
What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2008/05/01 12:56

I know, I can hear it already. Who cares about the NIT tournament or the CBwhatever that Utah played in. But toy with this idea with me for a minute. What if the non-cartel conferences aligned and put together their own play-off of sorts.

(In all honesty, the more I type, the lamer this sounds, but what the heck, it's the off-season and I'm ticked off at the monopoly that is the BcS)

C-USA, MAC, MWC, WAC, & SunBelt are the conferences to seed from. Also, include Army, Navy, Western Kentucky and Notre Dame (They wouldn't qualify lately though :laugh:)

Decide how many teams. Decide on what basis they are ranked (record, sos, ranking, etc)

Choose which bowl games are the best with which these conferences already have ties.

Then decide when to hold the tourney.

Like I said, it may sound lame but there are still sponsors not in the BcS mess that may be willing to come on board and help make it happen. Oh, and so we're not accused by the BcS of being exclusive we MAY allow a qualifying BcS team that didn't make the BcS games to play in one of our games (ie. Missouri last season, BC, etc.) but they would have to take a significant payout cut in order to play in "our" games!:laugh:

Go Cougs!!!

=====

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by TimO - 2008/05/01 13:12

good call, perhaps we could call it the NBS, the non-bull shiz championship series, of course we wouldn't be able to allow BcS teams in until after a few years of complete exclusion like they kept BYU out in 96, that's only fair.

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2008/05/01 13:52

TimO wrote:

good call, perhaps we could call it the NBS, the non-bull shiz championship series, of course we wouldn't be able to allow BcS teams in until after a few years of complete exclusion like they kept BYU out in 96, that's only fair. And '01!

Go Cougs!!!

=====

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by Isola - 2008/05/01 15:29

I'm in favor of upping the requirements for Div 1A (I would say FBS but if we are pushing for a championship game it doesn't make sense to call it Football Bowl Subdivision), which would effectively create a new lower level of competition, but I don't think BYU would be in the lower level. It just doesn't make sense to me that schools that pull in 110K to home games and have athletic budgets upwards of \$40 million are in the same division as schools that only pull in 15K to home games and have a budget of \$10 million.

Of course the stricter requirements would drop some of our MWC mates down a level, but it would also eliminate some "BCS" schools that do absolutely nothing in football.

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by jhw5 - 2008/05/01 15:32

I have loved this idea since someone brought it up last off-season. I'm too young to remember, but apparently the NIT was all the rave back in the day, until the NCAA saw how much money they could make by creating what we now have for BBall.

My question is, why not? When t.v. broadcasting companies start jumping the Cartel ship for a tourney that is gaining popularity (and \$\$\$), the Cartel will suddenly have an epiphone (sp?) that a playoff is the way to go.

Does someone know a university pres and AD that we can suggest this to? I am not convinced that the Cartel is the know-all, be-all of college DI football that we have somehow set them up to be.

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/05/01 16:27

jhw5 wrote:

I have loved this idea since someone brought it up last off-season. I'm too young to remember, but apparently the NIT was all the rave back in the day, until the NCAA saw how much money they could make by creating what we now have for BBall.

My question is, why not? When t.v. broadcasting companies start jumping the Cartel ship for a tourney that is gaining popularity (and \$\$\$), the Cartel will suddenly have an epiphone (sp?) that a playoff is the way to go.

Does someone know a university pres and AD that we can suggest this to? I am not convinced that the Cartel is the know-all, be-all of college DI football that we have somehow set them up to be.

The problem is that the basketball example existed in a simpler time. While athletic conferences existed, they existed only to facilitate regular season play, and they had no say over OOC or pre/post season matters.

The scene with the BCS is drastically different. You have universities locked into conferences which are locked into bowl berths and tv contracts. The best tournament you could conceivably offer would be a plus-one format within the existing bowl system as there are not enough bowl eligible teams to fill three additional games. Then, to get quality teams worth watching, you have to payoff the bowls to which they are bound to release them, and when all is said and done the best you are going to have is a playoff for the #5 or so placement every year. That's not going to draw eyes away from what the BCS offers.

