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*“Knight Court”*

**GENERAL FACTS FOR BOTH TEAMS**

Throughout the history of college football there has been significant ink spilled both over what exactly defines a “top-tier” college football program, and what benefits should be given to programs of that caliber. Though on-field success should perhaps be the sole defining criterion in determining a team’s tier, a school’s conference in many ways overshadows the direct success of a team on the field. This is reflected in endeavors such as recruiting, media rights revenue and fundraising, nonconference scheduling, and overall prominence on the national scale. For example, the Rutgers football team has won just 11 games in the past four years, yet their athletic program can boast a more successful and sustainable program than other institutions with much more on-field success because of their standing as a member of the Big Ten Conference.

These debates have only intensified since the introduction of the College Football Playoff (CFP) in 2014. The CFP was founded in an effort to clear up the controversy surrounding the selection of national champions in Division I-A football created by the previous Bowl Championship Series (BCS), which had allowed just two teams to compete for a national championship each year, even if more than two teams were worthy of competing for this honor based on overall success rates. The CFP has sought to solve these problems by allowing for a four-team bracket. While the BCS relied on the media, coaches’ polls, and computer rankings to select the two competing teams, under the CFP guidelines, a 13-member committee selects and seeds the four teams that take part in the competition. The CFP committee’s selection is based on several factors including a team’s strength of schedule, conference championships, team records, and head-to-head results against other prominent programs.

Despite the inclusion of two additional teams in the CFP, controversy remains as to exactly which teams can be included. In the five years of the CFP, with the exception of the inclusion of independent Notre Dame in the 2018-19 CFP, all of the teams selected by the committee for playoff competition have been members of the unofficially-named “Power Five” (“P5”) conferences that are granted special autonomy status[[1]](#footnote-1) by the NCAA: the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), the Big Ten Conference, the Big 12 Conference, the Pacific-12 Conference (Pac-12), and the Southeastern Conference (SEC).

Many college football fans feel that the emphasis on strength of schedule by the CFP committee unfairly precludes non-P5 schools from consideration, as games against P5 opponents are seen as significantly more impactful than games against non-P5 opponents, even if the non-P5 team objectively has a better record of success than the P5 team. Indeed, on several occasions the CFP committee has taken a one- or even a two-loss P5 team over an undefeated non-P5 team, much to the dismay of the non-P5 team’s fanbase.

Chief among such complainants is the University of Central Florida (UCF). The UCF Knights belong to the American Athletic Conference (AAC), which counts itself as part of the Group of Five (“G5”) conferences that makes up most of the rest of the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) of upper-division and bowl-eligible football schools.[[2]](#footnote-2) UCF has gained national prominence over the past few years based on an impressive streak of success that has included an undefeated season in 2017 and a 12-1 season in 2018. In both seasons, UCF earned top-10 rankings and placements in one of the “New Year’s Six” bowl games, which are reserved for the top-ranked teams that are not invited to the CFP.[[3]](#footnote-3) While UCF won the first of these bowl games when they defeated #7 Auburn 34-27 in the 2017 Peach Bowl, they suffered their first loss in two years when they fell to #11 Louisiana State 40-32 in the 2018 Fiesta Bowl.

Despite this recent success, however, UCF has still been lacking in one key area: placement in the CFP. In each of their two undefeated seasons UCF was left out of the CFP while P5 teams with a regular season loss were included. Indeed, in 2017 all four teams included in the CFP had one loss and the committee even included two SEC teams—conference champion Georgia and eventual national champion Alabama—at UCF’s expense. As a result, UCF declared itself the true “national champion” as the only undefeated school in the country after defeating Auburn in the Peach Bowl. In 2018, most reputable analysts and the CFP committee did not even include UCF as part of the debate over entry, narrowing the field to undefeated Alabama, Clemson, and Notre Dame, one-loss Oklahoma and Ohio State, and two-loss Georgia. Despite going into its bowl game undefeated, UCF finished eighth in the final 2018 CFP rankings behind those six schools and two-loss Michigan.

