

April 20, 2015



An interview with:

**JAY BILAS
BOB BOWLSBY
CHARLES DAVIS
DOUG GOTTLIEB
LISA SALTERS
KIRK SCHULZ
COACH GARY WILLIAMS**

COLLEEN NELSON: I'm Colleen McCain Nelson, and it's my pleasure to kick off the next panel discussion. This conversation promises to be entertaining and definitely opinionated. I'll be the moderator this afternoon, or in case of emergency, the referee.

But we love Saturday game days. We love arriving two hours early before tipoff to cheer on our team. But the college sports that we know or we think we know are changing. Change isn't necessarily bad, but it's coming in college athletics. What that change will look like is still an open question. The panelists here this afternoon certainly have opinions about these issues and they're all leaders in their field.

So I thank them for being here today to share their views. With that, let's start with introductions, and then we'll dive into a number of interesting topics.

Starting at my immediate left, we have Doug Gottlieb, he is a former Oklahoma State basketball player, a former professional basketball player who now works as a college basketball analyst for CBS Sports. He hosts an afternoon show on CBS Sports radio, and participates in CBS Sports Minute radio show, which airs throughout the country.

Next, we have Charles Davis, the lead analyst for Fox College Football. He makes

weekly contributions to power rankings on FOXSports.com as well as working as an analyst for the NFL Network. He has formerly worked with TBS, ESPN, CBS, the Golf Channel and SunSports, and he played college football at the University of Tennessee.

Next we have Bob Bowlsby, the Commissioner of the Big 12 Conference. Prior to his role at the Big 12, he spent six years as athletics director at Stanford University and 15 years as the chief administrator of the University of Iowa Department of Athletics. He has chaired several NCAA committees and served on the United States Olympic Committee Board of Directors.

Then we have Jay Bilas, a two-time Emmy nominee for best studio analyst, and he's currently a college basketball analyst for ESPN. He's a regular contributor on college game night and College Gameday as well as Sportscenter, ESPN News, and ESPN Radio. He played basketball at Duke University.

Next we have Kirk Schulz, the President of Kansas State University. He received the 2012 Chief Executive Leadership Award from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. He's the chair of the NCAA Board of Governors, and previously held the VP role for research and economic development at Mississippi State University where he was also the Dean of Engineering.

Next we have Lisa Salters, currently the sideline reporter for ESPN's Monday Night Football, as well as the lead sideline reporter for the coverage of the NBA on ABC. Previously she was a key contributor on ESPN ABC College Football and she played basketball at Penn State University.

And finally we have Gary Williams. He served as the head basketball coach for the University of Maryland, The Ohio State University, Boston College and American University. He led Maryland to an NCAA Championship in 2002. He retired from coaching after the 2011-2012 season,

ASAP sports
...when all is said, we're done.®

visit our archives at asapsports.com

April 20 Big 12 Forum Transcript

1

and is now basketball analyst for the Big Ten Network.

With that, let's get started. Let's jump right into talking about pay for play. Many people in college athletics have predicted or warned that paying players for their name, image and likeness at \$5,000 for player will mean cuts to the number of sports offered at major universities.

COLLEEN NELSON: Commissioner Bowsby, why don't we start with you? Is it a given that paying players will force universities to cut some sports?

BOB BOWLSBY: I don't think it's a given. In fact, I think Judge Wilken may have done us a favor. She may have put in place a ruling that will enable full cost of attendance, and we've struggled for years to get to that point on an NCAA basis. I think there is also a fence around the value of name, image, and likeness under her ruling, and it's an amount we can live with.

Now, of course, that ruling is under appeal. I don't think it's going to take programs under, but I think there will be individual choices made, and I think that some of those choices could include diminishment of the number of sports.

First of all, that isn't going to happen on the women's side. I think you'll see diminishments, if there are any, first among men's Olympic sports. But to a lesser extent, when a men's gymnastics program goes away, the women's gymnastics program is also weakened. When men's track & field or swimming goes away, the women's counterpart sport is also weakened.

So it's not too difficult to see a day when we would have three or four men's sports and twelve women's sports. And we'll have to decide if that's really what we want college athletics to look like, because I think it could be one of the unintended consequences, particularly of steps beyond full cost of attendance, and the name, image, and likeness amounts that we're currently dealing with.

COLLEEN NELSON: President Schulz, do you think you'd need to make cuts to pay players?

KIRK SCHULZ: I don't think so. I think we've taken steps to set money aside to make sure we're prepared for that, and not to do it for just a couple sports, but all of our student-athletes because I think that's an important part of anything we do. Whatever we do for our football team, we also have to do for our women's golf team. I think we've made great progress in the quality and the sports across gender over the last 25 years, and I don't we want to do anything to set that back.

Now, does that mean we have all this money just sitting there that we don't have something that we're doing with it? Absolutely not. But we're going to have to budget carefully and figure out what to do. But it's the right reason to be doing this. I think for a lot of the schools in the power 5 conferences or Big 5, whatever term you want to use, we've been pushing for this for a long time.

So now that we have this opportunity to go full cost of attendance, it's really on us to figure out a way to do it without compromising the number of sports or the opportunities for our student-athletes.

COLLEEN NELSON: Lisa, you played women's basketball. What would you tell athletic directors and university administrators about the prospect of making cuts, especially to non-revenue sports?

LISA SALTERS: In an ideal world, I understand we'd want to treat all athletes the same, what you provide for one, you want to provide for another. But I haven't been a student-athlete for 25-plus years. So now I see things differently. Out in the real world things are about dollars and cents.

So I'm wondering, does it make sense that you'd be able to treat an athlete who is participating in one of the major sports the same as an athlete who is participating in a sport that is not the revenue producer? Like a men's basketball or a women's basketball or football or even a baseball program. It doesn't seem like the programs are equal as far as what they bring into the university. While I understand you go down a slippery slope when you start treating athletes differently, but the reality is they are different as far as bringing in the money.

Is it at all possible? I'm not sure. But is it possible that the big revenue producing sports like men's basketball, women's basketball, football, do they bring in so much revenue that they can support all of the programs at a university? I guess that is a question to the commissioner and, Kirk, to you. Would that even be possible or would that even be fair? Looking at it from a tax perspective where the rich get taxed more because they are rich and they can afford it.

So if the bigger programs can afford it, should they be forced then to kind of take care of everyone and all the athletes at the university? I don't know?

COLLEEN NELSON: Jay, I know that

you've said that college sports programs have plenty of money as evidenced by their coach's salaries. Do you think there is plenty of money to pay players or are you hoping to dip into coaches' salaries to pay players?

JAY BILAS: It's not a question of dipping into it. It is just when you have a multi-billion-dollar business, you have billions of dollars that are generated and the revenues keep going up. And we keep saying we don't have enough money and it's all on the athlete. Even the question that is asked, which is a good one, but the premise of the question is if we provide an athlete more, who do we cut, not when Urban Meyer just signs a \$7 million a year contract, what is going to happen to the wrestling program? Nobody asks that. Or if we have a \$300 million dollars facilities initiative at State U, what about the wrestling program? Nobody asks those questions.

Everybody else is paid fair market value. Every school makes their own decisions with regard to that. But if we're going to provide more than a scholarship to an athlete, then we have a dooms day scenario. Not here, but you have a number of people that will trot out a dooms day scenario that it is going to be the end of college sports as we know it. I don't share that view. I think if we had a free-market system, things would work in an orderly fashion. The rest of the world seems to be able to handle it, but we couldn't handle it in regards to athletes. That doesn't make sense to me.

COLLEEN NELSON: Doug, do you think it's a dooms day scenario? Is it the end of the world if we pay college athletes?

DOUG GOTTLIEB: I don't think it's the end of the world, but I think it dramatically changes how athletes look at themselves and how athletes look at the sport that they play. I'm not as much against it because of the dollars and cents, but I do think at some point there is a limit to the amount of dollars. Of course as administrators you can speak to this more than I could.

But schools, there is a greater cost year after year after year for doing business, whether it's facilities, paying coaches, travel, etcetera, especially with these conferences getting bigger and bigger. And as much as the football team has to travel to these sites, so too do the Olympic sports. So there is a greater cost for everyone involved. I think we'd be blind not to admit that, yes, they're making more money, but they're spending more money not just to keep up with the Joneses, but to do business.