Either the BCS needs to be altered and made into the solution, or the entire bowl system needs to be dismantled in favor of a playoff.

=====

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by jaga97 - 2008/05/01 16:34

I have suggested this several times in other posts. No pussy footin either, call it the NCAA championship or the CFC.

Of course there are some negatives to the move.

What would the BCS do with the current inclusion if the other conferences made the move?

Would it really be as intriguing without the undefeated teams i.e. Hawaii, Boise State, and Utah in the respective year?

For me, I would enjoy watching extra BYU games every year. Some people want to play the games against big programs on the BCS stage. Personally, I don't care about Utah beating a mediocre Pittsburgh or Hawaii not hanging with whoever they played last year. What is the point of ending the season playing for 4th place and never losing a game.

=====

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/05/01 17:08

What a playoff featuring the 5 nonBCS conferences and independents would do is kill the smaller bowls. Because then you are talking about the best teams from the nonBCS conferences not playing in these smaller bowl games which trivializes them more than they already are.

This would eventually hurt the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place teams in nonBCS conferences because there would be no bowl games for them to play in. It is not worth the sacrifice to crown a "champion" that few would take seriously because the best college football team chose not to participate.

=====

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/05/01 17:10

There are so many problems with this idea that I don't know where to begin. Ammon, you've been around when we've talked about this proposal before.

Firstly, this is exactly what the BCS conferences would want. Then they could continue to hoard the money, talent, and tv even more than they do now.

Secondly, there already is a second level playoff system called the FCS. How popular is that? I think the championship game gets on television, but that is about it. We'd become the FCS without even a thought by the press as to whether the teams play good football, appalachian state included.

Thirdly, the talent would gravitate to the FBS-BCS schools. BYU has trouble competing with USC now, think how much more difficult it will be to compete with UCLA, Oregon, and Colorado should BYU step down in football competition, which is what would happen by separating from the BCS conferences.

Fourthly, TV would focus more on the haves, who would then have even more. No more mtn. deal, which as bad as it is, is infinitely better than what the MWC could get if they pulled out of the FBS.

Fifthly, coaching would suffer. All the good coaches would leave for the BCS teams, where now, coaches like Mendenhall actually stay in the MWC because they are at least competitive with the BCS conferences and even better than more than half of the BCS teams, regardless of being in the MWC and not one of the BCS conferences.

Lastly, the ABA and AFL all folded even though they could compete with the NBA and NFL on salary. Since there is no salary in college football payed to the players, there is no advantage gained by separating. The best players will continue going to the dominate schools, ad nauseum.

The only way to beat the BCS and break it is to play them and beat them. Without Congressional intervention, there is no other way.

=====

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/01 17:11

I'm ok with it, so long as we had rules regarding bowl eligibility similar to now...

Only one game against a BCS school can be counted towards meeting the requisite six wins.

We change the maximum # of scholarships so that it exceeds the number allowed for BCS schools as follows:

1. For each recruit, rated 4 stars or better by the two top rating services, that signs a committment letter and sticks with it, the school is allowed 1/2 additional scholarship (recruiting incentive reward) the following year.
2. We allow boosters to subsidize the "student athlete's" income with phone jobs and gifts - they just all have to be declared.
3. Every non-injured player that has started at least 10 games at a BCS school is allowed to transfer without penalty and

the school that he transfers to is awarded 1/2 additional scholarship the following year.

We don't play mid-week games.

We have our own combined (all five non-BCS conf) sports broadcast network with exclusive broadcast rights for all the non-BCS conf sports. :P

The new sports network negotiates broadcast contracts that guarantee broad based coverage.

To limit future growth we prohibit admission of any "research universities" (including those with just a medical school). ;)

Once in a while we allow a BCS school to play for the championship, but reserve the right to arbitrarily change that rule at any time.

Good thing they haven't put me in charge... B) :cheer: :laugh:

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/01 17:18

CougarPeasant wrote:

There are so many problems with this idea that I don't know where to begin. Ammon, you've been around when we've talked about this proposal before.

