
BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Sage - 2008/04/30 21:19

Apr 30, 6:01 PM (ET)

By RALPH D. RUSSO

HOLLYWOOD, Fla. (AP) -Even a four-game playoff scenario was too much for the BCS.

Bowl Championship Series officials rejected a plan Wednesday to turn the much-criticized system for deciding a national champ into a four-team playoff, starting in the 2010 season.

The BCS format will remain the same until at least the 2014 season.

"After a very thorough, very good discussion among the group, we have decided that because we feel at this time the BCS is in an unprecedented state of health, we feel it's never been healthier during its first decade, we have made a decision to move forward in the next cycle with the current format," Atlantic Coast Conference commissioner John Swofford said.

During five hours of meetings with the other conference commissioners, Southeastern Conference commissioner Mike Slive presented a plan for a plus-one format, matching the No. 1 team in the nation against No. 4 and 2 vs. 3 in the marquee bowl games. The winners would meet about a week later in the BCS title game. The plan also called for creating another BCS bowl game.

In the end, only the SEC and ACC wanted to even continue the discussion of the plus-one.

"I'm not unhappy," Slive said after those meetings with the 10 other conference commissioners and Notre Dame athletic director Kevin White at a resort hotel. "There's no such thing as standing pat. I think we've done a service. We owed the fans and media an explanation as to why we're not moving ahead.

"I can't say I'm surprised. There is a bit of disappointment."

There was no vote taken, the commissioners said, but the leaders of the Big East, Big 12, Pac-10 and Big Ten made it clear they did not want to move the BCS toward a playoff in any way.

Any change would've needed approval by university presidents.

In the current BCS format, the top two teams in the BCS standings - which use polls and computer ratings to grade teams - after the regular season are matched in the BCS national title game.

The idea behind the plus-one is to alleviate some of the controversy by sending four teams into the postseason with a chance to win the national championship.

The BCS has two years left on its current four-year, \$320 million TV deal with Fox. Negotiations will likely begin in the fall on a new contract with Fox, that'll probably run through the 2013 season and lock in the current format.

The decision came as no surprise. It was a long shot to survive, at best.

Coming into the meeting, Big Ten commissioner Jim Delany and Pac-10 commissioner Tom Hansen had said they were opposed to the seeded plus-one format that Slive was to present.

Big East commissioner Mike Traghese and Big 12 commissioner Dan Beebe, for the first time, made it known publicly that their leagues were also against moving the BCS in any way toward a playoff.

"There's a strong sense in that room of the slippery slope view that there's never been a collegiate or professional playoff that's stopped at four teams," Delany said.

Traghese said he favored an unseeded version of a plus-one, which would set the championship game matchup after the four major bowls are played using the BCS standings, over seeding the top four and playing them off.

"The seeded model looked like a playoff, and we don't think a playoff is in the best interest of college football," he said.

The Big Ten and Pac-10's relationship with the Rose Bowl has always been viewed as the major hurdle to changing the BCS. Turns out it was far from the only obstacle.

The concern about a playoff among college football's leaders is that it would make football a two-semester sport and would lessen the importance of a regular season that now has a do-or-die feel to it from week to week.

The Bowl Championship Series was implemented in 1998 after the Big Ten, Pac-10 and Rose Bowl agreed to join with the other five major conferences and three marquee bowls to create an annual national title game involving the top two teams in the country after the regular season.

While the BCS has created championship games that never would have happened under the old bowl system, it's been far from perfect. For the many college football fans desperate to see a playoff that would crown a more definitive champion, the BCS has been a target for their angst.

Almost every season, there's been some dispute leading into the championship game about whether the BCS selected the two most deserving teams.

In past years, undefeated Auburn was left out of the national title game after the 2004 season in favor of Southern California and Oklahoma. It was Auburn getting left out that first got Slive thinking that No. 1 vs. No. 2 might not be enough.

Nebraska reached the championship game after the 2002 season, despite getting blown out in its final regular-season game.

Last year, Georgia fans were the loudest to complain when the Bulldogs were left out of the BCS title game in favor of LSU and Ohio State.

"If it isn't broke," White said, "don't fix it."

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by biggulf - 2008/04/30 21:36

This needs to go back to Congress or somewhere.