But to me I'm more against it because of the simple fact that I was always under the impression that you went to college, and the awards for college were achieved after you left college. I think when we subsidize the process a little bit and we change how quickly somebody gets financial compensation for what they're doing, I think we take away the core of the lessons that we're supposed to teach young men and women and what that growth phase of college truly is about. No one has money in college. It's almost like a badge of honor that you ate ramen for four years and somehow made it. The only difference is one guy was playing basketball and the other guy was an engineering major.

I think that college athletes, myself included, going back 15 years ago, and I got a chance to spend some time around my alma mater this past weekend, I think they have it better and better and better. It doesn't mean there can't be changes made. Doesn't mean many fall through some of the holes just outside a Pell Grant. It doesn't mean we can't continue to try to push them towards having better facilities, better clothing, better education.

But I think when you look at it as a whole, you're treated not just with greater respect when you're on campus, but the reward for being a student-athlete for basketball, I'm up here with the Hall of Fame coaches and some esteemed gentlemen, and one esteemed lady. Just for me to be here today is a perfect example of the rewards that can be achieved based on hard work and being part of something special, which is college athletics.

So the core of why I'd be against it is not as much financial. I do think there are some implications there, the law of unintended consequences, if you will. But I think it's more about our core values of what college is about, and where the rewards should be. Because I warn people, if you think that paying a kid \$5,000 is going to stop the people from saying that's enough, there is never enough. There is never enough in the professional world. Why would it be enough in college? You pay them \$1,000, \$2,000, \$5,000, it doesn't matter. It won't change, because people inherently always want more. To me, college athletics is about earning more, but earning more once you obtain that degree or once you choose to go into your professional field.

COLLEEN NELSON: Charles, where do you come down on this? Is \$5,000 enough? Too

much?

CHARLES DAVIS: I'm pretty much with everyone else that whatever it's going to be people are going to have to figure it out and make it work. We had a young lady up here on the athlete's panel, Sune Agbuke from Baylor, who talked about didn't matter how much money you gave me, I was going to screw it up. I'm paraphrasing what she's saying. I get where she's coming from, because the money management part of it would be very interesting to me. No matter how much money they have, how much they're given, what you're going to have to deal with now. Once again, we talk about unintended consequences. Coach, I'm out of money.

How are you going to go on strike at a football bowl game? Athletes are going to sit down across the country, and we're going to sit down for our rights to get money. Well, our trainer somehow got wind of it, and came to me and said, are you really going to go on strike before this bowl game? And the first thing I thought of was what? Playing time. Not at all, sir. No way. That's part of where we are now.

I've heard many people talk about this. There is a right way to do things, and maybe people deserve a little bit more. The cost of full attendance -- the full cost of a scholarship is I think fantastic. But I think we've got to be very, very careful about where we're always going to go with these things because I think I've come down with Doug a lot on this one. Playing there gave me an opportunity to be here today. Does it mean everything was right about it? No. Was I excited when the dining hall was closed on Sunday? No. But did it kill me? Not at all.

So I would love to see these kids continue to get what they can. But the biggest thing is don't let a hurt kid not be taken care of medically. A kid who needs to get home for extenuating circumstances, make sure they're able to do that. Don't leave anyone behind on that sort of thing. That's more what I'm worried about than how much money I'm going to have if my pocket.

COLLEEN NELSON: Coach Williams, would you have wanted to see your basketball players get \$5,000 and above beyond their scholarship or any sum above and beyond their scholarship?

COACH WILLIAMS: First of all, the way my team played sometimes, I wish they would have gone on strike (laughing). But as far as getting \$5,000, I think that's nice and everything like that. A lot of these kids, you give them an

NCAA scholarship, and that doesn't put money in their pocket. That doesn't change their economic standing. It allows them to go to college, which is a good thing.

But I think we all have to remember where it is now. 20 years ago when I recruited, you walked into a recruit's home and the first question you get from the parents, if my son goes to the University of Maryland to play basketball, will he get a chance to get his college degree. Now it's if my son goes to the University of Maryland, will he be able to play in the NBA or are you going to try to keep him there if he wants to go after the year or two.

But I think the \$5,000 is nice. But that's not going to change the one-and-done guy. That's always going to be there. If I get a chance to go after one year, that \$5,000 isn't going to keep me there. But we should be more concerned with the total team makeup in football and basketball, not the guys that go to the NFL or NBA, because they're the guys that need the college degree for sure. They're the people that are going to be like everybody else. When they get out, they have to get it done, competing. The one thing, if you can make sure somebody has a good experience, it's going to put them in a position when they leave college to be able to compete.

I think this whole thing is a great opportunity to look at what we can do academically to enhance the experience. I know I've coached kids that came to college scared to death because they know they didn't do much in high school. You've seen some of these kids going to two or three different high schools. That means they haven't studied their whole high school career, usually.

Now you get them, and the pressure is on you to graduate the players. You have to have graduation rates. You have to do all of this. When they have to come from so far back that it's difficult to ever feel comfortable as a college student. So as we do these things to improve the lot of a college athlete, I think that's a great thing.

But at the same time, we have to go back and take a look at what can we do to make education become more important. It's kind of slid over the years. So that emphasis has to be there as we make these other changes financially.

COLLEEN NELSON: So right now, questions about the value of players' names, their images and likenesses and about whether they

should be paid are being hashed out in court. I'm interested in what you think the NCAA should be doing right now to prepare for a possible ruling that forces a change in the rules? Or should the NCAA have done something sooner to get ahead of this? President Schulz, what should the NCAA be doing at this point to prepare for a court ruling or to deal with this situation?

KIRK SCHULZ: I we're praying a lot.

COLLEEN NELSON: Good start.

KIRK SCHULZ: I think it goes back to the reason we got ourselves into some of these issues. It's not worrying about a student-athlete well-being or student-athlete welfare. I think what it required was governance change and governance reform to get us to the point where we have autonomy sessions and we're getting rid of some of the silly rules that have been there for a long time, trying to streamline operations. We're going to prepare, and we're going to (indiscernible) in the courts, and we'll have to wait to see how that plays out.

COLLEEN NELSON: Doug?

DOUG GOTTLIEB: Can I ask you a question, President Schulz. Lisa brought up something very interesting. You've now been able to break up the Big 5 from the rest of the Division I schools. What thought or discussion, if any, have you had about the ability to break up the revenue generating sports from the Olympic sports? It was always thought that it was a sacred cow because of Title IX. But Title IX is more about opportunity than it is about the cost of attendance, for example, as far as I'm familiar with it. Have there been discussions about changing the rules specifically for the revenue generating sports as opposed to the non-revenue generating sports since they're dealing with such different student-athletes and such different scales financially?

KIRK SCHULZ: Not that I'm aware of, or not that I'm a part of. That doesn't mean we're not going to have those discussions coming down the road, because I think they're going to be forced that we need to address it one way or the other. But at current time, autonomy has just kind of started, and we did the cost of attendance and a few other issues that many of the folks up here covered and have discussed. I think now, in a way, we frankly did some of the easier things. There was probably general agreement that we need to do. Now it's going to be time for some of those tougher discussions. I don't hear from a lot of the presidents or athletic directors that I speak with, a desire to separate those out or have a

separate set of rules for men's basketball or football.

So I think we're going to have to continue to be flexible and hear what the membership has to say. But I don't think we've encouraged those discussions yet, but they will come up, and we've got to be prepared for them.

COLLEEN NELSON: Commissioner, Bowlsby, did you want to weigh in on the discussion?

BOB BOWLSBY: Just to add a couple things, the question was asked earlier about where would we be had we been able to get out of our own way previously? And I was on the NCAA Financial Aid and Amateurism Committee in 1987 when we came up with a revolutionary new concept in student aid, room, board, books, tuition, fees and \$2,000 a year. And at that time, \$2,000 was higher than anybody's actual cost of attendance. Had we acted then or had we acted any time since then, we wouldn't be in the courts.

In my estimation, we really have a great difficulty getting out of our own way. This, I'm not sure we would have gotten the full cost of attendance had the courts not mandated that we did. We'd still be quibbling over the fact that each of us has a different actual cost of attendance. Well, now we have a court order, and we'll move ahead, and everybody thinks it's a really good idea.

Had it been done a long time ago, we wouldn't find ourselves in this sort of litigious environment. So I think we need to use that as a lesson as we think about what intercollegiate athletics looks like in the future, because we have a little more homogenous group now with the five autonomy conferences.

But the fact is there is a lot of money in the system, Jay is exactly right. There are billions of dollars in the system, and yet every year we pay out almost \$3 billion dollars in student aid for young athletes. It's the second largest scholarship program in the history of this country, second only to the GI Bill of Rights. There is an enormous amount of opportunity created.

