
Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by byunlvfan - 2008/06/27 22:24

I don't know if this has already been posted, but I ran across it and thought I'd bring it to the board in case any of you have missed it. Link:

<http://bleacherreport.com/articles/32799-pac-10-an-exhaustive-examination-of-expansion-options>

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/06/27 23:21

Pretty interesting. I'm curious about how accurate the statement "BYU has less than 20, but it is still considered by Carnegie to be a Research University" is since all I have ever heard is that they are not a "research institution".

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by TimO - 2008/06/27 23:40

i don't like your screen name, but had to give you karma for that find. It was nice to have a read like that. I wondered about a couple accuracies but for the most part seemed right. BYU is a great leader, and it feels nice to be a BCS school in a non-bcs world. At least according to crazy sonny lubbick

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by CougarCommy - 2008/06/27 23:46

imuakahuku wrote:

Pretty interesting. I'm curious about how accurate the statement "BYU has less than 20, but it is still considered by Carnegie to be a Research University" is since all I have ever heard is that they are not a "research institution".

FSN mentioned BYU as a bcs buster and also said if BYU can win a bowl that the pac-10 wouldn't hesitate to expand with BYU and either utah/tcu possibilities to join. But also said BYU was one of the highest research uni's and that BYU graduates more students per class than anywhere else non-bcs

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by SkumBucket - 2008/06/28 00:50

imuakahuku wrote:

Pretty interesting. I'm curious about how accurate the statement "BYU has less than 20, but it is still considered by Carnegie to be a Research University" is since all I have ever heard is that they are not a "research institution".

guess i must have gone to one of those stellar pac-10 schools. i count 25 doctoral programs at BYU (not counting jd). <http://www.byu.edu/gradstudies/programs/dprograms.php>

hold on, i'll do some more research - if i can find a pac-10 school that will count it toward my degree.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by iShowsToGo.com - 2008/06/28 02:37

I believe the Pac-10 commissioner has already said they are not looking to expand any time soon. For my interpretation

of that, it means not until 2015 will anything happen. Maybe by then BYU will have enough good seasons in football and basketball, that the Pac-10 will want to take BYU and Utah. Any other choices seem illogical. Nobody else comes close. Plus, it seems like each Pac-10 school is in it with its rival, OSU & Oregon, USC & UCLA, so you can't take BYU without Utah. They would dominate the Utah/Salt Lake media market if they took both schools.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Metal Bubba - 2008/06/28 06:31

SkumBucket wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

Pretty interesting. I'm curious about how accurate the statement "BYU has less than 20, but it is still considered by Carnegie to be a Research University" is since all I have ever heard is that they are not a "research institution".

guess i must have gone to one of those stellar pac-10 schools. i count 25 doctoral programs at BYU (not counting jd).

Why not count JD? Juris Doctor? Come on... you sound like my dad! He got a PhD in OB at IU and when I tell him I'd like to be called "Dr. Bubba" he gets his panties in a wad. "A law degree it NOT a doctorate"... hahahaha! I had to do 3 very tough years of graduate school AND had to do research papers and oral examinations... just like him. WTF? :laugh:

Good article though. I just don't see it happening... EVER. The discussion was already 10 years old when I was at BYU in the early 90s. I lack faith.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/28 08:37

Metal Bubba wrote:

Good article though. I just don't see it happening... EVER. The discussion was already 10 years old when I was at BYU in the early 90s. I lack faith.

That article pointed out how much weaker the resume is of BYU and Utah compared to schools that are already in the BCS west of the Mississippi. The Pac-10 isn't expanding anytime soon.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Hengst - 2008/06/28 08:41

I count 26, from the BYU graduate studies list.

<http://www.byu.edu/gradstudies/programs/dprograms.php>

and 71 masters programs (that was a quick count though, so I could be off by a couple)

<http://www.byu.edu/gradstudies/programs/mprograms.php>

Also, I'm fairly sure that there is a Ph.D. program in theoretical psychology, but it wasn't on the list (I know some people that are in it). It's fairly new, so it may not be accredited yet which may be why it is not on the list.

http://www.cougarblue.com/images/fbfiles/images/Picture_1.png

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Hengst - 2008/06/28 08:45

oh, and FYI, for those of you that care. the U has approximately 70 (it was a quick count though so I may be off by a bit).

http://web.utah.edu/gradschool/catalog_programs.html

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by HoosierCougar - 2008/06/28 10:53

A fella can dream, can't he!

Do I hope it happens? ABSOLUTELY!

Do I believe it will happen? STRANGER THINGS HAVE COME TO PASS!

Can the academic "elites" swallow their pride and accept a university that focuses more on undergraduate education?
DEPENDS ON THEIR COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY;)

Can we hang with the PAC 10 talent... WITHOUT A DOUBT!:cheer: I foresee a potentially rocky start as we get up to speed with the travel, teams, venues, etc. Then we challenge for conf championship year after year after year...

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/28 11:15

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

Good article though. I just don't see it happening... EVER. The discussion was already 10 years old when I was at BYU in the early 90s. I lack faith.

That article pointed out how much weaker the resume is of BYU and Utah compared to schools that are already in the BCS west of the Mississippi. The Pac-10 isn't expanding anytime soon.

Except for weaker Pac-10 teams like WSU, of course.