In explaining their rationale for leaving UCF out of the CFP, and out of the overall debate in the first place, CFP committee chairman Rob Mullens explained that UCF’s strength of schedule was the main factor against inclusion, stating that its schedule “just didn’t hold” up against the schedules of the four included teams. Supporting this assertion, UCF’s strength of schedule ranked 104th in the country by the appropriate metrics, in large part because it did not play a single team that ranked in the final top-25 rankings published by the CFP nor the final USA Today coaches’ poll or Associate Press media poll published before bowl season. UCF played just one ranked team that was ranked during the week of the game (a 38-13 Week 12 victory over then-#24 Cincinnati). Additionally, UCF only played one team from a P5 conference—a 45-14 home victory against 7-6 Pittsburgh. UCF did have a road game scheduled against 2-9 P5 school North Carolina, the game was canceled due to Hurricane Florence. For the most part, the judgment against UCF has been unanimous: if it wants to contend for the CFP and have status among the upper-echelon of college football, it must schedule more games against high-profile schools.

To its credit, UCF has attempted to do so, forming “1-for-1” agreements (where each team hosts one game) with P5 schools Pittsburgh, North Carolina, Louisville, and Georgia Tech—all of which compete in the ACC. UCF athletic director Danny White has been outspoken, however, in his frustration at trying to negotiate agreements with potential nonconference opponents from P5 schools. Most of the top schools either (1) simply refuse to play UCF; (2) cancel preexisting agreements with UCF in order to schedule games against other P5 schools; or (3) try to get UCF to agree to an unbalanced series where UCF hosts one game in exchange for two (or more) road games at the P5 school. White believes that unbalanced series are unfair and undeserving of the UCF Knights’ purported status as a top-tier football program.

Much of White’s ire has been directed towards one football program in particular: UCF’s in-state rival and SEC member the University of Florida (UF). Despite some recent struggles, including a disappointing 4-7 season in 2017, the Florida Gators are universally considered to be one of the strongest football programs in the country. They are frequently near the top of the strong SEC and constitute one of the two “crown jewel” college football programs in Florida along with UF’s bitter rival Florida State University (FSU). After hiring new coach Dan Mullen away from SEC rival Mississippi State in November 2017, UF bounced back in a big way in 2018, returning to national prominence with a 10-3 record and #10 ranking in the final CFP poll.

Over the past several months, White and UF athletic director Scott Stricklin have informally negotiated a nonconference series between UF and UCF through the press, and the two exchanged a few December 2018 emails about the possibility of scheduling a series.[[4]](#footnote-4) These public “negotiations” have led to conspiracy theories, with White accusing Stricklin (a CFP committee member) of deliberately steering UCF away from playing UF in the 2018 Peach Bowl to save the school the embarrassment of being beaten by an in-state rival in a bowl game. Stricklin has denied this, saying publicly that UF is willing to schedule games with UCF. While Stricklin will not agree to a 1-for-1 series with a non-P5 opponent, he would welcome a 2-for-1 series with UCF where the schools play two games at UF’s home stadium in Gainesville and one game at UCF’s home stadium in Orlando. White angrily and publicly rejected this proposal, stating that the school “deserves better” than a 2-for-1 offer.

In an attempt to cut off the public controversy surrounding the two programs once and for all, Stricklin and White have agreed to send representatives to discuss in good faith whether an agreement between the two schools is possible, and if possible, reach an agreement ready for presentation to the schools’ respective university presidents. Both Stricklin and White have given their representatives full authorization to be creative and find mutually beneficial agreements that will advance each side’s interests.