Firstly, this is exactly what the BCS conferences would want. Then they could continue to hoard the money, talent, and tv even more than they do now.

Secondly, there already is a second level playoff system called the FCS. How popular is that? I think the championship game gets on television, but that is about it. We'd become the FCS without even a thought by the press as to whether the teams play good football, appalachian state included.

Thirdly, the talent would gravitate to the FBS-BCS schools. BYU has trouble competing with USC now, think how much more difficult it will be to compete with UCLA, Oregon, and Colorado should BYU step down in football competition, which is what would happen by separating from the BCS conferences.

Fourthly, TV would focus more on the haves, who would then have even more. No more mtn. deal, which as bad as it is, is infinitely better than what the MWC could get if they pulled out of the FBS.

Fifthly, coaching would suffer. All the good coaches would leave for the BCS teams, where now, coaches like Mendenhall actually stay in the MWC because they are at least competitive with the BCS conferences and even better than more than half of the BCS teams, regardless of being in the MWC and not one of the BCS conferences.

Lastly, the ABA and AFL all folded even though they could compete with the NBA and NFL on salary. Since there is no salary in college football payed to the players, there is no advantage gained by separating. The best players will continue going to the dominate schools, ad nauseum.

The only way to beat the BCS and break it is to play them and beat them. Without Congressional intervention, there is no other way.

The minor bowls would suffer if the non-BCS restricted the number of OOC games against BCS schools. How many Big Least, Big 10 or SEC schools would be bowl eligible if then couldn't pad their schedule with extra home games against the non-BCS schools. At the very least mandate that only home-and-home contracts are allowed, none of this "two for us and one for you" crap.

BTW, your ABA & AFL examples don't fit. The AFL did not fold. It was so successful that the NFL found it necessary to propose a merger.

Even the ABA, though far less successful, managed to get several of their teams into the NBA through a limited merger (more like a leveraged buy-out).

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by stjohmsmythe - 2008/05/01 17:22

The NIT was (and still is) a private entity very similar to the BCS, and has no actual affiliation with the NCAA. The NCAA was able to relegate the NIT into obscurity by creating their own tournament, so why couldn't (or should I say won't) they do the same thing to the BCS? Does the BCS kick money back to the NCAA? Why would the NCAA sit back and let the BCS rake in all the cash, while sitting back and not even officially recognizing a national champion in football?

If they had started a tournament this year (this is hypothetical - I know all of these teams' conferences have contracts with bowls) teams like Missouri, Florida, Texas, BYU, Boston College, Auburn, Tennessee, Boise State, and a bunch of others could have participated. These teams aren't a bunch of scrubs that wouldn't generate any interest either, plus with almost every sports fan and sports journalist clamoring for a playoff, this thing would catch fire sooner rather than later. Maybe you would miss out on a few teams like USC, OSU, and LSU for the first couple of years, and you'd also have to wait for a bunch of lesser bowl contracts to expire, but the interest, money, and TV ratings the tournament would take away from the BCS would hurt their revenues, and they would slowly fade....just like the NIT did.

BTW, have any of you visited the BCS website lately? On the front page under the heading of "BCS news" are 5 headlines, four of which are anti-playoff-pro-BCS propaganda....looks like they might be nervous about something. <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfootball/>

Re:What about a

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/05/01 17:28

Conosticator wrote:

The minor bowls would suffer if the non-BCS restricted the number of OOC games against BCS schools. How many Big Least, Big 10 or SEC schools would be bowl eligible if then couldn't pad their schedule with extra home games against the non-BCS schools. At the very least mandate that only home-and-home contracts are allowed, none of this "two for us and one for you" crap.

BTW, your ABA & AFL examples don't fit. The AFL did not fold. It was so successful that the NFL found it necessary to propose a merger.

Even the ABA, though far less successful, managed to get several of their teams into the NBA through a limited merger (more like a leveraged buy-out).

