

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

**INTERVIEWS WITH
GORDON C. BURRIS**

Conducted on March 5, March 6, and March 19, 2012

by Sheree Scarborough



HISTORY ASSOCIATES INCORPORATED
300 N. STONESTREET AVENUE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850
Telephone: (301) 279-9697
Fax: (301) 279-9224
[**hai@historyassociates.com**](mailto:hai@historyassociates.com)

Gordon C. Burris

Biographical Statement

Gordon C. Burris was born in Wilmington, Delaware in 1943. He received his B.A. from Springfield College in Springfield, Massachusetts in 1965. In 1967, he received his master's degree in physical education from the University of Virginia. Burris was named head soccer coach in 1966 for the University. He went on to work as head coach in tennis and golf; assistant dean of admissions; assistant director of the Alumni Association where he was part of the team that developed the Legacy Admissions Program and the Jefferson Scholarship Program; and, in fact, was the first director of Jefferson Scholars. In the late 1980s, he returned to athletics where he served as assistant athletic director and director of development for major gifts. He played a role in raising the money for the McCue Center and Klöckner Stadium. From 1989 to 1991, Burris was director of the Maryland Education Foundation at the University of Maryland. He returned to the University of Virginia in 1991 to serve as special assistant to President John T. Casteen III, a position he still holds with the current president Teresa A. Sullivan.

Interview Synopsis

Mr. Burris begins the interview with a description of his early years in Wilmington, and the impact of childhood experiences and mentors on his future life choices. He goes on to discuss his educational experiences at both Springfield College and the University of Virginia. He recounts some experiences in his early years of coaching and working in the Alumni Association with University legends such as Lou Onesty and Gilbert J. Sullivan, as well as work and travels with Dean of Admissions John T. Casteen III. Mr. Burris describes the genesis and development of successful University programs, including Legacy Admissions, Jefferson Scholars, Alumni Parents Committee, and Virginia 2020. He narrates his long career and relationship with Casteen, including his twenty-year role as special assistant to the president, and explores such topics as capital campaigns, successful donor and alumni relations, controversies that were weathered, and the significance of Casteen's presidency on the University. The overall themes of Mr. Burris's love of athletics and relationship building permeate his forty-seven year career at the University of Virginia and the oral history interview.

The University of Virginia Oral History Project
Interview with Gordon C. Burris
Conducted on March 5, 2012 by Sheree Scarborough

SS: This is Sheree Scarborough and I'm here with Gordon C. Burris, special assistant to the president at the University of Virginia. This is for the University of Virginia Oral History Project. It's March 5, 2012. We are meeting at his office in Madison Hall.

I wanted to start today, Gordon, with a little bit about your background.

GB: I was born in Wilmington, Delaware in 1943. My parents had me a little later in their married life. My father died when I was six. Therefore, my mother raised me as a single parent until I was sixteen, and then she remarried. My stepfather was a gentleman by the name of Ed Kramer. I inherited with that marriage two stepbrothers, another Ed and Jim. They're still alive. The parents are dead, but they're still alive. One is living in California, who was a professor at Cornell, now is out at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The other who was a long-time teacher up at the Nichols School in Buffalo, New York, who has just retired this year and is living out here, in Stony Creek, out in the Wintergreen complex.

Needless to say, my father's death, at the age of six, had a significant impact on my life. And it probably affected how I look at a number of things, particularly regarding women, and what's been described as the glass ceiling and their employment, since my mother had to get a job immediately, upon the death of my father, and work the next ten years, so we could survive.

SS: Right, what did she do?

GB: She was an accountant for a real estate investment firm, which goes back to the 1950s. She went to a junior college called Goldey-Beacom, in Wilmington. She did the accounting for the firm. She wasn't trained as an accountant, per se, but she did the accounting for the firm, and also was a secretary. She combined those two jobs.

SS: She must've been a strong woman.

GB: That, she was.

SS: Then your college years, you went to Springfield College?

GB: Yes, I actually went to a high school in Wilmington called Alexis I. DuPont High School. It's interesting because the gentleman who works across the office, Michael Strine, who was just hired to take Leonard Sandridge's position, also went to Alexis I. DuPont High School. The difference was about twenty-seven years after I had been there.

From Alexis I. DuPont High School, I went to Springfield College, in Massachusetts, and was involved in history, and was in education. It was a school where, basically, you received a degree in education. You received a degree in leadership. A number of folks who came out of Springfield College all went into YMCA work. My undergraduate

degree was going to be in teacher education, with an emphasis in history and a minor in physical education.

SS: Is that something you knew you wanted to go into when you were in high school?

GB: I actually wanted to go to Springfield College and do that from the time I was twelve years old. That all came about because when my dad passed away; my mother wanted to keep me off the streets, so to speak. In those days, you were able to move around pretty well. I kind of grew up in a YMCA. The guys who were the heads of the Y were like mentors. As mentors, I asked them where they went to college and they both had gone to Springfield College. I decided that was a pretty neat place. So I decided when I was twelve years old I was going to go to Springfield College. I absolutely just followed it, right through to the "T."

SS: That's a rare instance. People many times have a wish to do something and then aren't able to follow through.

GB: Well, thank goodness the college wasn't that selective, academically. Otherwise, I probably couldn't have gotten in there. But the fact that it was willing to take me, and I was willing to commit to it, made it a happy marriage.

SS: It sounds like the Y used to function as an afterschool program, before those existed, it seems?

GB: Very much so. It was a place your parents could send you to, basically, keep you off the streets. Being on the streets back when I was growing up is very different from being on the streets today. The Y was very much part of my being, day in and day out.

SS: Did you do sports in high school?

GB: I did sports in high school.

SS: Which ones?

GB: I tried to play a little football, but wasn't very good at that. I ran some cross country, was pretty good at that, but gave that up all for basketball, because I thought I would be a decent basketball player. I was maybe above average, not very good, but above average as a basketball player. I should've probably continued to run the cross country, because that actually was the one sport that I could've excelled in, but that's past tense.

SS: Then at Springfield, did you go on scholarship or did you work part-time?

GB: No. My mom paid full boat. We didn't get any financial aid. I worked in the summertime to earn enough money to have it as spending money, and put gas in my car and things of that nature. I worked all four years I was in college. But up to college, I'd

gone to camps. So as I say, I really didn't work in the summertime until I went off to college. Then I worked every summer thereafter.

SS: What kinds of jobs did you have?

GB: I had one in particular. The first job I had was as a lifeguard at, interestingly enough, a YMCA pool. Then, after that, I had the same job for the next three summers. I was a starter and golf marshal at DuPont Country Club. So I got to play as much golf as I could, when I wasn't having to go out there and tell people to speed up play or take starting times and things of that nature. It was about as good a job as you could possibly have. In fact, it was so good I think when I retire, I might go back and try to get another one just like it.

SS: (Laughter.) What was college life like on that campus?

GB: Well, there weren't fraternities and sororities, so social life was what you made it. They had some pretty interesting rules, such as you had to wear a beanie your freshman year. You had to say hello to everybody. That was another rule. So when I went home at Thanksgiving in Wilmington, I caught myself walking down Market Street, which is the main street in Wilmington, saying "hello" to everybody. It looked like people thought I was half crazy, because people weren't doing that in those days, let alone if I did that today. It was a good four-year experience that allowed me to enjoy what I always thought I'd enjoy doing, which was teaching and coaching.

SS: Was it coed?

GB: It was.

SS: Tell me about your decision to come to the University of Virginia, after your graduation.

GB: The idea was to go and get a MAT, a master's in arts and teaching, which was a big program in those days. I was accepted into that program here, at Virginia. I also was accepted at Penn State. I can't remember if I was accepted, but I know I applied to Duke as well. I hadn't seen any of the schools I had applied to, to get into the MAT program. This was just the next step.

Of course, Vietnam was starting at that point in time to become a little larger than a blip on the radar. I knew there was a chance that I was going to be in the lottery. I had no idea what number I would come up. I came down to Virginia to get started in this Masters of Arts and Teaching Program, and the draft board gave me a one-year exemption to do just that.

The draft board had a little something to do with coming here and the course I took, but my decision regarding the program had to do with a couple of courses at Virginia that were very difficult for me. One, in particular, taught by a gentleman named Mr. Harris, who, I believe, was the head of the Department of Politics. I worked as hard as I could

and I really didn't have great success. I presented a paper to Mr. Harris that I thought I had done a pretty good job on. He asked me if this was the best I could do and I said it was. He said, "Well, I appreciate that, but the fact is maybe you ought to find a different direction to go academically."

It just so happened at the time that there were two professors here—Lawrence Ludwig and Raymond Heidloff—both were Springfield College graduates and both were teaching in the Curry School. At this point in time, I decided once Mr. Harris had made those comments, to go over and see if I could pursue a master's degree in physical education, which interestingly enough, was very much a part of my well being. The day I got to Virginia in September, I had gone over to see a guy named Jim West, James O. West. Jim was the head of Phys. Ed. at the time, here at the University, and also the head baseball coach. First year students at the University, up until 1970, all had to take physical education. If they were in the College, it was required for one year. It was not required if you were in engineering or architecture.

I went over, just to volunteer to teach what they call Service Physical Education. I was actually willing not just to volunteer to teach it, but I would probably have paid a little money to them if they had let me teach it for the experience. The fact is it ended up that I got paid to teach it, which was a really nice bonus, because I had no idea I'd be earning money while I was getting a master's degree. But this was a way to do it.

Along with teaching a full load of Service Physical Education classes, I then walked over to see the track coach, because I had run some track at Springfield College, to see if he needed help as a volunteer assistant. As he informed me, he didn't have any assistants, so he'd take any kind of assistance, whether they were volunteer or not. Lou Onesty was his name and now we have Onesty Hall named for him.

I went over to talk to Lou. He took me on as his assistant track coach. During the second half of my first year at Virginia, once I switched majors, I taught Phys. Ed. And I was also the assistant track coach through the spring of 1966. That's how the physical education major came about. I finally completed that degree in 1967, and at that point in time, had already been named the head soccer and tennis coach at Virginia.

SS: Let me take you back a minute, just to find out more about those physical education classes. What did they entail?

GB: Well, the first thing they entailed was everybody who came in had to pass a physical fitness test. That involved a strength test. That involved running. That involved a climbing the rope to the top of Memorial Gymnasium. That involved doing a lap in the swimming pool. It involved a number of things. If you passed that test, then you had the opportunity to take physical education classes.

They were broken down into eight-week segments, as I remember. You would take something like flag football, maybe the first eight weeks. Then the second eight weeks

you go back inside and you would take something like bowling, which we had in those days. Or you would take basketball or you would take boxing or something of that nature. Then there was a third eight-week session, which was really the first part of the second semester in the wintertime, and that was, again, inside. Then you go back outside for your final eight weeks—tennis, badminton, archery, golf, whatever it might be. They were offered both in the fall and the spring.

But if you didn't pass your physical fitness test, then you were required to take a physical training program for sixteen weeks, throughout the winter. And the stories that come out of that—watching kids go through that and then hearing now that I'm out speaking with alumni, having a number of them come and tell me what a hard guy I was to demand what I demanded of them and so on. It's kind of interesting. Those could go on forever.

SS: Then that was stopped in '70?

GB: We went coed. In the first year of coeducation, the College of Arts & Sciences no longer required physical education. It was a pass-fail course to begin with. The College of Arts & Sciences said that they would still allow a student to take an elective, one hour, pass-fail, in the fall and another elective for one hour in the winter-spring. So you can still, even as of today, get two hours of physical education classes. You can still earn two. Again, it's a pass-fail basis.

SS: So it was a function of going coed that that was changed?

GB: Yes, I guess they decided when we went to coeducation, because we grew so quickly, in such a short period of time, that there weren't enough teachers to keep up with the students. At least, in terms of Service Phys. Ed. classes. I can't remember the exact reason as to why they decided it. But there was a lot going on at the University. You've got to remember we went coed in 1970, recruiting the first class of women that time. There were 450 in that class and then 550 the following year. Again, you're into the Vietnam era, so there was a lot happening around here.

SS: Tell me about that, the mid-sixties here, on the Grounds.

GB: Well, it was a period of transition. Really, the mid-sixties were no different than the fifties. It was the late-sixties, when the transition started to occur. It really never hit until the seventies and the early-seventies. Mainly, again, because we went coed in '70, and Vietnam had heated up at that point in time. It was a difficult time here, particularly for a school that has a lot of tradition. It's considered, by nature, somewhat conservative, but really prides itself on its honor, integrity, and ethics.

Leonard [Sandridge] could tell you all about sitting out in a pickup truck one night, watching student movements the night they brought the Mayflower van in to haul students downtown, because they were going to arrest so many of them. I mean, these are stories he can recite to you. My main concern during the Vietnam era was to try and keep a harness on my student athletes somewhat so that they wouldn't be going off and

doing things that were going to jeopardize their opportunity to play on the tennis team or the soccer team.

SS: That's interesting. So it was in 1966 when you became head soccer coach?

GB: Yes, head soccer coach in 1966. So the fall of '66 was my first year of coaching soccer. The spring of 1967 was my first year of coaching tennis.

SS: You recounted in the speech you gave me that Steve Sebo hired you.