In the end, we have to all remember these are students. Our business is to help 18-year-old adolescents become 22-year-old adults. And in that process give them a great experience, and some of the things you heard from the panelists earlier today. We don't want to get to the point where we separate out football or basketball

players.

But we do have to recognize there are some significant ways in which they are different than the rest of the students on our campuses. And I think we can accomplish that. But we are best served not by accomplishing it in a courtroom, but by being mindful that we need to undertake the novel idea that we did today.

How about listening to the student-athletes and finding out what their experiences are? We've done a poor job of that over the years. I think we're getting a little smarter about it. But in the end, these are students, and we need to self-govern. We don't need to be directed by the courts unless we absolutely can't make a change any other way.

COLLEEN NELSON: Did the NCAA error by not being more proactive on this front? Why do you think the NCAA can't get out of its own way?

JAY BILAS: As Bob aptly put it, I was on the NCAA long-range planning committee when I was in college back in the '80s, and clearly we didn't do a very good job. Yeah, we didn't do a very good job. But all those issues existed then, but all student concerns or athlete concerns were kind of dismissed in a very paternalistic way. It didn't mean the administrators weren't great people. We're dealing with great people here that have really good intentions. We can't somehow say that we're selling these adolescents for billions of dollars, but say they're too young to partake in this, because they're not too young. If they're old enough to sell, they're old enough to benefit.

We are saying that an athlete is somehow different from any other student and needs to be restricted, when any other student can benefit to whatever the level of their value is. So the idea that money and education are mutually exclusive is absolutely false, and it's proven by the fact that every other student can get their value and their status as a student is not affected in any way.

Similarly, you have athletes now that are professional in one sport and amateur in another, and their status as a student is not affected. You have millionaires that are going to college that signed million dollars contracts in baseball and play college football or college basketball as amateurs. So, look, we can provide this. We're putting up these kind of artificial barriers. I get the fact that although we may differ, like whether Doug thinks it's enough, that's fine. If one person wishes to accept less, that doesn't mean everybody else should accept less.

If you're satisfied at a scholarship, that's fine. That doesn't mean that the entire industry, industry-wide, should cap everything. We've been down this road before. We capped coaches years ago. There was something called a restricted earnings position where a coach was capped at \$16,000 a year. It was well intentioned. It was to cut cost and provide entry-level coaches with an opportunity. They were sued, and oddly enough when you make billions of dollars, you get sued. They were sued, and the restricted earnings coaches won. I think it cost the NCAA \$15 million, give or take, in that ballpark.

It was a no-brainer and a trust violation. I believe in myself we're looking at that in regard to the athletes. This is a violation of anti-trust law. We'll see how it works out in courts. It would be crazy to suggest that the NCAA is going to lose every issue. But I think it would be equally crazy that they're going to win every issue. It may be too late. It may be that the courts are the only place to decide this.

CHARLES DAVIS: Jay, if they'd only kept laundry money, we wouldn't be here right now.

JAY BILAS: I think we'd still be here.

CHARLES DAVIS: I'm being somewhat facetious, but the graduated steps towards getting here, you said it yourself, Commissioner. We were right there, didn't take care of it, and we're in another spot. And we're going to continue to there as evidenced by growth of college athletics. Let's face it, I'm 50, so I'm going to go ahead and date myself. Did I ever think I'd be in a world where certain conferences would be aligned the way they are? Did I ever think I'd be in a world where San Diego State was going to be in the Big East at one point? Boise State was going to come to the Big East at one point? Doug made a great point. Yeah, we can fly the revenue teams to get them there and back.

Now I've got to send my cross country team, my tennis team, my whatever team, and they're off and doing their thing. And we're talking about student welfare, and we're all part of this. Maybe I shouldn't be speaking for anyone else, but in all the jobs we do, we're all part of this. Do we ever think to ourselves when that ball goes up in the air on 9:48 p.m. on a school night, that's a good idea? Do we think moving all these games around at different times, and we're saying student-athlete welfare, they're going to kick off at 8:30, and they're going to come back and start

their week the next week. Is that really what we're talking about?

In order to keep doing what we're doing, we have to keep making money. Keep expanding, keep going and getting, and keep doing that. It's almost like we've got it to a point now where how are we going to manage true student-athlete welfare based on what we're talking about? And that's a tough one as far as I'm concerned. A lot of it is incongruous to say this is student-athlete welfare and we're sending them out and doing that. And I'm a participant because I'm calling that game. If it's there and they tell me that's my assignment, and.

COACH WILLIAMS: Is taking his team out. He may not be happy about it, but she's sure not going to forfeit. And those are just small things along the way towards doing it. President Schulz, I know you said we're not talking about separating it. And I know you're saying the same thing, commissioner. I would think you've got to be thinking about it. Because I think the way this money is going, it's almost a natural separation starting to happen. We can say whatever we want. But when we go on to campus, everybody knows better. It's really not there.

BOB BOLWSBY: I didn't suggest there weren't ways they could be treated differently, they are right now. We have lots of differences. But if we ever go down the path of establishing an employee, employer relationship, or considering these young people as employees, we will have forever lost our way. We're about educating young people. Somebody said it earlier, I don't think you can change the entire system to benefit a few, and this is a lot bigger than -- you know, we're not here to be the minor leagues of the NBA or the NFL.

Likewise, we're not here to put people into the Olympics. Those are highly desirable by products of a high-quality, collegiate athletics experience. And they always should be. I think it's a wonderful by product. But we also have to call upon the NBA and the NFL to offer more legitimate alternatives for development. Because Major League Baseball spends a fortune on their minor league system, and each one of those teams has about three prospects, and the other 25 guys are hired to play against them so they can get better. They spend a lot of money on it every year, and the NFL, and the NBA generally speaking get by for not one nickel. There ought to be other legitimate opportunities to develop one's skills other than being forced into going to college

because it's the only avenue to get where you want to go.

CHARLES DAVIS: That's a tough one for you.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: Doesn't it speak though to the value of college? Of what college basketball, I think, not just teaches, but promotes their players. And Jay, this would be my question for you, if you can reform it in your own way, because college basketball players can go to the D-League right out of high school. They don't have to go to college.

BOB BOLWSBY: Better known as the Leaky Bus League. The college experience is a lot better.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: I agree. Listen, I'm with you.

BOB BOLWSBY: I know, I know.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: I think they go because they understand college experience is better. They want to play in front of those full arenas. They want to play. Even if it's just once, they want the experience of being able to do what the Kentucky kids and Duke kids are a part of. They can also have the benefit of coming back and getting their degree at any point in time and actually be on staff while they're on scholarship as a coach without being a coach and start to learn the profession while they're obtaining their degree. So I think that opportunity actually exists and it speaks to the value of it.

So I guess, Jay, you guys are on opposite sides. But I'm interested in how would you change it as opposed to just full cost of attendance?

JAY BILAS: I look upon that as being a false choice. Sort of the idea that your choice is the industry or not. I think choice means competitive offers within the industry, and the reason I say that is with an athlete we say, hey, if you don't like it, we're going to put an industry-wide cap on wages at a scholarship now plus a stipend, and we're all going to agree to do that. If we did it in any other context, it's cartel restriction.

But that would be a cartel restriction that would be per se violative of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the NCAA would lose that in two seconds. And we say, well, hey, your market, what would you be worth if you went to the D-League? Well, what would a coach be worth if the coach went to the D-League? And what would Bob and Kirk be worth if they were administrators of the D-League? A lot less than they make here. And the issue is

what are you worth in this? It's not a question of the percentage that getting to pro. Because if you look at the percentage of coaches that some day coach in the NBA or NFL, you're looking at an equally tiny number, yet they're paid their market value.

To go back to what I said before, being a student, education and money are not mutually exclusive. No other student is capped in any way. So they can get whatever value is in whatever endeavor they choose and still be a student, get whatever aid, get whatever they want from the university. The university can employ whatever students they want as long as they're not athletes.

So my solution, if you want to call it a solution, would be to do what you want the same way you do in every other aspect of university life. If you want to sign a player to a contract, then sign them to that contract. It would actually work in an orderly fashion. It would work in a more orderly fashion than now.

So instead of spending all this money on facilities to attract talent to your university, you could just pay the players and that would work in a more orderly fashion. I don't think this is that difficult. I think what we're doing is creating artificial barriers where none need to exist because they don't exist with any other student. There is no reason to have these here except we founded this thing on a certain principle. The NCAA was founded in scandal, and it's continued in scandal ever since.