Perhaps my biggest problem with the BCS isn't that USC and Texas get all the money/glory/etc., it's that the Baysors, WSU's, Dukes, Uconn's, Syracuses, Wake Forests, etc. get to ride the gravy train all the way. Those teams would give the UNLV's, SDSU's, San Jose States, and UAB's a lot of competition for the cellar-dweller positions in their respective conferences.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/28 11:19

iShowsToGo.com wrote:

I believe the Pac-10 commissioner has already said they are not looking to expand any time soon.

And then he retired.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by SkumBucket - 2008/06/28 12:08

BYUtx wrote:

iShowsToGo.com wrote:

I believe the Pac-10 commissioner has already said they are not looking to expand any time soon.

And then he retired.

too bad he and hair thompson didnt make it a joint event.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/28 12:55

BYUtx wrote:

Perhaps my biggest problem with the BCS isn't that USC and Texas get all the money/glory/etc., it's that the Baylors, WSU's, Dukes, Uconn's, Syracuses, Wake Forests, etc. get to ride the gravy train all the way. Those teams would give the UNLV's, SDSU's, San Jose States, and UAB's a lot of competition for the cellar-dweller positions in their respective conferences.

I don't know what they are gravy training. A million or two a year from the BCS? Who cares? That's not big money in today's college athletics. Many of those schools make up for their terrible football performances by being great in basketball and bring revenue to the conference in that way.

Those schools certainly don't get glory unless they beat the aforementioned Texas, USC, Florida type teams.

But that's why the BCS wasn't created for Duke, or Baylor, or Wake Forest. It was created for the 10 teams that are the most accomplished and most popular nationwide. They are Florida, Florida State, Miami, Michigan, Nebraska, Notre Dame, Oklahoma, Ohio State, Penn State, and USC. They have combined for 61% of the AP top 5 finishes over the last 30 years and not surprisingly 50% of all BCS bids.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/28 13:22

I disagree. More money, glory, membership in a BCS conference and the recruiting boost that that provides, etc. are things that the worst BCS teams flat out do not deserve.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Metal Bubba - 2008/06/28 14:03

BYUtx wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

Good article though. I just don't see it happening... EVER. The discussion was already 10 years old when I was at BYU in the early 90s. I lack faith.

That article pointed out how much weaker the resume is of BYU and Utah compared to schools that are already in the BCS west of the Mississippi. The Pac-10 isn't expanding anytime soon.

Except for weaker Pac-10 teams like WSU, of course.

Perhaps my biggest problem with the BCS isn't that USC and Texas get all the money/glory/etc., it's that the Baylors, WSU's, Dukes, Uconn's, Syracuses, Wake Forests, etc. get to ride the gravy train all the way. Those teams would give the UNLV's, SDSU's, San Jose States, and UAB's a lot of competition for the cellar-dweller positions in their respective conferences.

You do know that WF is a pre-season Top 25 team, is coming off back to back ranked seasons, an ACC championship in 2007 and that the entire ACC rode the Orange Bowl/BCS payday gravy train in 2007 thanks to WF... right? You also know that UConn is another rising football program too... correct?

B)

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/28 15:09

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

Good article though. I just don't see it happening... EVER. The discussion was already 10 years old when I was at BYU in the early 90s. I lack faith.

That article pointed out how much weaker the resume is of BYU and Utah compared to schools that are already in the BCS west of the Mississippi. The Pac-10 isn't expanding anytime soon.

Except for weaker Pac-10 teams like WSU, of course.

Perhaps my biggest problem with the BCS isn't that USC and Texas get all the money/glory/etc., it's that the Bayers, WSU's, Dukes, Uconn's, Syracuses, Wake Forests, etc. get to ride the gravy train all the way. Those teams would give the UNLV's, SDSU's, San Jose States, and UAB's a lot of competition for the cellar-dweller positions in their respective conferences.

You do know that WF is a pre-season Top 25 team, is coming off back to back ranked seasons, an ACC championship in 2007 and that the entire ACC rode the Orange Bowl/BCS payday gravy train in 2007 thanks to WF... right? You also know that UConn is another rising football program too... correct?

B)

Yeah-and they've always been awful-until 10 years of extra cash and hype finally paid off for them. Of course, Rasta would argue that this has nothing to do with their membership in a BCS conference.

Nevertheless, no need to be a smart-A. You know what the point is that I'm trying to make, right? (I guess I shouldn't assume that.)

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/06/28 15:49

The PAC-10 is a lame conference. The ONLY benefit the Cougs would gain by being in the PAC-10 would be the extra money the bowl "championship" series brings in. Otherwise, on a governing and policy level there are soooo many drawbacks to being in a conference with schools like Cal and Stanford. BYU would be at constant war with those schools and their agenda.

So, a much better scenario is for the Cougs and yewts to stay in the MWC but wiggle the conference into the bcs money pile with an automatic bid, or even better would be an automatic bid into an actual playoff. But that's a different subject.

If the MWC gets an automatic payday, I mean bid, then over only a few short years the recruiting, scheduling, facilities and performance on the field would improve dramatically. It would start a chain reaction that would make BYU a perennial top-10 contender. There would be 3 top-25 MWC teams at all times.

