competition in nonconference play anyway. The last time they beat a nonconference team that finished the season ranked was 1997. I'm not sure what the huge reward of consistently getting beat by the top 25 in nonconference games would be (12 in a row to be exact).

I'm all for a moderate schedule. A Pac-10 team, a Big 12 team, Utah State, and miscellaneous MAC, CUSA, WAC, or Sun Belt team each year. If BYU is great then they will be rewarded with a BCS berth. After a couple of those then we can start talking about scheduling like a National Champion.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by realfan - 2007/11/30 18:03

mormonrasta wrote:

SanAntonioBlue wrote:

Here's a question for you guys that think we should go with the soft scheduling route. Is that the kind of football that you like to watch? Do you really want to watch mediocre competition the whole season just to get a crack at one good game. Wow I can bet the satellite and cable companies will be scrambling to add the MTN to their lineup with that type of schedule. I'm guessing that the people in this forum who want a cupcake schedule are also complaining about the MTN. The MTN will NEVER go anywhere if the flagship team of the conferences makes a practice of playing nobodys.

To answer a question with a question, would you rather see BYU play Oklahoma, Texas, USC, or Ohio State in September or January?

We watch mediocre competition for at least 2/3rds of the season anyway. Why not the entire season? BYU rarely beats good competition in nonconference play anyway. The last time they beat a nonconference team that finished the season ranked was 1997. I'm not sure what the huge reward of consistently getting beat by the top 25 in nonconference games would be (12 in a row to be exact).

I'm all for a moderate schedule. A Pac-10 team, a Big 12 team, Utah State, and miscellaneous MAC, CUSA, WAC, or Sun Belt team each year. If BYU is great then they will be rewarded with a BCS berth. After a couple of those then we can start talking about scheduling like a National Champion.

Answer Both. Just because we were down for a decade doesn't mean we can't beat them now at home. It does not hurt us to play top 25 teams. If our only loss this year was to any of the teams you just named it would not hurt our ranking at all. What hurts it is losing to Tulsa. By playing the best once a year we have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by realfan - 2007/11/30 18:41

Am I the only one that thinks that with the offense we will return next year, the good play of our defense the last two years, and the way we have played at home that it's not the perfect time to schedule a big time program for our season opener? The timing is right for a David versus Goliath.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/11/30 23:27

I just hope when we play them and they break out into this formation, MWC refs will have the wherewithal to throw the flag for 12 (or more) men on the field....

http://www.stripes.com/06/dec06/armynavy_1/06armynavy10.jpg

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by BigL - 2007/12/01 17:23

I have to agree with Mormonrasta. A moderate schedule is probably the best way to go. Play a couple of very good teams and a couple of fair teams. Tough games with four strong opponents can leave you bruised and battered. Injuries could really cost us. BYU's first team can compete with the best but we are not (in most years) as deep as the BCS power teams. Also, I may not get too excited about Utah State, but it sure is more interesting than Eastern Washington or Northern Illinois.

=====

Re:Black Knights in 2011-2012

Posted by CAFB_04-12 - 2007/12/01 18:09

2001 (Lavell's last season) comes to mind, traveling to the East coast three (?) times against Florida St., Virginia, and Syracuse. That kind of travel is tiring.

=====