Hey, no poking holes in my detailed analysis! ;)

Actually, the ABA was bankrupt and was lucky the NBA took the teams they did. The NBA was hurting badly then as well and needed the successful franchises from the ABA to switch so they wouldn't have to expand into those cities and dilute the competition even more so.

The AFL can be considered a success of sorts, but that was because they showed that pro football was viable outside the monopoly the NFL had. What made them successful to some extent against the NFL was that they could compete for players. They payed much higher salaries than the NFL was willing to pay, which cannot be done in college football. That was my main point.

The idea of separating from the FBS really is still born if you want to compete at the highest level of college football.

Re:What about a

Posted by stjohmsmythe - 2008/05/01 17:30

mormonrasta wrote:

What a playoff featuring the 5 nonBCS conferences and independents would do is kill the smaller bowls. Because then you are talking about the best teams from the nonBCS conferences not playing in these smaller bowl games which trivializes them more than they already are.

This would eventually hurt the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place teams in nonBCS conferences because there would be no bowl games for them to play in. It is not worth the sacrifice to crown a "champion" that few would take seriously because the

best college football team chose not to participate.

Could they really be trivialized more than they already are? Back before every team with a .500 record got into a bowl game, the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place teams in nonBCS conferences didn't get into a bowl anyway. Do we really want to sacrifice a playoff so that we can save a bunch of watered down mediocre bowl games? Rewarding the top team in each conference with a tournament berth would make the regular season just as important as it is now. Besides, I would guess that several lower tier bowls would adapt to the change in the market and survive.

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/01 17:31

stjohnsmythe wrote:

The NIT was (and still is) a private entity very similar to the BCS, and has no actual affiliation with the NCAA. The NCAA was able to relegate the NIT into obscurity by creating their own tournament, so why couldn't (or should I say won't) they do the same thing to the BCS? Does the BCS kick money back to the NCAA? Why would the NCAA sit back and let the BCS rake in all the cash, while sitting back and not even officially recognizing a national champion in football?

If they had started a tournament this year (this is hypothetical - I know all of these teams' conferences have contracts with bowls) teams like Missouri, Florida, Texas, BYU, Boston College, Auburn, Tennessee, Boise State, and a bunch of others could have participated. These teams aren't a bunch of scrubs that wouldn't generate any interest either, plus with almost every sports fan and sports journalist clamoring for a playoff, this thing would catch fire sooner rather than later. Maybe you would miss out on a few teams like USC, OSU, and LSU for the first couple of years, and you'd also have to wait for a bunch of lesser bowl contracts to expire, but the interest, money, and TV ratings the tournament would take away from the BCS would hurt their revenues, and they would slowly fade....just like the NIT did.

BTW, have any of you visited the BCS website lately? On the front page under the heading of "BCS news" are 5 headlines, four of which are anti-playoff-pro-BCS propaganda....looks like they might be nervous about something.
<http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfootball/>

Now days the NIT is fully owned and operated by the NCAA. It is "private" only in the sense that the NCAA is "private".

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by stjohnsmythe - 2008/05/01 17:33

Conosticator wrote:

stjohnsmythe wrote:

The NIT was (and still is) a private entity very similar to the BCS, and has no actual affiliation with the NCAA. The NCAA was able to relegate the NIT into obscurity by creating their own tournament, so why couldn't (or should I say won't) they do the same thing to the BCS? Does the BCS kick money back to the NCAA? Why would the NCAA sit back and let the BCS rake in all the cash, while sitting back and not even officially recognizing a national champion in football?

If they had started a tournament this year (this is hypothetical - I know all of these teams' conferences have contracts with bowls) teams like Missouri, Florida, Texas, BYU, Boston College, Auburn, Tennessee, Boise State, and a bunch of others could have participated. These teams aren't a bunch of scrubs that wouldn't generate any interest either, plus with almost every sports fan and sports journalist clamoring for a playoff, this thing would catch fire sooner rather than later. Maybe you would miss out on a few teams like USC, OSU, and LSU for the first couple of years, and you'd also have to wait for a bunch of lesser bowl contracts to expire, but the interest, money, and TV ratings the tournament would take away from the BCS would hurt their revenues, and they would slowly fade....just like the NIT did.

