

DRAFTMETRICS

THE NFL'S MINOR LEAGUE – REVIEWING THE COLLEGES

Part 1

With rare exceptions, there is only one path to the NFL - - through the colleges. In the first part of a two-part article this analysis will focus on the big picture regarding the colleges that supply the most players and how successful those players have been. Part 2 will focus on analysis of a group of individual colleges.

It is not surprising that the 65 Power 5 schools are the training ground for most NFL players. Based on a study of the 2012 through 2020 drafts, about 75% of all draftees are from Power 5 schools. This study excludes special teams selections. Here is a list of conferences and the number of draftees from each school in each conference:

ACC	319	Big 10	341	Big 12	193
Clemson	48	Ohio State	63	Oklahoma	46
Florida State	45	Michigan	42	West Virginia	27
Miami	43	Penn State	36	Baylor	24
No Carolina State	28	Wisconsin	33	TCU	24
No. Carolina	24	Iowa	30	Texas	21
Virginia Tech	22	Michigan State	26	Oklahoma State	15
Louisville	22	Nebraska	20	Kansas State	12
Boston College	19	Maryland	15	Texas Tech	11
Pitt	15	Rutgers	15	Kansas	7
Virginia	14	Minnesota	15	Iowa State	6
Wake Forest	13	Illinois	13		
Georgia Tech	11	Indiana	11		
Syracuse	10	Purdue	11		
Duke	5	Northwestern	11		

Pac 12	286	SEC	487	Notre Dame	45
Stanford	37	Alabama	79		
USC	35	LSU	64		
UCLA	32	Florida	53		
Washington	31	Georgia	47		
Oregon	30	Auburn	33		
Utah	29	Arkansas	31		
California	23	Texas A&M	31		
Arizona State	19	South Carolina	30		
Oregon State	16	Mississippi State	28		
Colorado	14	Mississippi	22		
Washington State	11	Missouri	22		
Arizona	9	Tennessee	19		
		Kentucky	14		
		Vanderbilt	14		

It should be noted that Boise State had the most draftees (22) from schools outside the Power 5. Digging a little deeper, 31 colleges (called “the Group” in the rest of the article) in the Power 5 accounted for over half of all drafted players. The 31 schools and the number of draft from each are:

Alabama	79	Stanford	37	Oregon	30
LSU	64	Penn State	36	South Carolina	30
Ohio State	63	USC	35	Utah	29
Florida	53	Auburn	33	No. Carolina State	28
Clemson	48	Wisconsin	33	Mississippi State	28
Georgia	47	UCLA	32	West Virginia	27
Oklahoma	46	Arkansas	31	Michigan State	26
Florida State	45	Texas A&M	31	North Carolina	24
Notre Dame	45	Washington	31	Baylor	24
Miami	43	Iowa	30	TCU	24
Michigan	42				

It is no surprise that SEC schools dominate the list with nine schools, representing nearly 18% of all draft selections. The Big 10 is a distant second representing just over 10% of all draft choices.

The Group tends to be most dominant in the early rounds of the draft. This table compares the percentage of drafted players from three categories of schools in each segment of the draft. The categories are 1) Group of 31, 2) the other 34 Power 5 colleges and 3) everyone else.

Category	Round 1		Rounds						All
	1-20	Rest	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	
Group of 31	79%	65%	60%	51%	57%	48%	42%	38%	52%
Other P5	13%	24%	20%	22%	20%	23%	26%	26%	22%
Others	8%	11%	20%	27%	23%	29%	32%	37%	26%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Drafted	180	107	284	331	344	312	344	346	2248

Do players from one category tend to be more successful than the others? This can be reviewed from both an absolute and relative (i.e., considering when draft choices were made) perspective. The following data summarizes the data, with fullbacks excluded due to their small number of draft choices, Major Contributors and Contributors.

Category	Major Contributor				Contributors			
	Actual		Projected		Actual		Projected	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Group of 31	407	57.3%	423	59.6%	552	56.7%	566	58.2%
Other P5	149	21.0%	143	20.1%	195	20.1%	199	20.4%
Others	154	21.7%	144	20.3%	226	23.2%	208	21.4%
Total	710	100%	710	100%	973	100%	973	100%

As the table shows, in absolute terms the Group dominates, producing 57% of all Major Contributors. But there is a different result when an algorithm is used to calculate how many Major Contributors and Contributors those draft choices should have produced and that is compared with the actual number.

