STATEMENT OF CRAIG THOMPSON
COMMISSIONER, MOUNTAIN WEST CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

HEARING ON THE BOWL CHAMPIONSHIP SERIES: MONEY AND OTHER ISSUES OF FAIRNESS FOR PUBLICLY FINANCED UNIVERSITIES

May 1, 2009

Chairman Rush and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Craig Thompson, Commissioner of the Mountain West Conference (the "Mountain West" or the "MWC"). Thank you for inviting me here today to speak about the Bowl Championship Series ("BCS").

The BCS was formed to control the most lucrative postseason bowl games for universities whose teams play college football in the Football Bowl Subdivision ("FBS"). Each year, there are five BCS bowl games, including the "BCS national championship game."

Of the eleven FBS Conferences, under the current BCS system six are referred to as Automatic-Qualifying Conferences ("AQ Conferences"). These conferences' champions automatically qualify for a BCS bowl game every year, regardless of their record or ranking. The other five conferences are called Non-Automatic-Qualifying Conferences ("Non-AQ Conferences") because these conferences' champions do not automatically qualify for a BCS bowl game. Instead they must meet certain BCS criteria to earn a BCS bowl berth, and if two such Non-AQ universities meet the standards in the same year, practically speaking, only one of those Non-AQ universities will actually have an opportunity to play in a BCS game.

On March 4, 2009, the Mountain West Conference submitted a proposal (the "BCS Reform Proposal") to modify the BCS system. Our conference took this important step for four reasons. We wanted to (1) propose a solution that addresses each of the five fundamental flaws with the BCS system; (2) enable all FBS universities to earn more revenue from college football, which additional funds can be used for important athletic and academic purposes; (3) ensure that higher education sends the appropriate messages to students and the public concerning fundamental fairness, equitable treatment, and the opportunity to reach your goals; and (4) increase the excitement of the college football season for universities and their fans.

After discussing each of these issues, I would also like to address a few related matters.

1. First Objective of the BCS Reform Proposal is to Propose a Solution that Addresses the Five Flaws in the BCS System

As the Mountain West Board of Directors stated in an April 1, 2009 letter to the BCS, "[t]he President and Vice President of the United States, members of Congress, college coaches and administrators, football players, sports columnists and fans have all criticized the BCS system, and have asked for change." Anyone who follows college football knows the BCS has been subject to a mountain of criticism, virtually since its inception. But the MWC believes that criticism without a solution solves nothing. Accordingly, we analyzed the current BCS system carefully and recognized there were five fundamental flaws with the current system:

(1) The BCS Revenue Distribution is Grossly Inequitable

(2) The BCS Relies on Non-Performance-Based Standards to Determine Automatic-Qualifying Conferences

(3) The BCS is Based on a Flawed Premise, and Nearly Half of the FBS Teams are Eliminated from the National Championship Even Before the Season Begins

(4) The BCS Uses Confusing Computer Formulas and Pollsters to Determine Rankings

(5) The BCS Dictates Unbalanced Representation of Conferences on the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee

We then developed a proposal, the BCS Reform Proposal, which was tailored to address each of these flaws, as follows:

Flaw No. 1 The BCS Revenue Distribution is Grossly Inequitable

If two conferences each have exactly one team play in a BCS bowl game, should they each receive the same payout from the BCS that year? We think so.

Should it make a difference if one of those conferences has three teams ranked in the top 16 of the final BCS regular-season standings, whereas the other conference's champion is only ranked 19th? We don't think so. We believe the more equitable approach is that both conferences should still receive the same payout from the BCS for that year because they each had exactly one team play in a BCS bowl game. Of course, an argument certainly exists that the first conference, which had three teams ranked in the top 16, should receive a somewhat higher payout from the BCS than the second conference.

But what cannot be debated is this: there is no way the second conference – the one with its champion ranked 19th – should receive a higher payout than the first conference – the one with three teams in the top 16. And there is no way that such a higher payout should be approximately $9 million more. Yet, that is exactly what occurs under the current BCS system.

For example, in 2008, the Mountain West and an AQ Conference each had one team play in a BCS bowl. But the Mountain West had three teams ranked in the top 16 in the final BCS regular-season standings, all of whom finished above the AQ Conference's champion and automatic qualifier – who finished ranked 19th. Yet, the AQ Conference still received almost $9 million more from the BCS than the Mountain West. The AQ Conference received $18.6 million while the Mountain West received only $9.8 million.

In that same year, the Mountain West also had two teams ranked in the top 11 of the final regular-season BCS standings and another AQ Conference had none. That AQ Conference, like the Mountain West, had only one BCS bowl berth. Yet, that AQ Conference still received $18.6 million, almost $9 million more than the Mountain West.

Such economic disparities and anomalies cannot be justified and should not continue. Many have said the current BCS system ensures a permanent underclass. They are right.

The BCS Reform Proposal, on the other hand, calls for a more equitable distribution of revenue among all FBS conferences. Specifically, each conference that has exactly one team participate in a BCS bowl game in a given year should receive the same amount of revenue from the

BCS for that year.