**CONFIDENTIAL FACTS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA**

UCF athletic director Danny White feels disrespected. For White, the problems with college football amount to an impossible situation for programs like UCF. If UCF does everything right—beats everyone on its schedule by impressive margins—it still will not be considered for the CFP because it has not played a strong enough schedule. But when White has tried to schedule stronger teams, he has been rebuffed by the big school athletic directors or told that UCF must accept unbalanced 2-for-1 deals or play only at the P5 school. Even attempts to join the P5 cartel have failed; UCF has repeatedly lobbied the Big 12 Conference to add UCF and Houston to their roster, but they have not been able to garner a single vote in favor.

White sees UF’s attitude towards scheduling UCF as a perfect representation of his complaints. Prior to 2018, UF had lost at least four games each season since 2012, and its 4-7 finish in 2017 included losses to five unranked opponents. And yet UF won’t agree to a 1-for-1 with UCF—a team that boasted a 25-game win streak before the 2018 Fiesta Bowl loss, and two New Year’s Six bowl wins since 2012.

White believes that a balanced scheduling agreement is not only as a good business, but the only way to elevate UCF’s brand image on the national stage. For him, it is a line in the sand against the unfairness that his program and other G5 schools have faced in trying to compete with the established top-tier programs.

Overall, White wants UCF to be seen as a “legitimate” top-tier football program. This means receiving respect from other such programs that typically do not schedule an unbalanced, out-of-conference series with other top-tier football programs. And 1-for-1 deals between UCF and P5 schools do exist. Since 2016, White has brokered them with P5 schools Louisville and Georgia Tech, and he even scheduled a 2-for-2 with UNC (originally a 1-for-1 and expanded to 2-for-2 before the first game was played). All three of these opponents are in the ACC and have had significant recent success despite each having poor 2018 seasons. Given their records, White does not see how UF is any different from these schools and feels that UF should be willing to make a similar deal with UCF.

White takes issue with the notion that UF athletic director Scott Stricklin would be doing UCF a favor by playing it. UF has had difficulties attracting fans over the past few years. UF’s homecoming loss to Missouri this past year featured the school’s lowest homecoming game attendance since 1990. White suspects that UF’s attendance problems are in large part due to their refusal to bring good nonconference opponents to Gainesville. The last time UF hosted a ranked nonconference opponent was a blowout loss to #1 Miami in 2002. White knows that the buzz around UCF’s recent performance; the storylines created by the in-state matchup; and the close proximity of the UCF fanbase would lead to a guaranteed sellout. Indeed, White feels that UCF would be doing UF a favor by going to Gainesville.

White knows that UF has recently scheduled a 2-for-1 series with UCF’s conference rival USF and that Stricklin is likely going to want to use that contract as a baseline to start negotiations.[[5]](#footnote-5) However, White feels strongly that USF is in a substantially different situation than UCF. While USF had some success in 2016 and 2017 and was even ranked at the start of the 2018 season, it has not had the type of sustained success that UCF has had, particularly in the more prominent bowl games. Nor has USF had the same type of national buzz around its performance that UCF has had. UCF has been invited to “New Year’s Six” bowls in three of the last six years, including the last two seasons. USF has never attained this level of success in the 19-year history of its football program. White feels that these differences significantly distinguish UCF from USF and justify asking for a more favorable deal.

In sum, UCF feels that the focus of this negotiation should *not* be on how many games each school gets to host but instead on which school will host first. White is concerned that the team may not be as strong in a few years, and he would thus prefer that UCF hosts first. But White is willing to allow UF to host first to get a deal done. However, all of the games in the series should be as soon as possible so that UCF's momentum on the national stage remains intact. If the series is delayed too long, UCF may fall back or switch conferences, making the need for the series moot. UCF has only two of its allotted four nonconference games scheduled for 2020 (UNC and Georgia Tech) and 2022 (Louisville and Georgia Tech) and only one nonconference game scheduled for 2021 (Louisville), leaving plenty of opportunities available to schedule UF within the next few years.