People talking about wanting to join the PAC-10 reminds me of when so many people were excited about the prospect of hiring Kwhitt. It may look good on paper, but it's a really bad idea. Let's just do what it take to get our conference hands in the bcs cookie jar and forget about the PAC-10.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by DieHardCougar - 2008/06/28 16:13

Keep dreaming. The chances of a playoff being implemented are much greater than the chances of the MWC getting an automatic BCS bid.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by DieHardCougar - 2008/06/28 16:15

Oh, and by the way. Neither chance is very good...

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/06/28 19:28

mormonrasta wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

Perhaps my biggest problem with the BCS isn't that USC and Texas get all the money/glory/etc., it's that the Baylors, WSU's, Dukes, Uconn's, Syracuses, Wake Forests, etc. get to ride the gravy train all the way. Those teams would give the UNLV's, SDSU's, San Jose States, and UAB's a lot of competition for the cellar-dweller positions in their respective conferences.

I don't know what they are gravy training. A million or two a year from the BCS? Who cares? That's not big money in today's college athletics. Many of those schools make up for their terrible football performances by being great in basketball and bring revenue to the conference in that way.

Those schools certainly don't get glory unless they beat the aforementioned Texas, USC, Florida type teams.

But that's why the BCS wasn't created for Duke, or Baylor, or Wake Forest. It was created for the 10 teams that are the most accomplished and most popular nationwide. They are Florida, Florida State, Miami, Michigan, Nebraska, Notre Dame, Oklahoma, Ohio State, Penn State, and USC. They have combined for 61% of the AP top 5 finishes over the last 30 years and not surprisingly 50% of all BCS bids.

Boy, if I were an AD that could gravy-train like that (1-2 million) without doing A THING on the field, then I would be a happy cat... ;)

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by NotSackless - 2008/06/28 19:59

Cougy_Monster wrote:

If the MWC gets an automatic payday, I mean bid, then over only a few short years the recruiting, scheduling, facilities and performance on the field would improve dramatically. It would start a chain reaction that would make BYU a perennial top-10 contender. There would be 3 top-25 MWC teams at all times.

That chances of that happening are slim and none, an slim is busy sitting in front of his cable TV channel crusing looking for the MTN broadcast.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/06/28 20:02

NotSackless wrote:

Cougy_Monster wrote:

If the MWC gets an automatic payday, I mean bid, then over only a few short years the recruiting, scheduling, facilities and performance on the field would improve dramatically. It would start a chain reaction that would make BYU a perennial top-10 contender. There would be 3 top-25 MWC teams at all times.

That chances of that happening are slim and none, an slim is busy sitting in front of his cable TV channel crusing looking for the MTN broadcast.

LOL! Looks like you could use a bit of karma to bring you up to zero. Here's some coming your way. What's with using Airwolf's old avatar?

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by NotSackless - 2008/06/28 20:09

Conosticator wrote:

NotSackless wrote:

Cougy_Monster wrote:

If the MWC gets an automatic payday, I mean bid, then over only a few short years the recruiting, scheduling, facilities and performance on the field would improve dramatically. It would start a chain reaction that would make BYU a perennial top-10 contender. There would be 3 top-25 MWC teams at all times.

That chances of that happening are slim and none, an slim is busy sitting in front of his cable TV channel crusing looking for the MTN broadcast.

LOL! Looks like you could use a bit of karma to bring you up to zero. Here's some coming your way. What's with using Airwolf's old avatar?

Got it on loan from Frodo. It has a lot of power though. I keep getting this evil urge to say something nice about the yewts. I'm resisting though. As the keeper of the ring I hope to be able to throw it into the fires of RES this November. :S Oh the burden one must bear.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/06/28 20:13

DieHardCougar wrote:

Keep dreaming. The chances of a playoff being implemented are much greater than the chances of the MWC getting an automatic BCS bid.

I agree.

The chances of any scenario in this entire thread actually happening are close to zero, at least for now. But, the least likely scenario in my opinion is the PAC-10 inviting BYU to their conference, followed by the even less likely chance that BYU would accept the offer since it would most likely be attached to a number of stipulations regarding how BYU would manage it's campus and athletics.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/06/28 20:52

Cougy_Monster wrote:

The PAC-10 is a lame conference. The ONLY benefit the Cougs would gain by being in the PAC-10 would be the extra money the bowl "championship" series brings in. Otherwise, on a governing and policy level there are soooo many drawbacks to being in a conference with schools like Cal and Stanford. BYU would be at constant war with those schools and their agenda.

So, a much better scenario is for the Cougs and yewts to stay in the MWC but wiggle the conference into the bcs money pile with an automatic bid, or even better would be an automatic bid into an actual playoff. But that's a different subject.

If the MWC gets an automatic payday, I mean bid, then over only a few short years the recruiting, scheduling, facilities and performance on the field would improve dramatically. It would start a chain reaction that would make BYU a perennial top-10 contender. There would be 3 top-25 MWC teams at all times.

People talking about wanting to join the PAC-10 reminds me of when so many people were excited about the prospect of hiring Kwhitt. It may look good on paper, but it's a really bad idea. Let's just do what it take to get our conference hands in the bcs cookie jar and forget about the PAC-10.