If you go back and you look at what administrators said in 1906, 1926, 1946, 1966, all the way up to today, and you wrote all those down, put them in a bowl and pulled them out one at a time, you wouldn't be able to tell when they were uttered because we've been saying the same thing since the beginning in 1906. We've had the same complaints. The same discussions about the balance of athletics and academics. What was said earlier by Sune from Baylor when she talked about taking the time out during the summertime, that's a campus issue. That's not an NCAA issue. I trust the NCAA presidents. If they believe their students are practicing too much, then tell your coach quit practicing that much. There is really no reason for us to have an industrywide rule as to how much people can practice.

What we're looking at is we're going to build these gigantic opulent facilities which were built for one reason. That is to attract talent. And we're going to say, as soon as the season is over, you're locked out and cannot use them. That is the

definition of crazy in my judgment. I don't see how you have to do that. I would not -- I can't imagine we're headed down that road, but it appears like we are.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: President Schulz, wouldn't you say that the facilities.

JAY BILAS: You're out of a job by the way.

COLLEEN NELSON: I'm not needed here.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: Aren't the facilities to attract the boosters and that's where the real money comes from, the boosters donating to everything else on campus, or do you think it's just to attract the players?

KIRK SCHULZ: I think it's a mixture of both. But how do we fund intercollegiate athletics from our institution? Some comes from the conference. Some comes from private donation, and some comes from ticket sales, and you make that up in some sort of a mixture. So having a larger, more opulent arena means people come and they're going to pay a little more to come and have a premium seat and to be there for those particular events and get there two hours early and tour through campus and see their professors and things like that.

I think it's a mixture of both because we want fans there and fan experiences. Let me give you a quick but seemingly trivial sample. Look at the number of people that sit in an arena and have their cell phones out. They're looking for bandwidth and all that stuff because they want to see what Jay's saying about the game in the middle of the game and those kind of things. That's an expectation now of our students and our fans that are sitting there.

So that's not necessarily donor focused. It's so we're going to get people to come and watch the game live. So it all ties together. I wouldn't say it's one or the other.

LISA SALTERS: I have a quick question, Jay. You said consider the athletes like they were pro athletes and each athlete would get a contract based on his or her value like a pro athlete, right?

JAY BILAS: They could, yeah. I think they're already pro athletes.

LISA SALTERS: I agree with you there. How, I'm just curious because it sounds like a great idea. But how would you keep the contracts from being ridiculous like the \$250 million we're paying A-Rod and all these just crazy, how contracts for athletes have gotten out of hand?

How would you keep that from happening?

JAY BILAS: The same way we keep facilities spending down to a reasonable amount. We keep coaches' salaries down to a reasonable amount. There is no checking any of these things. I think everything would find its equilibrium. If we really believe in academics, there are actually more incentives to provide through a contract than saying, hey, come to our school as an amateur, and we'll use you. You'll get an opportunity to get an education, but we'll use you to make money. That benefits the rest of us. You'll have benefits too, but your benefits are going to be capped at this level and capped industrywide. I think you'd have more players that would be making the decision, hey, this is better. This three-year deal to stay here is better than me having opportunity to go earlier, and they'd be making that decision.

Would you keep Karl-Anthony Towns and Jahlil Okafor for that period of time? No. Would you keep Tyus Jones? Probably. So then you'd have, like I happen to believe that transfer restrictions in college sports right now are wrong. If you've got an amateur student that the NCAA says is a student like any other student and should be treated like any other student, how can we reinforce what I see as being a non-compete provision against them? Where you have schools where a player wants to transfer and the school can say, no, you're not transferring to any school that we don't want you to transfer to. You cannot accept aid for a year. You have to sit out for a year and pay your own way at your next institution unless we say it's okay. I think that's unconscionable if they're amateur students. They're not amateur students. They're assets of the university. They're in a professional athletic setting.

There is no difference between the College Football Playoff title game and the Super Bowl. The only difference is that the athletes are expected to go to school the next day in college. Otherwise, there is no difference.

LISA SALTERS: So there would be a cap though. Texas wouldn't be able to get a player because they can pay more than Penn State or Texas Tech or somebody else. So there would be a cap?

JAY BILAS: There could be, but that would have to be negotiated with the players, otherwise you couldn't have that. At least that's my view of it. If you take it into that realm, in order to have a salary cap, it would have to be collectively bargained.

LISA SALTERS: Otherwise there would be schools that would be like the Yankees that just pay for everybody.

JAY BILAS: Well, that's what they're doing now. Texas has more money for facilities and the like. They can spend more to attract better players. Otherwise we'd see the talent spread across the board, and it's not. You have players that are going to these higher dollar schools because they have more money, they have more exposure. They're higher level. And that is a question of resources. We're able to tell coaches, coaches can make whatever they want, and we don't call that a bidding war. We call that business. If a player, if there is something involved with a player, then that's a bidding war. When we put facilities in for players -- when they build a new library, that is a great benefit and wonderful asset to the university. They build a gym, that's a facilities -- that's the arms race in facilities because it's to attract players.

I think our whole narrative is wrong, given the enterprise we're engaged in. It's not Pandora's Box to give the players more. Pandora's Box was open when we started selling these players to the highest bidder for TV contracts and the like. You've got apparel deals that put all this apparel on the student-athletes. That's not for their benefit. That's for money for the school, and that's fine, but the athlete should be able to share in that.

COLLEEN NELSON: What do you think about Jay Bilas's new world order that he's sketched out for you?

COACH WILLIAMS: Well, Jay went to Duke, so. No, really, it's really a tough thing, and I felt this for a long time. I coached in the Big East in its formative years and I went to the Big Ten when that was rolling good, and of course the ACC. You could just see the -- I don't know if it's the NCAA or college presidents, but they tried to keep it the same for everybody. It's almost impossible, in anything, to keep it the same. It's not always fair. It just doesn't work that way. Not just in sports.

So what Jay was just talking about I think exclusively to football and basketball, right, because that would be the only things that people would compete with players for and things like that. I think that's something that has to be, as we're going through this now with a five-power conference and everything, everything has to be looked at. This is a chance to see everything.

I think before, typical NCAA legislation, I hope I'm not bothering anybody, we pass something, and next year we change it because it didn't work. That was typical NCAA legislation. So here's a chance to really look at some things the court has ruled a certain, now what can we do? And all these arenas, everything we talk about, the new facilities, Under Armour deals, Nike deals are based strictly on what they can gain from football or basketball.

So new buildings are built in sports just for football and basketball, basically. So do those student-athletes, which is the term the NCAA came up with, does a student-athlete in those two sports, do they get treated the same, not just in terms of their ability to play, how much money they make individually, but academically? Because a lot of these kids in football and basketball don't have the same academic backgrounds as somebody that's coming to play volleyball or somebody that's coming to play field hockey.

You know, Maryland wins women's field hockey or women's Lacrosse every other year it seems like. Those kids come from the top prep schools in this area of the country. Well, that's not true in basketball. A lot of those kids don't come from top schools. They need help academically before they come from school.

So as part of this, hopefully the academic part of this is counted too. In other words, if we can improve a lot of these college athletes and football and basketball, then hopefully we can do a better job. For some kids it might mean learning how to balance a checkbook before they get to college, because they don't know how to do that before they get on campus. And that is the way it is. There is a big gap between what a lot of the students can do academically coming into school with scholarships and other kids on scholarships. Somehow that has to be looked at.

COLLEEN NELSON: A number of people have suggested that paying athletes would only widen the gap between major programs and smaller colleges, and I think most of the universities representative of the stage could more easily reallocate funds to pay athletes, whereas smaller programs could take a bigger hit. I think, Lisa, you were touching on a related issue. Is that a concern this could create more of a haves and have-nots system where if we start paying athletes? Lisa, is there a way to address that? Is that a major concern?

LISA SALTERS: I don't see how you address it because it's just the reality. There are

haves and there are have notes. There are programs that generate considerably more revenue than others. My question was can the haves support the have-nots? Because that, to me, liberal me, that seems like the only solution is to have the haves support the have-nots, so that everybody is sort of treated equally. Except when you're the have, and you're like, why are you taking money out of my pocket to support those who aren't bringing in as much?

But I would say that doesn't work in the real world. But that's kind of how our taxes are done. But perhaps it could be done at the college level because we have to consider -- we have to look at every athlete, every student-athlete as being a student first. You can't treat one differently from the other. Yet I don't see how you cannot, based on what teams, what sports bring, or what amount of money each sport brings in.