GB: He did. He hired me, I think, because of two things. Number one, I was already teaching Service Physical Education, so he had a year to take a look at me doing that because he, himself, taught Service Physical Education. Everybody did in those days, including all the head coaches and their assistants. Number two, the fact that I was Lou Onesty's assistant, so he had a chance to watch me be an assistant track coach.

So he came to me and never asked me if I could coach. He asked me if I could recruit. He never asked me if I'd ever seen either tennis or soccer played. Obviously, I'd seen tennis played. I'd taught it in Service Physical Education. So the first soccer game I ever saw was the first one I coached.

SS: (Laughter.) That's funny.

GB: Again, the question was: “Can you recruit?” It had nothing to do with whether I could coach or not, just simply: “Can you recruit?” My answer was yes, I could; and yes, we did. It all worked out beautifully.

SS: Can you tell me something about working with Sebo?

GB: Well, Steve was interesting. He had actually been the head football coach at the University of Pennsylvania. They told him they were going to give him one more year to be a head coach. In other words, his contract was coming to an end. In his last year as head coach at the University of Pennsylvania, he went out and won the Ivy League football championship. For whatever reason, they still let him go.

Then he moved on to become a professional general manager of a team that I believe, if I remember correctly, in those days was still called the New York Jets. It might have been the New York Generals, but I think it was the Jets. Then he came down to Virginia to become the athletic director, before I ever arrived. That happened a few years before I got here.

He was delightful to work with. He took a lot of pride in his job, but what I really appreciated about Steve Sebo was the pride he took in teaching Service Physical Education. Here, he was the athletic director and yet he was as good as it gets when it came to paying attention to the students and truly teaching them the fundamentals of the

sport. He particularly enjoyed teaching them golf, because that was the thing that he enjoyed doing the most.

SS: Over the course of your career in athletics, you've worked with people who are now seen as legends in the University's history. Is there anything more you want to say about Lou Onesty or James West?

GB: Jim West was the head baseball coach here. He was a great guy and, again, was a legend in many ways.

There's not a nicer guy in the world than Lou Onesty. Traveling with him, in those days, we didn't have a lot of money, so we ended up having to share rooms. Here I am, twenty-three years old, sharing a room with a guy who's in his early-fifties at the time, maybe late forties. But what I really appreciated about Lou was he gave every young person who came out for track an opportunity to be on the track team. In those days, we didn't have scholarships, at least in what they now call the Olympic sports. In those days, they were called the non-revenue sports. We didn't have scholarships, so most of our teams—we as coaches—allowed for tryouts. We would cut based on the tryout performances and put our teams together.

If somebody was willing to come out and run track, even though they might be the slowest miler in U.Va. history, the fact is they wouldn't get cut. Lou was going to keep them on the team. As I say, he was very special. There have been many, many more that

I worked for over the last forty-seven years at U.Va. too who are names that people would recognize.

SS: One of those might be Gene Corrigan?

GB: It was. I actually took Gene Corrigan's place as the soccer coach. Gene coached the soccer team and lacrosse team. He got to a point where he was also sports information director. It got to be overwhelming, so he decided he'd have to give up the soccer. He did, and I then took his position as the head soccer coach.

SS: Tell me how you got a successful team without having much experience in soccer.

GB: Well, as I like to say, I'm a slow reader. I bought a book and started reading it and I got through the first chapter in the first year. We were zero-and-ten that year. I think I got through the second chapter; and we were two-and-eight. Then, the third year, I think we won four or five, so we were either four-and-six or five-and-five. Then I decided that no matter how hard I read the book, the fact is that I just didn't really and truly understand the game well enough.

I had some pretty good student athletes at that point in time that we had recruited. I wanted them to have a really good experience, so I went out and hired two assistant coaches, both graduate students here. One was getting an MBA and the other was getting either a master's or a doctorate in the College. Both had played soccer all their life. Both

were from England. I put one in charge of the offense, and one in charge of the defense. Then I got out of their way and let them coach.

SS: Who were they?

GB: Ian Falconer and Richard Lewis.

SS: That's a funny story. I'm sure you did more than that.

GB: Well, I don't know. You'd have to talk to the players.

SS: Because you won!

GB: That year we won the ACC. It was the first time in the history of U.Va. And it was the first time in the history of anybody in the Atlantic Coast Conference. Maryland had won it from 1953 until 1969. Then we went on and played in our first NCAA tournament we'd ever played in. We lost, first round, but we got to play. I think that was a real honor for those kids to have that opportunity. Then later on, Bruce Arena came to the University of Virginia and won four straight national championships in soccer, before he became the United States national coach. Anyhow, it's been a good sport.

SS: It all started here.

GB: Well, it started, no doubt.

SS: Now, at the same time you were coaching tennis?

GB: Yes, I was. We had a lot more success in tennis early on. Our records were like fourteen and seven, fifteen and three. Generally, we'd finish third in the ACC. North Carolina was always up there. At one point in time, South Carolina was in the ACC, although they departed the ACC while we were still coaching tennis. Tennis was, as I best remember, from 1967 to 1972. Then, I was the head golf coach in 1973-74. Then I was coming back to coach tennis—both men's and women's—in '75.

I took a job in the Alumni Association at that point in time, so I had to get out of coaching. You know, the five years previous to that point in time, I'd been in the admissions office and, thank goodness, because of a gentleman named Ernie Ern, had a chance to continue to coach, even though I was also assistant dean of admissions.

SS: Right, I do want you to talk about your time in admissions.

GB: We can either do it now or come back to it, whatever you want to do.

SS: One thing I want to ask you before we leave this time is when you're coaching soccer and tennis, what did your day look like? That sounds exhausting. It seems like there would be a coach for tennis and a coach for soccer.

GB: Well, sports were different in those days. Number one, the number of games you played were nothing close to what they're playing today. Number two, your soccer kids would play in the fall and your tennis kids in the spring. In those days, the soccer players really only played during the fall. It wasn't like it is today, where it's year-round training and you have to devote forty hours a week to your sport because you're on a scholarship and things of that nature. It was very different.

But it was still very time consuming, particularly in recruiting, because I would recruit as if we had scholarships, even though we didn't. It's the only way you could get kids competitive enough to be successful.

SS: Tell me about the recruiting you would do.

GB: Well, you'd go and visit the kids' high schools, not a lot different today, except for the fact we didn't have a whole lot of money in those days. You would be limited in the number of high schools you could visit. You'd be limited also in terms of your travel budget. Much of it was done on the telephone and convincing the student athlete to come down and take a look at the University. Then once they got here, you'd try and sell them and their parents that this is where they ought to go to school. As I said, we were successful in those endeavors, both in soccer and in tennis.

SS: Is that when you might be traveling with Lou Onesty?

GB: No, that really was just to meets, because I only was with Lou one year. So I didn't help Lou recruit at all. We would just go to meets. I was in charge of coaching the field events. I was the volunteer assistant in charge of field events.

SS: You recruited for soccer and for tennis?

GB: Yes, and later for golf, for a couple years.

SS: Okay. You also replaced Hunter Faulconer?

GB: Hunter Faulconer, yes. He had only been there one year and they had hired him, basically, just to come in and fill the shoes of a coach named Red Rohman, who was a famous coach at Virginia. He was here forever. Hunter was just a one-year and he wasn't involved with the University. He was a real estate agent around town. You would call that person an adjunct professor. In his case, I don't think he was an adjunct tennis coach, but he basically served a year.

SS: What were your professional ambitions at this point?

GB: I think the professional ambitions were dictated, in some cases, by my salary. I realized that in those days, coaches had to take a job in the summer if you wanted to make additional money. My first and only job I ever took in the summer at Virginia was a job

with Jimmy Graves, up at Graves Mountain Lodge, in Syria, Virginia. That was my first summer here, so that would have been the summer of 1966-67.

I want to just step back on one thought here, while I have it in my mind. I mentioned the draft board to you. After my first year here, I was married that summer. It came time for me to be drafted, because my number was up. About the time I got the call to be drafted into the service, I found out that my wife was pregnant. The draft board, actually, at that point in time, gave me a 3-A deferment. That's what allowed me to continue to coach and teach at U.Va. Because had I served in Vietnam, I certainly would not have been coming back here to be the head soccer and the head tennis coach.

SS: Right, thank you. That's a good point.

GB: That impacted significantly on my thinking in the future. As far as when I was here, I mentioned that the salaries were not high. I believe my first year salary for soccer and tennis and teaching a full load of Phys. Ed. was \$6,000. I just decided there was more I could do at U.Va. besides be a head coach. I was starting to get interested in administration.

I really wanted to try to make this thing work, where I could do both. That's why when Ernie Ern hired me to be assistant dean of admissions in 1970, we worked out an agreement that I could do that and help recruit the first five classes of women. Also he would allow me to continue to coach in the springtime, as long as I read all the

applications, and read my fair share of applications in the office. I didn't have a reduced load. I had to read the same number everybody else was assigned to read, but as long as I did that, he said it would be fine if I continued to coach. That's how I got lucky and got to continue to coach tennis and golf and then, as I said, back to tennis for a brief period of time in 1975.

I was very blessed to be able to have an administrative job. I was assistant dean of admissions, and head coach, again, of tennis and eventually golf. It did expose me to administration. Ernie mentioned to me while I was over there working as assistant dean of admissions, that since I had an interest in administration, I might want to pursue a PhD in what I would call higher ed administration at the Curry School, having had just completed the work on the master's.

I made a decision at that point in time that that wasn't where I wanted to go and that wherever I went, it would be without a PhD. I just wasn't committed to go that route. It was tough enough just to get the master's degree. That pretty much ended my chance of advancing in administration. Of course, in 1970 to '75, I had no idea, when I was making that decision to not get a PhD that I would ever end up as senior assistant to the president. That was never a thought in my mind. I couldn't ever see myself working in a president's office.

SS: Why not?

GB: Well, it was interesting. When I first came to Virginia, I noticed that the one thing that seemed to be missing between the athletic program and the academic program was communication. There was very little communication between what they call those on “the Hill,” which is where the president’s office is, and those below, which is where the athletic department was. So I used to volunteer my time to come in on Saturdays during the busy part of the admissions season to literally interview students.

In those days, they used to interview on Saturday mornings. I’d come in and interview students, just so that one of the deans of admissions, or assistant deans of admissions, who were traveling that week, didn’t have to come in after a long week out on the road. I did it for one reason. I wanted to take on the effort to try and improve communications between those on the Hill and those below; and also because I wanted to better understand why there was a lack of communication.

SS: Was that while you were assistant dean?

GB: This is while I was still coaching and teaching physical education.

SS: Okay, this is earlier.

GB: This is earlier. This is before I became assistant dean of admissions. I would volunteer my time in the admissions office. Ernie had a chance to see me operate, and therefore, when it came time for there to be an opening he knew I could do the job. When we went

coed, we knew we were going to have to beef up the admissions operation, because we were out looking for all these women and continuing to recruit men. We were going to beef up the operation and so he had to take on additional people. I was one of the lucky ones that was hired.

Again, the idea in mind was that I was looking around and I realized as a coach I just couldn't make that much money, because those were different days. Today, coaches make very competitive salaries, and they're also allowed to have their summer camps and do this and that. In those days, that wasn't the case. My way of trying to improve my salary was by taking on this assistant's role in the admissions office, and also it was a new challenge in my life, which I really enjoyed.

SS: When you were doing that was Edgar Shannon the president?

GB: Yes, Edgar Shannon was the president. That's exactly right. He was a good president. He was a very kind soul, very intelligent. I was really young then and I never had much of an opportunity to get to know him well. I really got to know him quite well after he was no longer president. In those days, being the age I was and everything, it was pretty intimidating to want to walk up and say, "Hey, President Shannon, how you doing? I hope everything's well." But, as I said, that's the reason I went up there to volunteer my time. I was trying to close that communications gap between those on the Hill and those below.

SS: And when you actually became assistant dean of admissions, were you able to further that goal?

GB: Yes, I think I helped on that. I think I helped because of the fact that now I had a position, and the fact that Ernie Ern, my boss, enjoyed athletics too. He was really good about listening to the coaches when they would bring in these names of the kids that they were recruiting, to see whether they could be accepted or not. So yes, I think we accomplished what we wanted to accomplish, very much so. I think so much of that was actually done in the early seventies, when we went coed and when Ernie became the dean.

SS: That was a vibrant time.

GB: It was a very interesting time, yes, as we've referred to earlier. Vibrant's a good word for it. (Laughter.)

SS: Was there also a strong push at this time to bring more minority students in?

GB: Yes, there was. That was something that we needed to do and, I might say, I thought we did quite well. It became a real push when John Casteen became the dean of admissions, even more so. The minority students that were here during our era—meaning the Ern era as dean—were just outstanding. Many of those same students that Ernie helped recruit

and admit to the University of Virginia are outstanding African-American alumni at the institution and are our leaders, and have been for many, many years.

SS: It sounds like you accomplished a lot in that role.

GB: It's all part of being a team.

SS: Do you remember when you first met Leonard [Sandridge]?

GB: No, not really, because he and I came just about the same time. He was a year after me, maybe two. He was in a whole different role. I would see him and say hi to him periodically, but I never really had a chance to spend a lot of time with him until I truly came back here in 1990 with John [Casteen]. Then we worked every day together after that. I didn't really know Leonard that well. Remember, I was off at the University of Maryland in 1989 and '90, and came back here January 1, 1991. But those two years I was off at Maryland.

