

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL YOUNG
PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST,
COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

HEARING ON THE BOWL CHAMPIONSHIP SERIES: IS IT FAIR AND IN COMPLIANCE
WITH ANTITRUST LAW?

July 7, 2009

Chairman Kohl, Senator Hatch, and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Michael Young, President of the University of Utah ("Utah"). Utah and eight other fine institutions of higher learning are members of the Mountain West Conference (the "Mountain West").

Thank you for inviting me here today to speak about the Bowl Championship Series ("BCS"), and more particularly whether higher education is acting in an equitable manner with respect to (i) competitive opportunities, and (ii) the distribution of revenues, among federally-funded universities under the BCS. Unfortunately, the answer to that question is no, and as a result Utah and the other members of the MWC, as well as many other universities across this nation, are being harmed.

I would not be here today if all universities had a realistic opportunity to compete for the national championship and if the BCS revenues were equitably distributed among the institutions. If those were the facts, and the only question was whether the correct teams were chosen to play in the championship each year, then the Commissioners of the eleven Football Bowl Subdivision ("FBS") conferences could adequately address any necessary tweaking to the BCS.

Unfortunately, however, those are not the facts and the BCS is perpetuating an unfair system that ensures the following:

- (1) Universities from certain favored conferences (known as "Automatic-Qualifying Conferences" or "AQ Conferences") are, for all practical purposes, guaranteed nine of the ten berths available in the most prestigious and lucrative bowls, known as the BCS bowls, regardless of their performance on the field.
- (2) Universities from the AQ Conferences are the only teams, along with Notre Dame, with any realistic opportunity to compete for the national championship each year.
- (3) Universities from AQ Conferences are guaranteed to receive the vast majority of the revenue from the BCS, regardless of their performance on the field of play.

Without a doubt, the BCS embraces favoritism, rather than fairness. As a result, the fifty-plus schools from the Non-AQ Conferences have to overcome tremendous odds to earn, for all practical purposes, the one available slot (out of ten) in the lucrative and prestigious BCS bowls. These other universities have no realistic chance – even before their seasons begin – to win a national championship. And these same universities receive only a very small percentage of the tremendous revenues the BCS distributes, no matter how well they perform on the field. As Mountain West Commissioner Craig Thompson correctly stated in his May 1, 2009 testimony to the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, Committee on Energy and Commerce (the "May 1 Congressional Hearings"), the BCS creates a permanent underclass.

This is wrong. In this country, we should decide championships by competition and not by conspiracy.

Universities have a paramount responsibility to teach their students to be good citizens. They have a responsibility to model fairness and equity and to lead by example. This is true in all aspects of University life, but particularly true for college football which creates some of the greatest interest, enthusiasm and attention among our student bodies. College sports should promote fairness and equity and the fundamental American concept that anyone with the skills and drive to succeed can achieve the highest levels of greatness. Unfortunately, these are not the messages that are being sent by college football today. Instead, the BCS system, with its stranglehold on college football, sends the message that economic power, rather than athletic ability, is the key to success. Rather than promoting fairness and equity, the BCS system promotes the status quo, perpetuates a system of schools who have and those that do not, and virtually assures that many highly successful athletic programs will forever be excluded from the highest levels of recognition and financial gain. These are not the values we want our students to take away from their college experience.

In this testimony, I would like to explain why the current BCS bowl system is fundamentally unfair. I will then address some of the arguments BCS representatives have used in the past to justify its patently unfair system.

Competitive Inequities

BCS Bowl Participation Must be Earned on the Playing Field

The BCS mandates that every year, each champion from an AQ Conference automatically receives a berth in a lucrative and prestigious BCS bowl game, regardless of how well the conference champion performed that year. Conversely, conference champions from the other five conferences, known as the Non-AQ Conferences, and which include the Mountain West, must earn a berth in a BCS bowl game, based on their BCS ranking. Moreover, if two or more of those Non-AQ Conference champions meet the criteria established by the BCS, the BCS provides that only the highest-ranked of those Non-AQ Conference champions will be assured of receiving a BCS bowl berth. And for all practical purposes, all of the other Non-AQ Conference champions will be excluded from a BCS bowl, regardless of how well they performed. That is why Western Athletic Conference champion Boise State finished the regular season last year undefeated and ranked 9th, but still did not get an opportunity to participate in a BCS bowl while 10th-ranked, two-loss, Ohio State (which was not even a conference champion), 12th-ranked, two-loss, Cincinnati, and 19th-ranked, four-loss, Virginia Tech all did.

