
Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Cornellcoug - 2008/05/09 19:01

Check out this link about 1/2 way down the page about BYU.

<http://cfn.scout.com/2/753458.html>

It is interesting to me to see what they said about the 1996 team which I think was an amazing team and beat KSU in basically a home game for them as it was played in the cotton bowl, very close to their home compared to BYU. That is the year that BYU was shunned from the BCS and finished 5th in the nation.

It always amazes me how they understate BYU's victories versus big team and then understate the importance of a bcs teams loss to non-BCS teams.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by WACoug - 2008/05/09 19:19

Cornellcoug wrote:

Check out this link about 1/2 way down the page about BYU.

<http://cfn.scout.com/2/753458.html>

It is interesting to me to see what they said about the 1996 team which I think was an amazing team and beat KSU in basically a home game for them as it was played in the cotton bowl, very close to their home compared to BYU. That is the year that BYU was shunned from the BCS and finished 5th in the nation.

It always amazes me how they understate BYU's victories versus big team and then understate the importance of a bcs teams loss to non-BCS teams.

What I don't like is how they always assume that all things will remain equal. If we were in a BCS conference our recruits wouldn't have to worry about not playing on TV or being able to play for a national championship. Honestly, if you put the Mt. West BYU in a BCS conference I could see us being a Michigan State or UCLA type. But if BYU were truly a BCS team with BCS money and BCS exposure I think BYU would be quite a bit more than a perennial Michigan State or Maryland. :huh:

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/09 19:32

That guy doesn't know what he's talking about. If BYU were in the Big-10 they would have been undefeated at LES and would have lost 1 or 2 on the road. They would have finished #2.

BYU would consistently finish in the top 3 of the PAC-10.

This guy acts like the MWC schedule is a piece of cake. There are probably no more than a dozen teams in the country right now that could have gone undefeated in the MWC for the last 2 years like BYU did--and that's being generous. And, if you make those other teams play BYU (which BYU obviously didn't have to do) there are probably less than 8 that could have pulled off the feat, especially if playing BYU in LES.

ND would finish somewhere between UNLV and SDSU if they were in the MWC.

I'm a Michigan grad, and I hate the yewts, but when yewtah comes to Ann Arbor this fall I won't be surprised if Michigan gets introduced to the MWC in a way they don't enjoy. The BcS isn't all that great. Just ask Appalachian St.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/05/10 08:42

The major problem I have is the designation BCS vs. nonBCS is sloppy. Yes, by and large BCS conferences are better and more difficult to navigate top to bottom, but they all don't carry the same degree of difficulty.

For example, I agree if BYU had a schedule similar to an average Pac-10 team. Their record would be significantly worse. That schedule IS a grind. Consider that every Pac-10 team plays 9 conference games and most play at least one VERY good nonconference game. No Pac-10 team has finished the season with less than 2 losses since they went to this kind of schedule.

However, if BYU played a Big East schedule of 7 conference games, half of which were Conference USA teams only 2 years ago, and the remainder of the schedule cupcake city against 1-AA opponents and service academies then their record would be much the same as it has been the last 2 years.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Isola - 2008/05/12 09:37

WACoug wrote:

What I don't like is how they always assume that all things will remain equal. If we were in a BCS conference our recruits wouldn't have to worry about not playing on TV or being able to play for a national championship. Honestly, if you put the Mt. West BYU in a BCS conference I could see us being a Michigan State or UCLA type. But if BYU were truly a BCS team with BCS money and BCS exposure I think BYU would be quite a bit more than a perennial Michigan State or Maryland. :huh:

I totally agree. If you look at the former CUSA teams that got the BCS badge a couple years back, all three have seen significant improvements. BYU and Utah would have compared favorably with South Florida, Cincinnati and even Louisville before they joined the Big East, and even now in many regards. The difference is that they were positioned well geographically, because it put them right in the midst of BCS conference upheaval.

Also it often comes down between BYU and a Pac 10 school for recruits and BYU wins over a lot of recruits but many also choose to go with the Pac 10 because of the BCS. Stick BYU in the Pac 10 and maybe Kaveinga sticks with his commitment to BYU instead of switching at the last minute to USC. I'm not saying that BYU would surpass USC, but the fact is that we already compete closely with the Pac 10 for recruits and if the playing field were leveled by being in the Pac 10, we would win more of those recruiting battles.

Plus how good would 's recruiting be if BYU were in the Pac 10 and they were in the MWC.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/05/12 10:39

I agree here. If BYU WERE to be in a "BCS" conference, they would be picking up those recruits that say, "I would rather be playing on TV and a shot a NC title", than be playing for a team that only appears half the time to only 1.5 million viewers scattered through Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho....

Recruiting and TV coverage WOULD make a difference in how BYU would play. Give them a couple of years, and they would more than likely be in the Top 3 in ANY BCS conference (other than the SEC).