I got to know Leonard a little better when I was in the Alumni Association and we had more time together, and then when I went back to athletics. A guy I knew really well by the name of Ray Hunt was his boss. Ray and I were in church together. Ray and I knew each other, until his death, for many, many years. It was through Ray that I got to spend some time with Leonard. I didn't get to know Leonard really well until I started working with him every day.

SS: Until later, right. Okay, thanks.

GB: So 1990 those were the days that we were working together.

SS: We'll get to that later, on another day probably. Are there stories you want to relate about golf and being the head golf coach?

GB: Oh, well, I could do vignettes forever. That's what I live on—vignettes. That's all part of what I do speaking to alumni groups now.

SS: Maybe one good one?

GB: Well, I don't know if we want to go into some of those stories about the golf and tennis and everything. I will say this. This is not a vignette; this is factual. One of the golfers who played golf on the golf team is a guy named Tom McKnight, who ended up being the best amateur golfer in the state of Virginia for a period of time. And then he went out on the senior tour and played on the senior tour and had some success. Another golfer that has been incredibly successful in the state of Virginia is a young man named David Partridge. I had an opportunity to sign David to the first golf scholarship that we ever gave at the University of Virginia. He received it.

SS: That started in the mid-seventies?

GB: That would've been in 1973, probably, when David signed, because he played, I believe, in '74. If not, it was '74 and then he played in '75. But I didn't get to coach him, just sign him, because I didn't coach golf in '75. I was back at tennis in those days. I never got to coach tennis, though. I got to recruit the men's and women's team for tennis.

It's interesting you should mention that, because it did just spark another note. The first in-state tennis player to receive a scholarship at Virginia was a young man named Hank Harris that I signed in '74 or '75. I never got to coach him, again, because I had to give up my tennis coaching to take the job in the Alumni Association. I don't think we want to go into vignettes. There are just certain things that happened. I'll tell you at some point, but not on the microphone.

SS: (Laughter.) All right. I do want to talk about your time in the Alumni Association, but maybe this is a good time to take a short break.

GB: Okay.

(Off record)

SS: Okay, we're back on.

GB: I just mentioned a couple things off record that I thought are fairly interesting. When I first got here, in the athletic department as the head coach, we didn't have the money that athletic departments have today. The kids on the team didn't have the equipment that the kids today have. It's night and day, in terms of where this direction's going. As an example, my second year as head soccer coach, when we went out to practice, we only had four or five soccer balls to practice with. Three of them were Phys. Ed. balls, rubber balls, that weren't even legal.

When we went to play in our first soccer game, I had to convince the athletic department to actually buy us legal balls. Otherwise, we'd have to forfeit the game. I know that in tennis, as an example, today the kids have all kinds of racquets and shoes and everything else. In order to try out for tennis during the period I'm talking about, you had to bring your own can of tennis balls. That tells you where we were, in terms of finances, in those days. It was a really tough time, financially, for the athletic department.

Also we used to have to drive state cars. They didn't have these nice vans that they have today to drive around in. I can remember on a number of occasions—when I say number, I've got to be careful what number I use—but there were a few occasions I can remember where one of our state cars didn't quite get back to University Hall, when the car I was driving did.

One of our players would have to drive one car and then I would drive the other, as far as tennis was concerned. There were a few times that I was called at a late night hour, one

time in particular in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, where our kids had been picked up for driving the car beyond the speed limit. The fact that they were in a state car and the fact that they were students, the police weren't sure whether or not they had the right to be in that car. At one or two o'clock in the morning, I had to go back to Hillsborough, North Carolina, and get them out of jail so that they could play in the match the next day.

Another time, coming back from a victory at the University of Maryland, the last tennis match of the spring, somehow one of our state cars got lost at Mary Washington College—now Mary Washington University. Then after leaving there at what would be eleven or twelve o'clock at night—I had tracked them over to a police station—when I got the call in Charlottesville, again, about two or three in the morning that I had a bunch of players over there, at least they claimed to be tennis players, driving a state car, and had misbehaved. So I ended up having to go and bring them back to Charlottesville to U-Hall. So that was a real problem, driving state cars. It was unlike having a van that I could drive the whole tennis team around, as they do today.

The soccer team used to travel in a bus. But the bus was the first bus the University bought for the athletic department and it ended up having about 300,000 miles on it when they got it. Actually, the baseball and soccer team had to travel together, in order to save money on the spring trip. But the bus was one that black smoke was constantly coming out of the back.

On one trip home from a spring trip, we had a couple of things happen. Number one, we found out, once we got out on the road, that our bus driver had night blindness. So at night he was only driving thirty-five miles an hour. Number two, on the way back through Petersburg, we got pulled over by the police. Not because we were going too fast. We thought we were probably going to get pulled because we were going too slow—but that wasn't the case. It was because the black smoke coming out the back was so heavy that it was creating a real problem, in a vision sense, for the cars that were behind us. Nobody could go by the bus, because they couldn't see because of the black smoke coming out the back.

So those were interesting days. That gives you an idea about how the athletic department in those days simply went with whatever they had and just did the best they could with that. There wasn't any money and access to be had by any means.

SS: Was that true for the football program as well?

GB: It was almost true for the football program. There was a saying in the football program that if your jock strap and your socks had elastic in them that meant that you would be starting the next day. But if there was no elasticity in your socks and your jock that meant that you would be riding the bench the next day. That's how you found out whether you were starting or not. The starters got the elastics and the back-ups and the bench players got the non-elastic ones, which simply meant they had been used for so long that the elastic had just disappeared. Even football had its challenges, in those days,

in terms of generating the funds necessary to produce an active athletic department that was financially sound.

SS: I understand that you've had a lot to do with that.

GB: Well, now, I'm not quite sure what you mean.

SS: Helping to raise money.

GB: Well, yes, we have done some of that over our forty-seven years here. Again, it's very different today. They were trying to raise money in those days, but it was very difficult. There was a period of time where they didn't raise enough money to cover their scholarship bill, and they actually had to take a loan from the University to help pay for the scholarships. Then they were able to raise enough beyond that that they could actually pay off that loan. Those were interesting days. You'll have to ask Leonard if he remembers those days. I think he probably does.

SS: Well, unless you want to share some other stories, I guess we're moving you into your years working in the Alumni Association.

GB: Well, the only other story I'll share—we will not use any names here—but I had an assistant soccer coach who loved to drive the bus I referred to earlier. We had another person that we all loved who was supposed to be the bus driver. It was not the gentleman

with night blindness, I might add. Anyway, he had the license you have to have, a chauffer's license, I guess, to drive a bus.

My assistant coach didn't have the right license, but because my assistant coach loved to drive so much, the driver, after he left Charlottesville, would, many times, just go on and get in the back and take a little nap while we went on down the road with our assistant coach driving the bus. The kids, I think, really got a real kick out of that. I don't think you'd be allowed to do that today. You'd probably get yourself in a little bit of trouble if you did something of that nature.

SS: I guess it was a more relaxed time, in terms of rules and regulations.

GB: It sure was. We lived in a much less litigious society in those days.

SS: Which do you prefer?

GB: The old days.

SS: Yes. Well, how did it come about that you became the assistant director of the Alumni Association?

GB: Well, that was somewhat fortuitous in that we had a year or so there where admissions had become pretty tough and there were a number of legacy students who either didn't

get into the University or, even if they got in, there were some communication problems. If they weren't going to get in, not communicating with them in advance, to let them know they weren't going to get in.

This was particularly apparent one year, in 1975. Gilly Sullivan, who was the director of the Alumni Association, came up, because he knew that I was involved in admissions, and said, "Look, we really need to try to do something about this if we can." I decided that year to go down and to try to help Gilly create a Legacy Admissions Program, which would not impact the decisions being made as much as the communication of those decisions.

That was the driving force for my going down, having been in admissions for five years at that point, and knowing who a lot of these people were. That was really the driving force behind Gilly bringing me down to the Alumni Association. Then, at that time, of course, serendipity was that they were looking for a new dean of admissions and John Casteen was hired to fill that position. That's how the two of us really got started together.

I was running alumni chapters nationwide and John was a great speaker. Everybody wanted to hear from the new dean of admissions, since that's a very high profile position. So John and I ran the roads for seven or eight years before he became Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth under Chuck Robb. We had the opportunity together,

the two of us, to establish a Legacy Program here at the University that still continues today in a very significant way, through the Alumni Association.

SS: Would you tell me something about the traveling that you and John Casteen did?

GB: Well, we traveled. In those days, again, there wasn't a lot of money.

SS: You weren't on that bus were you?

GB: No, we were off the bus, and we were in some pretty nice cars. The problem was that because we didn't have a lot of money, we ended up having to room together a lot. In fact, one of the things that he promised me when I came back in 1990 to be his assistant, was that we wouldn't have to room together anymore on these trips. You get to know somebody pretty well when you travel with them for eight years, and you room with them, and you're riding in a car at sixty, seventy miles an hour, for hours on end, because of the fact that we couldn't afford to fly many places. We really did build a wonderful friendship based on those trips.

After John had only been with us for a year or so, Gilly and I said to each other: "This guy's going to be president of the University of Virginia. It's just a matter of when he's going to be president." It's interesting how all that came about, that we felt that way. It was because of his ability to stand on his feet and deliver a beautiful message about the University, his incredible knack for being way ahead of his time, and understanding how

to recruit African-American students to the University, and just the fact that he was brilliant and had a photographic memory.

He was presidential fodder, so to speak. It didn't happen, obviously, the first time around, because Bob O'Neil was hired after Frank Hereford retired. Then the second time around it all happened in '90. As I said, you get to know someone well when you travel that far and that often, for that many days with them.

SS: Were you traveling around the country or around Virginia?

GB: We were traveling around the country, although most of it was on the Eastern Seaboard, because we were trying to be able to drive every place we went. I can remember on a number of occasions we would go up and speak in Philadelphia, for example, to an alumni club, and then the two of us would get back in the car and drive home and get back here about four or five o'clock in the morning. That was not unusual in those days. We didn't really have the money to stay out and we wanted to get back, because we both wanted to get to work the next day, doing what we needed to do.

I also remember a story about being up in Wilmington, Delaware, one night for something that Frank Hereford was involved in, which was speaking to the Wilmington Club. John and I also went up there. We went up on our own, and we met him and Ann there. That night, it snowed like crazy. We were just nuts enough to get back in the car

and start back to Charlottesville. And, literally, we drove all night in the snow to get back here, and got here about five or six in the morning.

What makes that one an interesting story is that we had a third party with us, a passenger by the name of Bill Dudley, who at that time was on the Board of Visitors. Bill decided he wanted to be there that night. He had been up in Philadelphia visiting a friend. Since he was in Wilmington that night and he needed a ride home, he jumped in with us. So Virginia's most famous football graduate came on back that night, got here about six in the morning, and John got one of his assistant deans to take him from here to Lynchburg, where he lived, and dropped him off. It was not unusual for us to drive a good part of the night coming home.

SS: That's dedication. Did you have one small child at home or two, at this point?

GB: At this point, I had two children, but I was divorced. I was divorced probably two or three years after John got here. Then when I remarried, I had a stepson. So that would be my third one, although he's the only one that lived at home at that point.

SS: I see, okay. Well, tell me something about how that would work. You would make a speaking engagement for John to talk to an alumni group and then what would the message be?

GB: The message was all about the University of Virginia. John, being a Jeffersonian scholar and Washingtonian scholar, there wasn't anything he couldn't talk about. When he went out, he would talk primarily about admissions, because that's what everybody's interest was. What's it going to take to get my son or daughter in the University? He would tie it in with a beautiful Jeffersonian message. It was for that reason, as I said, that he just left a wonderful impression on everyone. Needless to say, every time they could get him back, they'd try to get him back.

SS: Do you remember the first time you met him?

GB: Yes, I do. The first time we met, actually, was when I went over to his house to have breakfast before one of our trips, and his wife Lotta cooked breakfast for us. I got there about seven in the morning and then we took off from that breakfast. That was the first time I'd ever spent any time with him. I had talked to him before that, but never really spent any time with him.

SS: One thing I read about Hereford's administration is that this was the first time that alumni were actually tapped for donations.

GB: Well, you know, that is true if you say that in terms of a capital campaign. But it surely was not our first capital campaign. Our first capital campaign was in the late forties and was directed by Admiral Bull Halsey. They never met their goal, but it was right after World War II, which would've been a pretty difficult time to meet a goal. I think the

goal was almost \$5 or \$6 million, of which they raised a little over a million, maybe \$500,000, or \$600,000, something like that. That was actually the first campaign.

Because that was not successful, for all intents and purposes, the University really did very little fundraising until much later. In fact, at one time, the only fundraising done by the University was the Virginia Athletic Foundation, which was the Virginia Student Aid Foundation, and also the Alumni Association. It was those two groups that were doing all the fundraising for the University. The University did not really have an active, ongoing development operation of any significance until Frank decided to have a capital campaign. Then we really geared up and geared up quickly. There was always a director of development, but there was never any emphasis, because there was never any campaign.