It is a fair question to ask whether there should be any AQ Conference designations at all under the BCS. That is, should all conference champions have to earn the right to play in a BCS bowl game, by performing very well that year? The argument for having no AQ Conference designations is simple: let the best teams that year play in the best and most lucrative bowls that year. Alternatively, an argument can be made that conferences who consistently demonstrate their strong performance should be entitled to have their champions automatically qualify for a BCS bowl.

While both of these positions might be defensible, the current position of the BCS is not. The current system mandates AQ Conference designations, but then has AQ Conferences determined not by performance on the field, but rather by bowl tie-ins and agreements off the field. If performance on the field were the governing criteria, the Mountain West would join the other six AQ Conferences as an AQ Conference. But because agreements trump performance on the field

under the BCS, the Mountain West is forced to remain a Non-AQ Conference under the new draft ESPN agreement.

The Mountain West's performance speaks for itself. Over the past two years, in inter-conference games against the AQ Conferences, the Mountain West had a better record than any of the 10 other conferences, including all six AQ Conferences. For the top seven conferences over that period, the winning percentages in such games ranged from a high of 55% (Mountain West) to a low of 45% (SEC).

Moreover, the range of percentages for the top group is 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, which includes the Mountain West and the other six AQ Conferences, the percentages range from 62% (Pac-10) to 44% (Big 10).

But 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. The chart in Attachment 1 shows the undeniable inequity in the system. Accordingly, if the BCS is to continue to have AQ Conference designations (and it is debatable whether it should), at the very least it must ensure that such status is earned through performance on the field, rather than bowl tie-ins and agreements off the field.

The BCS Has Provided FBS College Football with a Dubious Distinction – It is the Only Sport that Effectively Eliminates Nearly Half of its Teams from the Championship Even Before their Seasons Begin

If someone suggested that college baseball and college basketball change their operations to effectively eliminate nearly half of their participating teams from the national championship even before their seasons begin, that person would be soundly criticized and subject to tremendous ridicule. Similarly, if someone proposed a system for a new college sport in which 120 universities were to participate, and suggested that nearly half of those institutions would be, for all practical purposes, eliminated from the national championship even before their seasons begin, that person's idea would be met with tremendous derision. Yet, that is precisely what the BCS has in effect done. As Commissioner Thompson correctly stated in his recent Congressional testimony:

Under the BCS system, nearly half of the FBS teams are eliminated from the national championship even before 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, the Mountain West had the best inter-conference record against AQ Conference teams. Utah 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. It simply doesn't add up. When your conference has the top inter-conference record against AQ Conference teams, and your university, from that same conference, has the top record in the country, you should have a chance to compete for the national championship. Yet, that did not happen.

Commissioner Thompson in his testimony at the May 1 Congressional hearing recognized: "Utah was eliminated this past season not by a team, but by a system – the

BCS.” In fact, no Non-AQ Conference team has ever had an opportunity to compete for the national championship since the BCS’ formation, and if Utah could not break the impenetrable barrier in 2008, it is highly unlikely that any Non-AQ Conference team could ever do so under the current structure.

Ironically, while the BCS frequently claims that its system has greatly benefited Non-AQ Conference teams, as compared to the old system, it ignores the undeniable fact that prior to the BCS, universities that were then not from AQ Conferences frequently won the national championship, as Attachment No. 2 shows. The BCS is markedly inferior to the old system in this important respect: only the BCS effectively freezes out nearly half of its teams from competing for the title. And how it does this is fairly simple to understand.