This table compares the variances by playing position and overall between actual and projected for each category of schools. A plus sign (+) indicates that actual exceeded projected and a minus sign (-) indicates the opposite.

	Group of 31	Other Power 5	All Others	Total
Quarterbacks				
Draftees	52	26	27	105
Major Contributors Variance	0	0	0	0
Contributors Variance	-2	+2	0	0
Running Backs				
Draftees	104	34	51	189
Major Contributors Variance	0	0	0	0
Contributors Variance	-1	0	+1	0
Wide Receivers				
Draftees	145	71	71	287
Major Contributors Variance	-1	-3	+4	0
Contributors Variance	-2	-2	+4	0
Tight Ends				
Draftees	69	22	33	124
Major Contributors Variance	+2	-1	-1	0
Contributors Variance	0	0	0	0
Offensive Line				
Draftees	201	83	92	376
Major Contributors Variance	+2	-2	0	0
Contributors Variance	+1	-3	+2	0
Defensive Line				
Draftees	207	75	94	376
Major Contributors Variance	-9	+5	+4	0
Contributors Variance	-10	+1	+9	0
Linebackers				
Draftees	168	73	75	316
Major Contributors Variance	+3	+1	-4	0
Contributors Variance	0	+4	44	0
Defensive Backs				
Draftees	215	107	131	453
Major Contributors Variance	-7	+8	-1	0
Contributors Variance	0	+2	-2	0
All Positions				
Draftees	1161	491	573	2225
Major Contributors Variance	-16	+6	+10	0
Contributors Variance	-14	-4	-+18	0

As this table indicates, the Group produced 16 fewer Major Contributors than would have been expected. This is just over 1% less than expected, so not a great difference but a difference nonetheless. Draftees from schools outside the Power 5 produced over 1% more than expected. This could be interpreted to indicate that players from the Group are a tad over-drafted. As you can see most of the differences are on the defensive side of the ball.

This table provides a summary for offense and defense.

	Group of 31	Other Power 5	All Others	Total
Offense				
Draftees	570	236	273	1079
Major Contributors Variance	+3	-6	+3	0
% Variance	+0.5%	-2.5%	+1.0%	
Contributors Variance	-4	-3	+7	0
% Variance	-0.7%	-1.3%	+2.5%	
Defense				
Draftees	591	255	300	1146
Major Contributors Variance	-19	+12	+7	0
% Variance	-3.2%	+4.7%	+2.3%	
Contributors Variance	-10	-1	+11	0
% Variance	-1.7%	0%	+3.7%	

This table shows that on offense, each category produces players roughly as expected. There are more significant differences on defense. An earlier table reflects that the biggest differences are defensive line (where the Group produced about 4% fewer Major Contributors than expected) and defensive back (where the Group produced about 3 % fewer Major Contributors than expected). Combined the two positions account for the entire amount of the Group's negative variance.

COMING UP: An analysis of the individual schools with the Group.

DRAFTMETRICS

THE NFL'S MINOR LEAGUE – REVIEWING THE COLLEGES

Part 2

In Part I, the dominance of a group of 31 colleges (the Group) in supplying talent to the NFL was discussed. As pointed out in that article, these teams accounted for over half of all draft selections and were especially prevalent in the earlier rounds of the draft.

- 79% of selections in the first 20 picks of the first round were from the Group.
- 65% of selections in the rest of the first round were from the Group.
- 60% of selections in the second round were from the Group.

Our analysis indicates, though, that compared to projected outcomes based on an algorithm, the Group's performance was slightly worse than might have been expected (16 fewer Major Contributors and 14 fewer Contributors). Major Contributors (MCs) are defined to be players who participated in at least 500 scrimmage snaps for at least three seasons. Contributors (Cs) are players who participated in at least 300 scrimmage snaps for at least three seasons. MCs are also included as Cs. This analysis excludes fullbacks due to their small numbers.

In this article the draft performance of each of the 31 members of the Group will be examined to isolate the source of the negative variances. The following table shows:

- The number of draft selections analyzed (2012 through 2020).
- The variance for both Major Contributors and Contributors,
- The percentage variance for each.