That "lame conference" placed four teams in the top seven of the final 2008 NACDA Directors Cup. BYU placed 41st, the only non-BCS school in the top 50. <http://nacda.cstv.com/> The Pac-10 football refs are definitely "lame" but the performance of the conference in the various athletic competitions is far from "lame".

Being invited to the Pac-10 would be an honor if they were willing to work with our no sunday competition standard. I don't see it happening.

I also don't see yewtah ever being invited (and being able to accept) without us. Too many people in the political arena in Utah that would fight the prospect of diminishing the rivalry between the schools. Remember the rilvary goes both ways. Heck there are people in the state that still seem to think that BYU and USU should be rivals in something. :laugh: :laugh: :laugh:

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Metal Bubba - 2008/06/29 05:38

BYUtx wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

Good article though. I just don't see it happening... EVER. The discussion was already 10 years old when I was at BYU in the early 90s. I lack faith.

That article pointed out how much weaker the resume is of BYU and Utah compared to schools that are already in the BCS west of the Mississippi. The Pac-10 isn't expanding anytime soon.

Except for weaker Pac-10 teams like WSU, of course.

Perhaps my biggest problem with the BCS isn't that USC and Texas get all the money/glory/etc., it's that the Bayers, WSU's, Dukes, Uconn's, Syracuses, Wake Forests, etc. get to ride the gravy train all the way. Those teams would give the UNLV's, SDSU's, San Jose States, and UAB's a lot of competition for the cellar-dweller positions in their respective conferences.

You do know that WF is a pre-season Top 25 team, is coming off back to back ranked seasons, an ACC championship in 2007 and that the entire ACC rode the Orange Bowl/BCS payday gravy train in 2007 thanks to WF... right? You also know that UConn is another rising football program too... correct?

B)

Yeah-and they've always been awful-until 10 years of extra cash and hype finally paid off for them. Of course, Rasta would argue that this has nothing to do with their membership in a BCS conference.

Nevertheless, no need to be a smart-A. You know what the point is that I'm trying to make, right? (I guess I shouldn't assume that.)

Yeah, I know what your point is. But those schools you mentioned contribute to their conferences with basketball revenue. Also... BCS money didn't payoff for WF, hiring Jim Grobe is what paid off!

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/29 10:28

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than they do in men's BB.

So you've explained away Wake Forest. Now please address these awful schools that would likely be middle of the pack or lower in the MWC and explain why they deserve to be in a BCS conference but schools like BYU don't (please note that the list is not exhaustive and may have a couple errors-this is off the top of my head): Syracuse, Baylor, Colorado, Washington State, Oregon State, Stanford (remember, we're talking FB), North Carolina, Duke, Uconn, Iowa State, Indiana, Northwestern, Minnesota...

Some of these schools have only sucked recently or may now appear to be improving, but have all sucked at levels worse than maybe even BYU's worst seasons.

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Ygridiron4ever - 2008/06/29 10:32

I think BYU wants in!

I wish I knew the grand scheme behind the changes like the "Ricks to BYUID" for example.

I think someone wants the main campus to be a research institution, and the other campuses will do most of the undergraduate educating (I think the article that started this post failed to mention that BYU now has 4 campuses). when I started my Ph.D. program at BYU in 1992, there were only 120 doctoral students (not counting JD candidates - and yes a lawyer is a doctor, as much as I am, anyway) on the whole campus!

That is definitely changing, and I am excited for the day when BYU, the Church, and Intermountain Health Care announce a new system of research units in several local hospitals (just dreaming here, don't cut my head off if you have proof that such a thing will never happen).

Lots of smart and good kids from my area aren't getting in to Provo - going to ID, SLC, or Hawaii instead.

There's got to be a plan behind the significant changes in the overall structure of BYU.

There were a couple of interesting threads here in the last month about the value of the football program in meeting the University's and Church's goals; I think having BYU as strong as any University on levels such as academics, research, and athletic conference affiliation are good for the church and some of its members. I know it would make my Ph.D. a little stronger!

I think BYU wants in!

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Metal Bubba - 2008/06/29 16:37

BYUtx wrote:

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than they do in men's BB.

Dook loses money on football almost every year. Revenue is another word for gross income. You need to look at net income. It's no secret that basketball is more lucrative than football for the majority of schools in this country. That's why there are so many more Division I basketball programs than there are football programs.

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

One word... coaching.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/06/29 18:04

Ygridiron4ever wrote:

I think BYU wants in!

I wish I knew the grand scheme behind the changes like the "Ricks to BYUID" for example.

I think someone wants the main campus to be a research institution, and the other campuses will do most of the undergraduate educating (I think the article that started this post failed to mention that BYU now has 4 campuses). when I started my Ph.D. program at BYU in 1992, there were only 120 doctoral students (not counting JD candidates - and yes a lawyer is a doctor, as much as I am, anyway) on the whole campus!

That is definitely changing, and I am excited for the day when BYU, the Church, and Intermountain Health Care announce a new system of research units in several local hospitals (just dreaming here, don't cut my head off if you have proof that such a thing will never happen).

Lots of smart and good kids from my area aren't getting in to Provo - going to ID, SLC, or Hawaii instead.

There's got to be a plan behind the significant changes in the overall structure of BYU.

There were a couple of interesting threads here in the last month about the value of the football program in meeting the University's and Church's goals; I think having BYU as strong as any University on levels such as academics, research, and athletic conference affiliation are good for the church and some of its members. I know it would make my Ph.D. a little stronger!