Flaw No. 2 The BCS Relies on Non-Performance-Based Standards to Determine Automatic-Qualifying Conferences

Football is defined by performance on the field. Teams play the game to win. Yet, the current BCS system ignores that fundamental fact. Instead, it relies on non-performance-based standards to determine which conferences are AQ Conferences (i.e., conferences whose champions automatically qualify for a lucrative BCS bowl game each year regardless of how they perform that year). Specifically, the BCS uses bowl tie-ins and agreements to determine which conferences are AQ Conferences. Therefore, under the BCS system, pre-arranged agreements trump performance on the field with respect to automatic access to the BCS bowl games.

The BCS Reform Proposal, conversely, ensures that performance on the field – rather than non-performance-based criteria – is the primary factor in determining which teams qualify for lucrative BCS bowls. Under the BCS Reform Proposal, a conference has to win at least 40% of its inter-conference games against AQ Conference teams over a two-year period to become an AQ Conference.

Under this standard, seven conferences easily met the mark over the past two years. The percentages for these seven conferences ranged from a high of 55% (MWC) to a low of 45% (SEC). With respect to the four conferences that did not meet the mark, the percentages ranged from a high of 18% (WAC) to a low of 8% (C-USA).

Moreover, the range of percentages for both the top group and the bottom group are nearly identical even if a four-year time period is chosen and even if bowl game results are included. In that event, for the same top seven conferences, the percentages range from 62% (Pac-10) to 44% (Big 10). For the other four conferences, the percentages range from 17% (WAC) to 7% (Sun Belt).

Because the current system does not use actual performance on the field as the determining factor, a conference like the Mountain West is relegated to Non-AQ Conference status – even though its on-field performance demonstrates that it belongs with the other AQ Conferences. This discrimination has a tremendously negative economic and competitive impact on Mountain West universities.

Flaw No. 3 The BCS is Based on a Flawed Premise, and Nearly Half of the FBS Teams are Eliminated from the National Championship Even Before the Season Begins

The current BCS system is based on a fundamentally-flawed premise: that computers and pollsters can look at six or seven outstanding teams, all of whom have lost no more than one game (and few, if any, of whom have played each other), and decide which are the two best and should play in the national championship game. But, it is impossible to know which of those great teams are actually the best – unless they play each other. Computers don't know, pollsters don't know, and the BCS surely does not know.

Moreover, nearly half of the FBS teams are eliminated from the national championship even <u>before</u> the season begins. None of the 51 teams that play in Non-AQ Conferences can, for all practical purposes, ever win a BCS national championship given how the current system is constituted. These teams are, in effect, done before day one. A system that produces this result is patently unfair.

In 2008, for example, the MWC had the best inter-conference record (among all 11 FBS conferences) against AQ Conference teams. Utah, the Mountain West champion, had a better regular-season record, 12-0, than any of the 65 AQ Conference teams. Yet Utah did not have an opportunity to compete for the national championship. Utah was eliminated this past season not by a team, but by a system – the BCS. Indeed, no Non-AQ Conference team has ever been permitted to play for the national championship since the BCS' inception.

To remedy this flaw, the BCS Reform Proposal creates an eight-team playoff, with the major bowls constituting the quarterfinal games. The BCS Reform Proposal will only extend the season by a week and a half on average (and sometimes by as little as 8 days), and then only for two teams. The remaining 117 FBS institutions would likely finish their season before the beginning of the second semester. In contrast, the NCAA FCS, Division II and Division III Football Championships playoffs last 21, 28 and 29 days, respectively – in some cases conflicting with final exams.

Under the BCS Reform Proposal, deserving conference champions and other great teams will finally have an opportunity to compete for the national championship. Additionally, not one team will be done before their season has begun – let alone 51 teams. Thus, a true college football national champion will be settled by the players on the field – rather than by the pollsters and computers off the field.

Flaw No. 4 The BCS Uses Confusing Computer Formulas and Pollsters to Determine Rankings

The current BCS system uses confusing computer formulas and pollsters to determine the rankings that decide which teams qualify for the BCS bowls. The computer formulas are so complicated and confusing that the University of Texas requested that one of the BCS computer rankings providers come to Austin to provide them with guidance on the assumptions underlying the system. After they left, Texas coach Mack Brown reportedly stated that he was more confused than ever.

As for the pollsters, a number of them admit that they rarely, if ever, watch some of the teams they are evaluating. When some of the voters in the Harris Interactive Poll, which helps determine the BCS standings and, ultimately, the title-game match-up, were asked about the University of Utah, the responses were as follows:

"I did not see them play [in the regular season]," Bobby Aillet said.

"I didn't see any live games," Lance McIlhenny said. "I just [saw] highlights."

"I just thought that the Mountain West is not as tough a conference [as others]," McIlhenny, a former SMU player, said. "Apparently I was wrong."

"I don't recall if I saw them play specifically during the regular season," David Housel said. "I don't remember a specific game."

"I wouldn't say I probably was wrong. I was wrong," said Housel, a former Auburn athletic director who had the Utes ranked 10th.