In their email chain, White offered to start a 1-for-1 series in 2021, mainly as a show of good faith to start negotiations given that he knows UF would prefer to wait to play UCF to see if its performance level drops. For the opposite reason, White would prefer UCF play UF as soon as possible. White is also aware that UF has already filled its four-game nonconference allotment for both 2019 and 2020, including a neutral-site opening day game against Miami this August. The Miami game likely takes 2019 out of the discussion, but UF’s 2020 schedule includes three “buy” games (single game agreements where a P5 opponent pays a weaker team to play a game at their stadium) that could be canceled or rescheduled without much issue. If this is the only obstacle to getting a deal done, White is willing to give UF a guarantee payment to cover these costs if it will help secure the matchup.

Without a required buyout, White would strongly prefer that the games be played without a guarantee. This is not because UCF does not have a budget for nonconference guarantees. White has authorized up to $1 million in guarantee payments for all of the games if necessary (with any payments by UF added to that total). It is instead more about respect. While both UCF and UF have structured their athletic department to avoid scrutiny by records requests, White wants to ensure that the public sees UCF treated as a legitimate top-tier program should the details of the contract get out. As such, White wants the deal to reflect the two schools on relatively equal footing, rather than as a “buy” game for UF or as UCF paying UF to do it a favor. However, White is not opposed to paying a little more than UF to make a deal happen, and he is certainly not opposed to getting a payment for the athletic program, so long as the payments between the two schools are relatively equivalent. The payment scheme that UF agreed to with USF—where UF pays USF $500,000 for the first game at Gainesville and the two schools each pay each other $250,000 for the other two games—would be a reasonable model. However, if UCF is forced into playing a third game at Gainesville, White would insist that UF’s payment for that game be much higher (at least $1 million). White views a 2-for-1 series as ceding significant ground by agreeing to UF, and thus he would agree to it only in conjunction with the higher payment from UF to UCF.

White also knows that UF will be looking for a fairly robust liquidated damages clause in case of breach. UF previously had a multigame 2-for-1 series with UCF for 1999, 2006, and 2007. UCF paid a $100,000 buyout to cancel the 2007 game after losing 42-0 in Gainesville in 2006. White suspects that UF would want a much higher liquidated damages clause if this happens again, especially if one or more of the games are deferred into the latter half of the 2020s. While standard liquidated damages clauses for nonconference series these days are around $1-2 million, White suspects that UF will want a clause in excess of $2 million. The USF/UF contract, for example, included a $2.5 million liquidated damages clause.

In the end, White does not care too much about the amount of a liquidated damages clause because he is confident that UCF will not want or need to cancel any of the games. In fact, White thinks it is more likely that UF cancels the deal if UCF takes an early victory. As such, White’s only concern with the amount of the liquidated damages clause is that the damages each school would owe from canceling must be equal.

Finally, White realizes that UCF’s need for this series is largely predicated on the grounds that it needs a more robust nonconference schedule in order to gain more stable national recognition and playoff consideration. This issue would obviously be moot if UCF is able to join a P5 conference. As such, White would like a clause in the contract that allows UCF to void the contract without paying liquidated damages if it joins a P5 conference prior to playing any games at UF. White is willing to be flexible on the particular wording of this clause (e.g. whether both schools have the right to void the deal or whether liquidated damages are reduced rather than eliminated entirely if UCF seeks to void the deal because it was admitted to a P5 conference). But White is very reluctant to do a deal without an escape clause if UCF is admitted to a P5 conference, especially if the deal is unbalanced in UF’s favor in any material way.

**CONFIDENTIAL FACTS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA**

UF athletic director Scott Stricklin is tired of the so-called “controversy” surrounding UCF. While Stricklin admits to a certain bias regarding this situation given that he is a member of the CFP committee, he feels strongly that the rules for CFP consideration are both fair and well-established. Stricklin can sympathize with UCF and its athletic director Danny White. After all, Stricklin served as an associate athletic director at UCF’s conference rival Tulane before taking the UF job in 2016. However, he does not feel that UCF has a legitimate gripe against the CFP and feels that UF has been unfairly picked on by White in his complaints against the Power 5 conferences.