The number of draft selections ranged from 77 for Alabama to 24 for three colleges. Colleges are ranked by their percentage variance for Major Contributors. Again, fullbacks are excluded due to their small numbers.

College	#	MC Var	MC Var %	C Var	C Var %	College	#	MC Var	MC Var %	C Var	C Var %
Arkansas	31	+3	+43.2%	-1	-0.9%	Notre Dame	45	-1	-7.8%	-2	-6.7%
Iowa	30	+4	+31.6%	+5	+29.6%	Michigan St	26	-1	-9.6%	-1	-0.9%
NC State	28	+2	+22.9%	+5	+45.2%	USC	34	-2	-10.7%	-3	-13.7%
LSU	63	+5	+19.2%	+4	+11.8%	Florida	53	-2	-11.2%	-2	-8.8%
Stanford	36	+3	+18.2%	+1	+10.0%	UCLA	32	-1	-15.4%	-1	-6.3%
Miami	42	+1	+14.0%	0	+1.1%	Washington	31	-2	-15.4%	-1	-6.1%
Penn State	36	+1	+13.2%	+2	+10.9%	Michigan	42	-2	-16.2%	-1	-4.5%
South Carolina	30	+1	+12.7%	+1	+7.5%	Texas A&M	30	-2	-17.2%	-4	-23.2%
Florida State	45	+2	+10.6%	+2	+8.1%	Georgia	47	-3	-17.5%	+1	+5.7%
Mississippi State	28	+1	+5.8%	+1	+2.0%	West Virginia	27	-2	-24.3%	-2	-16.0%
Wisconsin	31	0	+3.8%	0	+0.2%	Auburn	32	-3	-24.7%	-3	-19.5%
Ohio State	62	+1	+3.5%	+1	+3.4%	Oregon	30	-4	-35.6%	-6	-41.8%
Clemson	48	0	+2.2%	-2	-1.8%	Utah	29	-4	-38.2%	-3	-24.0%
Oklahoma	44	0	+0.2%	+4	+20.0%	Baylor	24	-4	-54.5%	-3	-34.1%
North Carolina	24	0	-0.3%	-1	-1.5%	TCU	24	-4	-59.2%	-5	-51.8%

Alabama	77	-3	-7.3%	-1	-2.6%	Total	116	-16	-3.9%	-14	-2.5%
							1				

A few explanations before discussing these results. The variances for MCs and Cs are the difference between the calculated expectation and actual results. The variance percentage is calculated by dividing the variance by the expected number of MCs and Cs, respectively.

Using Miami as an example, its number of Major Contributors was 12 while the expected was 10.53, resulting in a difference of 1.47. The amount of the variance shown is “1” which is the rounding of 1.47 but the variance percentage is calculated using 1.47 as a percentage of the expected (10.53) or 13.96%, rounded to 14.0%.

Arkansas is probably not the college anyone would have expected to be at the top of the list, but they produced nine Major Contributors versus the calculated expectation of 6.28 MCs with only 31 selections. Their positive variance is attributed to the fact that Arkansas did well with their later round selections while having only two picks in the first two rounds (both of which were MCs). They had three MCs in the fourth round, and one each in the 3rd, 5th, 6th and 7th rounds. It should be noted that Arkansas had the lowest average draft position of the Group. Also worth noting is that Arkansas had a negative variance when it came to Cs. It was boom or bust for them as the number of MCs and Cs were the same.

Iowa had more early selections than Arkansas (eight of their 30 selections were in the first two rounds) and did particularly well with offensive linemen (5 of 7 were MCs), TEs (3 of 4 were MCs) and linebackers (3 of 4 were MCs). They had 15 MCs out of 30 selections. Iowa also had the second highest positive variance for Cs.

Baylor and TCU were at the bottom of the rankings, with only three draftees each out of 24 reaching Major Contributor status. The difference in their variance percentage is due to the distribution of their selections.

Here is a breakdown of performance by conference among the Group.

Conf	MC Var.	Var %	C Var	Var %	Conf	MC Var.	Var %	C Var	Var %
ACC (5)	+5	+8.28%	+4	+4.30%	Pac 12 (6)	-10	-14.2%	-12	-12.2%
Big 10 (6)	+3	+4.01%	+6	+5.12%	Big 12 (4)	-10	-26.3%	-6	-11.9%
SEC (9)	-3	-1.7%	-4	-2.20%					

The PAC 12 and Big 12 colleges in the Group account for the entire amount of the variance, and more. Each of those conferences had one relative success (Stanford and Oklahoma) with the rest of the conference showing subpar performance.