BTW, have any of you visited the BCS website lately? On the front page under the heading of "BCS news" are 5 headlines, four of which are anti-playoff-pro-BCS propaganda....looks like they might be nervous about something.
<http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfootball/>

Now days the NIT is fully owned and operated by the NCAA. It is "private" only in the sense that the NCAA is "private".

thanks for the info...but in it's heyday it was a private company like the BCS

=====

Re:What about a

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/05/01 17:39

Actually, the NCAA owns the NIT. Link here.

The reason the NCAA is impotent in running college football is because of the US Supreme Court. The CFA rose up after the SC's landmark decision that said the colleges owned the broadcast rights to the football games, not the NCAA. Once that came down, it eventually evolved to the current state of the BCS. There are threads around here that go through history. We've talked about this issue a number of times with no clear solution other than beat the BCS teams head to head.

stjohnsmythe wrote:

The NIT was (and still is) a private entity very similar to the BCS, and has no actual affiliation with the NCAA. The NCAA was able to relegate the NIT into obscurity by creating their own tournament, so why couldn't (or should I say won't) they do the same thing to the BCS? Does the BCS kick money back to the NCAA? Why would the NCAA sit back and let the BCS rake in all the cash, while sitting back and not even officially recognizing a national champion in football?

If they had started a tournament this year (this is hypothetical - I know all of these teams' conferences have contracts with bowls) teams like Missouri, Florida, Texas, BYU, Boston College, Auburn, Tennessee, Boise State, and a bunch of others could have participated. These teams aren't a bunch of scrubs that wouldn't generate any interest either, plus with almost every sports fan and sports journalist clamoring for a playoff, this thing would catch fire sooner rather than later. Maybe you would miss out on a few teams like USC, OSU, and LSU for the first couple of years, and you'd also have to wait for a bunch of lesser bowl contracts to expire, but the interest, money, and TV ratings the tournament would take away from the BCS would hurt their revenues, and they would slowly fade....just like the NIT did.

BTW, have any of you visited the BCS website lately? On the front page under the heading of "BCS news" are 5 headlines, four of which are anti-playoff-pro-BCS propaganda....looks like they might be nervous about something. <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfootball/>

Re:What about a

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/05/01 17:59

stjohnsmythe wrote:

Could they really be trivialized more than they already are? Back before every team with a .500 record got into a bowl game, the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place teams in nonBCS conferences didn't get into a bowl anyway. Do we really want to sacrifice a playoff so that we can save a bunch of watered down mediocre bowl games? Rewarding the top team in each conference with a tournament berth would make the regular season just as important as it is now. Besides, I would guess that several lower tier bowls would adapt to the change in the market and survive.

I think they are worth saving. I think the smaller bowls have increased the strength of the smaller conferences. Many of these schools would NEVER get a chance to play on ESPN or ESPN2 if it weren't for the smaller bowls. This would hurt their overall exposure.

I think the Humanitarian Bowl played a large part in Boise State's success. They virtually had an extra nationally televised game each year which allowed them to outreruit their peers.

I believe the New Mexico Bowl could be a similar thing for New Mexico. Their 30 year streaks of bowl ineptitude and going winless against the Pac-10 ended this last season which probably wouldn't have happened if they were not a frequent visitor to many of these minor bowls.

And think of the kind of playoff that we would be sacrificing for. It is not worth getting rid of these smaller bowl games so we can have a playoff that doesn't include the best teams in the country. That doesn't help anyone.

Re:What about a

Posted by scott715 - 2008/05/01 20:37

I would not support forming a new division however I like the idea of an NIT playoff. Keep the bowls and then take the top 4 teams with 2 games to the championship. The other choice is seed 4 teams within the bowls then have one more game for the championship. Ideally you would have the bigger teams playing and get public interest. Last year you could have had BSU vs BYU (Hawaii was in the BCS) which could have drawn well and on the other side you could have had UCF vs Navy. The Sunbelt and Mid-America conference is just too much behind the other conferences to get good enough teams. Having BYU in their could help to make this playoff go. BSU after their BCS bowl last year would have been a good fit.