The BCS system effectively tells the world, and more importantly the pollsters, that Non-AQ Conference teams should be viewed differently because only the AQ Conferences are worthy of an automatic bid to a BCS bowl. Therefore, according to the BCS, the Non-AQ Conferences must be weaker. Indeed, the media picks up on this and almost universally calls Non-AQ Conference teams “Non-BCS teams,” even though they are BCS teams. And why would anybody expect pollsters to choose a “Non-BCS team” to play in the BCS National Championship.

Coaches and administrators from AQ Conferences perpetuate the stereotype by frequently denigrating the Non-AQ Conferences. For example, last season Alabama’s head coach stated that his team was the only team from a “real” conference to finish the regular season undefeated, thereby implying that the Mountain West Conference (where Utah finished undefeated) and the Western Athletic Conference (where Boise State finished undefeated) were not “real” football conferences. It is hardly surprising given these perceptions, which are created and maintained by the BCS system and its coaches and administrators, that pollsters never value Non-AQ Conference teams high enough – no matter what they do – to be ranked in the top two at the end of the regular season. Obviously, national champions should be chosen as the result of on-field performance, rather than skewed popularity contests.

Also contributing to the problem is the fact that only two teams have an opportunity to compete for the national championship once the regular season ends. Regardless of one’s views regarding a playoff, the combination of limiting the number of teams who get to compete for a championship once the regular season ends to two, and relegating some conferences to Non-AQ Conference status (thereby indicating they are weaker or perhaps not even “real conferences”), leads to the inevitable exclusion of Non-AQ Conference teams from competing for the national championship. No other sport that I am aware of in college, high school, or even youth leagues effectively eliminates nearly half its teams before their seasons begin. FBS college football must find a way to eliminate this dubious distinction.

Revenue Inequities Must be Corrected

The revenue inequities under the BCS system are stark. For example, as I mentioned above, in 2008 the Mountain West had the best inter-conference record against AQ Conference teams. In addition, the Mountain West champion Utah was ranked 6th in the Final BCS standings, TCU was ranked 11th, and BYU was ranked 18th. All three of these teams were ranked ahead of the ACC champion, 19th-ranked Virginia Tech, which only participated in a BCS bowl because of the ACC’s bowl tie-in with the Orange Bowl. Moreover, both Utah and TCU were ranked ahead of the Big East

Conference champion, 12th-ranked Cincinnati, which also only received a BCS bowl berth because of deals off the field. In addition, the Mountain West went 6-1 in regular season games against the Pac-10 that year as well. And all four of these conferences, the Mountain West, the ACC, the Big East, and the Pac-10 each had exactly one team play in a BCS bowl game. Yet, the three AQ Conferences each received \$18.6 million from the BCS for that year, whereas the Mountain West received only \$9.8 million.

While these economic disparities can't be justified in any way, let alone by performance on the field, they are nevertheless locked-in by the BCS. The numbers are even more startling when the past two or four years are considered, as the charts in Attachment 3 reveal. The Mountain West has performed well over the past four years against the six AQ Conferences. Yet, over that same period of time, on average the Mountain West has received \$60 million dollars less from the BCS than the six AQ Conferences, as the Mountain West has received \$18 million and those others have averaged \$78 million. While the joke is that the BCS has 60 million reasons to keep its current system in place, it frankly is no laughing matter given the budgetary constraints facing all universities. To make matters worse, despite the Mountain West's strong performance over the past four years, unless changes to the BCS are made, the dramatic differences in disbursements will only increase, with no justification whatsoever and to the tremendous detriment of the Mountain West.

The BCS system needs to be modified to rectify the unjustifiable revenue inequities clearly demonstrated in Attachment 3. No matter what the few BCS defenders claim, the numbers simply don't lie -- and they tell a story that should not be allowed to continue.

Harms to Non-AQ Conference Universities as a Result of the BCS' Revenue and Competitive Inequities

The competitive and revenue inequities that are an integral component of the BCS system cause tremendous harms to the Mountain West Conference universities and many other institutions across the nation. These inequities create a permanent gulf between the schools who "have" and those "who have not." As Commissioner Thompson accurately stated in his May 1 testimony:

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.