Jay has all the answers, so I'm going to ask Jay. How do you do it? Is there enough money that the haves can support the have-nots? That was my original question a while ago.

JAY BILAS: I don't think it would change to any level different from what it is now. Like you said, there are haves and have-nots now. So you could have, depending on what payout you wanted to provide as an association, that's fine. But how people -- how different institutions spend their money. I mean, Kansas State and Iowa aren't telling each other whether they can have a library or a hospital. They're not telling each other how much to pay their employees and how much they should spend on travel, and whether they should have a big locker room or smaller locker room. All they do is tell each other here's the limit that we're going to put on our athletes. I don't think that is a legitimate place to draw the only line in college sports in a multi-billion dollar business.

Look, I went through the system. It was great. I loved it. But I still go back to the point that money and education are not mutually exclusive. There is simply no reason for this. If we ran this like high school sports and salaries were in line with our stated mission and I'm not saying people don't believe it. But if we spent like we talk, I don't think you'd have all these lawsuits. I don't think you'd have people complaining, saying this isn't right. But we're not doing that.

My old coach I think does a great job. I think he's worth every penny. I think you guys are worth every penny. But my old coach is making

\$10 million a year. And then an athlete that gets a tattoo, everybody wants to know where'd you get the money? It's crazy. I don't disagree with what Charles said about how we're all part of it, but I don't -- our media companies don't behave any differently with regard to college sports, the NFL and the NBA. We cover all these things the same way. We pay a rights holder for the opportunity to put the games on the air, and we put the games on the air. We don't pay the athletes in the NBA or the NFL or Major League Baseball. That's up to the rights holder to deal with their employees. So we don't act any differently.

But somehow the idea that media money is propping all this up, maybe so, but when a media company comes to the NCAA and says, hey, we'd like to put your games on television. We'll pay more for a game at 9:00 o'clock than we will at 7:00, we're not seeing a whole lot of hands go down and say, we'll play at 7:00 and take less. They say, put us on at 9:00. Put us on Tuesday when we can have our own game. Put us on here. We're not twisting anybody's arms or offering candy out of a van for a kid to get in. These are adults making decisions in a multi-billion dollar business.

COACH WILLIAMS: Right there what Jay was saying. The only two sports you're talking about are football and basketball. We have to understand that. We're not talking about any other sport when we talk about those scenarios. So it is different.

What we have to do, and I really agree with Lisa, is make sure that everybody gets taken care of. I think we have the wherewithal to do that. I think college presidents can do that. No one is going to get left out in terms of getting the opportunity to compete, and getting the opportunity to get an education.

Now maybe they won't have the TV contracts or whatever. But at the same time, there is no reason why they can't have great equipment, travel first-class, do things like that, because most schools do have that kind of money, especially the five power conferences, to be able to handle that. Hopefully that can be worked out as we go along here. Doug.

CHARLES DAVIS: Isn't that going to be part of the haves and have-not issue that we already have. Lisa's saying the haves to take care of the have-nots. Yet we're a Power Five with more autonomy, who is going to look out for the Sunbelt? Who is going to look out for the CAA? Who is going to do all these things? Because the

five Power Five have to take care of themselves. They've got all this money.

To your point, Coach, it's football, it's basketball. June Jones before he left SMU was saying, you know something, maybe us non-Power Fives ought to play in the spring, because that's where we're headed. That's where we're going now. Everything is separating itself out almost naturally, and that's where we're going.

So I think the presidents, the ADs, the commissioners, you're in a heck of a spot right now. Because if we're trying to support have-nots when you're taking care of yourselves? Do you really think anybody cares about Georgia State?

DOUG GOTTLIEB: My questions, President Schulz to you, when the Big 12 realigned, if you will, there were some thoughts that if Kansas got left out or if you guys got left out, that the idea of being non-profit maybe would be challenged in the courts. One of the things, if you're going to pay your athletes, they're going to tax your athletes as well. And schools operate under the shelter of being not for profit. There has to be some level of concern that at some point one of these have-nots, the non-Power Five goes to their state senator and says hold on a second now. The Power Five are in it for business. They're generating massive amounts of revenue and they're not being taxed. That is part of the discussion, is it not?

KIRK SCHULZ: I think that's part of the national discussion, and we hear that quite a bit. When we talk about the Power Five, remember, there is another set of schools and conferences that would in a heartbeat love to be considered in that same group. These are great universities and great schools with wonderful athletic traditions that, for whatever reason, were sort of when the music stopped, didn't have one of those exclusive chairs, that are going to do everything they can to keep up with those 64, 65 schools.

So I think we've got to look in a broader set of universities, the Mountain West. I'll use a specific example. There are great universities there, and they want the same opportunities for the student-athletes as the Power Five do. So I think we've got a larger set of schools out there. And the NCAA is struggling a little bit with the haves and the have-nots. And do we worry about the Sunbelt? Do we pick out whatever your favorite conference is that doesn't have the same resources as one of those others? I don't know

that we have a good answer for that. Obviously we don't yet.

But we're talking about how to do that. One of the ways is the money generated from the NCAA tournament. One of the greatest college sports events that we have in this country, and a lot of that money is used to help a lot of those schools and fund their athletic programs. But another aspect to this -- and Doug you didn't bring this up, but I think it's very important -- but a lot of public universities are seeing increasing funding constraints from the states they live in. If you have a self-supportive program, like we do at my institution, but there are a lot of those outstanding schools, a bunch in the Power Five that aren't self-supporting, and they have to rely on state dollars coming from general funds to do those athletic programs and to remain competitive with the haves, if you will.

I think we're going to see increasing pressure from faculty and people at those institutions that say, I was spending \$20 million in athletics to keep up with whomever. And that will be a traditional point at a lot of the universities, that's traditionally where we've gone to get money where we needed it. We could say we're taking from the university money and say it's for the good of the institution. So there are a lot of pressure points here in different places.

I think there are 20-something schools out there that have self-supporting athletic programs out of 350 Division I schools. That's not very many.

COLLEEN NELSON: I wanted to talk about the broader NCAA landscape and the rule book. Athletic departments have people on staff who do nothing but just deal with compliance. The NCAA has so many rules that folks' entire jobs are focused on just complying with the rules. Is there something that could be done to simplify the rule book? And where do you start on that task? Commissioner Bowlsby?

BOB BOLWSBY: I was hoping you didn't ask me that. Actually, we've done a fair amount of deregulation already in some areas where it was low-hanging fruit. I think Ty Darlington earlier said we legislate for the worst among us, and we don't do a very good job of incentivizing positive behavior. I think as we think about the new day from a governance standpoint, we have to think about how do we put in place a stratified schedule so that institutions that really are doing an exemplary job get credit for it. And that credit needs to come in the form of funds going back to

the institution, access to the postseason, and access to recruits. Those are the kinds of things that are really valued in the operation.

As much as anything, and I probably should have said this at the outset, the NCAA gets portrayed as this one-eyed ogre that is in Indianapolis that hands down usually highly unfavorable outcomes for the student-athletes. Well, the fact of the matter is the NCAA is us. The NCAA is nothing more than an aggregation of institutions that get together and make rules by which we're all going to try to live.

So whatever it is today, we made it that way. Whatever it is tomorrow, we'll have had a hand in making it that way. Simplification of the rule book is a portion of it. We've done a very poor job of it because we've always sought to legislate for the worst actors among us. Lord knows, there are enough bad actors out there. There are some of America's very best institutions have been involved in academic fraud and recruiting violations and lots of other things where we're very much overregulated.

But that is loosening a little bit right now. We're trying to force more of it back on to the campus, and as Jay says earlier, if you don't want your coach and your team practicing in June, tell them not to practice in June. That's hard to do when the coach comes to you and says but those guys down the road are practicing in June. If we're going to keep up, we've got to do it. So it's always about the Joneses. I think as a watch word, we need to go into this and say we need to put in place good rules that are highly enforceable and carry real rewards for doing well and penalties for doing poorly, and get rid of the rest of it. And start trading on a little more trust until we determine we absolutely can't do that. It's easier said than done to get rid of those rules. But I think I serve on the new NCAA Division I council. That is the body that will be finalizing the rules with oversight by the Board of Directors. And President Schulz has been very actively involved in the reorganization process.

But I come to work every day realizing we could make it worse if we are not careful. We are up against some real challenges, and those challenges in some measure, the solutions are being driven by the courts. We are going to need to figure out how to extricate ourselves from that process, and then begin putting in meaningful rules that make sense for a 21st century student-athlete.