As for that "homer" that wrote the article, that 1996 was a VERY GOOD team. They came within a TD of beating UW on their field and go undefeated. As for the 2001 team, they just out-scored everyone until they got the wind knocked out of them by being turned down. I believe we had the option to drop the Miss St. game - we should have done that, even with the win. Luke Staley broke his ankle at the end and Doman and Mahe were banged up. (We probably should have dropped the Hawaii game, as well - I think we had an option on that, as well, IIRC...)

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/12 11:02

mormonrasta wrote:

Consider that every Pac-10 team plays 9 conference games and most play at least one VERY good nonconference

game. No Pac-10 team has finished the season with less than 2 losses since they went to this kind of schedule.

Your sample size of two years is a bit small.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Slugger - 2008/05/12 11:56

I haven't even read the article yet but just the thought of someone dissing the 1996 team gets me all fired up! That was a great team. Too bad they let that one game get away from them at Washington. But they still set the NCAA record for victories in a season with 14. I would suspect, giving the law of averages, that even the vaunted BCS teams and nat'l champion winners would likely lose a game if they were pushing their schedules to 15 games. I love watching that team, they were so solid all around. James Dye was a playmaker in every sense of the word. Keep in mind, their first game in the Kickoff Classic (or was it the Pigskin Classic?) was against Texas A&M which was the pre-season #1 for that year. Technically speaking, BYU has knocked off two #1's in their history. BYU is doing the best with what they have to work with. Given the same tools and resources, they would compete fine in "BCS Land". No matter how you dice it, we did squash Oregon by 30 points, that deserves some level of respect.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Mingjai - 2008/05/15 12:49

Slugger wrote:

I haven't even read the article yet but just the thought of someone dissing the 1996 team gets me all fired up! That was a great team. Too bad they let that one game get away from them at Washington. But they still set the NCAA record for victories in a season with 14. I would suspect, giving the law of averages, that even the vaunted BCS teams and nat'l champion winners would likely lose a game if they were pushing their schedules to 15 games. I love watching that team, they were so solid all around. James Dye was a playmaker in every sense of the word. Keep in mind, their first game in the Kickoff Classic (or was it the Pigskin Classic?) was against Texas A&M which was the pre-season #1 for that year. Technically speaking, BYU has knocked off two #1's in their history. BYU is doing the best with what they have to work with. Given the same tools and resources, they would compete fine in "BCS Land". No matter how you dice it, we did squash Oregon by 30 points, that deserves some level of respect.

I'm one that thinks that the 1996 team was BYU's best team ever, but just one point of order--A&M was ranked #14 preseason, which is why BYU barely cracked the top 25 after their win in the Pigskin Classic.

Back to the article, I don't have as many problems with it as many here do. On the '96 team, though the team beat some big name competition, it still lost to #16 Washington and struggled in the Cotton Bowl against #14 Kansas State. Despite being ranked #5, I think the team would have struggled against Florida (#1), Ohio State (#2), Florida State (#3), Arizona State (#4), and Nebraska (#6). They weren't especially overrated though as the writer suggests (I'd rank them at #6 behind Nebraska). Regarding the 2001 team, I wouldn't put the 2001 team in the top 5 of BYU's all-time teams (maybe not even the top 10, but I'd have to think about it).

As far as the hypothetical of putting BYU in a BCS conference, I'd agree that in any given year, if you plucked BYU from the MWC and put them in the Pac 10 or Big XII for that year, they'd finish in the 3-4 range. But as people have discussed, that whole concept is oversimplified because if BYU were a member of a BCS conference, BYU would recruit much better and hence be able to challenge for the conference championship within a few years.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by declocoog - 2008/05/15 16:27

Mingjai wrote:

Slugger wrote:

I haven't even read the article yet but just the thought of someone dissing the 1996 team gets me all fired up! That was a great team. Too bad they let that one game get away from them at Washington. But they still set the NCAA record for victories in a season with 14. I would suspect, giving the law of averages, that even the vaunted BCS teams and nat'l

champion winners would likely lose a game if they were pushing their schedules to 15 games. I love watching that team, they were so solid all around. James Dye was a playmaker in every sense of the word. Keep in mind, their first game in the Kickoff Classic (or was it the Pigskin Classic?) was against Texas A&M which was the pre-season #1 for that year. Technically speaking, BYU has knocked off two #1's in their history. BYU is doing the best with what they have to work with. Given the same tools and resources, they would compete fine in "BCS Land". No matter how you dice it, we did squash Oregon by 30 points, that deserves some level of respect.

I'm one that thinks that the 1996 team was BYU's best team ever, but just one point of order--A&M was ranked #14 preseason, which is why BYU barely cracked the top 25 after their win in the Pigskin Classic.