Commissioner Thompson also correctly summarized some of the many beneficial uses for additional revenue from the BCS, which would be available to the Mountain West universities (and many other institutions) if the system were operated equitably. As Commissioner Thompson stated, the following are areas where additional funds could be utilized:

- 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).

Harms to Students from the BCS

As educators, one of our primary missions is to ensure that our students leave college with a firm grasp of the differences between right and wrong, and between equitable and inequitable treatment of others. Accordingly, in the classroom, our professors do far more than teach substantive content, they also help ensure that students leave college with the proper value system in place. If, however, we say one thing in the classroom, and do the opposite outside of it, at best we are sending mixed messages to our students and at worst we are teaching them that good values do not matter.

College sports are a particularly meaningful avenue for reaching and teaching our student populations. College football generates interest, enthusiasm and attention from the student body. College sports should promote fairness and equity and the fundamental American concept that anyone with the skills and drive to succeed can achieve the highest levels of greatness. Unfortunately, these are not the messages that are being sent by college football today.

We have a responsibility to teach and encourage our students to strive to make all playing fields in life level, and to give everyone the same opportunities to succeed. Yet, the BCS denies nearly half its universities a chance to compete for the championship, no matter how well they perform. The BCS changes the old saying, "if you can't beat them, join them" to this: "If you can't beat them, eliminate them." This is a bad message to send to our student populations.

Nearly 6,000 students are eliminated from competing for the championship in college football every year because the BCS continues to defend its system, making claims that every university gets unfairly treated *some* of the time. The problem with that analysis is that it ignores the fact that Non-AQ Conference institutions get unfairly treated *all* of the time because they have no realistic chance of competing in, let alone winning, the national championship.

Similarly, when a conference is achieving the same or greater success on the playing field but receives \$60 million less than other conferences who have the economic power to prevent equitable treatment, that sends the wrong messages to our students. The principles of fundamental fairness and equitable treatment can only live through the actions of this generation now, and the next generations in the years to come. We need to make sure that the youth in this country receive a consistent message on these important values. The BCS' treatment of the Non-AQ Conferences, to say the least, is a step in the wrong direction in our endeavor to ensure that our students leave college with the proper values.

Higher education institutions teach the right things in the classroom about these principles. Conferences and universities have a responsibility to live by these principles as well.

The BCS' Attempted Justifications for its System

In the May 1 Congressional hearings, Commissioner Swofford, on behalf of the BCS, attempted to justify the current system. In fairness, he had the unenviable task of trying to justify a fundamentally unfair system. Commissioner Swofford essentially provided three purported justifications for the current BCS system. First, he argued the current system is the only system supported by the marketplace. Second, he claimed that a more competitive championship process would render the regular-season games less exciting. Finally, he predicted a change to the current system would destroy the bowls. None of these justifications have any merit.

The BCS asserts the Current BCS System is Mandated by the Marketplace

The BCS asserts that the BCS system is the best and only system supported by the marketplace. This is clearly not true. The public outcry concerning the current BCS system as well as recent bowl experiences and common sense demonstrate that a fair and equitable system would meet the needs of, and be supported by, the marketplace.

In 2008, the University of Utah was selected to play in the Sugar Bowl, when the Sugar Bowl still had an opportunity to select Big East champion Cincinnati. The Sugar Bowl presumably selected Utah instead of Cincinnati because it believed the public (i.e., the marketplace) would be more interested in watching Utah play in a bowl game than Cincinnati. Undefeated Utah certainly would have also been selected by a bowl before four-loss ACC champion Virginia Tech was selected were it not for the ACC's tie-in with the Orange Bowl. In fact, the Utah vs. Alabama Sugar Bowl had far higher television ratings than the Cincinnati vs. Virginia Tech Orange Bowl. Despite a BCS system that devalues and underrates Non-AQ teams, the marketplace supported Utah's participation in the Sugar Bowl. This experience demonstrates that the marketplace favors and supports athletic achievement.