Teams from conferences such as the Mountain West are viewed far less often by many pollsters than teams from the current AQ Conferences. What's more, pollsters have no obligation to ensure they have all the necessary information to make the most sound judgments. In essence, their votes can easily be based on long-held perceptions, rather than knowledge. Moreover, there is a pre-season poll bias in favor of the AQ Conferences, and against the Non-AQ Conferences. The Associated Press (which was previously a component of the BCS standings) has never ranked a Non-AQ team higher than #15 in the preseason poll during the BCS era. The preseason AP and Coaches' Polls have ranked three or more Non-AQ teams just once – despite the fact that at least three Non-AQ teams were ranked in the previous season's final polls five out of 10 years. In both 2003 and 2004, five Non-AQ teams were ranked in the final AP and Coaches' Polls.

Given this bias, Non-AQ Conference teams garner far less points in the preseason polls each year than they do in the final polls. Because these teams start so far back in the polls, they are at a tremendous disadvantage.

The BCS Reform Proposal calls for a replacement of the computers and pollsters with a 12-member selection committee similar to the Committee that determines the field for the college basketball championship. The committee members will be charged with gathering and analyzing all of the pertinent data before ranking the teams. The committee will closely follow the teams over the course of a season to rank them as accurately as possible. As Chair of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee several years ago, I am completely aware of the painstaking efforts made to ensure that the people deciding who receives bids have all the information they could possibly need. The basketball committee members take their responsibility very seriously. College football teams and their fans deserve no less.

Flaw No. 5 The BCS Dictates Unbalanced Representation of Conferences on the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee

The BCS dictates unbalanced representation of conferences on the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee, which is the body that runs the BCS. As of now, the five Non-AQ Conferences share only one vote, while the six AQ Conferences and Notre Dame each have their own vote.

The BCS Reform Proposal equalizes the representation of the FBS conferences on the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee by allotting every conference and Notre Dame exactly one vote.

****

The importance of adopting the BCS Reform Proposal is underscored by some of the harms arising from the current system's five flaws, which include limitations for football programs, other athletic programs, enrollment and student-athletes in conferences that do not enjoy automatic qualification.

Over the past four seasons, the AQ Conferences have received over $492 million in BCS revenue (87.4% of the total), while the Non-AQ Conferences have received less than $62 million (12.6% of the total). With respect to the football programs, this tremendous revenue disparity greatly impacts Non-AQ Conferences institutions' ability to compete effectively in the areas of recruiting, facilities, coaches' salaries and scholarships. By comparison, during the past five years, the six BCS AQ Conferences have received only 61% of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Tournament revenue.

Non-AQ Conferences are harmed in recruiting not only by the monetary differences but also by the lack of access to the national championship game. Some AQ Conference coaches have told recruits that if you go to a Non-AQ Conference school you'll have no chance to play in a national championship game.

Other athletic programs are impacted as well. Particularly in the current economic climate, Non-AQ Conference universities are challenged financially and may have insufficient funds to adequately support other athletic programs. Without the guaranteed revenues provided to the AQ Conference universities, these institutions find it more difficult to comply with Title IX requirements, which issues are exacerbated for those institutions that sponsor football.

The advantages that AQ Conference universities receive because of the inequities in the BCS system impact more than just athletics. Conferences who are guaranteed annual participation in BCS bowl games garner increased media attention and recognition for their member universities. The increased visibility for universities that play in a BCS bowl game can have a positive effect on enrollment applications. Accordingly, universities that are discriminated against with respect to opportunities to play in such games are denied opportunities to grow their student and, ultimately, alumni bases.

Student-athletes who compete in Non-AQ Conferences are also harmed by the BCS. There are over 6,000 such football student-athletes who do not have a realistic opportunity to compete for the national championship. This is the only sport among the 51 team championships the NCAA sponsors in three divisions where this is the case. In fact, every other division of college football has a playoff. In no other division of college football are student-athletes denied an opportunity to win it all – only here.

2. Second Objective of the BCS Reform Proposal is to Enable all FBS Universities to Earn More Revenue from College Football

The second objective of the BCS Reform Proposal is to provide far more revenue for all FBS universities, which can be used for athletic and academic purposes. The BCS Reform Proposal would result in considerable additional revenue for all FBS universities from two sources: television and bowls. The television revenue would increase substantially given the addition of three more bowl games. Such revenue would also increase because, under the BCS Reform Proposal there would be seven bowl games with national championship ramifications, rather than just one. New revenue would also be realized from the rights fees the extra bowls would certainly pay the FBS universities for those games.

In addition to the guaranteed revenues referenced above, this incremental extra funding would help meet both athletic and academic needs. The following are areas where additional funds could be utilized, including several which directly benefit student-athletes:

- Improved academic programs (additional academic advisors, additional tutors, upgrades to computer laboratories, summer school opportunities).
- Increased scholarships (both number and value).
- Increased medical support (additional athletic trainers, payment of student health care costs).

- Improved team travel (minimize missed class time).
- Facility improvements.
- Debt retirement (re-pay the university's general fund).
- Upgraded uniforms and equipment.
- Increased funding for Olympic sports (including possibly adding a sport to create more opportunities).