Stricklin and the rest of the UF athletic department, boosters, and administration are not opposed to scheduling nonconference games against UCF. On the contrary, many boosters have told Stricklin that they want such a matchup to knock the upstarts off their high horse and show the country who really rules college football in the state of Florida. Stricklin also feels that scheduling UCF to a multi-game series could be a strong business decision. UF football game attendance has fallen sharply recently and Stricklin has found through surveys and conversations with boosters that fans are tired of seeing home nonconference games filled exclusively by easy wins and rival FSU. Aside from their legislatively-mandated yearly battles with FSU, UF has not hosted a ranked nonconference opponent since 2002. This past season’s nonconference home games against lower division schools—Idaho, UAB, and 3-9 Colorado State (a member of the G5 Mountain West Conference)—featured three easy Gator victories and thousands of empty seats. Scheduling UCF could change that. And even if UCF’s performance level drops, thousands of nearby UCF fans would make the two-hour trip to Gainesville.

At the same time, Stricklin is wary of the possibility of creating a bad precedent. If he agrees to an unfriendly nonconference series with a G5 team, future nonconference negotiations might be negatively impacted, both for UF and for SEC programs in general. Indeed, Stricklin has spoken to many of his SEC athletic director colleagues and SEC commissioner Greg Sankey about this issue. While they all encouraged Stricklin to make a deal with UCF if one can be reached, they have all warned him that UCF could score a major victory for the G5 conferences before they even take the field if the contract is not negotiated carefully.

The biggest challenges that Stricklin sees in negotiating a deal with UCF are (1) the number of games included in a potential series, and (2) where those games will be played. While Stricklin has certainly noticed White’s constant statements to the press about how allegedly “unfair” it is that UCF cannot get a straight 1-for-1 agreement with a top-tier Power 5 program, Stricklin is hoping that the UCF delegation negotiators will come to their senses at the table. UF has a firm policy of not scheduling 1-for-1s with non-Power 5 schools and has no interest in breaking that policy now. In fact, UF recently announced a deal with fellow in-state rival USF for a 2-for-1 series that includes two games in Gainesville in exchange for one game at USF that Stricklin feels can, and should, be a model for a UCF deal.[[6]](#footnote-6)

UCF’s status as a G5 school has very little to do with Stricklin’s hardline stance in this regard. UF has not scheduled a 1-for-1 series with a nonconference team other than FSU since Miami in 2008 and 2013 and Southern Cal in 1982 and 1983. Other than Miami and FSU, UF has not played a nonconference road game against a P5 school since playing Syracuse in 1991.

UCF’s G5 affiliation does matter, though, within the grand scheme of things. Generally, a 1-for-1 series between P5 and G5 schools is a practice of only the lowest caliber P5 schools, like North Carolina and Pittsburgh. Further, Stricklin has received pressure from UF boosters and SEC administrators to not “legitimize” UCF's bluster by giving into its demands for a 1-for-1. As such, while Stricklin is perfectly happy to agree to a 2-for-1 series with two games in Gainesville or a single game in Gainesville (and none in Orlando), Stricklin will not accept any offer from UCF for a balanced series unless UF receives substantial concessions in other areas.

Another issue with UF scheduling UCF is the timing of any potential games. Per SEC and NCAA rules, UF is allowed only four nonconference games per season along with its eight-game conference schedule. UF always plays archrival FSU on the Saturday of Thanksgiving weekend, which consequentially fills one of the four total nonconference game slots every year. And UF already has its complete nonconference slate scheduled for 2020. All three non-FSU games (New Mexico State, Eastern Washington, and South Alabama) are “buy” games (single game agreements where a P5 school pays a weaker team to play a game at its home stadium). Each contract requires a buyout of the full guarantee for playing the game, and each of the three games includes a $1.5 million guarantee from UF to each respective school.