The things that were in play when I was a student-athlete or Jay was a student-athlete, they're different today. The challenges for the kids are different, and the architecture around it ought to be different as well. But we've always been a socialistic undertaking.

To Lisa's point earlier, we share among conference schools, and in my league there are \$100 million different from the budget at the bottom and the budget at the top. So we weren't all homogenous. Likewise, on campus it's always been socialistic. Football and men's basketball, and a few other sports on individual campuses make all the money, and what money there is gets rolled back into broad-based programming. At Stanford, we had 36 sports. We offered just about anything that was available in the NCAA, and had some advantages in how we funded it. There was a very significant commitment to broad-based programming, but you couldn't be broad-based if you weren't applying football and basketball revenues in order to fund the rest of those enterprises. The 20 that make money on an annual basis, and the 330 that don't make a positive profit all are funding what breadth they have within their program based upon football and men's basketball revenue or institutional support.

The institutional support is not inconceivable that we could see a lot of formerly very strong Division I programs get significantly reduced as a result of trying to chase the Holy Grail. It's very troubling.

It isn't about whether we're paying or not paying kids. It's just getting harder to fund major college football, and major college basketball. There are many schools among that second five FCS conferences that are getting tens of millions of dollars in support in order to continue to play at that level. And as state funding diminishes, I don't think it's inconceivable that you'll see significant program reductions.

KIRK SCHULZ: I think, there is no question this is an area of great opportunity for the NCAA to do a much better job on.

But I go back to Jay's quote that take these quotes and put them in a hat from every 20 year time period and you can't tell where they're from. So the question is why now should we be able to do something different than we did 20 years ago. And there is really a couple of things, and I think autonomy is going to help. You have schools that are very vested in wanting this to be a successful part of our DNA as institutions. And that group of schools is going to force some things

to happen, and force discussions to occur that wouldn't have been there before.

But I think even more notable is when you saw the student-athlete panel up here, we have a student-athlete that is a voting member of the Division I board. I can tell you from the one meeting we've had, that student-athlete brought some perspectives that influenced the way we were discuss things and thinking about things in a much different way.

So we also have a conference commissioner and an athletic director. You can say, well, Kirk, that's kind of trivial. You've added a few more voices to the room, what difference does that make? I think it gave us the opportunity to hear from practitioners living it every day, unlike a president, to say, well, Kirk, this is just a silly, stupid rule, and it hurts us in these ways. I thought, well, man, I never thought about that.

So I do think there are some things in place that give me some optimism that we are going to clean this up. It's like the IR S tax code, it just grows every year. We've got to find a way to get it deregulated and making a lot more sense than it currently do you see.

COLLEEN NELSON: Doug, where would you start on the NCAA Rule Book? I'm sure you have ideas.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: I always thought it was simple. Don't buy your players. Don't change anybody's grades. That's about it. I'm with Jay. I don't think you put any limitations on working with your student-athletes because if you work them too much, they'll leave. They won't want to play or you'll burn them out. A lot of these teams go on these overseas trips and find they're around each other too much, and it actually does damage at the end of their season because it's too much time together.

So I think it's rather simple. I think everybody had a good reason for a lot of these rules being put in place at the time, but there are these unintended consequences of it. I wouldn't restrict. My brother's been an assistant coach for 20 years. My dad was a recruiter and head coach for another 20. I don't understand the ideas of the limitations on a guy who is recruiting for his school. He can go out some periods. He can't go out some periods. Let him do his job. If his job is to go find the right players, then let him find the right players. If we want to make high school basketball more important than AAU basketball, then it's

pretty simple. Eliminate the early signing period and empower the high school coaches again, because right now you can make a decision. I signed a letter of intent for Notre Dame before I ever saw them play the game before my senior year in high school.

So you do away with the early signing period. You let -- not necessarily a free-for-all, but you have these dead periods and non-dead periods. You just allow guys to go out and sell their school and recruit kids. Obviously, you'd have some restrictions on terms of when they could visit and couldn't visit, even the phone call rules, the text message rules. If you call a kid too much, it will turn him off. If you text a kid too much, he'll block you. That's where you guys were talking about the new-school way of recruiting is so much different than the old-school way of it.

But the basics of it are don't change a kids grades to get him to school or while he's in school. Academic impropriety I know no one at the NCAA especially those of us who are former student-athletes, we don't have any time for it. At least I do, when I see it, I feel disgusted because I earned my degree. My teammates earned their degree. Anytime you hear a story where you say Oklahoma State, people think of Dexter Manley. I went to class. I may not have been the best student.

But I sat there and I tried to comprehend, and I tried to integrate myself into a class. So that to me is always a wall issue. Don't change anybody's grades to get into school or his SATs or ACTs, no academic improprieties once they're in school. And don't buy your players to get them to come to school. If you go from there and streamline it from there, I think you're in better shape.

COLLEEN NELSON: Words to live by.

CHARLES DAVIS: This is interesting, because maybe it's just me, but that sounds a lot like, in a sense what Jay's been advocating about how we're going to go about doing things. So I guess my question is for both of you guys, it sounds like we're going to go, if we're going to blow in things up and let things sift and find their own way, how big of a bump early before we get to, as you said, I can't remember the right term you used there, Jay, but it regulates itself. It takes care of itself. How big of a bump early in blowing up some of these things to get to that point? Because I think that's what natural fear is. I think there is a natural fear to we're going to blow this up, and we're not sure how it's going to come out.

...when all is said, we're done.®

ASAPsports

visit our archives at asapsports.com

One of the things is if we start paying these guys and these women, the next time they miss that key shot down the stretch, we don't treat them like student-athletes any more. They're professionals.

JAY BILAS: We don't treat them that way now. When somebody misses a shot, it's not like they have a media or Twitter exemption.

CHARLES DAVIS: They get killed on Twitter. But the myth is still out there. You ask most people, they think we treat student-athletes a lot better than we treat the pro kids or the athletes out there when they miss that shot or field goal. The reality is not matching up. But you ask people, I would bet you people would say, well, there is a lot more gentile in the college athletics. Kid misses, we'll take care of him. In fact, they came and opened up their Twitter account. You got clobbered and you hurt my team. I'm just wondering, what is the bump going to be initially before you start getting these things orderly and regularly taken care of, because Commissioner Bowlsby is right. Rules were made because people were screwing it up. Everybody knew what they were supposed to do. But other people pushed it too far, so we had to make the rule to stop that person from going too far.

JAY BILAS: I think the rules were made because we've always had a toddler view of this. It's not fair. His cookie is bigger. It's not fair. We can't afford to feed our players training table three times a day. Okay, you can only have one meal. So we tried to equalize it that way. We've tried to create this mythical playing field, which doesn't exist. It just doesn't exist. An analog, and maybe it's not a perfect one, may be the Olympics.

There is no greater disparity in resources in haves and have-nots than the Olympics. Trinidad and Tobago does not have the same resources as the United States. Now when they run the hundred meter dash, they don't say, okay, Trinidad and Tobago, you've had a rough time, and the U.S. has more, you get a 20 meter head start. Everybody says, look, you want to run? Race starts at 1 o'clock, shoot the gun off. If you finish first, second, third, you get a medal. If you finish fourth or worse, tough. That's the way it goes. It's athletic competition.

BOB BOLWSBY: But you know what Trinidad and Tobago does? Those kids come to the U.S. to go to college.

JAY BILAS: Maybe so. And you've got

that now in college where a really good player wants to be at the higher-revenue institutions. Sort of the same deal. We're always going to have -- we're never going to have the level playing field. The rules, like the NCAA in my judgment, should be concerned with the rules of athletic competition. This other stuff, when somebody mentioned academic fraud, that is an issue of accreditation. We are not going to solve that through the Indianapolis office with this sort of enforcement structure that we have.

So, as Bob said, reasonable rules that make sense that are enforceable, which we don't have -- right now we don't have reasonable rules that make sense, and they are not enforceable. So we're in a bad spot. I think we have to start over on all these rules. I don't think it's that hard.

But to me, the rules are, if you step out of bounds, the other team gets the ball. If you foul somebody after shooting, you get two shots. This other stuff is not relevant to athletic competition. We have been using this toddlers lament, if it's not fair, it's not fair, to increase this rule book to get this level playing field that does not exist.