3. Third Objective of the BCS Reform Proposal is to Ensure that Higher Education Sends the Appropriate Messages to Students and the Public, and Supports a System that is Above Reproach

We believe that by remedying the five flaws in the current BCS system, the BCS Reform Proposal helps to ensure higher education is sending the appropriate messages to students and the public, and is acting beyond reproach. As educators, one of the primary objectives of universities is to ensure that their students graduate with a firm understanding of the principles of fundamental fairness and equitable treatment. Yet, support of the current BCS system is not consistent with those principles because it is fundamentally unfair and inequitable to (1) distribute revenue to similarly-performing conferences in an extremely inequitable manner; (2) use non-performance-based standards to determine which conferences' champions automatically play in BCS bowl games; and (3) purport to determine a "national" champion, yet effectively eliminate nearly half the FBS schools in the "nation" from the championship before the season begins.

In addition, students look to their leaders, including within their universities, to develop their outlook on issues. The correct message for higher education to send with respect to reaching one's goals should be as follows: if you work extremely hard and are successful in all of your endeavors, you will have a chance to reach any goal. But the current BCS system is inconsistent with this message. As noted above, nearly 6,000 students play for football teams that because of the BCS system have no realistic chance of winning the national championship no matter how hard they work, and no matter how successful they are on the field.

Higher education's position on issues – including this issue, which transcends sports – should be above reproach. As Senator DeWine stated at the 2003 BCS hearings, the BCS "needs to do more than survive legal scrutiny. It also must be fair." Similarly, as Scott Cowen, President of Tulane University, stated at the 2003 BCS hearings, a "system that requires the involvement of legal or legislative inquiry to determine its legality is not the kind of system our higher education institutions should have."

The Mountain West Board of Directors agrees with those views. The Board stated in its April 1, 2009 letter to the BCS that higher education should "reform the system before even more goodwill is lost and further resources are expended defending a system that the public overwhelmingly views as 'rigged' and 'corrupt.'" The time to do that is now – not five, 10 or 20 years from now. If you can fix something that is flawed, you don't wait.

The BCS is a highly-exclusive system that is derived from an interlocking arrangement with six conferences, the major bowls and a TV network, which group determines all pertinent aspects of the BCS system. Given these facts, it is hardly surprising that the system has received so much scrutiny. Virtually everyone seems to know it is fundamentally flawed. It is time for the BCS to acknowledge the need for change and take the appropriate steps to develop a more equitable system.

4. Fourth Objective of the BCS Reform Proposal is to Increase the Excitement of the College Football Season for Universities and their Fans

The final objective of the BCS Reform Proposal is to increase the excitement of the college football season for both universities and their fans. Under the BCS Reform Proposal, far more regular-season games will have national championship implications, making the regular season much more exciting. In fact, depending on how you perform the calculations, we estimate there will be at least 200% to 400% more regular-season games with national championship implications under the BCS Reform Proposal than there are under the current system. That's a lot of games. Representative examples of just a few of the games that would have had national championship implications under the BCS Reform Proposal, but did not under the current system in 2008, include Boise State at Oregon, Virginia Tech at Nebraska, Oregon State at Utah, Minnesota at Illinois, Oklahoma State at Missouri, BYU at TCU, TCU at Utah, Oklahoma State at Texas Tech, Boston College at Florida State, BYU at Utah, Fresno State at Boise State, West Virginia at Pittsburgh, Oregon State at Oregon and Boston College at Virginia Tech.

Additionally, the current system greatly hinders postseason excitement because, with the exception of the national championship game itself, no BCS bowl game affects which team captures the national championship. There are currently 34 postseason games, and only one of them has national championship implications. Under the BCS Reform Proposal, seven games would have national championship implications. The three-week playoff build-up to a national championship would also create tremendous excitement.

A Few Related Matters

1. Comparison of the BCS to the Prior System is Generally Irrelevant, Yet Still Telling in One Important Respect

The issue today is whether the current BCS system is flawed and needs to be modified due to the harms it is causing. The issue is not whether the current system is better or worse than the prior system.

Having said that, it is worth noting that the BCS system, by guaranteeing tremendous competitive and revenue advantages every single year to the AQ Conference teams at the expense of the Non-AQ Conference teams, is actually significantly worse than the old system in one very important respect. The BCS system ensures for as long as the system is in place that there will be "Haves" and "Have Nots."

Under the BCS system, as indicated earlier, bowl tie-ins and pre-arranged agreements (all of which favor the AQ Conference teams) trump performance on the field with respect to automatic access to the BCS bowl games, which are by far the most high-profile and lucrative games. Moreover, even where a Non-AQ Conference team plays in a BCS bowl game, its conference still receives many millions of dollars less than each of the AQ Conferences.