These buy games could seemingly be canceled or rescheduled without significant issue. Stricklin does worry, however, about the potential for harming his carefully negotiated relationships with these schools’ athletic directors, and thus would strongly prefer not to alter these contracts. Stricklin would thus obviously expect UCF to pay for any buyout—it insists on playing a game in 2020—either through an upfront payment to UF or through an increased compensation offer for playing the game.

UF only has three nonconference games scheduled so far for 2021, which leaves open one spot that UCF could conceivably fill. However, UF’s 2021 nonconference schedule already includes in-state rivals USF and FSU, and Stricklin does not want to “overload” what would promise to be competitive games against their Florida rivals. As such, scheduling a game in 2021 is off the table—regardless of venue. More generally, UF would prefer to schedule any game or games at UCF in the late 2020s, preferably no earlier than 2025. The reason for this is simple: Stricklin feels that UCF will be unable to maintain its current level of success, and by the time UF plays UCF, it will have reverted to pre-2016 levels of performance. If UF must play a game at UCF’s fabled “Bounce House,” Stricklin wants any such game to be when the Knights are most likely to be at their weakest and the Knights fans to be at their most docile.

Along these lines, Stricklin wants to see a fairly extensive liquidated damages clause in any contract made with UCF in case it cancels the series partway through. UF previously had a multigame 2-for-1 series with UCF for 1999, 2006, and 2007 that UCF paid a $100,000 to cancel after the 2007 game because of a 42-0 loss in Gainesville in 2006. While that contract and subsequent breach involved a different UCF administration, Stricklin sees a lot of similarities between these situations and suspects that White may look to get out of the deal if and when UCF loses to UF. And this result is even more likely, Stricklin believes, if UCF has in general fallen off of its current level of success by the end of the series. Currently standard liquidated damages clauses for nonconference series are around $1-2 million, but Stricklin wants a liquidated damages clause even higher than that to secure the deal. Based on similar concerns Stricklin included a $2.5 million liquidated damages clause in the USF deal, and he would like to see a clause worth at least $3 million in any deal with UCF. Preferably, this clause would be one-sided in UF’s favor to give Stricklin an out if the series does not go as planned; a clause where UCF pays over $3 million if it breaches, but UF pays closer to the industry standard if it breaches would be ideal.

Also important to Stricklin is the amount of upfront money at stake in the form of a guarantee. Guarantees are payments made from one school to another in order to secure a nonconference matchup. In this case, the guarantee is particularly important for maintaining Stricklin’s reputation. While both UCF and UF have structured their athletic department to avoid scrutiny by records requests, he does not want the contract to seem like he gave UCF any special favors that he would not give any other G5 school, like USF, should the details of the contract get out. As such, if a balanced series must be on the table, Stricklin would like any game in Orlando to seem like an unorthodox “buy” game where UCF is paying a significant sum (at least $5 million) to get UF to play an additional game in Orlando.

Stricklin is willing to be much more reasonable if White will agree to an unbalanced series in favor of UF. He would like to structure the guarantees in this series similarly to what was agreed to with USF, where UF will pay USF $500,000 for the first game at Gainesville and the two schools each will pay $250,000 to each other for the other two games. In order to secure this unbalanced series, however, Stricklin is willing to go above $500,000 for the unbalanced portion of the series and can pay up to $2 million to get that deal done.

Finally, Stricklin knows that UCF’s need for this series is largely predicated on the grounds that it needs to schedule a more robust nonconference schedule in order to gain more stable national recognition. This issue would obviously be moot if UCF is able to join a Power 5 conference. As such, Stricklin would like a clause in the contract that allows UF to void the contract without paying liquidated damages if UCF receives an offer from a Power 5 conference prior to UF playing any games at UCF. Stricklin is willing to be flexible on the particular wording of this clause (e.g. whether both schools have the right to void the deal or whether liquidated damages are just reduced) but wants to have a way to get out of the contract if it becomes unnecessary, especially if it is not unbalanced in UF’s favor in any material way.
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