As might be expected, the draft performance of each college varies by playing position. Results by playing position are discussed below. Because of the small number of data points, total variance and not percentages are used in the discussion.

Quarterbacks

Analyzing the variances is pretty much meaningless when it comes to QBs. Only two schools (Oklahoma and Oregon) had two or more MCs, with Oklahoma having three (Hurts, Mayfield, Murray) and Oregon with two (Hebert, Mariota). Of the other 29 members of the Group, 13 had one MC and 16 had none. Three colleges had no QBs drafted.

Running Backs

With substitution patterns and the ever-present injury threat it makes sense to look at RBs both from a Major Contributor and Contributor perspective.

Alabama had both the highest number of MCs (4) and Cs (6) and had a positive variance (+1.01 and +1.40, respectively) in both. Seven of their eight drafted RBs, most of anyone, were selected in the first three rounds of the draft. Florida State had the largest positive variance in both MCs (+1.92) and Cs (+2.09). With five draft selections they had three MCs and four Cs. Other colleges with good results at RB were Georgia, Miami and Penn State.

On the negative side of the ledger, Oregon had four RBs drafted (with three in the first four rounds) and produced no MCs or Cs, giving them a negative variance in both MCs (-0.85) and Cs (-1.64). Auburn also had four RBs drafted with no MCs or Cs, giving them negative variances of -0.84 and -1.25, respectively. Others performing below expectation were Florida and Texas A&M. Florida had six RBs drafted (with four after the fourth round) but none reached MC or C status.

LSU posted interesting results. They had the highest negative MC variance (-0.94) but among the best C variances (+0.74). LSU had six RBs drafted with four in the first two rounds. Of the four early round selections, only one reached MC status but all were Cs.

Wide Receivers

Only Major Contributors were considered in evaluating WR performance. LSU rated best in both the number of MCs produced (6) and variance (+2.90). LSU had nine receivers drafted with five in the first two rounds. Clemson was the second most productive for wide receivers with five MCs and a positive variance of +1.85. Clemson also had nine WRs drafted. Texas A&M also did well with three of their drafted receivers reaching MC status. SEC (+4 variance) and ACC schools (+2 variance) tended to do better with WRs with the rest of the Group having a -7 variance.

West Virginia was at the bottom of the ratings with a variance of -2.25. They had two WRs drafted in the first 20 selections, and six overall, but none reached MC status. Washington only had two receivers drafted but one was in the first 20 selections and the other in the second round with neither achieving MC status.

Ohio State had the most WRs drafted with 10 with seven going in the second or third round (none in the first) but only three were MCs, giving them a variance of -0.74.

Tight Ends

For TEs, both MCs and Cs were examined. Stanford, Stanford, Stanford. Stanford led in number of draftees (7), number of MCs (5), number of Cs (also 5), MC variance (+2.82) and C variance (+1.22). Iowa also did well with 3 MCs and positive variances in both MCs (+0.88) and Cs (+0.95). Penn State had only two TEs selected but both reached MC status.

Georgia had arguably the worst record with four TEs selected and none reaching either MC or C status. All of their selections, though, were after the third round.

Offensive Line

Only MCs were considered in evaluating OL performance. Three Big 10 schools (Michigan, Wisconsin and Ohio State) were dominant among OL. All three had seven MCs among their selections and all had positive variances. Michigan led the way with a +2.80 variance, followed by Wisconsin (+2.09) and Ohio State (+1.76). The six Big 10 schools in the Group accounted for an MC variance of +8. The rest of the Group combined had a variance of -6.

Alabama also had seven OL MCs (out of 12 draftees) but five were in the top 20 selections and they performed about as expected. Draftees from South Carolina, North Carolina State and Oklahoma also exceeded expectations.

On the negative side, Oregon had the worst variance (-2.07) with only one MC out of seven selections. USC had two MCs but a variance of -2.03. Florida State rounded out the bottom three with two MCs out of 10 draft selections and a variance of -1.67.