Under the old system, which was a more open system, a team like the University of Miami could come of out of nowhere as an independent and gain national prominence and win multiple championships. Other then-independent teams were able to do the same thing. Indeed, even

BYU won a national championship under the old system as a member of what is now a Non-AQ Conference. All of that occurred because the old system didn't effectively prevent teams who weren't in the major conferences from winning the championship, as the current system does for all practical purposes (with the exception of Notre Dame). But once again, the important point here is that the current system is flawed, and those flaws need to be addressed.

2. The BCS Reform Proposal's Impact on Academics and Student-Athletes

As discussed earlier, the BCS Reform Proposal could enhance the student-athlete experience, while also allowing universities to set a positive example – without negatively impacting academics. Increased revenues could be used for athletics or academic programs and scholarships. Taking action to establish a more equitable system would speak far more loudly than any words. The length of the season would not be significantly impacted, and students are generally on break (or at most in the first week of school) when the championship game would occur. Final exams would have been completed a month earlier. The minimal impact on academics, if any, would pale in comparison to that of March Madness – which involves 65 teams, at least four of whom are competing for more than three weeks during the middle of a semester.

In addition, the physical demands of the BCS Reform Proposal would not be an undue burden for the football student-athletes. The two teams in the championship game would play 15 or 16 games that season. Athletes younger, older and the same age as these athletes play approximately as many or more football games in a season. High school teams that reach the championship game can play up to 15 games a season in a number of states, while teams in other divisions of college football can play 16 games in a season if they make it to the national championship game. Unlike those other groups, football student-athletes in FBS conferences have approximately a month off before their BCS bowl games, resulting in far more rest during the season than any of these other athletes.

3. The BCS Reform Proposal Will Help the BCS Bowls While Not Harming the Non-BCS Bowls

For the BCS bowls, the BCS Reform Proposal will be a tremendous boon. Under the BCS Reform Proposal, the BCS bowl games will have national championship ramifications every single year (i.e., 100% of the time), instead of once every four years (i.e., 25% of the time). The Virginia Tech/Cincinnati Orange Bowl was the lowest-rated BCS bowl game ever. Is there any doubt that a quarterfinal Orange Bowl match-up between two of the top-eight-ranked teams would have been a far bigger attraction?

Simply put, the public is clamoring for these games, and between university fans and local citizens in the cities where the bowls are located, they, as well as the semifinals and finals, should have no trouble selling out. Indeed, the NCAA has far more ticket requests for its Final Four in men's basketball than it can even handle, and even the regional finals sell out every year. Yet, football is unquestionably more popular in this country than basketball.

As for the non-BCS bowls, they are generally played in December (with a couple of exceptions), whereas the playoffs under the BCS Reform Proposal would be in January of the following year. Therefore, people who watch the non-BCS bowls will still do so because there is absolutely no conflict between them and playoff games that will be played the following month. Moreover, the non-BCS bowls have reportedly thrived since the BCS' inception, even though the BCS added a national championship game. A couple of playoff games in January should not negatively impact those non-BCS bowls.

4. The BCS Reform Proposal Will, at a Minimum, Greatly Diminish the Controversies

Caused by the Current System

By addressing the glaring revenue and competitive inequities under the current system, the BCS Reform Proposal should put an end to the tremendous controversy swirling around the current system as to these matters. It will also greatly reduce any controversy relating to which teams should have an opportunity to compete for the national championship once the regular season ends. While the 9th place team under the BCS Reform Proposal may be disappointed they were not ranked 8th by the committee among the BCS bowl teams, and therefore were not in the playoff, that team is generally in a far different position than teams near the top of the standings are today.

For example, in 2008, if the BCS Reform Proposal had been in effect, Ohio State may have complained if it was left out of a playoff, but Ohio State's position under such a scenario would have been far different than what Texas, USC and Utah had to confront while being left out of an opportunity to compete for the title. Ohio State lost convincingly to USC and fell to Penn State as well in 2008. In contrast, many people thought one-loss USC was the best team in the country, one-loss Texas had beaten Oklahoma (who nevertheless played in the national championship game), and Utah was unbeaten and defeated the only team (Oregon State) that had beaten USC. March Madness has controversy each year over the last teams left out, but few are advocating a change to the system because the level of controversy is small. The same would be true under the BCS Reform Proposal, which would greatly reduce the level of controversy hovering over the BCS system today.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about these matters.

AIR FORCE | NEW MEXICO | UNLV
BYU | SAN DIEGO STATE | UTAH
COLORADO STATE | TCU | WYOMING

CRAIG THOMPSON, COMMISSIONER

The Mountain West Conference submits the following proposal (the "MWC Proposal") to reform the Bowl Championship Series ("BCS") to its fellow Football Bowl Subdivision ("FBS") conferences and the University of Notre Dame. The MWC Proposal covers the 2010 through 2013 seasons.[1] The MWC Proposal addresses the inequities under the current BCS system and enables the national championship to be decided (1) in the proper location – on the field of play, and (2) by the appropriate parties – the players.

