

<Genesys Conference Call>
<Confirmation Number: 3740962>
<Date: July 22, 2003>
<Time: 4:30 p.m. CST>
<Header: Tulane University Telecommunications>
<Host: Debbie Grant>
<Length of Call: 27:00>

OPERATOR: Good day, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the Presidential Coalition for Athletics Reform conference call.

All participants will be a listen-only mode. Later, we will conduct a question-and-answer session, and instructions will follow at that time. As a reminder, this conference call is being recorded.

I would now like turn the conference over to your host, President of Tulane University, Mr. Scott Cowen. Please go ahead, sir.

SCOTT COWEN, PRESIDENT, TULANE UNIVERSITY: Good, thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm delighted to be joining us today for this press call.

Today, 44 university presidents and chancellors formed a group called the Presidential Coalition for Athletics Reform. These 44 presidents represent 44 of the 52 non-BCS schools, including independents.

We represent five conferences. And those five conferences are Conference USA, the Western Athletic Conference, the Mid-America Conference, Mountain West and the Sun Belt, as well as independents.

The 44 schools – of those 44 schools, 36 were on our telephone call today. And I will try to briefly summarize what we accomplished.

Also joining me, though, on this call today are six of the presidents who were on the phone call, and they will also be prepared to answer any questions you may have.

I have Kermit Hall, who is the President of Utah State, John Peters (ph), who is President of Northern Illinois University, Shelby Thames, who is President of the University of Southern Mississippi, Malcolm Gillis, who is President of Rice University, Bill Greiner, who is President of the University of Buffalo, and Shirley Raines, who is President of the University of Memphis.

Let me tell you what our objectives were for the meeting. We had three objectives. First of all, to see whether we as a group had a common interest in three issues, dealing with access to postseason play in football, increasing academic standards for student-athletes, and for reducing costs for being a Division I-A school.

Our second objective was, that assuming we had these shared interests, could we join together as a coalition to push for change as a group?

And the third was to get that process started today and to lay out a course of action.

I am pleased to tell you that it was unanimous on everyone on the phone call and all 44 that the coalition be formed and that we share the same goals that I just described.

We think the timing, by the way, is excellent for our particular effort. And let me tell you why. The Bowl Championship Series contract is up in 2005. We think it's an ideal time to enter into dialogue about what postseason play will look like after that. We believe that we have a vested interest in it and are very concerned about the current system.

We also feel that we have a new president of the NCAA, Myles Brand, who is a former university president. And he will bring a perspective to the dialogue that we have not seen in recent years.

Third, we have learned our lessons from the ACC-Big East story, and we want to find a way to work cooperatively with all Division I-A presidents and chancellors around the issues we've articulated.

And lastly, we have also noted that we think public opinion is getting, if you will, more harsh towards intercollegiate athletics, and people out there are asking more questions about what's going on in our universities, and we need to prepare answers and to meet the challenge, so we do not lose any integrity or our reputation in the eyes of the general public.

Today, we agreed to form a presidential coalition executive committee. That committee will be made up of one president and one AD from the five non-BCS conferences, as well as one president and an athletic director from an independent school.

That will be a committee of 17 people, because it will also include all the five commissioners.

We are going to charge that committee to do two things in the very near future. The first is to prepare for a meeting on September 8th with presidents from the BCS conference and a commissioner. That invitation was extended to us. We accept that invitation. And we will be prepared at that meeting to talk about a number of topics that will be of mutual interest.

For that meeting to be productive, by the way, we think it's very important that we develop a jointly-agreed-upon agenda for the meeting and set up topics, that it's a two-way conversation, and that we come to the discussion with an open mind. We do not believe it's appropriate for anyone to have declarative statements of what options are not available at this moment in time before we've ever had a conversation about the future of postseason play.

But we are very pleased by the invitation and believe we can have a fruitful and productive discussion on September 8th.

We are also, however, asking the presidential coalition executive committee to develop a number of proposals that we might consider that would govern postseason play after 2005, some of which may involve the Bowl Championship Series, others which may not.