SS: I wondered about that. Interesting. Was this happening just here or do you think it was a national trend at this time?

GB: I think it was that suddenly philanthropy was becoming more important at every college and university. It had always been that way at the Ivy Leagues, because they were private. So many years the public schools didn't have any reason to raise money because their states gave them the money that they needed in order to operate. When the states started cutting back, then suddenly, philanthropy became very important.

As you will know, having talked to John, when he got here, state support was over 30 percent. Today it's 5 to 6 percent.

That Hereford campaign was a big deal. He got the most important alumni he could find who would be willing to volunteer their time. He surrounded himself with a very strong volunteer committee. Our goal was \$90 million, but we raised \$145.9 million, I believe, when it was all said and done.

And the way Gilly and I and the Alumni Association were involved in this is that, basically, we had regional campaigns and the development office wasn't staffed up to the numbers necessary to support all these regions. So Gilly and I volunteered to take on a number of regional responsibilities. One of those regions was Philadelphia, another region was Wilmington, and the third region was Baltimore, Maryland. We were primarily responsible for trying to help all the volunteers in those areas.

SS: Raise money from alumni in those areas?

GB: Yes. I could be corrected on this, but I think Pem Hutchinson was in charge of Philadelphia; Bayard Sharp in charge of Wilmington; and Bill Blue in charge of Baltimore. That's who we worked with.

SS: Can you tell me some more about the Legacy Admissions Program?

GB: Yes. The Legacy Admissions Program is, basically, any parent who graduated from the University of Virginia, male, female—or for that matter, because we didn't go coed until 1970, we even defined a legacy as a parent who graduated from Mary Washington up until 1974. Once we hit 1974-75, all of a sudden, our own graduates were going out, getting married, and starting to have children. As you know, when we went coed, it wasn't just first year students. There were a number of women that were involved, transfer-wise, so they were a little bit older. My point is that it was sons and daughters of alumni in the admissions process.

They would be judged on in-state criteria, rather than out-of-state, if they were out-of-state. If they were in-state legacies to begin with, if it was a close decision, and it got down to, say, two kids in a school group, the legacy would probably get the nod. Again, the admissions standards, as witnessed by everybody, have done nothing but continue to go up and up. This wasn't a matter of making it easier for legacies to get in. Needless to say, if you're out-of-state, you have a real advantage because if you're looked at with the in-state pool, you're not competing against all those thousands of out-of-state kids. The fact is that it still was then—and remains today—a very difficult school to get into, whether you're legacy or not a legacy.

SS: Right, why is admissions such a hot topic here?

GB: Well, it's not just here. It's a hot topic everywhere. It's a hot topic because of the popularity of the school and the fact of the selectivity. But you also have very loyal

alumni who feel very strongly about the University. Not every school has such loyal alumni. Not every school has alumni who feel that their kids need to follow them to that school. I'm not suggesting that they all feel that way, but they sure want their kids to have an opportunity to go here if they want to go here.

It was a program that was on the cutting edge, actually, at that point in time. Since then, the Ivy Leagues and others have followed suit in doing many of the things that we started doing here back in the late seventies. It was very important. Again, the bottom line was not necessarily the decision. The real, true value of the Legacy Program was how to communicate the decision. We try to make it a little more personal than just a form letter saying that you're not going to be admitted to U.Va.

SS: How did you make it more personal?

GB: Well, if people weren't going to get in, we would let them know in advance they weren't going to get in, so they could manage the process with their kids. When I say "the people," I'm talking about the alumni. We just thought it was the right thing to do.

SS: It sounds like what you said is that some schools have followed in your footsteps. What made you cutting edge? What made you realize that that was what needed to happen?

GB: Again, you hear me constantly say: "It's not necessarily the decision, it was how you conveyed the decision." There was a particular year I referred to earlier, when there were

a number of high profile alumni whose kids were either waitlisted or denied, and they received form letters. There was nothing in advance, letting those folks know that the child was not going to make it, so that they could've prepared the child for that.

Then there was the other part. It is the educational part of this, which has nothing to do with the admissions part. It's educating the student in terms of expectations at the University of Virginia. The Alumni Association started a program where legacy students would come to the University and we would actually discuss with them what was going to be expected of them.

It was a one-on-one type discussion. It was in lieu of, in many cases, an interview in the admissions office. It was an interview in the Alumni Association. And it was an interview of children of alumni. We would discuss with them what was expected of them and what the curriculum should look like. This has been very much a part of what we have tried to continue to do and do quite well, and what the Alumni Association does today.

SS: What was expected of them in what way?

GB: Academically.

SS: Before they got here or when they got here?

GB: No, what was expected of them before they got here.

SS: So that they could get in?

GB: Exactly. But also, expectations if they were admitted. For example: “This is the environment you’ll be dealing with. Your advisors are not going to be coming to look for you. You’ve got to go find them. Your faculty members aren’t going to be looking for you. You’ve got to go find them.” So it was expectations before admission and then expectations if admitted.

SS: Was self-governance mentioned?

GB: All the time, in every single one. There was never a prospective student that self-governance wasn’t mentioned to.

SS: It does seem to be something that is different about the University of Virginia.

GB: It is. It’s part of the undergraduate experience, which makes it somewhat unique from other schools. You can get a great degree at many schools in this country. But there are not many schools in this country where you have self-governance; where you teach ethics; and where honor is just that. In our case, we have a one-strike system, as opposed to a two or three-strike system, it’s what makes this whole undergraduate experience

unique. It's why kids grow here in a little different way than maybe they do at other colleges and universities.

SS: Interesting. Yes, I've been impressed learning about it.

GB: One of the other things that we put in, regarding the Legacy Program, was whenever kids were accepted—and they continue this today—in the beginning of the school year, when the students are brought to the University to move into the dorms, we had a separate legacy luncheon, or brunch, for the parents and their kids. Then at the end, when they graduate four years later, we have a separate lunch or brunch for the parents and their kids. We try to get a picture of them the year they come in and then we have a picture of them the year they go out, to share with the families.

Also, there was a weekend in June—and there still is—where the students can come with their parents and hear from our admissions officers in an extended weekend period. This is not just U.Va., meaning that this is a weekend set aside for college admissions, but it isn't just selling U.Va. It's for legacies. The parents and their kids get here and they get to hear all about how you fill out the application, how you write a good essay, what's the difference between a good essay and a bad essay, and things of that nature. There was a period of time—although that doesn't happen now—where the parents actually took the SATs with the kids at the same time.

SS: Oh, my goodness! (Laughter.)

GB: That was an interesting one.

SS: I can see why that didn't last.

GB: No, that didn't last. I'm just saying, it's a service that the Alumni Association's been providing all these years. That all started in 1977-78.

SS: That was an idea hatched between you and John Casteen?

GB: Yes, it was. But Gilly Sullivan was very much involved in this too. As I said, I would not have gone to the Alumni Association had he not brought me down specifically to help establish a program of this type. We didn't call it the Legacy Program the first year, but it became the Legacy Program very quickly. We knew what we wanted to do, so we got down there and we started working on it. The great thing was having John Casteen as the dean of admissions who helped promote it.

SS: Do you want to tell me more about Gilly Sullivan?

GB: Oh, my goodness. I could talk about Gilly forever. He was a man who devoted his entire life to the University when he was an undergraduate. He graduated at about eighteen years of age. In those days, you'd come in when you were sixteen and you'd go straight through school. You even went to summer school year round. It was during the war

years, so people were churning through. After he got out, he went to work in the Alumni Association for Mack Luck, and then he actually started the Virginia Student Aid Foundation, which is the fundraising arm of the athletic department. He was just an unbelievable human being.

When I got down there, of course, as I mentioned, the Legacy Program was important, but there were a lot of other important things the Alumni Association was involved in. So I had a chance—during my time there with Gilly—to work with him to get a Non-Alumni Parents Committee started, which is still in existence today. It's called the Parents Committee now, not Non-Alumni, because there are a lot of alumni now who are members of that committee. We started that around 1980. Within three years it became the largest fundraising group of parents at a public university. It only took three years to get it there.

I will always remember our first meeting. We were trying to figure out how to bring in twenty-five couples who had never met each other before, all non-alumni parents, and break the ice. For the icebreaker, we did a Bloody Mary party before lunch. After lunch, we were going to have our first business meeting. Well, they had so much fun getting to know each other drinking Bloody Mary's, that by the time we finished lunch, the first hand that went up suggested that we forego the business meeting in lieu of naps, so that they could come back that night and get ready to party again. So it was a really wonderful opportunity to break the ice, so to speak. From then on, it just got better.

We also had a chance to start the Jefferson Scholarship Program around 1980. John acted as the first go-between, between Alumni Hall and the scholars, as he was dean of admissions. Then, a year later, Gilly asked me to take that on as another responsibility, to direct that program, which I did for a couple years until Jimmy Wright came in, who's still the present director of the program. That was nice. I think our fundraising goal in those days was around \$6 million. It was a lot of fun. We were doing all that. We weren't giving up any jobs down there. We were continuing to do the jobs we did, plus we were just adding to our portfolio, so to speak.

SS: With these very impressive programs.

GB: Yes, they ended up being quite good, because of the people who were involved in them, not just at the beginning, but more importantly, the people who carried those programs to where they are today. I think our fundraising goal was \$6 million, as I mentioned. I think today, the Jefferson Scholar endowment probably is a little over \$220 million.

SS: How did that idea come about?

GB: The Jefferson Scholar idea came about based on a scholarship that they had in the state of Maryland. They had a merit scholarship in the state of Maryland that the Maryland alumni had raised the money for—a lot of it through their Bull Roast. They had a very successful Bull Roast every year. Over the years, they had raised enough money to give a merit scholarship to a student coming from the state of Maryland to the university.

We didn't have any merit scholarships at U.Va. The Alumni Association was trying to figure a way that they could help in their mission to promote the University. The idea came up that, look, why don't we have a merit scholarship program, because there is none? So that idea got started. We got a lot of important alumni behind it and it really got traction. So that's really where it came about. It was the Alumni Association trying to do something to help itself, in terms of its visibility.

More importantly, the association was doing something for the University that the University, possibly, couldn't do. You can't run a merit scholarship program at a public university. You have to keep it in as a separate foundation. When I say a merit scholarship program, it's where you're paying everything, if the student doesn't qualify for financial need. Now, if a student qualifies for financial need, there's ways that you can provide their education for them, but I'm talking about strictly merit-based.

It was something we could give to the University, as an Alumni Association, that we could be proud of, that they could be proud of, that would be very important, in terms of trying to get these kids that were running off to Harvard to come to U.Va. That's really what it came down to: "Let's get the best and the brightest." One of the important things was that this wasn't just based on academics. This was based on leadership and public service. You had to show you were an outstanding student. You had to show that you were a student leader. You had to show that you were involved in your community.

SS: It seems like a very impressive program.

GB: It has been over the years. Actually, there's a book written about its history, its first twenty-five years. Of course, now they have their own grounds. They even have their own building. They used to share with the Alumni Association, but now they've moved into their own building. It's about two years old now. It's become quite the program.

SS: You must feel good about that accomplishment.

GB: Oh, without a doubt. I feel good about a lot of those. As I say, we were just a part of the team, but they ended up being very successful.

SS: Did you go on other recruiting trips, not just for legacy?

GB: Oh, yes, very much so. Do you mean with John or on my own?

SS: Either.

GB: Well, I'd go out and speak to alumni chapters. I mean, I took John out, but John was just one of many. I took a lot of faculty out. It's just that John and I did the majority of them together. I took a large number of faculty members out to speak.

SS: About their own programs and their different fields?

GB: Oh, yes. Ed Ayers, who is now the president of the University of Richmond, was one of the ones I took out. He had just gotten to U.Va. He was dynamic. He was off and running. You know, Ray Bice, who just passed away, was one that people loved to hear.

I took Emerson Spies one time to Philadelphia and set him up to play tennis at Merion Cricket Club. He went out to play and he couldn't get on the court, because he forgot to bring his whites. You have to have whites on at Merion. I had to give him my whites and not play. So that night I said, "Emerson, where do you want to stay?" And Emerson, who at that time was probably in his late-fifties, said, "No, we're not staying. We're going back to Charlottesville." He said, "I've got a tennis match tomorrow morning." We drove all night. At three in the morning, we were sitting in Warrington, Virginia, and I was buying him breakfast at a Howard Johnson's, which was our stopping point for those late-night trips home. We stopped there many, many times because so many times, as I said, we were coming back.

SS: What about minority recruitment trips?

GB: No, I really wasn't involved much with minority recruitment trips. I did take out student leaders, periodically, to these alumni groups, one of who later became rector of the University. I was not involved directly, no. That was John out there with his admissions folks. They were the ones that were involved.

SS: You've mentioned several programs that we want to talk about, I think, the Virginia Student Aid Foundation is one.

GB: Yes, it has grown to be very sizeable and very successful.

SS: It's called what now?

GB: Virginia Athletic Foundation.

SS: Right. You helped develop that program, correct?

GB: Well, I don't think I'd make that comment. (Laughter.) I helped along the way. When I left the Alumni Association to go back into athletics, I was hired by the Virginia Student Aid Foundation to come back and raise money for bricks and mortar—not for scholarships.