I think BYU wants in!

I think your dreaming.

BYU will never be a major player as a "research university" for one reason, Federal research grants come with too many strings attached. The Church has always avoided putting BYU in a position where the Feds can dictate what everything. :P I don't see that problem going away. Meantime, BYU continues to seek corporate and private grants but they don't add up to much compared with Federal largess.

Yup, I'll try to break it to you gently. Your and my taxes are supporting yewtah, UCLA, USC, Stanford & the rest of those "research universities". :angry:

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/29 22:17

Nevermind-I'm now bored of this thread.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 07:59

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than

they do in men's BB.

Dook loses money on football almost every year. Revenue is another word for gross income. You need to look at net income. It's no secret that basketball is more lucrative than football for the majority of schools in this country. That's why there are so many more Division I basketball programs than there are football programs.

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

One word... coaching.

You are correct, sir!!!

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/06/30 09:24

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than they do in men's BB.

Dook loses money on football almost every year. Revenue is another word for gross income. You need to look at net income. It's no secret that basketball is more lucrative than football for the majority of schools in this country. That's why there are so many more Division I basketball programs than there are football programs.

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

One word... coaching.

You are correct, sir!!!

The jury is out on those programs right now. Let's see what happens over the next two or three years to determine if they have built a program, or if they just have some special players. Some teams peak for a couple of years because they had some great players and then drop off the radar again once those players are gone.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by GolfDiveNCougs - 2008/06/30 09:43

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership. One word... coaching. You are correct, sir!!! Humorously enough, I agree with all three of you.

I made this comment on a thread a few months ago:

The ACTUAL influence that the BCS SYSTEM is imposing on ALL of collegiate athletics due to quality recruits going to fewer and fewer non-power schools, even LESS funding for non-power programs thanks to the current Bowl payout setup, better coaches abandoning non-power posts, BCS schools not being interested in potential ignominious losses, ETC... has caused a severe downturn in the actual competitive capacity of non-power teams. Conversely, any recruit that isn't good enough to go to one of the 10-15 "royal" BCS schools won't even give a non-BCS school a second thought. Wake Forest and a shot at a BCS game or Fresno State and a shot at the Aunt Jemima Syrup Bowl is kind of a no brainer. Same goes for the play callers. Now, I don't disagree at all that UConn and Wake Forest are accomplishing what they're accomplishing due in large measure to an improvement in coaching. I also believe, as my previous quote indicates, that coaching is just one of the many facets of the developing advantage of BCS affiliation. Even a coach at a

"bad" BCS school is STILL taken more seriously than a coach that has made a non-BCS school great.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/30 09:44

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than they do in men's BB.

Dook loses money on football almost every year. Revenue is another word for gross income. You need to look at net income. It's no secret that basketball is more lucrative than football for the majority of schools in this country. That's why there are so many more Division I basketball programs than there are football programs.

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

One word... coaching.

You are correct, sir!!!

If by "correct" you mean really good at pulling out two parts of an argument and refuting them instead of addressing the argument as a whole (because it really can't be touched), then, yes, he may be correct.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by GolfDiveNCougs - 2008/06/30 10:05

And I don't mean to be contentious Bubba:

Metal Bubba wrote:

Also... BCS money didn't pay off for WF, hiring Jim Grobe is what paid off!

One word... coaching....but Jim Grobe's past track record supports BYUtx's point and mine more than yours. Now, lest you assume I'm disparaging your coach for the fun of it, let me assure you, I don't know a thing about the guy. All I found out about Grobe is that he was a .500 coach at MAC school Ohio (exactly, in fact, at 33-33-1) before being hired at Wake. His coaching prowess couldn't take a middle-of-the-road non-PowerConf team to any greater heights than usual, but as soon as he checks in to a BCS program, the team begins to far exceed previous capabilities. If he couldn't get it done at the small school, it might not be just him getting it done at the big school. It might just be that 5 years or so of the BCS mentality began to draw more than just his talents to the same BCS school that hired him.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/30 10:42

I do find it interesting that those defending the BCS as a fair institution are those that are fans of middle to lower tier BCS FB teams. (And, yes, I also our own biases as fans of a FB that is substantially better than a couple dozen BCS teams, on par with most and only surpassed by a couple dozen.)

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 10:51

BYUtx wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than they do in men's BB.

Dook loses money on football almost every year. Revenue is another word for gross income. You need to look at net income. It's no secret that basketball is more lucrative than football for the majority of schools in this country. That's why there are so many more Division I basketball programs than there are football programs.

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

One word... coaching.

You are correct, sir!!!

If by "correct" you mean really good at pulling out two parts of an argument and refuting them instead of addressing the argument as a whole (because it really can't be touched), then, yes, he may be correct.

Your argument had soooooo many errors he had to pull out the best parts.

The reality is that there are still haves and have nots. The BCS did not create that, change or alter it in any way. Yes, the Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forests of the world have no greater power than they did before the BCS as manifested on the field. Duke is still Duke and they have proven they would struggle against ANY D1 competition. The only time Duke was any good in the recent college football era was when, you guessed it, they had a GREAT COACH (Steve Spurrier)!!! Funny how the more things change the more things stay the same.