Back to the article, I don't have as many problems with it as many here do. On the '96 team, though the team beat some big name competition, it still lost to #16 Washington and struggled in the Cotton Bowl against #14 Kansas State. Despite being ranked #5, I think the team would have struggled against Florida (#1), Ohio State (#2), Florida State (#3), Arizona State (#4), and Nebraska (#6). They weren't especially overrated though as the writer suggests (I'd rank them at #6 behind Nebraska). Regarding the 2001 team, I wouldn't put the 2001 team in the top 5 of BYU's all-time teams (maybe not even the top 10, but I'd have to think about it).

As far as the hypothetical of putting BYU in a BCS conference, I'd agree that in any given year, if you plucked BYU from the MWC and put them in the Pac 10 or Big XII for that year, they'd finish in the 3-4 range. But as people have discussed, that whole concept is oversimplified because if BYU were a member of a BCS conference, BYU would recruit much better and hence be able to challenge for the conference championship within a few years.

I'd have to add National Championship contender almost every year as well.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by CougarBandit - 2008/05/15 17:23

Mingjai wrote:

Back to the article, I don't have as many problems with it as many here do. On the '96 team, though the team beat some big name competition, it still lost to #16 Washington and struggled in the Cotton Bowl against #14 Kansas State. Despite being ranked #5, I think the team would have struggled against Florida (#1), Ohio State (#2), Florida State (#3), Arizona State (#4), and Nebraska (#6). They weren't especially overrated though as the writer suggests (I'd rank them at #6 behind Nebraska). Regarding the 2001 team, I wouldn't put the 2001 team in the top 5 of BYU's all-time teams (maybe not even the top 10, but I'd have to think about it).

True, they barely got past KSU, but they also had to beat the SEC refs who were determined to put upstart BYU in their proper place. I have never seen such a ridiculously biased refing job against BYU as in that game. :ohmy:

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Jarhead - 2008/05/15 20:09

I don't remember the specifics, but I still recall a couple of awfully officiated pass interference situations.

Great teams don't necessarily demolish their opposition every game. Just look at the national champions last year, or the patriots during the regular season last year. There have been many great teams that had to make it through a tight spot here and there. The bottom line is always wins and losses.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by domanater - 2008/05/15 21:06

CougarBandit wrote:

Mingjai wrote:

Back to the article, I don't have as many problems with it as many here do. On the '96 team, though the team beat some big name competition, it still lost to #16 Washington and struggled in the Cotton Bowl against #14 Kansas State. Despite being ranked #5, I think the team would have struggled against Florida (#1), Ohio State (#2), Florida State (#3), Arizona State (#4), and Nebraska (#6). They weren't especially overrated though as the writer suggests (I'd rank them at #6 behind Nebraska). Regarding the 2001 team, I wouldn't put the 2001 team in the top 5 of BYU's all-time teams (maybe not even the top 10, but I'd have to think about it).

True, they barely got past KSU, but they also had to beat the SEC refs who were determined to put upstart BYU in their proper place. I have never seen such a rediculously biased reffing job against BYU as in that game. :ohmy:

Kstate had 2 offensive series the whole game and the refs were robbing our receivers blind. It shouldn't have been close in the 1st place.

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/05/16 07:19

Here is another interesting link from the same site. Question #2

<http://cfn.scout.com/2/633167.html>

If each of the BCS conferences were going to add 1 mid major team, either by expanding or replacing a current team, who would go where? If each of the BCS conferences were going to add 1 mid major team, either by expanding or replacing a current team, who would go where?

Stupid punctuation problem! :angry:

I'm not going to retyp this. Notice four MWC teams are slotted into BCS conferences and all the WAC got was an honorable mention (BSU). One bit of irony is that he puts CSU in the BIG-12 (along with TCU) but AF, NW, and WY have all been better than CSU for several years now. I actually think that if the MWC were a BCS conference they would consistently be better than the Big East and be at least as good if not better than the ACC. I would actually put them on par with the Big 10.

I think it is amazing how well the MWC teams have done considering the disadvantages they must overcome before the first snap of the season.

My list would go

1. SEC
2. PAC10
3. BIG 12
4. BIG 10
4. MWC
6. ACC
7. Big East

If FLA St. and Miami ever recover-which I don't think they will-then they would be number four and the Big 10 and MWC would tie at 6. Of course by then TCU, Utah, and BYU would become very strong programs because of the BCS affiliation and might keep the conference at number four and possibly push for number 3. Other MWC teams would improve-NM, AF, WY, and to a lesser degree, SDS. I just don't see any hope for UNLV. John Robinson couldn't do much with them and I don't see Sanford doing any better. Regardless of what you think/thought of Robinson, he was a huge get for UNLV and still couldn't turn them around.

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Yzzazz - 2008/05/16 08:30

Which is why, despite travel costs and fan/rivalry issues for the first few years, BYU would be better off in the Big East.

They would dominate EVERY year.

=====

Re:Interesting take on BYU

Posted by Yzzazz - 2008/05/16 09:04

of any conference in America outside of the SEC and maybe the Big 12. This year

=====