No matter how big the facilities are, no matter how big the TV contracts are, we're always going to have the smaller school that rises up and upsets the bigger one. That is not going to go away. But the idea that we can somehow have a multi-billion dollar business like this and we're going to have everybody equal over 351 Division I institutions and basketball has never been true. It's not true now, and it never will be true. It's not possible, and trying to legislate that is going to mire us in this for an even longer period of time.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: So you would have no legislation?

JAY BILAS: No, I didn't say that. I would say the NCAA should stay within its lane, what's reasonably within its purview. Having a minimum standard for eligibility, not for admission, but for eligibility that is based on a GPA is relatively meaningless in my judgment. I don't think it really does anything. I think the institutions can handle all of that. You've all heard this: You'll have somebody that says, well, the 2.3 academic requirement, that doesn't affect us because our standards are so high. But they want that thing higher. Well, it's not because we wouldn't take those kids. Okay, well you don't have them. What are you worried about? What they're really saying is we don't want to play against them, and I have a problem with that.

I think if a member of the NCAA wants to take an athlete, and they feel that that athlete is qualified to do the work and they admit him, that's their business. Let them do it. Let them handle it. If you want to handle it a different way that's fine.

I did a game years ago against Cornell and Kentucky, and everybody wanted to make it a morality play. Cornell just happened to have a player that was starting for them that transferred in from Kentucky. And one of the Kentucky players was caught on a microphone -- the NCAA tournament has microphones everywhere -- in a huddle before they went out on the floor, and said, Come on, guys. This isn't a spelling bee. Let's go. People made a big deal out of it.

The truth was it wasn't a spelling bee. It was a basketball game. We were not going to decide the better institution, the better student, who is better at jeopardy. We're not going to decide that by who wins the game. It's a basketball game.

If we limit it to that and just keep it about sports, I think we'd be in a much better place instead of making it a morality play on all these other things. To me, it just doesn't make any sense.

BOB BOLWSBY: Well, it is, indeed sports within higher education, so the academic elements are germane. While you can quibble over whether or not whose got the bigger cookie, having a context for the competition is -- I agree with your argument. It's going on in Dallas right now. They've just signed a couple of very high-profile players that have had significant problems with the law. They make that choice. They pay them the money, and they go forward.

But that doesn't mean the sports competition that we have in colleges shouldn't be with a backdrop and context of higher education, and I think with that comes standards.

JAY BILAS: But the individual schools have their standards.

BOB BOLWSBY: Well, sometimes they do and sometimes they don't.

JAY BILAS: Well, that's an accreditation issue. If you've got people within your association that you feel are not living up to the standards -- because when people within the NCAA structure talk about other institutions, what do they say? A great school, great institution, great administrators. Then they say, but there are some that aren't. We're talking out of both sides

here.

If we feel some people aren't doing it the right way, let's call them out for it, and if you want to kick them out, fine. But other than that, we're putting everything on the athlete. I don't think that's right. I think within the context of this, all these schools can do their own business, and we are not worried about what the requirements are for graduation at one school versus another in comparing those. There is no minimum standard for graduation.

BOB BOLWSBY: Those don't get compared now, neither do the admission standards. But to have an overall context of preparedness coming in the front door makes perfect sense, and we'll just have to agree to disagree on it. I think that having a solid academic context, you know, using the accreditation associations is a really great idea, except there are about 14 of them around the country, and they all conduct their business differently. I think that is exactly what a national organization does.

We should define that context, but we should do it as simply and as crisply and forthrightly as it applies to athletics as we possibly can. I don't think we've done a particularly good job of that. But to say there should be an absence of all those things, I think is an easy answer to a hard question.

JAY BILAS: What is the hard question?

BOB BOLWSBY: The hard question is how do you go about having a fair competition among institutions that are reasonably like one another and play with students that are reasonably comparable in terms of their preparedness. I think that's what we're about. That's what higher education is about. That is what the NCAA should be about.

It isn't just about sports. It's about sports in the context of an educational environment. And absent a national organization that by vote of its members comes to those conclusions, I think you have anarchy.

JAY BILAS: I'm not sure with minimums, and I'm not sure we do disagree, but I'm not sure when you have minimums for initial eligibility, and that's all we're really talking about here, you have like students playing against each other. There is a vast disparity in students, no matter what we do, because we have vast differences in institutions. What gets you a degree with a great GPA is the 351st Division I institution, which is a member, and the first one doesn't get you through the door. So we've got differing institutions playing against each

other. And all we're really doing is playing ball. All of these schools can educate their students on their own.

I don't think the NCAA as an association really forwards that as much, and certainly as much as the rhetoric suggests that it should.

BOB BOLWSBY: And in the end, I think that's our real challenge. Our stated beliefs and our actions are too often inconsistent with one another.

Kirk and I have both talked about that, and I really think we have a lot of work to do. Sometimes it's a 9:48 tipoff, and sometimes it's three days of competition in a row. But we need to own some of what we now have in our lap and fix it. Fix what we can. I think some of that is rule book simplification. I think some of it is sticking to our -- starting to walk the walk.

COLLEEN NELSON: Coach Williams, I know you had a final thought on this, and we'll move on to another topic.

COACH WILLIAMS: Well, everyone is trying to win. Winning is very important. It's important to the student-athletes, obviously the coaches. But it's important to the schools. In other words, the University of Maryland in 2002 we won the National Championship, and applications went up 25% that spring. Our pool increased where college boards went up from about 1213 to 1300 as an average college board score.

So people are trying to win. This is big business, this winning thing. It's big business. It's big business to the schools. Your whole alumni throughout the country feel much better about your school when you win and give more money when you win, and all those things that come with winning.

Now how we can keep that on a competitive basis in terms of, as Doug said, I really liked what you said about the fewer the rules, probably the better we can keep check of these people that want to cheat. So that has to come along with whatever we do is have some way to keep it. Where if I outwork somebody, then I get what I deserve and win some games that we probably couldn't win. Because I outworked them, not because I found a way to take advantage of a rule or something like that.

So the fewer things we have -- in other words, if I can go out every day and recruit a player and the other guy only wants to go out every other day, I'm probably going to get that player

regardless of what the rules are, as long as the guy doesn't give him money or doesn't promise him things once they get to school. So that has to be part of that where you still have the ability to compete at a player level, at a coaching level, at a university level.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: Coach, how do we get away from that? How do we get away from the 1960s and '70s when the recruiter would set up camp, and set up shop to the limitation? Where did the change occur in the rule book to now we have these open periods, closed periods. You can call them, but you can't have them on campus. How did this come to be?

COACH WILLIAMS: I think once again, you have to look at is summertime recruiting a good thing for colleges? Is it a good thing to be able to go out in the summertime?

DOUG GOTTLIEB: What do you think?

COACH WILLIAMS: I don't think it's a good thing at all. It's so far removed from the high school situation, from the family situation in most cases. Most of the time people making decisions, as you know are not part of the family, are not part of the high school situation. Once that comes into play, you know, you're talking about people that are looking to make a living off these kids if they're coaching in the summertime rather than a high school coach who most of the time is trying to make that kid do well in school so that he can become a student-athlete in college.

CHARLES DAVIS: Marginalize the high school coaches.

COACH WILLIAMS: Without a doubt. They're never in a home visit any more.

CHARLES DAVIS: I've got a 17-year-old now who has a chance to be a college athlete in two different sports. It will be certain levels at each sport. Low major in this one, high major in that one, potentially, depending on what we have. Sat down with his basketball coach, Okay, what are we going to do? And he looked at me like what do you mean what are we going to do? We won't be doing anything. They don't come through me any more. No one calls me. No one does all these things.

So looking at all this stuff and trying to corral it, we're having a great time here trying to put it all together, and we can shoot holes in just about everything that's out there. But I keep coming back to the phrase that is always used, the welfare of the athlete, the welfare of the student. And a lot of these things, we've get out of whack on all of that stuff.

Or we made some of these rules saying it was in the best interest of the welfare of the student, the texting, the calling. There were a lot of complaints about my phone's blowing up all the time, and my kid's being bombarded. And people came together and said we've got to help them out. The 20-hour week rule. We're just taking these kids too far and doing all these different things.

COACH WILLIAMS: 20 hours a week? I played in the Stone Age, but we'd practice 40 straight days at one point, and we had no academic support. Yet we were supposed to graduate in four years because the Vietnam war was going on, and if you didn't do well, you were going to Vietnam. So that's the way it was then. Now fast forward to where it is now, and it's just the amount of money being spent on academic support in institutions now, I'm sure it's a good thing. But it's incredible, millions of dollars are being spent on academic support.

CHARLES DAVIS: But for only going 20 hours a week, why are we struggling so badly for these kids?