Oklahoma gets two BCS teams while Utah same size gets zilch.

However, the chance of the Senate or Congress doing something is also zilch.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/04/30 22:47

biggulf wrote:

This needs to go back to Congress or somewhere.

Oklahoma gets two BCS teams while Utah same size gets zilch.

However, the chance of the Senate or Congress doing something is also zilch.

The difference being that in Utah religion is more important than football.

In Oklahoma, football is their religion. Served four months of my mission in Norman, OK (during football season 1972) and another four months in Fayetteville, AR (spring training 1973).

For most people in Norman, if they had to choose between going to a baptism, wedding, funeral, or a Sooners game, the game wins hands down.

Regardless of the level of fanaticism involved, the BCS cartel should still be broken up by the Feds. Where are all those class action attorneys when we need them?

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/04/30 23:14

How can someone read this or similar stories and not find it repugnant. All I can think right now is "those dirty bastards."

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/01 05:22

...we have decided that because we feel at this time the BCS is in an unprecedented state of health, we feel it's never been healthier during its first decade, we have made a decision to move forward in the next cycle with the current format," Atlantic Coast Conference commissioner John Swofford said.

Translation: ...we have decided that because our accountants at this time tell us our blatant exploitation of collegiate sports is making us an unprecedented amount of money, we feel we've never made this much money in a decade, we've made the decision to move forward in the next cycle with the same bank account numbers...

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/01 05:29

The Big Ten and Pac-10's relationship with the Rose Bowl has always been viewed as the major hurdle to changing the BCS. Turns out it was far from the only obstacle.

Translation: The Big Ten and Pac-10's relationship with money has always been viewed as the major hurdle to changing the current exploitation of college football. Turns out the other BCS conferences love money more than sports too.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/01 05:33

Almost every season, there's been some dispute leading into the championship game about whether the BCS selected the two most deserving teams.

Translation: Almost every season, there's been some dispute leading into the popularity contest known by the misnomer of "championship game" about whether the Business of College Sports selected the two most deserving teams. However, there has been no dispute among the Business of College Sports conference commissioners that the most deserving conferences have received all the money.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/01 05:38

The concern about a playoff among college football's leaders is that it would make football a two-semester sport and would lessen the importance of a regular season that now has a do-or-die feel to it from week to week.

Translation: The concern about a playoff among college football's self-proclaimed leaders is that it would make football a two-semester sport, which would require the tutors at Florida to do the players homework in January too. It would also lessen the importance of the current Business of College Sports teams as their mediocrity would be exposed in neutral site do-or-die games each year with "mid-majors".

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by cougarfan87 - 2008/05/01 07:18

Cougy_Monster wrote:

The concern about a playoff among college football's leaders is that it would make football a two-semester sport and would lessen the importance of a regular season that now has a do-or-die feel to it from week to week.

Translation: The concern about a playoff among college football's self-proclaimed leaders is that it would make football a two-semester sport, which would require the tutors at Florida to do the players homework in January too. It would also lessen the importance of the current Business of College Sports teams as their mediocrity would be exposed in neutral site do-or-die games each year with "mid-majors".

Uh, Florida is in the SEC--who wanted the plus one game. Perhaps, in keeping with the socialistic view of most universities, Florida likes the idea of keeping its tutors gainfully employed. ;)

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/05/01 07:50

Sage wrote:

"If it isn't broke," White said, "don't fix it."

Wow. This line is a joke, right? I've never met a soul who believes the BCS is just fine. Love of money rules officially rules college football I guess.

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Real.Men.Wear.Blue - 2008/05/01 07:59

MizzouCoug wrote:

Sage wrote:

"If it isn't broke," White said, "don't fix it."

Wow. This line is a joke, right? I've never met a soul who believes the BCS is just fine. Love of money rules officially rules college football I guess.

Remember that this is a meeting of BCS conference presidents, not fans. Whether fans like it or not, the BCS schools, conferences, and their presidents are raking in the cash. So, in their dirty minds, the system is anything but "broke." It's going to take something drastic to convince these jokers to cut off their own gravy train.

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/05/01 08:24

Yeah it just made me think of our current POTUS options; not one of them has any connection to the average "fan." They are just people who are so high up there (in their own minds) that they think they know better than anyone else what the answers are. They don't represent me and neither do these bozos in charge of the BCS.