Similarly, the George Mason story in basketball showed that everybody loves the underdog. The marketplace is not demanding that all Non-AQ Conference teams be effectively eliminated from the national championship. And Non-AQ Conference teams perform well in BCS bowls when given an opportunity, winning three of the four games they have played, including Utah's demolition of Pitt and easy victory over Alabama, and Boise State's thrilling comeback against Oklahoma. It is not the marketplace that wishes to shun excellent Non-AQ Conference teams – it is the BCS itself. In short, the marketplace would support a BCS bowl system that rewards athletic achievement and opens the door to greater participation by deserving teams in the BCS bowls.

With respect to the distribution of BCS funds, the marketplace certainly does not require that when four conferences each have one team in a BCS bowl, three of the conferences (the Big East, ACC, and Pac-10) should receive \$18.6 million and the fourth conference (the Mountain West) should receive only \$9.8 million. Yet this is what occurred in 2008. Despite Utah's dominance on the playing field, the BCS paid Cincinnati's and Virginia Tech's conferences almost \$9 million more than the Mountain West. If ratings or desirability of the teams was the true determinant, the Mountain West would have received far more last year than the ACC or the Big East, instead of nearly \$9 million less. And, at the very least, the new ESPN agreement should seek to rectify that imbalance. Neither the marketplace, nor any other factor can justify the undeniable and extraordinary economic disparities among similarly performing conferences mandated by the BCS.

In sum, fairness dictates that the tremendous competitive and revenue inequities that plague the BCS system be eliminated.

The BCS claims that Changes in the BCS Bowl System Would Render the Regular Season Far Less Exciting

The BCS claims that the current system produces a far more exciting regular season because "every game is important," since it claims that each game can have national championship implications under its system. That is, if a team loses in September it may be eliminated from the national championship under the BCS. The BCS' argument, however, turns logic on its head and is objectively wrong. Under the BCS' logic, the most important games by far are those with

national championship implications. To that extent, I agree. But where the BCS' argument falls apart is in its assumption that more games have national championship implications under the current system, than would occur if more teams were given a real opportunity to compete for a spot in the national championship game.

In fact, quite the opposite is true. As the system is currently set up, and as explained previously, no Non-AQ Conference team has realistic hopes of competing in the National Championship Game. For those schools and their fans, every season begins with the understanding that no game has national championship implications for their teams.

Although the Mountain West's eight team playoff proposal is not the only option for reforming the current BCS system, the proposal further illustrates the fallacy of the BCS' argument. In 2008, for example, every game with national championship implications under the current system would also have had national championship implications under the BCS Reform Proposal. Conversely, there are more than 100 games that would have had national championship implications under the BCS Reform Proposal, that had no national championship implications under the current system. Attachment 4 contains 10 examples of such games.

Utah and Boise State, alone, would have had 24 regular-season games with national championship implications under the BCS Reform Proposal – instead none of their games had national championship implications under the current system. Moreover, the vast majority of games involving two-loss (and often three-loss) teams from AQ Conferences would have national championship implications under the BCS Reform Proposal, but not under the current system. Yet, implementing the BCS Reform Proposal would not be akin to the NCAA basketball tournament (where some teams know they are in the tournament early in the season), because under the BCS Reform Proposal few second-place conference finishers would qualify, whereas in college basketball often even sixth- and seventh-place conference teams earn a berth.

Accordingly, the BCS' repeated claims that the regular season is more exciting under the current system is belied by the facts, which show the opposite is true.

I believe there is more than one option for reforming the BCS in order to make the system more fair and equitable. The Mountain West Conference has proposed one such model, an eight-game playoff. Without insisting upon a playoff as the only solution, I would like to refute two of the BCS' other arguments against a playoff system.

The BCS Claims that a Playoff Would Result in the Elimination of the Bowls

The BCS claims that any type of playoff, such as the Mountain West's BCS Reform Proposal, will destroy virtually all of the bowls. This argument has no merit. Even with a short playoff in January, the teams that play in the non-BCS bowls, which are mostly in December, will still want to play in those games. The non-BCS bowls will still want to host those games, and ESPN and the other networks will still want to fill their programming line-up with those games. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that the sponsors of these bowls will continue to support them. In fact, there are well over 1,000 sponsors of bowl games. To think that they would or could all jump ship to sponsor a couple of extra games is naïve at best.