We also decided today that in addition to the topic of increased access to postseason play in football, we also want to look at the issue of Division I eligibility and membership criteria. As many of you know, new membership criteria has come into place, effective 2004. We feel the impact of that increases the cost of Division I-A athletics, and we would like to explore the possibility of finding ways to lower the cost of being Division I-A, not increasing the cost.

The last thing that I would simply mention for today before I answer questions from any of you is that Tulane University will be hosting a national symposium on athletics reform on November 11th in New Orleans. We have already had an acceptance by Myles Brand to come and speak with us about the future of the NCAA and his vision for it, Bill Brolin (ph), who is past President of Princeton University, currently President of the Carnegie Mellon Foundation, and author of the book, "The Game of Life," will be here to talk about athletics reform.

We will also have as part of that symposium, a debate. We are asking for a debate between one president and one commissioner from a BCS conference, and one president and one commissioner from a non-BCS conference, to have the debate about the future of the Bowl Championship Series.

We feel that this particular subject is important to all of us, that there should be transparency, there should be openness, and are willing to have a dialogue, and we should debate with ourselves on this particular issue.

So I will be extending an invitation, a written invitation within the next two days to the presidential oversight committee of the BCS, requesting that they designate some president and commissioner to join us on November 11th for what I promise will be a very interesting debate.

The other thing I will tell you is, as of today, we have established a Web site for our coalition. The name of the Web site is coalition dot – I'm sorry – coalition@tulane.edu.

On that Web site, we will continually post information that I think you will find interesting, as the debate continues over the next 12 months about the future of intercollegiate athletics at the Division I-A level.

I think with that, I will simply end here and open the floor for any questions that you may have of me or any of my colleagues who are on the phone.

OPERATOR: As a reminder, ladies and gentlemen, if you do have a question, please press the one key now.

COWEN: Jeff, and what I'd like to do is I have a number of reporters in the room here. Perhaps we'll start with two questions from those in the room and then go to two questions from those— maybe four questions, from those on the phone. Because there's a lot more on the phone.

OPERATOR: Certainly.

COWEN: All right. Please.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Given the strength of your numbers and obviously the present support you're getting from the non-BCS schools, are you getting any response at all from a BCS commissioner, anywhere along the line? Non-official response or official?

COWEN: Yes. The question has been asked from me, given the tremendous strength we have of interest of the non-BCS schools in our effort, have I had any correspondence or interest from BCS presidents?

I can tell you today that a half a dozen BCS presidents have contacted me personally, endorsing the dialogue that we want to have and suggesting that this is a very rich and appropriate topic. I have not had any conversations with any commissioners from the BCS.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Any negative response at all?

COWEN: The question is, have I gotten any negative response? None that has come to me directly.

All right, Jeff, go to the phone, and let's get four questions.

OPERATOR: Certainly. Jennifer Lee (ph) of the Sports Business Journal. Please go ahead.

JENNIFER LEE (ph), SPORTS BUSINESS JOURNAL: Hi, Scott. You were mentioning earlier that the new I-A criteria will actually make it more expensive than less expensive for I-A schools. Can you explain how that will ...

COWEN: Yes, there's four components – and Malcolm and Bill, I'd ask you to join me in this also if I miss anything. There are four components to the new criteria, as I remember.

First of all, before – for the number of scholarships you have to offer as a Division I-A school has gone up significantly. Secondly, the number of scholarships you have to do for football, the minimum number of scholarships, has gone up significantly. Third is, there are now attendance requirements at the games themselves, which will, I think, will force a number of schools, both BCS and non-BCS, to do some things to make sure that they have more paid attendance.

And the last thing is, you now have to sponsor 16 sports, rather than 14. And Malcolm and Bill, I would – if either one of you are on, I would ask you to elaborate if there's something.

BILL GREINER, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO: Yes, on line, it's Bill.

COWEN: Great, Bill. Anything you would add to that?

GREINER: Well, I – also, there is another set of requirements about the number of Division I-A games you have to play, the number of home games you have to play, so it becomes a whole set of restrictive requirements. And I've said in other forums that it is absolutely classic cartel behavior, totally unjustified. And I really think, this is another symptom.

I look upon the BCS – I look upon these new requirements as just symptoms of a much larger problem in which we have big-time football now dominating all aspects of sports, and the conferences who have the big time football – and they've also moved in and made it more difficult for the non-BCS conferences to participate in the, at sufficient level, in my view, in the NCAA annual basketball tournaments, men's and women's.