The additional revenues and exposure that was given to the BCS conferences because of the BCS have been nice, but the revenue that nonBCS schools have received has improved by a bigger share due to increased bowl and tv revenue. That's why, in case you haven't noticed, nonBCS teams have actually become MORE competitive in terms of wins and losses and ranking in the BCS era rather than LESS competitive.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 11:00

BYUtx wrote:

I do find it interesting that those defending the BCS as a fair institution are those that are fans of middle to lower tier BCS FB teams. (And, yes, I also our own biases as fans of a FB that is substantially better than a couple dozen BCS teams, on par with most and only surpassed by a couple dozen.)

I've noticed that people who whine about the economics of the BCS clearly do not understand the revenues that are involved and have an extremely provincial understanding of the college football landscape.

I don't think I've ever said it was fair. The adverse affects of the BCS have been at best weakly substantiated on this board when it comes to revenue. The supposition that we would be in a significantly fairer economic world in college football by dissolving the BCS is laughable.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/30 11:06

mormonrasta wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Metal Bubba wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

basketball schmasketball. Even schools like Duke earn more revenue from football for being in a BCS conference than they do in men's BB.

Dook loses money on football almost every year. Revenue is another word for gross income. You need to look at net income. It's no secret that basketball is more lucrative than football for the majority of schools in this country. That's why there are so many more Division I basketball programs than there are football programs.

BYUtx wrote:

I would love to hear a good argument that explains why perennial losers like UCONN, Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forest have seen rapid improvement, without ANY regard to their BCS membership.

One word... coaching.

You are correct, sir!!!

If by "correct" you mean really good at pulling out two parts of an argument and refuting them instead of addressing the argument as a whole (because it really can't be touched), then, yes, he may be correct.

Your argument had soooooo many errors he had to pull out the best parts.

The reality is that there are still haves and have nots. The BCS did not create that, change or alter it in any way. Yes, the Rutgers, Kansas, and Wake Forests of the world have no greater power than they did before the BCS as manifested on the field. Duke is still Duke and they have proven they would struggle against ANY D1 competition. The only time Duke was any good in the recent college football era was when, you guessed it, they had a GREAT COACH (Steve Spurrier)!!! Funny how the more things change the more things stay the same.

The additional revenues and exposure that was given to the BCS conferences because of the BCS have been nice, but the revenue that nonBCS schools have received has improved by a bigger share due to increased bowl and tv revenue. That's why, in case you haven't noticed, nonBCS teams have actually become MORE competitive in terms of wins and losses and ranking in the BCS era rather than LESS competitive. And yet you still can't do it.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 11:12

BYUtx wrote:

And yet you still can't do it.

You mean I can't respond to error filled argument. You're right.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/06/30 11:52

mormonrasta wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

I do find it interesting that those defending the BCS as a fair institution are those that are fans of middle to lower tier BCS FB teams. (And, yes, I also our own biases as fans of a FB that is substantially better than a couple dozen BCS teams, on par with most and only surpassed by a couple dozen.)

I've noticed that people who whine about the economics of the BCS clearly do not understand the revenues that are involved and have an extremely provincial understanding of the college football landscape.

I don't think I've ever said it was fair. The adverse affects of the BCS have been at best weakly substantiated on this board when it comes to revenue. The supposition that we would be in a significantly fairer economic world in college football by dissolving the BCS is laughable.

The supposition that non-BCS schools are in a significantly worse economic world in college football by the existence of

the BCS is actual fact backed up by the data.

The BCS had three goals, 1) control of TV and Bowl revenue, 2) control of who get to play for the mythical NC by controlling the rankings, and 3) control of the NCAA D1-A (FBS) by maintaining a slight majority over the non-BCS schools. They have been wildly successful in all three areas.

Any improved competitiveness between the BCS and non-BCS is due to the NCAA limitations and football scholarships and academic qualification standards not to any supposed benefit the non-BCS schools received by being left out of the BCS revenue stream.

A prime example of the dark side of the BCS was when the proposed SLC bowl game was not approved this year. The games that guaranteed one or both spots to BCS conf members were approved. Of course the BCS continues to take in new schools whenever it is necessary so that they can maintain a voting majority in the NCAA FBS and thereby control the Bowl approvals.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 13:19

Conosticator wrote:

The BCS had three goals, 1) control of TV and Bowl revenue, 2) control of who get to play for the mythical NC by controlling the rankings, and 3) control of the NCAA D1-A (FBS) by maintaining a slight majority over the non-BCS schools. They have been wildly successful in all three areas..

Agree with point 1 and 2, but not point 3.

The nonBCS conferences were irrelevant in the formation of the BCS. The bowls care about having access to 10 to 20 teams. These are teams that dominate the college football landscape and are the most popular. In order to get those teams they needed to make deals with the conferences where those teams reside. Since none of those teams reside in nonBCS leagues there was no thought paid to them other than possible antitrust which they paid off the other conferences to keep quiet.

Any improved competitiveness between the BCS and non-BCS is due to the NCAA limitations and football scholarships and academic qualification standards not to any supposed benefit the non-BCS schools received by being left out of the BCS revenue stream.