SS: You left the Alumni Association?

GB: Yes, I left the Alumni Association in '85 and went back to the athletic department, hired by a guy named Dick Schultz. I went back to the athletic department to raise money for bricks and mortar. The McCue Center and Klöckner Stadium were the results of that effort. Although when it was finished, I was off at the University of Maryland from 1989-90. I had left my position in the athletic department to go off to the University of

Maryland. I actually was hired to come back to the athletic department from the Alumni Association by Dick Schultz and then later, Jim Copeland became the athletic director, behind Schultz.

SS: So why did you make that move, from the Alumni Association back to athletics?

GB: At that point in time—even going back to where we were earlier—because we talked about this briefly and you said, “From coaching, where were you headed or what were you thinking about, professionally, that you wanted to do?” I’m a man of challenges. I get to a point where I’m looking for new challenges. I love athletics. It’s been very much a part of my life from day one.

It gave me an opportunity to go back and take on a challenge, which was to get the money for these buildings raised. I’d been ten years in the Alumni Association, at that point, and we had started the programs I mentioned. There were no new programs on the horizon. We’d done the chapter deal. It was an opportunity to take on a new challenge.

I want to get back to Gilly, briefly, and give you a couple of Gilly Sullivan vignettes. One that I mentioned when I was talking about Gilly and one I mentioned at his funeral. A friend got us tickets to the final game—it ended up being the final game, we didn’t know it was going to be the final game—to the Kansas City-Philadelphia world baseball championship, the World Series.

Gilly and I left here. We were going to go up and tailgate in Philadelphia, in the parking lot up there, go to the game, and then maybe stay someplace on the way home. We left here, we got up there, and we tailgated. We went to the game and we sat out in right field. There were four guys sitting next to us on our left. There was one woman sitting next to me. There were actually two women, but one in particular, sitting next to me on my right. Gilly's on my left and the woman's directly on my right. He's got four guys sitting next to him on his left. Here we are at the World Series. Again, the Phillies won that night, so that was the final game, but we didn't know it was going to be the final game.

On Gilly's left, these guys are smoking this cigarette. It's got a very pungent type of aroma. Gilly says, "I smell something sweet. What's going on here?" "Well, Gilly," I said, "You see what they're smoking over there?" "Yeah, yeah, I see them." I said, "Well, that's marijuana." "Marijuana? You mean they're smoking marijuana out here in public in this baseball stadium?" I said, "Yes, that's right."

Well, every time the Phillies did something exciting, Gilly, of course, is over there with these four deadheads. But this young lady on my right would always grab my arm. Any time the Phillies did anything she'd grab my arm. Finally, Gilly looks over at me and gives me an elbow and says, "Look, I'm your boss. It's time for you to move over here in my seat. I'm coming over to your seat." (Laughter.)

Then on the way home that night, when he decided we weren't going to stay and we were going to drive home all night. This was after we had tailgated, after we'd seen the game, and after we had celebrated in Philadelphia, with all the crazy people. Well, we start home that night. So I take the first leg. Gilly sleeps a little bit. He says he'll take the second leg.

Well, in the second leg, he gets lost around Washington. Then the next thing you know, he's pulled off on a Connecticut Avenue exit, which he never should've done, because you stay on the Beltway. He'd gotten off the Beltway. He just got confused. It was four in the morning. He wakes me up and says, "I don't know where we are. Tell me where we are."

I had to figure out where we were. When I did, I said, "Look, you've got to go down here and make a left and then come around, and come on back to the road." He says, "Well, why don't I just go down here to this light and make a U-turn?" I said, "Because if you notice, it says 'No U-turn.'" He says, "Well, there are not going to be any police around here at four in the morning."

Immediately, he made a U-turn and the old red lights went on and the next thing you know, he was being picked up by the cops. The cop says, "Where were you?" He said, "I was at the World Series game." The cop says, "What was the final score?" So Gilly gave him the score, which legitimized that he was at the World Series game. So he said, "Well, can I see your license?" He says, "Yes, sir." He said, "Did you see that there was

a no U-turn at that light right there?” Gilly said, “Well, I just didn’t see it. My buddy here, in the right seat, pointed out to me there was no U-turn and my comment to him was, ‘Well, there ain’t going to be any cops around here at four a.m. in the morning.’”

The policeman started laughing a little bit. Then he looks at Gilly’s license and sees he’s from Charlottesville, Virginia. He says, “You know, I used to play baseball in the summertime down at Lovington.” Gilly was a big summer league baseball player. “Oh, Lovington, yeah,” he said, “You play down there at that park?” “Yeah, I did.” Before you know it, they had got this conversation going. Now it’s time to leave, so the cop says to Gilly: “Look, I’ll tell you what. Just so you don’t have any more problems getting home, you follow me out of here. I’m giving you a police escort out to the Beltway,” which he did. But that could only happen to Gilly!

So, about an hour later, I’m saying, “Gilly,” it’s now like four-thirty, “We’ve got to get home.” He said, “No, we’ve got to stop and get breakfast at the Howard Johnson’s in Warrington.” We stopped and got that and that was about five a.m. We drove in the next morning, obviously, the same morning we were traveling. We each got back to our house around seven-fifteen or seven-thirty, after we had breakfast. We took a shower and went right back in the office and worked the next day.

SS: Oh, my goodness.

GB: Yes, it was one of my fun nights with Gilly.

SS: How do you account for your stamina?

GB: I guess I've been lucky. I try to stay in somewhat decent shape, as best I can. In fact, after you and I get done with this, I'm headed out to go get a workout. That's how we try to stay with what little stamina we have left at sixty-eight years of age. Anyhow, that's one of my Gilly stories. There are many others. I won't wear the tape recorder out telling you.

SS: Those are great. Thank you for sharing your stories.

GB: That's my man, Mr. Gilbert J. Sullivan. We always knew when someone called on the phone and asked for Gilbert that they didn't know him, so we never put them through.
(Laughter.)

SS: (Laughter.) Let me pause here.

(Off record)

SS: Okay, we're back on.

GB: Another story—this is a great story—about Gilly that I love to tell. I tell it wherever I go now. It is part of my speech “From Memorial Gym to Madison Hall,” and is my favorite story about Gilly. It’s the Rinetti story.

Doc Rinetti was an Italian professor back in the forties. All students were required to take a foreign language here—and they still are. Well, back in the forties, the football players, particularly, had this great affection for a professor by the name of Rinetti, Doc Rinetti, as he was called. The reason was, at least Gilly told me, because of the fact that Doc Rinetti loved football players. What they would do is they would spend about five minutes trying to discuss Italian and then they’d spend the last forty-five minutes talking about football and the upcoming game and so on.

So, Gilly took Italian along with many of these football players. That was going to be his foreign language. He was in his last semester and he was in his last year, his fourth year, or in this case, third year at U.Va. I mentioned earlier that Gilly graduated when he was nineteen and went straight through. But he had to pass Rinetti’s course in order to get his degree.

He takes the final exam, the last exam in Rinetti’s course. He studies hard for it. He, interestingly enough, is one of the first ones to complete the exam. He brings it up to Rinetti, hands it to him, and signs a pledge: “I’ve never given nor received data on this examination.” He’s about out the door and Doc Rinetti says, “Mr. Sullivan?” Gilly says

all of a sudden that's all he had to say was, "Mr. Sullivan." Gilly says he can feel the sweat starting to come down.

He turns around and says, "Yes, sir, Doc?" He says, "Mr. Sullivan, how did you do on the exam?" "Oh, Doc, I studied hard for this one. I really think I maybe did the best I've ever done since I started taking Italian." "Oh, I see. Okay, Mr. Sullivan. Well, did you check your exam or go over it at all?" "Oh, Doc, yeah, I did. I went over it and everything." "You went over it, Mr. Sullivan?" "Well, I thought I did, Doc."

"Well, let me ask you a quick question, Mr. Sullivan. You come back here, near my desk." He said, "Mr. Sullivan, if you get out of Italian, if you pass this course, will you promise me that you'll never take another Italian course?" "Oh, yeah, Doc. Not a problem. You can be assured of that." "Mr. Sullivan, this question, too: If you pass this course, will you promise not to tell anybody who your Italian professor was?" "Oh, yeah, Doc. That's not a problem at all."

"Well then, Mr. Sullivan, you say you studied for this test. Let me ask you a question. You want to look at Part 2?" It was a three-part exam, each part's worth about thirty-three point three points, right? Thirty-three points, three part exam, Part 2. "Oh, Doc. Man, now I see where my mistake is." "Yes, Mr. Sullivan. You will notice that I asked for present tense and you gave me past tense." He said, "So Mr. Sullivan, what I'm going to do, because of your promise to me on the honor code, is I'm going to simply change

the question so that it works out with your answer. Congratulations, Mr. Sullivan. You've now graduated from Italian." (Laughter.) Isn't that beautiful?

SS: (Laughter.) That is wonderful.

GB: That's what it used to be like, back in the good old days.

SS: That story reminds me of the Corrigan Report.

GB: Yes, we can go there too. Do you want me to go there right now?

SS: Yes, I think it's a nice segue.

GB: Well, it is, but then we have to follow through on Ralph Sampson. We can do the Corrigan Report right now and talk about that. Then come back and talk about the results of that report the next time we speak.

SS: That sounds good.

GB: As I mentioned to you, when we were talking about when I got here in the sixties, I said there was very little communication between the Hill and the athletic department and very little trust. It had gotten so much better with Ernie Ern becoming dean of admissions. Then Frank Hereford became president of the University. He took over

from Edgar Shannon. Because of Shannon's ability to build the faculty, we were, at that point in time, getting to be relatively well known east of the Mississippi for sure as a strong academic institution.

President Hereford really loved playing tennis. In fact, he and I used to play. Every Monday, he would be on the calendar. We would never schedule any trips, so that we could always play tennis Monday at noontime. This was back when I was in the Alumni Association. This is how I really got to know Frank well, because of our playing tennis every Monday. It was doubles. He loved it.

He was very competitive. He made the comment, "Look, if we have excellence in academics, there is absolutely no reason we can't have excellence in athletics. I think it's the fact that we're not competing in athletics, the fact we're in the Atlantic Coast Conference. I want our athletic department to be as strong as our academic department is. I want excellence in both areas. Gene Corrigan, I want a report from you telling me exactly what has to be done for us to be competitive in the Atlantic Coast Conference."

So Gene Corrigan compiled a report. Certain things in that report stand out. One was the transition program that we started, which John Casteen was responsible for. The program allowed student athletes to come to the University and take a couple of courses in the summer, almost in one-on-one type environment, where it would be a faculty member and the student athlete. Not quite like that, but it was somewhat similar in that they

would always have the academic support they needed to be able to transition to the undergraduate curriculum. That helped a great deal.

The fact that we had always required at least two years of a foreign language, and we were willing to waiver that under certain conditions. Not many met those conditions, but at least we were able to waiver it, so that it no longer became totally a hurdle that you couldn't jump over. There were some kids that were able to jump over that hurdle. Such things as academic support for student athletes and starting to have the athletic department be involved in the academic support for their own athletes were part of that program.

As a result of that, we started having some success while Frank was in his early years as president. The end result was tremendous success and accomplishment of what he had set out to be his goal, which is excellence in both departments, both the athletic department and also in the academic arena.

SS: Okay, great. Thank you.

[End of Interview]

**The University of Virginia Oral History Project
Interview with Gordon Burris
Conducted on March 6, 2012 by Sheree Scarborough**

SS: This is the second interview with Gordon Burris. This is Sheree Scarborough and it's March 6, 2012.

Gordon, yesterday as I was walking out the door, we talked about a story we were going to start with today, which was during the capital campaign with Frank Hereford and a story about flying with Sandy Gilliam.

GB: Yes, exactly. It was during the campaign, and this story actually was with Sandy and a gentleman named Marion Peavey, who was the director of development. Sandy was assistant to the president at this time and I was in the Alumni Association. One of the areas that we were responsible for was Louisville. So the three of us had been to Louisville and we were flying home. We're over West Virginia and we were in a King Air 200. I believe it belonged to a local person; we were leasing the plane. And the right engine went out. Sandy and Marion were hard at work and they didn't even notice it, so I went up to the pilot. We only had one pilot then, it wasn't even two pilots, just one, no co-pilot.

SS: How did you notice it?

GB: I could see that the prop had stopped. There was a prop since it was a King Air. I could see the prop had stopped turning and the pilot was what they call “feathering” the prop. So I went up to him, and he said, yes, he had to shut the engine down because there was a fuel valve that was throwing out too much fuel into the engine, and he didn’t want to burn the engine up. So now we’re flying on one engine in a two-engine plane.

I let it go for about another twenty, thirty minutes and then I just couldn’t take it anymore, so I said to Sandy and Marion, “Do you guys notice something?” I said, “Isn’t that unusual out there for that right engine to be just kind of fluttering around, not really working?” And then they looked up, saw it, and then they went into a little bit of a panic also at that point in time. So I thought maybe the best way to solve this problem was to go back and have a stiff drink, which I did in the back of the plane now that I had brought it to their attention so they could suffer with me.

SS: That’s right. (Laughter.)