1. **Determining Which Conferences are Automatic-Qualifying Conferences**

   a. **Criteria for a conference to automatically qualify** – An FBS conference will be an "AQ Conference" (its champion will automatically qualify each year for a BCS bowl berth) if over a two-season period the conference (1) has played a minimum of twenty inter-conference regular-season games against the six current AQ Conferences, and (2) has a minimum winning percentage of .400 in these games.[2]

   b. **Conferences that have earned automatic qualification** – As indicated in Table 1 of the Appendix, the ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, MWC, Pac-10, and SEC conferences will be AQ Conferences for the 2010 through 2013 seasons based on their performance during the previous two seasons.[3]

   Note 1: As indicated in Table 2 of the Appendix, even if the criteria used in paragraph 1(a) were employed over a four-season period (instead of a two-season period), and even if the criteria included bowl games against the current AQ Conferences as well, the same seven conferences listed in paragraph 1(b) above would qualify as AQ Conferences.

   Note 2: Over the past five postseasons, only the Pac-10 (.750), MWC (.700), SEC (.636) and Big 12 (.545) have winning records against AQ Conference teams.

[1] This period coincides with the four-year term of the proposed ESPN agreement.

[2] A conference that has played fewer than 20 such games can be an AQ Conference if its winning percentage would still be at least .400 if it had lost the remaining games needed to reach the 20-game benchmark. For example, a conference with a 10-9 record would be an AQ Conference because even if it had lost a 20th inter-conference game, its 10-10 record and .500 winning percentage would be sufficient.

[3] One or more of the four remaining FBS conferences can become AQ Conferences before 2013 if they satisfy the criteria under paragraph 1(a).

15455 Gleneagle Drive, Suite 200 • Colorado Springs, CO 80921 • Tel: 719.488.4040 • Fax: 719.487.7240 • www.TheMWC.com

2. **Determining Other Universities that will Earn BCS Bowl Berths**

   a. **A new committee is created** – The BCS Standings will no longer be based upon computer formulas and pollsters. Instead, a 12-member selection committee ("Committee") comprised of one representative from each of the 11 FBS conferences and one representative from Notre Dame will determine these standings. This Committee will carefully study and evaluate the teams over the course of a season before determining the rankings. The Committee will rank the Top 25 teams at the end of each regular season, and these rankings will constitute the final BCS Standings.

   b. **The Committee will determine the remaining BCS bowl teams** – Notre Dame and a champion of a non-automatic-qualifying conference ("Non-AQ Conference") may automatically qualify for a BCS bowl berth in a given year, depending upon their rankings in the final BCS Standings in that year. The minimum rankings in the final BCS Standings that Notre Dame or a Non-AQ Conference champion must have to automatically qualify for a BCS bowl in a given year will not change from that required under the current system. The Committee will also select the remaining BCS bowl teams based on the final BCS Standings.

3. **Determining the National Champion**

   a. **Five BCS bowls** – The Rose Bowl, Fiesta Bowl, Orange Bowl, Sugar Bowl, and a new fifth BCS bowl game (the "Fifth BCS Bowl") will be played the first week of January. The Fifth BCS Bowl will be awarded to a bowl that currently hosts a non-BCS game. Requests for proposals will be solicited from other bowls.

   b. **Ranking the BCS bowl teams** – Using the Committee's Top 25 standings, the Committee will rank the BCS bowl teams from 1 to 10.

   c. **Two lowest-ranked BCS bowl teams will play in Fifth BCS Bowl** – The two lowest-ranked BCS bowl teams will play in the Fifth BCS Bowl, and their seasons will end at the conclusion of that game.

   d. **Top eight BCS bowl teams will play in the Rose, Fiesta, Orange or Sugar Bowls** – The other eight BCS bowl teams (the "Top Eight BCS Bowl Teams") will play in either the Rose Bowl, Fiesta Bowl, Orange Bowl, or Sugar Bowl (the "Top Four BCS Bowl Games").

   e. **Preserving bowl tie-ins** – To the extent that the champions of the ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-10, and SEC are Top Eight BCS Bowl Teams, they will play in their respective bowl tie-ins.[4]

[4] If the champion of the ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-10, or SEC is one of the two lowest-ranked BCS bowl teams, that team will play in the Fifth BCS Bowl.

f. **Choosing the remaining match-ups for the Top Four BCS Bowls** – The Committee will choose the games in which the remaining Top Eight BCS Bowl Teams will play.[5]

g. **Semi-Finals and National Championship Game** – The winners of the Top Four BCS Bowl Games will each play in a semi-final game (the "Semi-Finals") approximately one week after their bowl games conclude.[6] The winners of the Semi-Finals will play in the National Championship Game approximately one week after the Semi-Finals.

h. **Hosts for the Semi-Finals and the National Championship Game** – The Rose, Fiesta, Orange, Sugar and Fifth BCS Bowls will be given the first opportunity to host the Semi-Finals on a rotating basis. If these bowls are not interested in hosting the Semi-Finals, requests for proposals will be solicited from other bowls. The Rose, Fiesta, Orange, and Sugar Bowls will host the National Championship Game once every four years in addition to the game they host the first week of January.

4. **Other Matters**

a. **Presidential Oversight Committee** – The composition of the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee will be modified to include one voting member from each FBS conference and Notre Dame.

b. **Revenue calculations** – An equitable revenue calculation will be determined once all revenue, including from television and the bowls, is known.