A prime example of the dark side of the BCS was when the proposed SLC bowl game was not approved this year. The games that guaranteed one or both spots to BCS conf members were approved. Of course the BCS continues to take in new schools whenever it is necessary so that they can maintain a voting majority in the NCAA FBS and thereby control the Bowl approvals.

I hate to break your conspiracy theory, but the facts suggest otherwise.

In 1997 the year before the BCS there were 20 bowl games. Only 7 "non BCS teams" participated (6 if you count Cincinatti as a BCS team). In 2007 there are 32 bowl game where 19 of the 64 spots are going to nonBCS teams.

The bowl growth has certainly helped conferences like the MWC as it gives teams a little bit extra revenue, but more importantly practice time and exposure. Look at what the Humanitarian Bowl has done for Boise State and the New Mexico Bowl has done for New Mexico as examples.

The SLC bowl was a bad idea and didn't have much support behind it which is why it was nixed. If the BCS didn't want nonBCS teams to participate in new bowls then there would be no New Mexico Bowl.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/30 13:20

mormonrasta wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

And yet you still can't do it.

You mean I can't respond to error filled argument. You're right.

Thanks for killing any chances for a meaningful discussion. It's disappointing that the snobbishness (intellectual or otherwise) that is so prevalent on CougarBoard often makes its way over here.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 13:55

BYUtx wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

BYUtx wrote:

And yet you still can't do it.

You mean I can't respond to error filled argument. You're right.

Thanks for killing any chances for a meaningful discussion. It's disappointing that the snobbishness (intellectual or otherwise) that is so prevalent on CougarBoard often makes its way over here.

You're not interested in a meaningful discussion. If you were you would try to support your opinions with facts and then we would have something.

The fact is none of the schools you have mentioned have had sustained success. They were 1 year wonders and nothing more. All of those schools have had a little bit of success similar to their stellar season in the BCS era before the BCS. You've got to do better than identifying 1 year wonders.

In order for your theory to hold any water you would need to demonstrate IMPROVED performance from the collective BCS schools versus nonBCS schools. That hasn't happened.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/06/30 14:14

<http://emoticons4u.com/violent/sterb003.gif>

DIE THREAD DIE!!!!

WHY WON'T THIS THREAD DIE!!!!!!!!!!!!

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/06/30 15:08

Here is an example of the problem.

In 2003 the 66 BCS members split approximately \$90 million in bowl revenue. That same year the 55 non-BCS members split about \$6 million. Supposedly a non-BCS team could qualify for an "at-large" bid but not did. Even being undefeated was not good enough.

That was the reason for the Congressional investigation into possible anti-trust violations. As a result the BCS made the rules slightly more balanced but still has locked out the non-BCS schools from any chance to play for the NC since their control of the coaches poll effectively prevents it.

What happens if two non-BCS teams are ranked in the top 14? Sorry, only one gets to play in a BCS bowl. They don't allow more than a single (the get out of anti-trust jail free card) team non-BCS team to play in one of the BCS bowls in

any given year. Of course, you are in the BCS you can even play for the NC despite having two losses.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Metal Bubba - 2008/06/30 18:42

Mormonrasta and BYUtx both make good points. I give the nod to Mormonrasta though... hahaha.

Seriously though, I really see no point in arguing further. Message board arguing is a lot like Bible bashing. We go into it with our own opinions and refuse to budge. We pick the weakest part of the opponent's argument and then try to focus on that. Emotions run high. Occasionally insults get tossed out. And in the end it was really just a waste of time because nobody changes their mind or tries to understand the other's point of view.

So I'm gonna move on with one parting shot... jump on the bandwagon now, friends. Yea verily, coacheshotseat has predicted WF to go 11-1 this season: Analysis.

:lol:

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/06/30 18:52

Conosticator wrote:

Here is an example of the problem.

In 2003 the 66 BCS members split approximately \$90 million in bowl revenue. That same year the 55 non-BCS members split about \$6 million. Supposedly a non-BCS team could qualify for an "at-large" bid but not did. Even being undefeated was not good enough.

That was the reason for the Congressional investigation into possible anti-trust violations. As a result the BCS made the rules slightly more balanced but still has locked out the non-BCS schools from any chance to play for the NC since their control of the coaches poll effectively prevents it.

\$90 million sounds like alot until you divide that up among 66 teams. 1.36 million doesn't even buy 4 games of Nick Saban. The real money is made on regular season home games, boosters, and regular season TV deals. Ask Notre Dame to choose between their tv deal and the BCS and they say "see ya" to the BCS.

The revenue disparity only gets worse if there is a playoff. It would result in BCS conference teams playing alot more games thus earning more money while the subsequent reduction of the bowls would hurt nonBCS teams more than BCS teams.

What happens if two non-BCS teams are ranked in the top 14? Sorry, only one gets to play in a BCS bowl. They don't allow more than a single (the get out of anti-trust jail free card) team non-BCS team to play in one of the BCS bowls in any given year. Of course, you are in the BCS you can even play for the NC despite having two losses.

That is not true. Only 1 automatic bid from the other conferences, but they can have an at large bid. Straight from the BCS website:

No more than one such team from Conference USA, the Mid-American Conference, the Mountain West Conference, the Sun Belt Conference, and the Western Athletic Conference shall earn an automatic berth in any year. If two or more teams from those conferences satisfy the provisions for an automatic berth, then the team with the highest finish in the final BCS Standings will receive the automatic berth, and the remaining team or teams will be in the pool of teams eligible for selection by the bowls as at-large teams.