GB: We didn’t lose much altitude at all. We made our way over West Virginia, and we were coming in over Lovington. So I went up to the pilot and I said, “So how are we going to do this?” He said, “Well, it’s very simple. I’m down here over Lovington because I’m setting up my glide ratio.” And I said, “Well, what’s a glide ratio?” He said, “Well, if the left engine goes out, we have a chance to make it in.” I said “Oh, okay,” knowing full well he was setting up his glide ratio, I went to the back of the plane, I had another big, stiff drink. So we’re on approach, and I look down at the runway and I notice the fire

engines down there and everything else because it had to be an emergency landing since we was just one engine. So he brought it in, and he hit ground. We blew both tires, which we didn't realize we had done. It didn't seem that hard a hit but it must have been.

The next thing we know the sirens are blaring and the red lights are flashing. A tractor pulls up to the front of the plane and starts to pull us off the runway. That's when we realized we had flat tires. But anyhow, that said, we finished it, we got home and all was well. Although, at that point in time, I was not quite feeling exactly the way I would have felt had I had to go into this thing stone sober.

SS: (Laughter.) That sounds really scary.

GB: It was a lot of fun, a lot of thrills and all part of a very successful capital campaign.

SS: I misspoke by saying that Frank Hereford was on board as well, but were there other stories you wanted to tell me about Frank and his wife Ann?

GB: One of the things that I think probably goes unwritten in the history of the University was just what a wonderful spouse Ann Hereford was for Frank, and how she played as much a part of the presidency. It was truly shared—the work, the play, and everything else that went in between. It was a wonderful marriage the two of them had, and she should get a lot of credit for the success of the campaign, certainly as much as Frank. I know that with the loss of their daughter midway through his presidency, he started to lose focus,

which is very natural for any human being. But Ann was very, very strong and she basically said to her husband, “Look, you’ve got good people running this university. Why don’t you and I go out for the next year or so and let’s—the two of us together—travel throughout the country and get this campaign finished. Let’s meet the goal and then we can decide where you might want to go from there as to how much longer you want to stay president.”

So that’s exactly what happened. They did, together, really have incredible success with our alumni and friends of the University. Wherever they went, they were very popular. And the goal was met, as I mentioned before. It was a \$90 million goal, and we raised it to 145.9 million. I think that says a great deal for them as a couple. But again, I want to give Ann a lot of credit for the success of that campaign.

SS: Yes, thank you for sharing that. She sounds remarkable.

Well, in the interview yesterday, you had talked some about the Corrigan Report, and then my prompt today to you was to ask you to talk about the success of that report and the changes that were made from suggestions in the report.

GB: I think the result of all those changes and everybody now suddenly pulling in the same direction was that we were very blessed. When that report was being finalized, a young man from Harrisonburg, Virginia, by the name of Ralph Sampson made a decision to come to the University of Virginia. UNC and the University of Kentucky were also very

much involved in the picture. Ralph was the top high school basketball player in the country that year. He was seven feet, four inches, and was an exceptional talent. So he came. And then almost at the same time, again the stars being aligned, there was a football coach who came to us from the Naval Academy who would later become a Hall of Fame coach by the name of George Welsh.

George took over the football program. And after going to our first bowl game in the University of Virginia's history, which was the Peach Bowl, a few years following that success, George's teams won seven or more games for twelve consecutive years. He did this at the University of Virginia where everyone said it couldn't be done. When he was introduced at the press conference someone said, "Well, Coach, the University of Virginia's been the graveyard for many a head coach that's come through here." George's response was, "If it is a graveyard, I can tell you it's the most beautiful graveyard that I've ever walked through."

In the meantime, Terry Holland had recruited Ralph Sampson. During Ralph's time here, he was on the cover of *Sports Illustrated* six times. He also was on the national game when they played Ohio State before the Super Bowl. There was only one national college game during that era. The U.Va.-Ohio State game was the game that was picked to be on national TV. Ralph went for forty-one points that game. I think it was fifteen or sixteen rebounds, and put on a quite a show. Later he matched up against Patrick Ewing in the famous U.Va.-Georgetown game, Sampson against Ewing. Both guys were on the

cover of *Sports Illustrated*. Ralph was three times named the National College Player of the Year—second year, third year, and fourth year—which is very unusual.

But all of a sudden, the University of Virginia started getting national exposure, well beyond just what I will call the eastern part of the Mississippi. We started to become known—and this goes back to the Hereford goal—as an outstanding academic institution, but also an outstanding athletic institution. The result of that was hundreds of applications that then ran into the thousands of applications that suddenly started coming west of the Mississippi as opposed to just east of the Mississippi. So we increased our numbers, in a sizeable sense, from the East, where we already had large numbers. But, more importantly, was the impact from the West, where suddenly a state like California became the third or fourth state in terms of sending us out-of-state students. Before that, we had received very few applications from the state of California. So it gave us national visibility. That was exactly what Frank Hereford said would be his goal, which is academic excellence and athletic excellence.

SS: And for you, working in athletics all those years, that certainly must have felt good to have that goal reached and know that you were part of it.

GB: Very much so. It was very much a part of being on the team, because again, all of that's done through a team effort.

SS: So this leads us to when you took the job of assistant athletic director and director of development and major gifts.

GB: Yes, that was after ten years in the Alumni Association. I just thought there might be some other chapters of my life I wanted to explore. I decided to go back to athletics and was basically tasked with the responsibility for bricks and mortar, raising the money for the McCue Center and also Klöckner Stadium. So we got those projects started and they were well along the way. It was then that I left to go off to the University of Maryland.

I was hired by Dick Schultz and worked under the umbrella of the Virginia Student Aid Foundation. I was very involved in putting together a great volunteer team of alumni who were very helpful in the success that we had in completing those two projects.

One I remember vividly had to do with the brilliance of Bruce Arena, who was then the head soccer coach and had won four national championships in a row. We went to a company called Klöckner Pentaplast to deliver a proposal to them to see if they would be willing to put their name on a new soccer stadium. At that point, we were specifically talking soccer. We later added lacrosse. I will never forget, it was Bruce's idea that since we were going to present this to the board of directors and since this was a German company, we had a faculty member write the proposal in German. I think that had a lot to do with their approval of that. The head of the company, here in Gordonsville, Virginia, was a very avid soccer fan, Harry van Beek was his name, and he helped drive

all this. So between Bruce and Harry, the stadium—what is now Klöckner Stadium—became a reality.

SS: That's an interesting story. Well, you were very successful. From the figures I see, you raised \$10 million for the McCue Center.

GB: Right. Now, again, I was part of that.

SS: Yes, part of the team.

GB: I was part of the team, helped get that started, I was not here to finish it, but we got off to a nice start.

SS: I'm wondering how you did that. It wasn't part of the University capital campaign. It was between campaigns wasn't it?

GB: It was between campaigns, and projects like that are ongoing. They have to be. It just is the way the world is in athletics today. If one school has it, another school needs it. So they've got to go out and build one, and they try to build it a little bigger and a little better.

SS: Okay.

GB: But we'll talk about that when we talk about the Casteen years and the two campaigns. I'll refer back to that.

SS: Thank you. So you went to the University of Maryland next to oversee their athletic fundraising foundation?

GB: I did. It was called the Maryland Educational Foundation. It was a fancy name for what was their annual and also their capital fundraising efforts—both bricks and mortar and annual giving scholarships—affectionately known as the Terrapin Club. Since you have the Maryland Terrapins, they just call it the Terrapin Club. If you gave them \$1,800, you got a terrapin with a little diamond on its back that you could wear as your lapel pin to all Maryland athletic events.

SS: Tell me about your decision to go to Maryland.

GB: Well, it was a two-part decision. The first part was that it would provide me with an opportunity to run my own operation—assuming I got the job, which fortunately I did. In those days, I still had some thoughts about possibly wanting to become an athletic director, and this was a logical next step. I had the academic background through admissions. I had the extensive athletic background. I'd been a head coach, but I had not run anything in an athletic department. That's where I was lacking. I wanted to fill in the resume, so to speak. So that was one of the driving forces. And, actually, a second driving force had to do with salary.

Their offer was way beyond what I was making here at U.Va. at the time. I had two kids in college and one in prep school. I was also stuck because I had grown up in the University system. I was stuck in the University system in terms of pay, particularly pay raises, be they merit or raises because everyone received it. I just thought I needed the opportunity to run something in order to try to maybe become an athletic director, and number two, I needed to make more money. Those were the two driving forces that sent me off to the University of Maryland.

SS: Okay, interesting.

GB: And there's a saying: "Sometimes you have to go away in order to come back." You can look around and see that that's been the case with a number of people. I had a great experience up there. I went in about a year after Lenny Bias died. Maryland athletics was really starting to struggle at the time. So it was a real challenge to try to increase annual giving in an environment that would not really be favorable to doing that. There was a perk at that point in time where the donors at Maryland were receiving free football season tickets and basketball season tickets for a contribution. My responsibility was to let the contribution be the contribution, and then the donors would have to also, at the same time, pay for their tickets.

Maryland had this unique system, and it just couldn't hold up when their teams started having some difficulty on the playing fields. So I changed the system, it was part of my

two years there. I can't say those were the most popular changes that were made. In fact, there was a number that just said, "I'm not moving forward with this," so we had to create new resources or funds. It was a real challenge, but it was a really wonderful experience. And it was a growing and learning experience for me. I really felt after a couple years there that I was getting into a pretty solid position to go ahead and start applying for some AD jobs. But that never happened because the University decided in 1990 to bring back one of its own—talking about going away in order to come back—John T. Casteen III, to become the seventh president of the University of Virginia.

At that point, I was working for my second athletic director at Maryland, Andy Geiger. I had been hired by Lew Perkins. It's kind of an interesting story. John Casteen was the president at the University of Connecticut and his athletic director was Todd Turner, who he had hired from the University of Virginia. When Todd Turner decided to leave Connecticut when he heard John Casteen was leaving, that opened up the job. Lew Perkins, my athletic director at Maryland, accepted that job. He would be working with the new president, Harry Hartley, and that opened up the Maryland job. Andy Geiger, who was presently the AD at Stanford, and who had an incredible career with winning all these national championships at Stanford, decided to take on the challenge of the Maryland position, and so he did.

At that point in time, there were some changes occurring and everything was going well. I can tell you that had John Casteen not become the president of the University of Virginia—or even if he had—he might not have asked me to come back. It just so

happens he did ask me to come back, and it just so happens I accepted. That's when it all started, at least in my next career here, on January 1, 1991.

SS: Right.

GB: So we came back in the middle of the year, and off we went. We spent our first seven or eight months here as the acting vice president for development. That was my assignment. John sent me over there because of my development background and the fact that I knew a lot of alumni from my time here before, with the idea in mind that I was to tidy up the shop, so that whoever we chose to be the next vice president for development could come in and surround himself or herself with their own team. In this case, it ended up being a male, Bob Sweeney. That's how we got back here, and that's how we started off here.

SS: Yes, very interesting. This takes us to our next phase, the focus for these interviews really, the last twenty years at the University of Virginia. I wondered if you could share with me the story about a meeting. In the December meeting with John Casteen, Leonard Sandridge, Sandy Gilliam, you, and me, there was a meeting mentioned that took place. I don't know whether John had been offered the position or if he was considering the position. The meeting was on a sun porch at the University of Connecticut or maybe it was in Annapolis.

GB: Well, I do not think I was at that meeting.

SS: Okay, all right.

GB: Remember, John was offered the position in the winter of 1990, I guess it would be. I always remember, I was at the Atlantic Coast Conference basketball tournament. He was at the Big East basketball tournament, and the word came down that he had been offered the position as president of the University of Virginia. So I'm not really familiar with that meeting. Evidently, that meeting would have happened at University of Connecticut if they were still courting him at the time.

What the world didn't know is that John Casteen was also up for consideration at the same time to become chancellor of the University of Maryland System. And because I had been at the University of Maryland for two years, I had gotten to know some of the legislators in Annapolis quite well because the majority of them were very big supporters of the University of Maryland. So I was able to throw John's oar in the water. I'll tell you, they were excited. Had he not taken the Virginia job, I still believe he would have been offered the chancellorship for all colleges, since the chancellor oversees those colleges in the state of Maryland.

SS: Oh, interesting. Did the two of you stay in touch while he was at Connecticut and you were in Maryland?

GB: Yes, we did. We talked maybe once a month, sometimes a little more. But there was never any discussion about, "Well, when you're named the president of University of

Virginia, I'd like to come back." As I said, I was living in Annapolis, I had a boat, life was good, and I really wasn't that interested in coming back.

SS: What was it that swayed you?

GB: It was John.

SS: Just the chance to work with him?

GB: It was a chance to work with him again. As he said when he called, "Let's put the dog and pony show back on the road." Because that dog and pony show is what we had going for eight years, at least seven plus years when we were in the Alumni Association, he was in admissions, which we've already talked about. That was the idea—to put that back on the road.

SS: He was offered the presidency because Bob O'Neil left the presidency after five or so years.

GB: Right, his contract was not renewed at the end of a five-year period.

SS: You haven't talked much about O'Neil's presidency.