It's – what we have is, I think, a situation where there are some people who are or think they are they haves, and for reasons that escape me, if we think in terms of what should be the values of higher education in this regard, intend to do their damndest to beat on the have-nots.

MALCOLM GILLIS, PRESIDENT, RICE UNIVERSITY: This is Malcolm. Is the line open?

COWEN: Yes, it is, Malcolm.

GILLIS: Yes, I am in accord with all that has been said by Scott and Bill. I would only add that the way that the requirements are written and the way that they interact, they work in very insidious fashion. And they are well designed to try to reduce the number of schools in Division I-A, because, given the way they interact, if you are meeting all the requirements yourself, but someone in your conference is not and they lose I-A status, then, your I-A status is jeopardized, because you won't meet your requirement for six home games against I-A opposition.

I've always maintained – I've been opposed to this for three and a half years, when I first noticed it. And I've always maintained that this was no accident that it worked out this way. It was done on purpose.

COWEN: All right, Jeff. Let's take some more questions from the telephones.

OPERATOR: Kelly Whiteshead (ph) of USA Today. Your line is open.

KELLY WHITESHEAD (ph), USA TODAY: Yes, for whoever wants to take the question. I – considering that the presidential oversight committee of the BCS said yesterday that they won't consider a playoff beyond 2005 in their next negotiations, how do you join the party? How do you – how do you get in if that's their stance?

COWEN: Well, there's two things. First of all, Myles Brand, who has been asked to be a mediator, assures us that they are open to lots of options. So we take Myles at his word that that's, in fact, the case.

Secondly is, please remember that the BCS schools are not the governing body of the NCAA for anything. So they may have a particular point of view, but there are other schools that are Division I-A, and we have a right to have a point of view.

Plus, we also believe that our colleagues on the BCS side are very reasonable, thoughtful, talented people. And if we can enter into a true dialogue, there may be opportunities for options that right now people are not thinking about or think they're against.

OPERATOR: We have a question from Ray Glycer (ph) of the New York Times. Please go ahead.

RAY GLYER (ph), THE NEW YORK TIMES: Scott, it sounds like this playoff discussion and getting access to the BCS, that you guys want to link graduation rates to this. That you – somehow there's an inference that the schools in the major conferences aren't keeping things in order here.

COWEN: Well, we believe very strongly, but we also think, Ray (ph), that all Division I-A presidents share the same goal in this. We all have a preference for higher academic standards for our student athletes. And I would

have to say, I think there are very little differences there between, if any, between all the presidents. I think we share that in common with our colleagues across it.

It is true that many of us have been distressed that there are schools that are participating in postseason play, whether it be football or basketball, who have really embarrassing graduation rates of their student-athletes. Yet, they are allowed to participate in high-visibility, high-revenue-sharing events.

We do believe that Myles Brand's proposal for incentives and disincentives is getting at that particular issue. And we share support with other BCS presidents on that particular initiative.

OPERATOR: We have a question from Jay Wissig (ph) of Houston Chronicle. Please go ahead.

JAY WISSIG (ph), HOUSTON CHRONICLE: Yes, Dr. Cowen, I was wondering, if none of this works out, are you prepared or your colleagues prepared to argue your case when the next session of the U.S. Congress convenes?

COWEN: I would say this, I would believe that we are going to look at all options in front of us and not rule out any. We would hope that we would not have to use drastic options, because we believe there is a cooperative, collegial way to work out a compromise. So that is our preference.

But we are of the mind that we would not rule out any option as we go forward.

WISSIG (ph): Thank you.

COWEN: Malcolm, do you want to add to that?

GILLIS: Nope, you've said it very well.

COWEN: OK. Well, he was a Houston reporter. I just wanted to make sure you had your two cents there.

GILLIS: No, we know each other.

COWEN: OK. Please, next one on the line, then I'll come back in the room here.

OPERATOR: Stanley Mislner (ph) of the Denver Post. Please go ahead.