In fact, when the BCS elevated the importance of some bowls (i.e., the BCS bowls) over other bowls, and created a National Championship Game, the non-BCS bowls did not fold. Instead, they continued to grow in number. These bowls are not harmed by having more important bowl games played in January, as everyone already realizes these non-BCS bowls play a different role. Moreover, I believe the BCS bowls would actually benefit from a playoff system, as each bowl would have national championship implications every year, rather than only once

every four years.

The BCS Claims that a Playoff Would Negatively Impact the Academic Mission

Although not currently its main focus, the BCS has argued that a short playoff would negatively impact academics. This argument is clearly a red herring. As Commissioner Thompson testified, "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." In addition, Commissioner Swofford indicated at the May 1 Congressional hearing that the current system has no significant impact on academics, even though the final game may be played around January 10th. Under the BCS Reform Proposal, the final game will be played just shortly thereafter, between January 17th and 19th.

In fact, the impact upon academics from the BCS results not from when the last game is played, but from the message it sends to the students. For the reasons previously stated, I strongly believe that a fair and equitable system would promote academic values to our students and enhance the entire academic mission of our universities. Under the current BCS system, the public overwhelmingly believes that higher education has taken the lowest of roads. That is quite disturbing to me.

I have the utmost respect for my fellow university presidents, who I believe have similar views as myself when it comes to ethical matters. As the recently retired Chair of the BCS Presidential Oversight Committee, David Frohnmayer, correctly stated in a speech: "We can easily go too far - authority is seductive; we can reach a personal tipping point Some environments blind us to the human consequences of our actions- so we MUST be attuned to the consequences of our behavior ...[The] ethical life is hard work - knowing right from wrong requires diligence, self-scrutiny and looking into a very well-lit and refractive mirror." I believe the BCS should follow President Frohnmayer's advice from his speech and take a very hard look in the mirror at what it is doing -- and then take the steps necessary to make sure we are heading on the right path. Actions, after all, speak far louder than words.

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

ATTACHMENT 1

CONFERENCE STRENGTH BASED ON PERFORMANCE ON THE FIELD

2007 - 2008

Inter-Conference Regular-Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008)	
<u>Top Seven Conferences by Percentages</u>	
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)

CONFERENCE STRENGTH BASED ON PERFORMANCE ON THE FIELD

2005 - 2008

Inter-Conference Regular-Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008)	
<u>Top Seven Conferences by Percentages</u>	
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)

ATTACHMENT 2

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.

1983

Independent – Miami (11-1) – 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.

1976

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

ATTACHMENT 3

BCS DISTRIBUTIONS – 2007-2008

Conference	Inter-Conference Regular- Season Records Against AQ Conferences (2007 - 2008) <u>Top Seven Conferences by Percentages</u>	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

BCS DISTRIBUTIONS – 2005-2008

Conference	Inter-Conference Regular- Season and Postseason Records Against AQ Conferences (2005 - 2008) <u>Top Seven Conferences by Percentages</u>	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

ATTACHMENT 4

2008 Season: There were More than 100 Games that Would Have Had National Championship Implications Under the BCS Reform Proposal, but Did Not Under the Current System (Here are Ten Examples of Such Games)

Oct 16 – TCU (6-1) vs. BYU (6-0)

Nov 1 – Oregon (6-2) at California (5-2)

Nov 1 – West Virginia (5-2) at Connecticut (6-2)

Nov 6 -- Utah (9-0) vs. TCU (9-1)

Nov 8 – North Carolina (6-2) vs. Georgia Tech (7-2)

Nov 8 – Ohio State (7-2) at Northwestern (7-2)

Nov 8 – Cincinnati (6-2) at West Virginia (6-2)

Nov 15 – Florida State (7-2) vs. Boston College (6-3)

Nov 22 – Penn State (10-1) vs. Michigan State (9-2)

Nov 22 – Cincinnati (8-2) vs. Pitt (7-2)

**2008 Season: Examples of Games that Had National Championship Implications
under the Current System, but Would Not Have Under the BCS Reform Proposal**

None