Re:What about a

Posted by scott715 - 2008/05/01 20:55

I took a look at Sagarin's rating and come up with these possibilities from last year with their rankings:

BYU	17
APP St. (Div AA)	44
Cen FL U	46
Boise St	48
Troy	53
Navy	74

Interesting that Southern, a Div AA conference, was higher ranked than the Conf USA, Sunbelt and Mid-America conferences.

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by jaga97 - 2008/05/02 14:59

I don't care a lick about the BCS money. Doesn't it suck that if BYU runs the table this year they will end up playing some team for 4th place. Who gives a crap about the Las Vegas and New Mexico Bowls. I could care less if those bowls disappeared tomorrow. ESPN or CBS would pay money to have teams in a football playoff. I guarantee they would pay more than they do for the rights to the Poinsetta or Jack's Truck Stop bowl.

The comparison of the Division 2 playoffs is not relative. The schools in Division 2 do not have the same fan base.

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by splitbamboo - 2008/05/02 16:03

If the top one or two teams play in a BCS bowl, what value would crowning a champion in a football NIT be?

Sounds like a worthless proposition to me...

Re:What about a \"Non-BcS\" Championship

Posted by rackem - 2008/05/02 17:02

The BCS will never be a good forum for a national champion to emerge; the proponents all say that they are putting #1 against #2. But how can a poll decide that? If teams are matched up against one another with conference champions competing for the ring, then and only then can it be said there is a true National Champion. Opinions are just that, opinions, the proof is played out on the gridiron. There are 119 universities that comprise of "X" amount of conferences and independents in this Division, adding an at-large winner in a second tier conference that "has as much right to a National Championship bid as the rest" could compete for this prize.

It's true that the season-ending 64-team tournament diminishes college basketball's regular season. For the most part, all that matters are the conference tournaments and the Final Four. But, under a football playoff, conference play would count more than ever. If you can't win your conference, you can't play for the national title.

Who gave these BCS morons so much power to screw this up beyond belief?

The answer is to give the NCAA power to disband the BCS all together and turn the system into a play-off system rather than coddling to these 8 proponents of a system that is flawed

Re:What about a

Posted by kiwibacon - 2008/05/02 17:07

jaga97 wrote:

I don't care a lick about the BCS money. Doesn't it suck that if BYU runs the table this year they will end up playing some team for 4th place. Who gives a crap about the Las Vegas and New Mexico Bowls. I could care less if those bowls disappeared tomorrow. ESPN or CBS would pay money to have teams in a football playoff. I guarantee they would pay more than they do for the rights to the Poinsetta or Jack's Truck Stop bowl.

The comparison of the Division 2 playoffs is not relative. The schools in Division 2 do not have the same fan base. I was thinking the same thing much less the same facilities, attendance, etc...

Re:What about a

Posted by rackem - 2008/05/02 17:20

kiwibacon wrote:

jaga97 wrote:

I don't care a lick about the BCS money. Doesn't it suck that if BYU runs the table this year they will end up playing some team for 4th place. Who gives a crap about the Las Vegas and New Mexico Bowls. I could care less if those bowls disappeared tomorrow. ESPN or CBS would pay money to have teams in a football playoff. I guarantee they would pay more than they do for the rights to the Poinsetta or Jack's Truck Stop bowl.

The comparison of the Division 2 playoffs is not relative. The schools in Division 2 do not have the same fan base. I was thinking the same thing much less the same facilities, attendance, etc...

Isn't the purpose of a play-off, to see who is the best team, period? I don't care if the team draws 5,000 spectators. If they beat the other guy, that's it. They're the best. Take Appalachian State over Michigan. I'm not sure how many people they draw to their games, but it's not as many as the Wolverines. It just made a bunch more people upset is all.