STANLEY MISLER (ph), THE DENVER POST: Yes, the five non-BCS conferences, there's all one umbrella goal, and that's, of course, BCS status. But within the ranks there are conflicting interests. How does everybody get on the same page? I'm curious as to the number of presidents that might be missing, if that's just academic conflicts or vacancies in it. And if you could just again repeat who Bill is that spoke before.

COWEN: Sure. I'll say something – Bill, did you hear that also? Bill Greiner?

GREINER: Yes, I did Scott.

COWEN: OK. You want to comment or you want me to?

GREINER: No, go ahead.

MISLER (ph): Oh, President Cowen, that's fine. I just wanted to know – Bill Greiner – OK. Very good.

COWEN: Oh, you just wanted to know who he was.

MISLER (ph): Yes.

COWEN: That was Bill Greiner from the University of Buffalo.

MISLER (ph): OK.

COWEN: To go back to your question, first of all, it's interesting the way you phrased it, that we want to all get into the BCS. I think our preference would be that the BCS system would go away completely.

MISLER (ph): OK.

COWEN: And that it would be replaced by some other system, just like we have in every other single NCAA-sponsored sport. You realize that? In every other NCAA single sport, there is some kind of playoff system. And we are fully aware, by the way, of the criticisms of the playoff system in terms of student-athlete welfare.

But quite honestly, those issues also are of concern in every single other sport. There's nothing unique about football. But there's lots of ways to deal with that.

GILLIS: Yes, it's really incorrect to say that all the non-BCS members want to be BCS members. The question has to do with the way the BCS members have wrapped up the non-BCS bowls, first by their exclusive arrangement where the sixth team in one conference can play the seventh team in another, and might both have records of 6-5 or 6-6.

Second, and we have documented cases of this, and I'm sure you can find out yourself, where conference – BCS conferences are actually bidding in some of these bowls to keep out non-BCS schools.

So it's much more than just the BCS bowls. It's a set of problems that goes well beyond that.

MISLER (ph): Could you identify yourself please, sir?

GILLIS: Yes, I'm Malcolm Gillis, Buffalo University.

MISLER (ph): Oh, OK.

COWEN: All right, I would like to take a question in the room. Lee?

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: I don't want to put word in your mouth. I think you said something like you hope some kind of compromise could be worked out. But it basically sounds to me, either BCS stays as it is or we start playoffs.

COWEN: The question was, it sounds like we'd like to find a compromise, but if everybody's entrenched, you know, how are we going to get a compromise? I can tell you right now that the presidents that were on that telephone call today are not entrenched on a particular position, other than the fact that the BCS arrangement has to be significantly modified.

That I do not think there was a president that was on that phone call today who would feel good if that BCS arrangement wasn't in some way significantly modified after 2005.

Malcolm, Bill, and the rest of you, would you agree?

GILLIS: Yes.

COWEN: Kermit, are you there?

KERMIT HALL, PRESIDENT, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY: Yes, can you, can you hear me, Scott?

COWEN: Yes, I can hear you very well, thank you.

HALL: Well, I think the answer to that question is that, in point of fact, there is a variety of ways to address the issues that are being presented here, beyond having one additional conference or an additional team involved in the BCS bowls.

I think Malcolm has really put his finger on something important, and that is the general structure of the bowl system. And with the way in which institutions come up with very fine seasons, find themselves unable to compete because a team from a conference that had a much poorer record, but because it's a BCS conference, ends up in a stronger position.

I think, well – I mean, my speculation of this would be, what we're going to find is a good deal of willingness to innovate on the part of the non-BCS presidents. And I think that, perhaps more than anything else, will get at addressing issues that really have to do with the cost-driven, revenue-producing character of the BCS.

And it's – my colleagues have described it as a cartel. That is surely what it is. And if you cannot get at that issue, then you're not going to make, I think, a significant dent. So we got to do some things differently, beyond what is presently being done.

GREINER: Scott, Bill Greiner again. Just let me add a footnote. As you know, I'm sorry, I'm a little impassioned on this issue.

But, I think it, I think this is – as I said, I think the BCS thing is a symptom of a much more difficult and problematic set of issues. And it is the extent to which those conferences and their commissioners, frankly, are now dominating the way in which the major university athletics is run in this country.