---

[5] In making these determinations, the Committee will seek to avoid regular-season rematches, and, to the extent reasonably practicable, pairing any of the top three-ranked teams against each other.

[6] The Committee will determine the pairings for the Semi-Finals. The Committee will designate that the highest-ranked team remaining play the lowest-ranked team remaining in one of the Semi-Finals, with the other two teams playing in the other Semi-Final, unless the Committee determines that a very strong justification exists for a different pairing.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Inter-Conference Regular-Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008)	
Conference	**Record**
MWC	16-13 (.552)
ACC	22-18 (.550)
Big Ten	10-9 (.526)
Pac-10	10-9 (.526)
Big East	14-15 (.483)
Big 12	12-14 (.462)
SEC	13-16 (.448)
WAC	6-28 (.176)
MAC	11-57 (.162)
Sun Belt	5-43 (.104)
C-USA	4-44 (.083)

TABLE 2

Inter-Conference Regular-Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008)	
Conference	**Record**
Pac-10	32-20 (.615)
SEC	43-36 (.544)
Big East	36-38 (.486)
Big 12	35-37 (.486)
MWC	29-32 (.475)
ACC	45-52 (.464)
Big Ten	29-37 (.439)
WAC	13-62 (.173)
MAC	17-109 (.135)
C-USA	11-92 (.107)
Sun Belt	6-78 (.071)

Comparison of Current BCS System and the BCS Reform Proposal

What Needs to be Determined	Current BCS System	BCS Reform Proposal
Revenue Distribution among the Conferences	Six Conferences Each Receive Millions More than the Other Five Conferences Each Year, Regardless of Performance	Calls for Equitable Revenue Distribution, Based on Performance of Conferences
Which Conferences Automatically Qualify for BCS Bowl Games Every Year	Non-Performance-Based Standard Bowl Tie-Ins and Agreements	Performance-Based Standard Results of Inter-Conference Games Against Automatic-Qualifying Conferences
The National Champion (Once the Regular Season is Completed)	Selects 2 Teams to Compete for the National Championship More than 50 Teams Are Effectively Eliminated Before the Season Begins Numerous Outstanding Conference Champions are Eliminated at the End of the Season Because Only Two Teams are Permitted to Compete for the National Championship	Selects Top 8 Teams to Compete for the National Championship No Teams are Eliminated Before the Season Begins Allows the National Champion to be Determined On the Field by the Players, Rather than Off the Field by Computers and Pollsters
The BCS Standings (Which Universities Receive BCS Bowl Berths)	Pollsters -- Some Admit they Rarely Watch the Teams they are Evaluating Computers -- Complex, Confusing Formulas	Committee -- Tasked with Gathering and Analyzing All Pertinent Data Before Making Decisions
Composition of the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee	Six Conferences and Notre Dame Each Have a Separate Vote Other Five Conferences Share Only One Vote	Each Conference has its Own Vote, as does Notre Dame

CONFERENCE STRENGTH BASED ON PERFORMANCE ON THE FIELD

2007 - 2008

Inter-Conference Regular-Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008)

Top Seven Conferences by Percentages

Winning Percentage Range: 45% - 55%

Conference	Record
MWC	16-13 (.552)
ACC	22-18 (.550)
Big Ten	10-9 (.526)
Pac-10	10-9 (.526)
Big East	14-15 (.483)
Big 12	12-14 (.462)
SEC	13-16 (.448)

Inter-Conference Regular-Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008)

Other Four Conferences by Percentages

Winning Percentage Range: 8% - 18%

WAC	6-28 (.176)
MAC	11-57 (.162)
Sun Belt	5-43 (.104)
C-USA	4-44 (.083)

CONFERENCE STRENGTH BASED ON PERFORMANCE ON THE FIELD

2005 - 2008

Inter-Conference Regular-Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008)

Top Seven Conferences by Percentages

Winning Percentage Range: 44% - 62%

Conference	Record
Pac-10	32-20 (.615)
SEC	43-36 (.544)
Big East	36-38 (.486)
Big 12	35-37 (.486)
MWC	29-32 (.475)
ACC	45-52 (.464)
Big Ten	29-37 (.439)

Inter-Conference Regular-Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008)

Other Four Conferences by Percentages

Winning Percentage Range: 7% - 17%

WAC	13-62 (.173)
MAC	17-109 (.135)
C-USA	11-92 (.107)
Sun Belt	6-78 (.071)

BCS DISTRIBUTIONS – 2007-2008

Conference	Inter-Conference Regular-Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008) Top Seven Conferences by Percentages	Aggregate BCS Distributions for 2007-2008
MWC	16-13 (.552)	$13,512,800
ACC	22-18 (.550)	$36,965,634
Big Ten	10-9 (.526)	$45,997,717
Pac-10	10-9 (.526)	$36,997,717
Big East	14-15 (.483)	$36,965,634
Big 12	12-14 (.462)	$45,975,632
SEC	13-16 (.448)	$45,997,717