=====

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by GolfDiveNCougs - 2008/06/30 19:17

mormonrasta wrote:That is not true. Only 1 automatic bid from the other conferences, but they can have an at large bid.
Straight from the BCS website:

No more than one such team from Conference USA, the Mid-American Conference, the Mountain West Conference, the Sun Belt Conference, and the Western Athletic Conference shall earn an automatic berth in any year. If two or more teams from those conferences satisfy the provisions for an automatic berth, then the team with the highest finish in the final BCS Standings will receive the automatic berth, and the remaining team or teams will be in the pool of teams eligible for selection by the bowls as at-large teams. Rasta, your point is very technically correct, but the implication of the aforementioned rule (which I believe Conosticator was channeling...) is that there's not much chance of an eligible non-BCS team to be chosen by a BCS Game without an auto bid.

Raise your hand if you think a BCS Bowl would pick a non-BCS school over the eligible BCS pool if they didn't have to...

Anyone???

Yeah, me neither.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/30 21:08

imuakahuku wrote:

<http://emoticons4u.com/violent/sterb003.gif>

DIE THREAD DIE!!!!

WHY WON'T THIS THREAD DIE!!!!!!!!!!

Because BYUtx and Rasta are stubborn.

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/06/30 21:10

Metal Bubba wrote:

Mormonrasta and BYUtx both make good points. I give the nod to Mormonrasta though... hahaha.

...says the fellow BCS fan. ;)

Re:Interesting Pac-10 expansion read

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/06/30 22:17

mormonrasta wrote:

Conosticator wrote:

Here is an example of the problem.

In 2003 the 66 BCS members split approximately \$90 million in bowl revenue. That same year the 55 non-BCS members split about \$6 million. Supposedly a non-BCS team could qualify for an "at-large" bid but not did. Even being undefeated was not good enough.

That was the reason for the Congressional investigation into possible anti-trust violations. As a result the BCS made the rules slightly more balanced but still has locked out the non-BCS schools from any chance to play for the NC since their control of the coaches poll effectively prevents it.

\$90 million sounds like alot until you divide that up among 66 teams. 1.36 million doesn't even buy 4 games of Nick Saban. The real money is made on regular season home games, boosters, and regular season TV deals. Ask Notre Dame to choose between their tv deal and the BCS and they say "see ya" to the BCS.

The revenue disparity only gets worse if there is a playoff. It would result in BCS conference teams playing alot more

games thus earning more money while the subsequent reduction of the bowls would hurt nonBCS teams more than BCS teams.

What happens if two non-BCS teams are ranked in the top 14? Sorry, only one gets to play in a BCS bowl. They don't allow more than a single (the get out of anti-trust jail free card) team non-BCS team to play in one of the BCS bowls in any given year. Of course, you are in the BCS you can even play for the NC despite having two losses.

That is not true. Only 1 automatic bid from the other conferences, but they can have an at large bid. Straight from the BCS website:

No more than one such team from Conference USA, the Mid-American Conference, the Mountain West Conference, the Sun Belt Conference, and the Western Athletic Conference shall earn an automatic berth in any year. If two or more teams from those conferences satisfy the provisions for an automatic berth, then the team with the highest finish in the final BCS Standings will receive the automatic berth, and the remaining team or teams will be in the pool of teams eligible for selection by the bowls as at-large teams.

Yea that \$1.36 million for each BCS team is sure a paltry amount compared to the \$0.1 million that each non_BCS team received. My heart goes out to those poor BCS teams that have to struggle so much for so little revenue. :dry:

You also fail to mention that the BCS automatic qualifiers just need to have 9 wins and be conference champs. The (one at-most) non-BCS "automatic qualifier" has to meet additional criteria of being ranked in the top 14 of the final BCS poll or be ranked in the top 16 if it is ranked above the champion of one of the automatic qualifier BCS conferences.

Then assuming a 2nd non-BCS team also was undefeated or had only one loss (only chance for a non-BCS team to be ranked high enough to even be considered), it then is just part of the "at-large" pool and can easily lose out to a BCS team with both lower ranking and more losses.

Consequently, until such time as two non-BCS teams are invited to the BCS bowls I stand by my previous statement that it can't happen. Between the current BCS rules and the fact that the BCS bowls have a vested interest in selecting a BCS school, it can't happen.

The current BCS selection criteria reminds me of a company I worked for that was required by the Feds to post certain job openings. Whenever they had a specific person in mind (either within the company or a particular possible applicant) they would write the job description so that it sounded great, had many specific areas of "required expertise and experience", and enough other very unique requirements that guaranteed only the targeted individual would qualify.

One of my managers even went so far as to obtain the resume of the targeted individual and write the job requirements straight from the person's resume. Of course the position was officially posted for all applicants, but the requirements when combined with the manager's final approval ensured that only the targeted individual received a job offer.

The BCS rules with the Bowls having the final say in the at-large selections is just such a shell game.

If the current multi-year BCS rules review results in a change to allow two non-BCS conference champions (one proposal would do that), then we might see two. Until then, it's one or nada.

Also, I'll take the paltry \$1.36 million over the \$0.1 million any day Rasta.

=====