And in some senses, we kind of let the NCAA get hijacked by this new management structure, which puts so much power into the hands of people and committees. And so we're trying to track the legislative process. And the NCAA now is very, very difficult – having a say on matters that come before the NCAA is very, very difficult now if you're not an insider.

HALL: Bill, you're ...

GREINER: Yes?

HALL: Bill, you're right on target. And in point of fact, what we're left with – isn't it ironic, we have to find an informal, non-institutional way to proceed with what is arguably the most significant issue currently facing college athletics. I'm grateful for Myles Brand. I'm grateful for his willingness to ...

GREINER: Here, here.

HALL: ... act as a mediator. But I – but in the end, the system that the NCAA has can't accommodate the issues that the majority of Division I-A schools have.

GREINER: We used to have a very messy but very interesting process for legislating in the NCAA. In the end, all of these things had to stand or fall in a room full of 2,000 people representing all the members. And the presidents used to attend and engage themselves. It was messy. It was, had its problems and all the rest. But I have to tell you, it's better than what we have now.

COWEN: Let's make sure we get all the reporters. We want to answer as many questions as we can get out. Another one in the room here, please.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: I guess, first of all, it's more of a clarification than a question. The Presidential Coalition for Athletics Reform, right now 44 of 52 are currently in?

COWEN: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: That was done today?

COWEN: That was done today.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Starting today. Now, as far as the next move for you guys, we get the September 8th, the executive committee. Or, what's next, I guess ...

COWEN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: ... for this – for this coalition?

COWEN: The question was, what's next for the coalition? Let me repeat what I think I said before. We will, out of this coalition form the presidential coalition executive committee. And that will be made up of five presidents, five ADs – I'm sorry, six presidents, six ADs and five commissioners.

They will – we will have that group together by the end of next week. So it is our goal, by the end of next week, we will have that group together.

That group then will be meeting during August to start to prepare for the September 8th meeting with our colleagues from the BCS.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: Do you have an official title in this yet?

COWEN: I have no official title. All I have been is a convener of people. I have no official title. I'm just one of the 44 presidents.

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: President Cowen, at any point, has anyone come up and said, couldn't we see this coming?

COWEN: That's going to be a question that's going to come along. I mean, obviously, the financial ramifications, maybe weren't realized at the time.

But the question was, there hasn't been anyone all along saying, you know, hasn't someone seen this coming? And I think a lot of us have seen this coming. We have known, when you look at what's going on in Division I-A and you see what's happening financially, some of the academic issue and the integrity issues, a lot of us have realized sooner or later that something was going to give. And, as I said, now there's a window of opportunity.

I have to admit, I'm sort of late to this game. It's only been within the last year that I've really begun to focus on the systemwide issues and really got educated as part of the review process.

But colleagues like Kermit Hall, Malcolm Gillis, Bill Greiner, they've been at it for years. So they have, you know, have sensed these issues. But I think now they're coming to a head.

And I think it's important, you're getting the sense from my colleagues that, we believe, and I think it's shared by all presidents who were on that phone call today, that the BCS is anti-competitive, has the characteristics of a cartel, and we welcome the fact that there will be congressional hearings looking into the BCS. We think the more transparency and openness and inquiry there is, the more likely it is that we can effect change over time.

Yes, let's go to, Jeff, some of the phone calls.

OPERATOR: Mike Lewis (ph) of Salt Lake Tribune.

MIKE LEWIS (ph), SALT LAKE TRIBUNE: Hello, President. My primary question was answered already. But I'm also curious, how will you decide, or who decides which presidents and athletic directors will be on the executive committee?

COWEN: We are going to ask each of the conferences to make that decision for themselves. So, tomorrow we are asking the Commissioner of Conference USA, Britton Bronounckey (ph), to contact his counterparts at the other conferences and to ask them within a few days to come up with both a president and an AD who will represent that conference.

LEWIS (ph): Thank you.

COWEN: Yes, keep ...

OPERATOR: Allen Schmitkey (ph) of Orlando Sentinel, please go ahead.

ALLEN SCHMITKEY (ph), ORLANDO SENTINEL: Hi, Dr. Cowen.

COWEN: Hi, Allen.