GB: Bob was selected president in '85, and that was the year that I moved from the Alumni Association over to athletics. I possibly would have spent more time with him if I had still been in the Alumni Association but I really never had that chance. Based on being over in athletics and having this new position and this new challenge, I really didn't have a lot of time to interact with him. I was only here three of those five years, three and a half maybe, if you count those extra months in there. I really wasn't part of or understood why the contract wasn't renewed. There's a lot of third-party information out there, but at this point and time in my life third parties aren't quite as important to me as maybe they once were.

SS: Right, okay.

GB: I was not here when all that came down. Therefore, I was not involved with the selection of John Casteen, except to know who all the people were on the selection committee and to know them quite well.

SS: Could you list their names?

GB: Well, I think the three that really stand out are Josh Darden, Ed Elson, and Bob Butcher.

SS: The first two were on the Board of Visitors?

GB: The first two were on the Board of Visitors and they were responsible for the search.

[End of Interview]

**The University of Virginia Oral History Project
Interview with Gordon Burris
Conducted on March 19, 2012 by Sheree Scarborough**

SS: This is the third interview session with Gordon Burris. Today is March 19, 2012, and I'm meeting him in his office in Madison Hall. This is for the University of Virginia Oral History Project.

Gordon, we left off last time talking about your transition here to the University of Virginia, after John Casteen had been appointed president. That was in 1991. I believe you told me the exact date.

GB: January 1st of 1991.

SS: What was your charge? What were you coming into?

GB: Basically, because John and I had spent so much time on the road together back when I was in the Alumni Association and he was the dean of admissions, the idea was that we were going to put the "dog and pony show" back on the road. But this time with the idea of raising money, knowing full well that he was going to be challenged early in his tenure, with a capital campaign.

The goal, at that point in time, of course, had not been determined. We knew that it was going to take a lot of work and effort. So the idea of coming back, which has been an underlying theme of my work for the last twenty-two years here, is basically relationship building—building relationships for the University. That was my primary charge, doing that both with my own individual travels, but also with travels with John for both alumni and development events.

SS: How did John know or how did the administration know the money issue was going to be the first thing they would have to deal with?

GB: I think when he was being interviewed for president it became very clear that that was an expectation of whomever the new president was going to be. The expectation was going to be that they run a successful capital campaign and that campaign would be sooner, rather than later.

SS: So being on the road, would you speak to alumni groups?

GB: Yes, primarily over that period of time—the last twenty years—when John and I traveled it would mainly be alumni groups, but it could be individual development appointments. It could be one-on-one or one-on-two. John, being the president, as all presidents, would open the cultivation, which would continue beyond the first visit, or might very well go in and ask for the gift in the final visit, depending upon where the alumnus or friend of the University might be in the cultivation process.

SS: When I talked to John, he told me the number of days that he was away from the office on a yearly basis. I can't call that figure to my mind right now, but it was a lot! So you were with him on many of those days?

GB: Yes, I was always with him, as I have been with Terry Sullivan. I was with John for most, if not all, of his alumni visits and development visits. On many of these trips, we combined both. Yes, we were together extensively. I would not travel with him when he was going to professional meetings and things of that nature or going to Richmond or going to Washington to talk to the Congress and so on. We didn't miss many trips together, when it came to alumni relations and development.

SS: That's a lot of traveling.

GB: Yes, but that's been the fun part of the job and that's the relationship building I referred to. It's been a real joy to establish these relationships on behalf of the University and for the University. In many cases, they've become more personal relationships, beyond the University of Virginia. That's been the real joy of doing what I've done for the last twenty-two years in this position.

SS: Well, that sounds nice.

GB: I will mention, so we have it for the record, when I came back in '91, John's first assignment was that I would be the acting vice president for development, because we did not have a VP for development at that time. I actually worked out of the Rotunda my first six or seven months here. My job was primarily to create an organization that would be lean and mean for the person who would be named vice president for development later. Of course, that person is Bob Sweeney. So that when he walked in his shop, he could basically surround himself with his own team and that those who would be on the margins would no longer be working here.

Then Bob would build his own team for the upcoming capital campaign. I guess the best way to say that is that I was expected to get rid of the deadwood. Bob came in to a very lean shop, I might say, and built from that a wonderful team to help him be successful in that first campaign in the early nineties, which as you know, was a real success, raising a billion, 400-plus million.

SS: Can you give me a couple of reasons why that campaign so successful?

GB: I think it was successful for a number of reasons. One, it was very well organized. Bob had the organization. He put together a great team, in terms of development officers from all the different schools and units at the University. I think it was successful because of the fact that we had great volunteers. The campaign was headed up by Josh Darden.

One of the things Bob and I did early on—before we asked Josh to become chair—we visited key alumni throughout the state of Virginia, and even out of state, and asked them who they thought the best campaign chair would be, if we could entice them to do it. Josh Darden's name was always number one. He was willing to do it. Under his leadership, and all the other volunteers on that particular Campaign Executive Committee, we were able to have great success.

Then, when it was evident that the campaign was going to be very successful, Josh decided to hand down the leadership responsibilities to Tom Saunders and Ed Mitchell, who became the co-chairs and who helped finish up the campaign. When you come down to it, it was Josh Darden and John Casteen, with a lot of support behind them, who really drove this. Then, at the end, it was Ed Mitchell and Tom Saunders, again, with the president. You cannot have successful campaigns if your president isn't front and center. If you do not have a great volunteer group behind you of alumni and particularly the leadership of that group.

SS: Was Josh Darden the rector at that point or was he on the Board?

GB: No, Josh had been the rector. Josh had been on the board. But Josh went off the Board about the time John was elected president.

SS: That's helpful, thank you. I believe, at that point in time, that was the second-largest amount of money raised by a public university.

GB: I don't know. It was an awful lot of money raised by a public university.

SS: Yes, and you have the scars to prove it?

GB: As I say, it was above and beyond anything we thought we were capable of doing. I remember at one point they were talking about a goal of \$250 to \$275 million. And then the goal went up to \$500 million, and then from there, it went up to \$700 million. Then the night of the kickoff, we had raised so much money in the week before the kickoff, that we set the goal up to \$750 million. And when we looked like we were going to blow by that number, the campaign executive committee voted to move the goal up to a billion. Then we blew by a billion, but we didn't move the goal any further at that point. We just took the billion, \$400-plus million and considered it an incredible success.

SS: Yes. I guess the backdrop of this was the funding cuts that were happening at the state level for higher education at this point.

GB: Yes. I might not have my facts exactly right, but when John Casteen became president, I believe the University was receiving, overall—and that would include the academic side of the house along with the medical side of the house—around 32-33 percent from the state. Maybe it was 31, but it was in the 30s. It quickly evaporated, going down precipitously to where it is today, which is about 5 percent.

SS: Governor Wilder suggested to U.Va. and the other colleges that they reduce their goals or they have the professors do less research or something like that?

GB: Yes. That was part of the inaugural speech. I was not here. I was still at Maryland at the time that all of that occurred. I had yet to get here, because John was actually president six months before I came. When that occurred, I was not here. But it became very evident that the state support was going to be disappearing, not just from the University of Virginia, but statewide, as far as state support for education.

SS: John and the administration decided, “No, we’re not going to do that. We’re going to raise our own money.”

GB: Right. I think the great thing, because you’re talking with Leonard Sandridge and you’ve already talked to John, is that they truly have knowledge of the internal part of this. That was something I was on the periphery of—since most of my life has been spent externally—here at the University. They got a much better feel for the numbers and how quickly the support diminished.

There are only two ways that you can really help offset that. Well, there’s actually three ways. You’ve got tuition. But, of course, during John’s era we had one governor who froze tuition for four years and another governor who cut 20 percent off the frozen number. So we went almost eight years, actually, with losing tuition in a significant way,

particularly when you consider the price of inflation. But again, that's something Leonard and John can talk about at length.

From my perspective, what it meant was that you can only replace those dollars either through tuition, through research or, in the case of the University of Virginia, in particular, philanthropy. So our philanthropic dollars were critical. We had no choice but to conduct a capital campaign, and we had no choice but to conduct a second capital campaign later on in John's tenure.

SS: Right. And that's ongoing now, correct?

GB: It is. A little over \$2.6 billion has been raised as of today. We're going to work it until we get to \$3 billion. And when we get to \$3 billion, then we'll declare victory, even if it's going to be six to twelve months beyond what our goal was. I don't think there's any question that had we not had the economy turn upside down in 2008, that we would've reached the goal and been beyond that campaign and already discussing the next campaign—which of course, I will not be part of. There will be one and it will be soon. It will have to be, if we continue to strive to be the best we can be.

SS: Well, let's go back to when you first arrived back here in 1991. Were there changes that you noticed?

GB: No, there really weren't. I had been away only two years, so it was just like coming home. You and I spoke about this earlier. I mentioned my role in athletics from 1985 to '88, helping to raise the money for what would become the McCue Center. Well, it's interesting that when I returned, we actually dedicated the McCue Center. The money had finally been raised for it over that period of time that I'd been away. So I was here for the dedication of it. It was one of the first buildings dedicated when I came back to the University.

SS: That was nice.

GB: Yes, that was very nice, actually, to be part of that. Having helped start it, but not be the one to finish it, it was nice to come back to that.

SS: You worked over in the Rotunda for a while, in the development office, cleaning that up. Then did you come back here?

GB: I did come back to Madison Hall and have been here ever since.

SS: It seems like almost first thing out of the chute, there was an issue that developed, the NCAA violations in the football program. Can you tell me something about that?

GB: That was interesting, because it was the first that I know of in Virginia's history, where it was considered a major violation, not a secondary violation. You report secondary

violations almost every day in athletics now, no matter what school you're affiliated with. I say every day, that's probably an over generalization. But my point is that secondary violations go on all the time, so I can't say there weren't secondary violations before the major infraction came.

It had to do with giving and providing loans to graduate assistant coaches, which was a violation. I'm not sure that it was a well-defined rule. I mean, it was obviously a rule, because it ended up being a violation. It's evident when people start supplying benefits to players, but graduate assistant coaches, that was probably a rule that was not well understood. But anyhow, it was a violation.

It ended up being a time of division here, because of the fact that some of the folks that were involved in this were very popular, having been here many years. In fact, most of their university life they had spent here. John had to make some tough decisions because this kind of thing falls on the shoulders of the president. They call it institutional control, which is a major concern for the NCAA.

He had to make some tough decisions and terminate some folks. That did not make it any easier for him to be president of the University of Virginia, simply because it created some division in the community. But he did what he had to do as president and then we moved on. We got beyond that. We had to get beyond it. It was very important. We couldn't raise the money we raised, particularly on the athletic side of the fence, if we couldn't get beyond it. So we did and we moved forward from there.

SS: Were some of the people that were terminated in the Virginia Student Aid Foundation or were they coaches?

GB: They were administrators, primarily, athletic administrators. One, of course, was the head of the Virginia Student Aid Foundation, Ted Davenport. The other that caused a great deal of consternation among the community was Jim West, who was a really close friend of John's. Then the third one was in the Student Aid Foundation, an athletic administrator by the name of Joe Mark. I was very close to all three of them.

SS: Right. You worked with them, didn't you?

GB: Jim West hired me to teach physical education here. I probably wouldn't have stayed at the University of Virginia for forty-seven years if Jim West hadn't hired me to teach Phys. Ed. in my first year here as a graduate student, because that's where my life all started, in Memorial Gym.

SS: It must've been hard for you.

GB: Well, it was, particularly in light of the fact that much of my time had been spent in the athletic department, as a coach and, as we talked about, as a fundraiser. It was a difficult time. Again, John had to do what he had to do and we had to move on. That was all part of it. So we did.

SS: It seems like the University of Virginia did so many things right after they found out about the violations.

GB: Well, yes. Also the fact is the athletic director at the time of the violations, who had hired me to come back to athletics, Dick Schultz, was at that time the head of the NCAA. After this came out, and particularly since all this occurred on his watch, when he was athletic director here, I think he felt that he wasn't sure he could be effective as the head of the NCAA. As I remember it, at some point in time after that, he stepped aside. It had a significant impact on a number of folks.

SS: Is that when Terry Holland was brought in as athletic director?

GB: No, actually, Jim Copeland was brought in as athletic director after Dick Schultz. Then, Terry Holland was brought in as athletic director after Jim Copeland had moved on and gone to SMU. Jim was actually the athletic director when this NCAA investigation occurred. He was the one who had to report it and reported to the president. But it was not during his watch that this occurred. Needless to say, that was tough, having to report it, because those who were impacted by it were very close friends of his and folks who worked for him, as athletic director. Jim, himself, had worked in the Virginia Student Aid Foundation at one point in time, before he started into the athletic administrative end of the business.

SS: I'm sure that must have been difficult. It must have been almost like reporting family.

GB: Very much so.

SS: It seems that, in the long run, everything came out fine for the University.

GB: It's like anything that happens at a university, particularly the University of Virginia. I like to tell people that this university is going to be here long beyond any one individual. We still have professors here in their eighties that walk into the classroom that are revered. The fact is they're going to pass on and the University's going to keep going forward.

So this was not a pleasant time. It was very difficult, particularly on those of us that had all these close relationships. At the same time, the University was going to survive this, and anything else that occurs, because it is the University of Virginia and has been here since around 1817. It's going to be here way beyond my lifetime and the lifetime of those you're interviewing, and the lifetime of those who are presently here, who are in their thirties and forties, that might decide to commit their life to the University.