JAY BILAS: Because it's not 20.

CHARLES DAVIS: We know it's not 20. Not even close to it. That's the so-called rule.

COACH WILLIAMS: When has it been 20 hours a week? If I'm a music teacher and I have a great singer, I can spend as much time with that singer on a university campus to develop the voice, to develop them.

CHARLES DAVIS: We agree on that. I'm not disagreeing on that at all. It's just it's interesting to me that we made these rules for the betterment of the student-athlete, yet we're still having the same debate about time. We're still having the same debate about when can they get the academics in.

JAY BILAS: That's not why we made the rules though. The betterment of the student-athlete wasn't why we made the rule.

CHARLES DAVIS: That was stated.

JAY BILAS: That's stated now. It wasn't stated back then.

CHARLES DAVIS: Why was it then instituted?

JAY BILAS: Because most of the time it was made because of what Bob had said before, coach comes to you and says the school down the road is doing more. And a lot of these are competitive-balance issues, or what we perceive as being competitive balance.

CHARLES DAVIS: But they covered it with that.

JAY BILAS: Yeah, the quote unquote level playing field, exactly, so the same issues we have with most of these rules, and some of it has come from the coaches. Like the issue of being out on the road. Some of the coaches say we need restrictions because I don't want to be on the road all the time. And you're going, well, then, go home. But the other guy will be out on the road. Well, Geez, I'm sorry. But at some point the adults have to go, you know what? I'm going to go home.

Same thing, there are no restrictions to how much time students can spend in the library. So should we be doing that? At some point you have to say you do it your way. We'll do it our way. We think we know how to educate our students. You educate yours. We may be different. We'll see you at 1 o'clock on Saturday and we'll play. It's really not that difficult.

As Bob said, this level playing field has gotten in our way for a long time, and it doesn't exist. There is no way with 120 football teams and 351 basketball teams that you're going to have equality across the board. Or the quote/unquote parity thing that people strive for, it doesn't exist, and it never has.

CHARLES DAVIS: It never has. But it's going to be the influence about who is telling you to take the day off and feeling okay about it, and not going into the gym and being okay about it.

JAY BILAS: But Doug's right on that. There are coaches -- coaches are looking for a way to dial down a lot of this rather than ratchet it up. It's been shown that there is a detriment to overuse and overwork. I think they're doing a much better job with regard to all those things. I don't think that smart people need to be told what to do 24 hours a day. That's what the NCAA Rule Book, in my judgment, contemplates is telling people what to do all the time. I think Bob said, it's overregulation, and there is no getting around that. It's absolutely true. The question is how much regulation do we need in order to play games? And ultimately that's what this is about.

If Kansas State has students that they think are qualified, and Iowa has students they think are qualified, and Oklahoma and Tennessee and all that, great, we'll play. But the rest of it, I think the NCAA Rule Book serves as a barrier more than anything else.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: I think there is more competitive balance, Jay, than you're giving credit. In the Big 12, Baylor was a doormat, and now

they're a champion. And Texas, as you pointed out, Commissioner Bowlsby, spends \$100 million in -- is it Oklahoma State? Who spends the least? Your school beat them five years a row in football, I believe. My numbers may be off, but there is something to allowing some form of competitive balance.

JAY BILAS: But you're comparing two power -- you're comparing schools in the same conference.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: But Baylor is not comparative at all to Texas.

JAY BILAS: It's comparable, absolutely it is. You're talking about -- what is the budget at Baylor? \$40 million versus \$120? \$40 million is a lot. We're talking about 351 Division I institutions of basketball. Where you're talking about teams that are playing 15 non-conference basketball games in order to fund their program versus Texas.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: No question. They let too many teams in Division I. You're absolutely right there. If you really want to start over, you cut off the bottom hundred that don't belong in in the Division I. You had a party. You had a velvet rope, and you had a bad bouncer who let everybody in. And said wait a second, now we've got a VIP room, and we have the five power conferences in. And slowly but surely, others are going to find a way to climb into the VIP room.

COLLEEN NELSON: Time is going to expire soon. I want to hear from Lisa on whether you think at this point there are undue burdens on student-athletes. We've talked a lot about the 9:48 p.m. tip off. I don't know if there is anyway to put the horse back in the barn when you have crazy fans like me who will watch Kansas basketball regardless of what hour it's on. But is there a point where this is too much for students and athletes?

LISA SALTERS: I remember back in the day when I played, and I didn't really get much time. I was a bench warmer, but it was exciting for us. I just thought it was the greatest thing in the world. But I also knew that I had to get to class the next day too, and my grades had to be at a certain level as well. I know just sitting back, watching it as a parent maybe and it's not your kid and you're watching on TV, your natural reaction is probably going to be to say this is way too much. I would never want my kid playing at 9:30, because I think that now. I'm like wow, this is awfully late. I'm about to go to bed. I can't believe they're about to

play.

They're 18, 19, 20, if they weren't, they'd be getting ready to go out at 11, 12:00 anyway. Like Charles said, when you're 50, everything seems late. Anything after 9:00 seems late.

CHARLES DAVIS: 8:30.

LISA SALTERS: Seems like. But when you're 18 to 22, you know, unless you hear the athlete -- I'm curious what the athletes earlier this afternoon what they said. If they said, Wow, you know what? These games are really starting too late. That's how I feel now as a sideline reporter doing a game on the west coast. I'm like this game is just starting way too late for me. I should be in bed. But if I'm 18 to 22, it's perfect time.

CHARLES DAVIS: They're fine game time. They're fine game time.

LISA SALTERS: How about class the next day?

CHARLES DAVIS: They're not so fine the next morning when you say 8:00 o'clock class, be there.

LISA SALTERS: I never saw it as a problem. I never did. They're so excited.

DOUG GOTTLIEB: Why would you sign up for an 8:00 o'clock class?

CHARLES DAVIS: Some of us weren't very smart, Doug. I'm just saying when you have that over and over. I see it. I hear it. I wonder about the academic side of it for those kids. All of them going, corralling those kids and making sure they were up and going. You were self-motivated. Others might not be.

LISA SALTERS: I wasn't a star player either. I wasn't a men's basketball player playing two nights a week. Football is what? One night a week.

CHARLES DAVIS: I'm not saying they can't do it. I'm just saying when we talk about it all and put it in total, it's part of that package too.

I can't believe for a second that. Coach Williams didn't think some of those road trips, oh, my God, next week, not just getting them to class. But I've got more games piling up on this one. It all rolls into the whole package. We have a whole lot of this that's going on. That is just one minor piece of it.

COACH WILLIAMS: When you're a player, and, Jay, when you played, that is probably as an exciting thing as you've done in your life. I coached a lot of games, I was a horrible player. I was worse than you were, guaranteed. But when I played, that's what I remember a lot when you

think about basketball is when I played, not when I coached.

These kids, don't forget, these kids are really enjoying what they do for the most part. So whatever we can do to make it better, great. Help them out in whatever way we can, financially or whatever other way, academically. But at the same time, if a 9:30 game that we'd play means you're on national television, okay, that's pretty cool to play on national television if you're a college basketball player.

LISA SALTERS: You certainly may complain about it, but you also wear it as a badge of honor.

CHARLES DAVIS: As long as you were making class and making those academics. I know that all 12 of those players, that wasn't a piece of cake now.

LISA SALTERS: You're going to complain, of course. You have a game in San Francisco on Saturday, and turn right around and a game in Cleveland on Sunday. If you're going to complain like, gosh, can you believe this? This is ridiculous. You wear that as a badge of honor.

COACH WILLIAMS: You leave on Tuesday. Now with the number of teams in conferences, you leave on Tuesday, you don't go to class the rest of the week if you continue to do well in the conference tournament.

CHARLES DAVIS: This is bringing me back to Jay in a hurry right now. Let the schools worry about it. Don't worry about the accreditation. Jay, you're bringing me around because now no one's worried about it. Piece of cake. I'm in. Let's go.

COLLEEN NELSON: Somewhere a buzzer is sounding, I'm afraid. The buzzer is sounding somewhere. So we'll have to have an overtime conversation at the reception following this.

But I'd like to --

CHARLES DAVIS: I missed a golden opportunity.

COLLEEN NELSON: I'd like to thank our esteemed panel for a fascinating conversation. I'm hoping that we can take the Bob and Jay show on the road and continue that debate across the country, because I think the whole world should get access to that. But this has been a fantastic conversation, and I'd just like to thank our panel.

FastScripts by ASAP Sports