SCHMITKEY (ph): No disrespect here, but where were – where were these strong voices when this, the Division I-A criteria went through the NCAA pipeline a year and a half ago? I mean, this was not exactly a surprise move. I guess, just address the lack of a voice that some of your colleagues have expressed. And I'll ask anybody that chimes in here, if you could please identify yourself.

GREIMER: Malcolm, can I jump in that one, and Scott?

COWEN: Bill, I'm going to ask you and Malcolm. Because you two have really been the ones that have been fighting this for the last couple years. So, why don't you each take a couple of minutes and answer that.

GILLIS: I'll tell you where we were? I've got a heap of letters that I have written to NCAA and various presidents over the past three years, not just the past year and a half, about the insidious nature of the new membership requirements for Division I-A. It's just that we haven't been able to get a lot of people to listen.

GREIMER: I had the same experience. I talked with colleagues, I know. Many of the people were in leadership roles in NCAA. And frankly, on deaf ears. This was something that got on a roll. I can't even – I can't even determine what the origin of it is. I get all sorts of different explanations of that.

You can't know how impenetrable the new governance structure of the NCAA is, if you are not one of the insiders who's in on that structure. I really think it's a major problem. And I don't know how Myles is going to deal with it, but I know he'll try.

HALL: Scott, if I may, I want to add to this, as well. I mean, I've been at my job two and a half years. The first NCAA convention I went to as a president, I basically was told by the then-president of the NCAA that I, what I needed to do was to fall in line and understand. And actually, ironically, the only person at the damn convention that I could find that would pay any attention to me at all was Bob Lipsight (ph) from the New York Times.

And, he, in fact, said, you know, tell me. And I, you know, Bill is right on target. I don't think you folks understand the kind of OPEC-like character of the operation that's governing the NCAA.

COWEN: All right. More questions?

OPERATOR: Al Miand (ph) of the News and Observer please, go ahead.

AL MIAND (ph), NEWS AND OBSERVER: Dr. Cowen, you had mentioned drastic options and not ruling those out. It was my understanding that you had explored legally the basis of challenging the BCS on an antitrust basis. Could you talk about that?

COWEN: It is correct to say that Tulane University has had discussions in the last year with some very outstanding antitrust lawyers about the BCS. Those conversations continue.

But I want to reiterate, that was Tulane University. And I also want to reiterate, that would only be a very, very last resort, as far as I'm concerned. I do not think it would be productive for higher education and the universities for us to be suing one another. So I am hoping collegial, cooperative ways can reach an agreement.

But this is such an important issue to all of us, that I think we cannot rule out any options right now.

OPERATOR: Chris Dufriends (ph) of Los Angeles Times. Please go ahead.

CHRIS DUFRIENDS (ph), LOS ANGELES TIMES: Yes, my question was sort of answered. But I guess I'll follow-up and ask, what would be your response to what members of the presidential oversight committee said yesterday, which was that we do not believe we have antitrust issues. We believe that we have been inclusive, via the at-large adjustment that was made after the BYU incident in '96, and that, the BCS will distribute its \$42 million over the life of the contract to non-BCS schools, money that they would not otherwise received?

COWEN: All right, well, there's several comments I have.

DUFRIENDS (ph): Right.

COWEN: I have heard several times about the \$42 million, about the non-BCS schools will receive over the life of the contract. Has anyone told you how much the BCS schools will receive over the life of that contract?

DUFRIENDS (ph): 900 million, I think.

COWEN: Yes. The number is a staggering number. So, folks, if you want to really have an understanding of the nature of the problem, you can't say, look how much the non-BCS schools are getting, 42 million, and they never refer to how much they're getting, but it's in the \$800 to \$900 million category.

GILLIS: Yes, this is Malcolm Gillis. What do you expect them to say? What you've just quoted is a dog-bites-man story.

COWEN: I would say – so this is an issue that's, you know, you can say it's an important one. Now, I'm not sure – there was one other part of your question. I'm sorry.

DUFRIENDS (ph): The, I guess, to address the access issue into which the non-BCS schools are, I mean, do have entre into the BCS system if they finish number six or higher. And how would you address that? I mean, that's just sort of what the concession they made the last go-around, after the BYU threat. I think they think that satisfies the antitrust issue.

GILLIS: That – this is Malcolm. That is no kind of concession at all ...