Defensive Line

Due to substitution patterns and the rotational nature of the position, both MCs and Cs were considered in the analysis. Alabama led the way with seven MCs and 10 Cs (out of 16 selections) and had positive variances in both MCs (+1.08) and Cs (+0.98). Arkansas had the highest positive variance (+1.41) with three MCs out of eight selections, six of which were after the third round. Mississippi State had the second highest positive variance at +1.21, with four MCs out of six selections. SEC colleges in the Group performed just about as expected. The remainder of the Group had a combined -8 variance.

Clemson and Ohio State had six MCs each and both posted positive variances (+1.02 for Ohio State and +0.57 for Clemson). LSU had five MCs and a +0.92 variance. North Carolina State had the highest positive C variance at +1.89. Five of their seven selections reached C status despite having only one selection in the first two rounds. NC State also had a +0.96 variance in MCs.

Michigan and Auburn did the worst of the Group. Despite 10 selections, Michigan had only one MC and three Cs. They had the worst C variance (-2.13) and third worst MC variance (-1.67). Auburn had the second lowest variance in both MCs (-1.88) and Cs (-1.86), despite having five selections in the first three rounds. Oklahoma had the worst MC variance at -2.13 but was not quite as bad with Cs posting a -0.94 variance.

Linebackers

Only MCs were considered in this evaluation. LSU, Florida and Georgia all had five MCs. Interestingly, only Georgia had a positive variance (+0.41). LSU (-1.05) had 11 LBs drafted with six in the first two rounds, so their projection was for 6.05 MCs. Florida had 12 LBs drafted with seven in the first three rounds and a -0.47 variance.

The top performers from a variance perspective were Stanford (+1.76), Florida State (+1.76) and Iowa (+1.67). Stanford and Florida State both had only five LBs drafted but three reached MC status. Iowa had only four LBs selected, but also had three reach MC.

Alabama has the most LBs drafted with 14 but only three reached MC status, despite nine being drafted in the first three rounds. They had the worst MC variance at -2.97. Michigan and Clemson also had subpar performances. Michigan produced only one MC out of seven selections with a -2.16 variance. Clemson had four LBs selected in the first two rounds but had only two MCs and a -2.01 variance.

Defensive Backs

Only MCs were considered in this evaluation. LSU had the second highest number of DBs drafted (15) and the highest number of MCs (10) and the best variance (+1.64). Alabama had the most DBs drafted, the second highest number of MCs (9) but a minor negative variance (-0.31). Ohio State had the third highest number of draft choices (13) and MCs (8); they performed exactly as expected.

Florida State had the second highest positive variance (+1.13) with six MCs out of nine selections. Seven of their nine selections were in the first three rounds. Also with good grades were Iowa, Arkansas and West Virginia.

TCU and Florida were the poorest performers with variances of -1.89 and -1.79, respectively. TCU has no MCs out of six selections with two of those selections in the first round. Florida had five MCs out of 12 selections, but eight of their 12 selections were in the first two rounds. Miami also did not do well with only one MC in nine selections with a variance of -1.39.

Final Comments

There were varying levels of difference between best and worst variances for the playing positions. Wide receivers showed the greatest difference followed by offensive line and linebackers. Quarterbacks and running backs had the narrowest ranges.

The rest of this article contains two tables that show the breakdown of selections by both draft position and playing position for each college in the Group. One somewhat interesting thing to note in the draft selections by position is that the selections for about half of the Group were evenly balanced between offense and defense while the rest showed an imbalance. Nine schools (Arkansas, Baylor, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Stanford, Texas A&M, Wisconsin) had predominantly offensive players selected. Seven colleges (Alabama, Clemson, LSU, Mississippi State, Penn State, Utah, Washington) were predominantly defense.