Conference	Inter-Conference Regular-Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008) Other Four Conferences by Percentages	Aggregate BCS Distributions for 2007-2008
WAC	6-28 (.176)	$12,394,000
MAC	11-57 (.162)	$3,602,400
Sun Belt	5-43 (.104)	$3,591,600
C-USA	4-44 (.083)	$5,275,200

BCS DISTRIBUTIONS – 2005-2008

Conference	Inter-Conference Regular-Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008) Top Seven Conferences by Percentages	Aggregate BCS Distributions for 2005-2008
Pac-10	32-20 (.615)	$71,680,837
SEC	43-36 (.544)	$85,180,836
Big East	36-38 (.486)	$71,648,753
Big 12	35-37 (.486)	$80,658,752
MWC	29-32 (.475)	$18,092,400
ACC	45-52 (.464)	$71,648,753
Big Ten	29-37 (.439)	$89,680,836

Conference	Inter-Conference Regular-Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008) Other Four Conferences by Percentages	Aggregate BCS Distributions for 2005-2008
WAC	13-62 (.173)	$22,452,000
MAC	17-109 (.135)	$ 6,617,200
C-USA	11-92 (.107)	$ 8,811,600
Sun Belt	6-78 (.071)	$ 5,994,800

NCAA Football Post-Season Format: Current System vs. BCS Reform Proposal

Current System

2007

Date		Bowl
January	1	Rose Bowl
January	1	Fiesta Bowl
January	2	Orange Bowl
January	3	Sugar Bowl
January	8	National Championship Game (Phoenix)

2008

Date		Bowl
January	1	Rose Bowl
January	1	Sugar Bowl
January	2	Fiesta Bowl
January	3	Orange Bowl
January	7	National Championship Game (New Orleans)

2009

Date		Bowl
January	1	Rose Bowl
January	1	Orange Bowl
January	2	Sugar Bowl
January	5	Fiesta Bowl
January	8	National Championship Game (Miami)

BCS Reform Proposal

2007

Date		Bowl
January	1	Rose Bowl
January	1	Fiesta Bowl
January	2	Orange Bowl
January	3	Sugar Bowl
January	4-6	"5th" BCS Bowl
January	8-9	Semi-Final 1 (Rose Winner vs. Fiesta Winner)
January	9-10	Semi-Final 2 (Orange Winner vs. Sugar Winner)
January	16-17	National Championship Game

2008

Date		Bowl
January	1	Rose Bowl
January	1	Sugar Bowl
January	2	Fiesta Bowl
January	3	Orange Bowl
January	4-5	"5th" BCS Bowl
January	8-9	Semi-Final 1 (Rose Winner vs. Sugar Winner)
January	9-10	Semi-Final 2 (Fiesta Winner vs. Orange Winner)
January	16-17	National Championship Game

2009

Date		Bowl
January	1	Rose Bowl
January	1	Orange Bowl
January	2	Sugar Bowl
January	5	Fiesta Bowl
January	6-7	"5th" BCS Bowl
January	8-9	Semi-Final 1 (Rose Winner vs. Orange Winner)
January	13-14	Semi-Final 2 (Sugar Winner vs. Fiesta Winner)
January	20-21	National Championship Game

Current System

2010	
Date	**Bowl**
January 1	Rose Bowl
January 1	Sugar Bowl
January 4	Fiesta Bowl
January 5	Orange Bowl
January 7	National Championship Game (Pasadena)

BCS Reform Proposal

2010	
Date	**Bowl**
January 1	Rose Bowl
January 1	Sugar Bowl
January 4	Fiesta Bowl
January 5	Orange Bowl
January 6-7	"5th" BCS Bowl
January 8	Semi-Final 1 (Rose Winner vs. Sugar Winner)
January 11-12	Semi-Final 2 (Fiesta Winner vs. Orange Winner)
January 18-19	National Championship Game

FBS FOOTBALL TEAMS OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS THAT WERE UNDEFEATED IN THE REGULAR SEASON YET DID NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMPETE FOR THE NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

2008

MWC – Utah (12-0)

WAC – Boise State (12-0)

2007

WAC – Hawaii (12-0)

2006

WAC – Boise State (12-0)

2004

MWC – Utah (11-0)

SEC – Auburn (12-0)

WAC – Boise State (11-0)

*Records listed do not include the result from bowl game.

BEFORE THE INCEPTION OF THE BCS

TEAMS THAT WON OR WERE IN NATIONAL TITLE CONTENTION

1991

Independent – Miami (12-0) – Won national title via polls.

1989

Independent – Miami (11-1) – Won national title via polls.

1987

Independent – Miami (12-0) – Won national title via polls.

1986

Independent – Penn State (12-0) – Won national title via polls.

Independent – Miami (11-1) – Lost to Penn State in Fiesta Bowl to finish second.

1984

WAC – BYU (13-0) – Won national title via polls.

1982

Independent – Penn State (11-1) – Won national title via polls.

SWC – SMU (11-0-1) – Finished second in the polls behind Penn State.

1982

Independent – Miami (11-1) – Won national title via polls.

1976

Independent – Pittsburgh (11-0) – won national title via polls.