COWEN: That was no concession. Theoretically, you could probably get in if you're non-BCS, practically, if you look at that ranking. And remember, it's a BCS ranking. That was a conceived ranking by the BCS to control what schools get into it. That ranking has a distinct bias. And you are talking to a president of a school who's team was 11-0 in 1998 and had no chance of getting into it because of that particular ranking.

So what I would say about the antitrust, I understand why they think there's no issues. But why don't we air the issues out? Congress will do that and, you know, I don't want it to go to a lawsuit. But I am led to believe by some very, very outstanding antitrust lawyers that there are some significant issues with the BCS, and it does seem to have the characteristics of a cartel.

And therefore, it's a self-fulfilling prophecy. They invest more. Of course, they invest more. They have more money to invest. And we don't have access to those same funds. Yet we're all Division I-A. We're living by the same membership.

So my feeling is, we'll have a debate about some of these issues on November 11th, Congress will look at these issues, and there may be other opportunities to look at these issues. And then you don't have to take their word for it or my word for it. We'll let ultimately either Congress or the courts decide, if we come to that point.

HALL: Well, I think it's fair to say the ants are scratching at the Sugar Bowl. And the purpose of this exercise is to kind of remind everyone that there are a lot of equitable interests here that really have been pushed to the side. So the ants are scratching at the Sugar Bowl.

COWEN: By the way, that was Kermit Hall from Utah State. All right, next question.

OPERATOR: Josh DeBull (ph) of the Associated Press. Please go ahead.

JOSH DEBULL (ph), ASSOCIATED PRESS: Hi, I was just wondering if you could guide – if someone could just go over the specifics on the changes. You know, you know, the number of scholarships, what they were going from and to, and the attendance requirements, how that's changing other than the sponsor stuff that's 14 to 16 sports. But in terms of the other changes. Do you have the details on that, or?

COWEN: Josh (ph), we could get you those details. Rather than me try to verbatim do it, it would be better if we got them. And we could get them to you, you know, within an hour.

DEBULL (ph): OK, that's fine. Yes.

COWEN: OK? All right, other questions?

OPERATOR: Ray Glycer (ph) of New York Times. Please go ahead.

GLYER (ph): For Bill Greiner. Bill, there's a – there's a pretty substantially arms race going on in college football ...

GREINER: You got it.

GLYER (ph): ... at the major schools. And, you know, Penn State's expansion and indoor stadiums and all that.

GREINER: Yes.

GLYER (ph): They need this money for their expansions. Why should they even think about giving it to you guys?

GREINER: Let's not ask about them giving money to us. Let's not – let's face what the real issue is for being here. And that is, they want to drive people out. They want to drive people out of the competition at the Division I-A level, unless we come up to some standard that they decide to set, in terms of expenditures, attendance and all the rest.

You know, that, I think, is just plain, flat-out wrong. Worse, to change the rules of the game in midstream when there are institutions like mine which, in good faith, went down the track of going into Division I because it's appropriate for us, given the nature of the university we are, to participate at that level.

And then we jumped through all the hoops that are set by the NCAA. And then suddenly they come along and say, well, that's not good enough. Now, if you ask me how I'm going to explain to the governor, the attorney general of this state, the SUNY trustees, to the counsel of my university, why it is that we should be threatened by people on these grounds, I got a hard time doing that, except to say, this is classic cartel behavior. It's what John D. Rockefeller tried to do to his competitors, drive up their costs, make it more difficult for them.

If some of the big schools want to spend \$300 million on a stadium, I'm all for it. Let them go spend the \$300 million. But don't, in the process, decide that in order to feed that, they're going to be driving, or trying to drive out of the competition, places that don't want to spend at that level but still do a pretty good job.

My conference, the Mid-American, is described as a midmajor conference. Every year, one or two of our teams will whack on somebody from one of the BCS conferences.

So you can do some competitive work at, in both football and basketball and women's basketball, without having to spend the kind of money that other places do.

I had a – one of my colleagues who is a president of a BCS conference school, said to me, in the end however, it's really all about the money. We want you guys out because we don't want to share any money with you at all. That, I believe, is what cartels do. That is wrong.