DRAFT SELECTIONS BY ROUND
(Includes fullbacks)

	1 st Round		Rounds						Total	Avg Position
	1-20	21+	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th		
Alabama	20	6	17	7	9	10	4	6	79	2.95
LSU	10	4	14	12	17	4	4	9	64	3.33
Ohio State	14	3	12	13	7	2	6	6	63	3.11
Florida	5	6	7	8	10	6	6	5	53	3.58
Clemson	10	2	6	6	10	5	5	4	48	3.44
Georgia	5	5	4	5	7	9	5	7	47	3.94
Oklahoma	4	2	6	7	12	3	8	4	46	3.87
Florida State	5	3	10	3	6	7	6	5	45	3.71
Notre Dame	5	5	8	6	6	3	8	4	45	3.53
Miami	1	3	1	6	10	7	9	6	43	4.53
Michigan	3	3	3	10	6	6	8	3	42	3.93
Stanford	4	2	6	7	6	6	4	2	37	3.54
Penn State	1	0	9	4	6	7	6	3	36	4.08
USC	6	1	7	6	7	3	3	2	35	3.26
Auburn	2	2	4	6	7	4	5	3	33	3.91
Wisconsin	1	4	4	5	6	9	2	2	33	3.73
UCLA	3	2	3	4	6	7	3	4	32	4.00
Arkansas	1	0	1	4	7	6	8	4	31	4.81
Texas A&M	5	3	4	5	3	4	5	2	31	3.45
Washington	4	3	10	0	4	4	4	2	31	3.26
Iowa	4	1	3	5	7	5	1	4	30	3.77
Oregon	6	0	3	3	3	5	4	6	30	4.13
South Carolina	4	1	3	2	7	2	4	7	30	4.27
Utah	2	0	5	6	4	4	5	3	29	4.03
No. Carolina St	2	0	2	7	6	4	1	6	28	4.25
Mississippi St	2	2	7	5	1	2	7	2	28	3.68
West Virginia	4	0	1	7	5	7	2	1	27	4.00
Michigan State	2	1	3	2	10	2	3	3	26	3.74
Baylor	3	0	2	2	4	2	6	5	24	3.75
North Carolina	4	1	3	3	5	3	0	5	24	4.17
TCU	0	5	2	3	2	1	4	5	24	4.58
Total	142	70	170	169	196	151	146	130	1174	3.73

DRAFT SELECTIONS BY PLAYING POSITION
(Includes fullbacks)

	QB	RB	FB	WR	TE	OL	OFF	DL	LB	DB	DEF	total
Alabama	2	8	2	6	3	12	33	16	14	16	46	79
LSU	3	6	1	9	2	8	29	9	11	15	35	64
Ohio State	2	5	1	10	2	11	31	12	7	13	32	63
Florida	0	6	0	6	1	7	20	9	12	12	33	53
Clemson	2	3	0	9	2	3	19	11	8	10	29	48
Georgia	2	5	0	8	4	9	28	3	10	6	19	47
Oklahoma	4	3	2	8	3	9	29	8	6	3	17	46
Florida State	2	5	0	3	2	10	22	9	5	9	23	45
Notre Dame	1	3	0	6	6	6	22	8	6	9	23	45
Miami	1	6	1	6	3	6	23	8	3	9	20	43
Michigan	1	0	0	6	3	9	19	10	7	6	23	42
Stanford	2	4	1	2	7	7	23	5	5	4	14	37
Penn State	2	2	0	4	2	4	14	10	4	8	22	36
USC	3	2	1	5	1	7	19	3	6	7	16	35
Auburn	1	4	1	3	1	6	16	8	2	7	17	33
Wisconsin	1	4	2	3	1	9	20	1	9	3	13	33
UCLA	2	3	0	4	3	6	18	5	7	2	14	32
Arkansas	2	5	0	4	4	4	19	8	2	2	12	31
Texas A&M	2	3	1	5	1	7	19	6	1	5	12	31
Washington	1	3	0	2	3	3	12	5	6	8	19	31
Iowa	2	0	0	1	4	7	14	4	4	8	16	30
Oregon	2	4	0	2	1	7	16	5	5	4	14	30
South Carolina	0	2	0	6	4	6	18	5	3	4	12	30
Utah	0	3	0	1	0	7	11	7	3	8	18	29
No. Carolina St	3	3	0	2	0	4	12	7	3	6	16	28
Mississippi St	2	2	0	0	2	5	11	6	5	6	17	28
West Virginia	2	2	0	6	1	3	14	3	4	6	13	27
Michigan State	2	3	0	5	1	2	13	5	1	7	13	26
Baylor	2	2	0	6	1	5	16	3	2	3	8	24
North Carolina	1	3	0	3	1	5	13	5	3	3	11	24
TCU	0	0	0	4	0	6	10	3	5	6	14	24