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by frdbtr - 2008/05/01 08:33

Is anyone REALLY suprised by the result of these meetings?

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Yndian - 2008/05/01 08:59

Sage wrote:

"The seeded model looked like a playoff, and we don't think a playoff is in the best interest of college football," he said.

Because it sure hasn't worked out for professional football... What he meant to say is it's not in the best interest of the conferences already making all the money, and winning all the championships. I think they look at wild-card teams winning the Super Bowl and have nightmares about Tulsa in the national title game.

The concern about a playoff among college football's leaders is that it would make football a two-semester sport and would lessen the importance of a regular season that now has a do-or-die feel to it from week to week.

I looked around at the 2009 schedule for BYU plus one school from each BCS conference (and ND). In 2009, BYU starts classes on the 5th of January. Ohio State starts on the 5th as well. USC doesn't start until the 12th. LSU starts on the 12th. West Virginia starts on the 12th. Notre Dame starts on the 13th. Texas doesn't start until the 20th(?!). Virginia Tech doesn't start until the 20th. Since 2006, the BCS Title game is ALWAYS on the 7th or 8th.

And they're complaining about a two-semester sport?!? A lot of schools don't start classes until after the title game anyway! And if any school felt like their football players should really be in class (or, in a lot of cases, at home on Christmas break) on that day, I would have no problem releasing them from their obligation to play in the title game.

Pure B_S.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Yndian - 2008/05/01 09:01

Oh, and as for lessening the importance of the regular season, I guess it would do that for all the teams that can just coast through their schedule into the top 4 at the end of the year without really trying. :dry:

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Yndian - 2008/05/01 09:04

And I guess what they meant to say was it would lessen the importance of all but two weeks of the regular season. Go ahead and lose on a couple of weekends and they'll still let you in the title game (if they feel like it). In that case it's really a do-or-die-or-die-again-but-then-do situation.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/01 09:04

frdbtr wrote:

Is anyone REALLY suprised by the result of these meetings?

Yes and No.

Yes, I'm suprised every time I watch college football and I'm reminded that nobody has shot down the bcs cartel that makes millions in the free market off of college athletes who are denied their share of the revenue and are limited by strict regulations meant to "protect" their college education.

No, I'm not surprised that the powers that run the Business of College Sports values money more than collegiate athletes.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by stjohsmythe - 2008/05/01 10:10

Interesting to read the mission statement of the NCAA and compare it to this article:

Our MissionCore Ideology

The NCAA's core ideology consists of two notions: core purpose - the organization's reason for being - and core values - essential and enduring principles that guide an organization.

Core Purpose

Our purpose is to govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount.

Core Values

The Association - through its member institutions, conferences and national office staff - shares a belief in and commitment to:

The collegiate model of athletics in which students participate as an avocation, balancing their academic, social and athletics experiences.

The highest levels of integrity and sportsmanship.

The pursuit of excellence in both academics and athletics.

The supporting role that intercollegiate athletics plays in the higher education mission and in enhancing the sense of community and strengthening the identity of member institutions.

An inclusive culture that fosters equitable participation for student-athletes and career opportunities for coaches and administrators from diverse backgrounds.

Respect for institutional autonomy and philosophical differences.

Presidential leadership of intercollegiate athletics at the campus, conference and national levels.

Sad that the NCAA has let college football fall into the hands of a private entity that couldn't care less about the purpose and values that the NCAA claims to uphold.

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by jaga97 - 2008/05/01 10:56

Our greedy little commissioner would fit in perfect with these tools. Screw the fans and athletes! Show me the money!

=====

Re:BCS Monopoly are getting away with it

Posted by Mars - 2008/05/02 04:52

stjohsmythe wrote:

Interesting to read the mission statement of the NCAA and compare it to this article:

Core Purpose

Our purpose is to govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount.

Aren't the two-facedness and lies of the NCAA simply amazing? They aren't willing to risk their place in things to try to win fair-play for all, and the money-makers don't want an even playing field either.

The BCS Motto is "Screw the Fans, Show Me the Money"

The NCAA Motto is "I ain't seen sh*t"