And remember, the NCAA thought they were immune when the restricted-earnings coaches brought a law suit, and all of us who were members of the NCAA helped pay a \$55 million judgment.

GILLIS: Ray (ph), the other thing that Bill emphasized, I think it's important. We simply want access like we have in all other sports. We just want a level playing field. There is not a level playing field in postseason football.

You know, you have on the phone Malcolm Gillis, representing Rice University, that won the college World Series this year. The smallest, I think, Division I-A school there probably is. And you know what? We're all very proud of that. But you know what? None of us have a chance for that national championship right now in football.

So, we're not looking for some handout here. We're looking for access and a level playing field, and then whatever happens, happens. So if we can't compete at that level, then, you know, by God that's, you know, that's our problem.

HALL: And yet the principle – this is Kermit Hall. The principle means of recruiting is to say, you can be part of the BCS system. And then you exclude the majority of Division I schools from being able to compete for that particular end. The result is, that the recruiting field really gets shifted in the direction that's unfavorable for all of us.

GILLIS: Yep.

HALL: It's – I mean, what – the BCS has done a great job of creating some sense of stability and certainty for the purpose of expanding the entertainment sports dollar.

It's not done a very good job at all of creating the uncertainty principle, which is such a tremendous part of college basketball, where it is, in fact, possible for someone to go out, recruit, work, build a program, with the aspiration to be as good as they can be and play the best. And it just doesn't work.

GILLIS: Let's get back also to the cost issue. And I also hope we will have some time on the academic side. This is Malcolm Gillis.

But one of the ways in which the cost structure is being driven toward insanity, is with huge salaries being paid to football coaches in the BCS conferences. Are there any of you, among the reporters, who believe that there's a college football coach, that's worth \$3 million a year. And if so, why?

COWEN: OK, next question. We're coming to the end, so we have time probably for two or three last questions. So, Jeff, see if there's other people who have got a question.

OPERATOR: As a reminder – we have Natalie Mislner (ph) of the Denver Post.

NATALIE MISLER (ph), THE DENVER POST: Yes, just one more clarification on the number of presidents that weren't represented. Was there any significant reason there, either positions not filled or vacations or travel?

COWEN: Are you asking, you mean, the difference between the 44 and the 52? Or just ...

MISLER (ph): Right. Yes, where were the other eight people?

COWEN: You can assume we will post the list. The other eight people, for whatever reasons, did not want to be part of this dialogue on an ongoing basis.

MISLER (ph): Was there more representation from one conference or another? And I know there's some schools, there might be vacancies or presidents traveling around the country, around the world right now.

COWEN: Natalie (ph), I looked at that. The nos, of which there were eight, were almost evenly divided across the conferences. So there was no concentration of nos in any particular conference.

MISLER (ph): OK, thank you.

COWEN: OK?

We got a question in the room. Ted (ph)?

TED (ph): This is for – I'm sorry. I forgot the name of the President from Rice.

COWEN: Malcolm Gillis, this is a question for you.

GILLIS: Sure.

TED (ph): First of all, what do you feel like was accomplished in your meeting today? And secondly, you said something about this, you knew of BCS schools that were, in essence, had worked to drive non-BCS schools out of bowl contracts. Could you be specific?

GILLIS: First of all, what was accomplished today was that a lot of presidents found out that there's widespread concern across the country, among not just non-BCS presidents, but the public at large, the numerous scandals that have hit intercollegiate athletics in the past 12 months. And I don't think you need me to go over those involving coaches and other things.

Second, yes, there are documented cases in which BCS conferences have bid on non-BCS bowls. OK? And I will send those to you. And have been successful.

COWEN: OK.

GILLIS: And the reason they've been able to do it, is because they are engorged with revenues from the BCS arrangement. So, you have one conference that I know very well, because I used to be in a school in that conference, paid, I believe, it was \$500,000 to one bowl, so that one of its teams could go. And that came from the conference, not the university.

COWEN: All right. Time for two more questions, Jeff.

OPERATOR: As a reminder, if you do have a question, press the one key now.

There are no questions in queue at this time.

COWEN: All right. Very good. Thank you, everybody. Thank you, Jeff.

OPERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, this does conclude your conference. We thank you for your participation. You may disconnect at this time.

END