SS: That's nice, to have that long-range vision.

GB: If you don't, then you ought to find another job.

SS: Right. (Laughter.) Was this issue made more difficult since it seemed to happen just as John came into office?

GB: Yes, very much so. But understand, these issues are always difficult. Look around, see what's going on elsewhere right now. You see people having to leave. You see a number of things. It's never a good time. You never want it to happen. But hey, it did happen and John had the ability to deal with it and knew he had to deal with it and did. Again, we move on.

SS: Well, after that, a few years later, were the basketball NCAA violations. Those were minor violations, though, I believe.

GB: Well, they weren't necessarily minor, but let me say that they weren't as significant, at least. The fact, though, that they came shortly after the NCAA probe and then the NCAA probation, probably exacerbated those violations to a point, at least in the public's mind. All of a sudden it looked like our athletic department was out of control. But those were recruited athletes, and one in particular, Melvin Whitaker, that we had to deal with. Again, we dealt with it and we moved on.

It takes a little while to come away from those things with your image being what it is, but at least in this case, it's like a nightmare, it ends. It's not continuous.

SS: Because of your history with athletics, were you brought in to help with any of these issues?

GB: No, not really in a direct way, maybe in an indirect way. I was always given the opportunity—provided by John and with his blessing—to interact with the athletic department, from the athletic director on down through the coaches. It's always something I've done. It's always something I wanted to do and it's always something that's been part of my life. John allowed me to continue to interact. But the athletic director reported to Leonard Sandridge. He never reported to me, never should, never would.

But the fact is that I was a liaison, in many cases, and would handle situations that might arise with coaches or administrators, and do so as much as I could behind the scenes. I always was there and continue to be there, today, as supportive as I can be, from my position up here in this particular office.

SS: Because relationship building is external, but it's also internal?

GB: It's still part of what we do for a living. It is. Many times there's a crossover there, between the internal and the external, meaning our coaches go out and speak. So along with coaching and running their teams, which is internal, they're also out there as ambassadors for the University, and particularly the athletic department, which means

they have an external challenge also. It's part of coaching. Having been a coach, I can very much appreciate that.

Having been a coach, I try to make it a point, throughout the years, to make sure all the head coaches that come in here, particularly the revenue sport coaches, meet the vice presidents or meet the deans. So that they all get to know each other, outside the athletic and academic arena, as friends and understand each other's interests, whatever those might be. Again, all this is outside the athletic and academic arena.

SS: Okay, interesting. Well, tell me about legacy admissions.

GB: Legacy admissions has quite a history. It's a wonderful history. It's a very positive history. When Gilly Sullivan hired me to go down to the Alumni Association, part of my responsibilities was going to be to try to help alumni and their children better understand the admissions process. And the challenge of what I call representing them in the admissions process, which is the reason John and I became great friends to begin with, was a part of my responsibilities.

We started this program when John became the dean in 1975. I'm proud to say it was so successful that the University of Virginia Alumni Association continues it today. It's much more sophisticated than it was when we first started it. It was basically a one-man operation down at Alumni Hall. It's become something now where the Alumni Association has a couple of people involved in it, and they try to serve their alumni and

their alumni children to the extent of helping them to better understand what their challenges are going to be to be admitted to the University of Virginia.

What we did early on was set up a situation whereby any alumnus, or in some cases friends of alumni, who had an interest in U.Va. and wanted to apply here, would come to Alumni Hall. I would sit and interview the student and meet the parents and try to lay out the challenges of what it's going to take to get into the University of Virginia. Then John and I would meet during the admissions process, particularly the month of March.

We also had early decision then, so I should say our first meeting together would be in November, discussing early decision candidates. Our second meeting together would be in March, going through the regular decisions. Then our third meeting together would normally be in May or early June going through the waitlist. I did that every year, for ten years, in Alumni Hall.

I worked with three different deans, because John left in '83 to become Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth under Chuck Robb. Jean Rayburn succeeded John. I had known Jean when I was assistant dean of admissions, and we traveled the road together. We had gotten to be good friends. In fact, that was one person John had gone out and hired when he got here. He also hired Jack Blackburn, who was the dean of admissions of the time at Mary Baldwin.

Then Jean tragically died of cancer about two years after she took over the deanship from John. I worked with Jean probably from 1984 to '85. And, Jack, I actually worked with briefly, because I had moved back to athletics, as I mentioned, in '85. I think I had about six months, maybe a year. I believe Jean passed away in 1985. That's the first time Jack and I had a chance to work together.

When I went to athletics, the Alumni Association kept the Legacy Admissions Program going at that time. I pretty much divorced myself from admissions. Then when I came back in 1990, John decided that it was really important that we continue it, even though now we were in the president's office. It was important because of all the letters we got from legislators, friends, and alumni; because of all the deans that were now starting to have an interest in the admissions process; and because of all the schools, units, and foundations that had an interest. We created what I will describe as a giant funnel. All those names would come to this office.

I would go over and sit down with the dean, in this case, Jack Blackburn. Again, it was early decision in November, in March regular admissions, and May and early-June waitlist. We would discuss all those names that were funneled through this process. It was a lot of names. It got to be quite extensive, beyond numbers that we really could deal with later. In the beginning, we would go through each and almost every name, because the one thing we would promise folks is that they would get a careful review. In order to give someone a careful review, and since there was honor and integrity in our

comments, we literally had to go through each and every one. Our time together was extensive.

Jack and I had been together back in the early seventies, when he was the dean at Mary Baldwin and I was assistant dean here. We knew each other well. In knowing each other well, we actually truly became great friends. The great thing that happened in all this is that we were able to do this and separate that friendship in a professional sense. It was always wonderful to know that you could work with a colleague professionally, not agree on everything, but still know that your friendship would extend well beyond your professional relationship with that person.

Jack and I used to run and train together for the Charlottesville Ten Miler. That was something we had in common up until the day that he had to stop running because of cancer. So that was a lot of time together. That was from 1990 to 2009. We just celebrated his third year of the time that he passed away, which is a celebration because that's the way he would want it to be.

SS: Tell me something about him.

GB: He was unique in that Jack had this wonderful ability to make every student feel important. He also had an incredible ability to call parents whose kids were not going to be admitted and explain the decision to them in such a way that when the parents would call me after a conversation with Jack—I can't say they were happy about the decision—

but he handled it in such a professional way that they were very positive in their comments. And it is really hard to be positive when you've just been told that your child's not going to be admitted to the University. Jack had that unique ability.

Every student that went in to interview with Jack Blackburn came out thinking they were going to get in the University. Not because he told them that, he just made them feel so comfortable. It's a unique talent. There's not a hall of fame for deans of admissions, but if there were, Jack would be the first person admitted to it. He was a man who literally committed his life to college admissions, be it Mary Baldwin or the University of Virginia.

SS: The time period when he was dean saw a new program, AccessUVa.

GB: That was something that meant a lot to Jack. Jack was troubled by the fact that in early decision, we would only get applications from kids that did not have need. If they were admitted to U.Va., they had to commit to U.Va., and they had no idea what their financial package was going to be. If you had any need factor at all in the admissions process you didn't apply early, because you couldn't afford to do that and not know what other schools might be offering you.

He was convinced that the only way to really create a level playing field was to do away with early decision. Now we have the early admission, which means it's non-binding. But because early decision was binding, he just thought we needed to do away with it,

which we did. As part of that, particularly later in his life, as dean of admissions at U.Va., Jack became very passionate about trying to find funding for kids who couldn't find it themselves.

He and John Casteen, with the help of the Board of Visitors, were the driving forces behind AccessUVa and fully committed to it. Part of that commitment, I'm proud to say, allowed the opportunity to approach his friends before he actually passed away. In doing so, we were able to raise \$2 million, which he was aware of before he passed away. That's the amount of money that had been raised in his name for AccessUVa.

SS: That's touching. I did read that that was a very successful endowed scholarship.

GB: It was and it was done very quickly. Everybody stepped forward. I can't remember one person who told me they weren't going to make a contribution to it. I can tell you that a lot of people who made contributions were making it because of Jack, not necessarily because that was their passion.

SS: You were in charge of that, right?

GB: Only because of our friendship and a few other things, yes. That was the most important thing—to try to get that money raised before Jack passed away—so he would be aware of just what it was and what we were doing for him.

SS: That's great. Well, also during those years that he was dean, U.Va. saw an increased diversity in the student population.

GB: He helped drive that. I think it's very important to know that that was also a major commitment of John Casteen's when he was dean of admissions here. What Jack did was just continue what John had already started. That was one of the great advantages this university had, by the way, was having a president who had been dean of admissions and who had an incredible commitment himself to diversity—in order to diversify his administration, in order to diversify his faculty. Then from a student perspective, Jack continued that because of Jack's passion. When you have a president and a dean of admissions who are both on the same page when it comes to diversity, that's the ideal situation.

SS: I suppose there was so much pressure on admissions because the University was becoming better known as a better university, and more people wanted to get in?

GB: Students were the ones setting the bar higher because of the competition. We didn't set it higher. It was self-selection. It was the students that set the bar higher. More applied and those applying were stronger academically. Therefore, that had a significant impact on legacy admissions. We would use in-state criteria when admitting a legacy student. What happened was as the in-state students continued to improve in a significant way, it made it tougher for legacy students to get in, because they had to match the in-state

criteria. The selectivity became very difficult. Jack was committed to try and always have, assuming yield, an entering class that would number around 15 percent legacy.

Sometimes we went a bit over that number, and other times we were a bit below. A lot of that had to do with yield, in the long run. But, basically, that's a commitment we were hopeful that we could do. We wanted to continue to perpetuate the generational opportunities here: where grandparents came here, parents came here, and then children came here. And hopefully, their children will come. One of the great advantages of having been here as long as I have is that I interviewed a number of the parents when they were applying to the University, and then their children came in for the same interview.

SS: That must be fulfilling.

GB: In the last ten to fifteen years, that's not an unusual situation. That's what happens when you live that long.

SS: Well, in the late nineties, there was a bit of a controversy that arose—at least from the *Cavalier Daily's* standpoint. I'm not sure how big of a controversy it was in the life of the University, but it was about legacy admissions.

GB: Yes, there was. And it became national news. It was interesting. Number one, the information that was shared with the *Cavalier Daily*—I don't want to use the word

stolen—but had walked out the door. I suspect that we know who walked it out, but that's not important at this point in time. The fact is that it was controversial at the time, but briefly. There's an old gypsy expression that the dogs bark and the caravan moves on. So for about a two to three week period, there was a lot said, a lot written.

What was interesting is a number of schools, and I remember Duke in particular, saying that, yes, if schools don't pay attention to their alumni, they're being shortsighted. That's where the philanthropy comes from, ideally, primarily from alumni. And if they don't look at it in terms of being generational, they're being shortsighted.

In our case, the great thing that we had going for us with our alumni kids was that they well understood before they got here the honor system and our teaching of honor, integrity, and ethics, because their parents had been through it. Maybe their grandparents had been through it. So they came in knowing full well what the expectations were. That's one advantage of trying to have as many alumni children, at least at the University of Virginia, in the entering class as you can have.

At the same time, the controversy kind of went away when it was explained that in some ways it was a better way to deal with the situation. Jack was the perfect one to be dean of admissions when this happened, because as he said, "I don't want to take calls from Board members; I don't want to take calls from deans; and I don't want to take calls from vice presidents." The system was set up, in the words of Bob Sweeney, as a firewall between the administration—which encompasses everyone I mentioned, we just didn't

deal with legacies, we dealt with anybody who wrote a letter to the president's office—the public.

So Jack only had to deal with one person and that just happened to be me at that point in time. And he did not have to worry too much about having to hear from his colleagues and putting pressure on him, as dean, to at least reconsider a decision or do whatever he had to do. It made it much easier on him.

I've mentioned that the Legacy Program was ongoing. So the Alumni Association continued to present names to Jack. Interestingly enough, I was in the room when that occurred. Many of the names that they had on their list as alumni, we had on our list. There was a multiplicity of names, but that was an opportunity to just deal with them one time, in terms of giving them this careful review that they had been promised, that the office of admissions would give them.

Again, it was an opportunity. In Jack's mind, it was what he wanted to do and how the system had been set up. The system had already been set up by John Casteen earlier. Jack didn't change anything. We just continued to do what we had done for many years and it worked very well. We were aware at some point in time probably something would hit the newspaper, but we weren't hiding anything. If anything, we were providing a real service. Therefore, as I said, it was news for about a three-week period and then it disappeared.

There have been a number of articles written involving other schools that do similar things and books that have been written since then about legacy admissions. It even became a national issue. I think it had something to do with one of the presidents who was talking about why alumni and kids that had diverse backgrounds, why they would be given special consideration, as opposed to the admissions process being a complete, level playing field. Anyhow, that's what happened. That was another great thing about the University of Virginia, as I mentioned earlier, you deal with it, take care of it and move on.

SS: Let's clarify what hit the papers. There were some memos that came out of the office.

GB: Right, they were memos that had been in my files that, as I said, somehow walked out of this office and then were handed over, in an anonymous way, to the *Cavalier Daily* about a year later. That was not instantaneous. They didn't walk out of the office and two months later that information appeared. They walked out of the office and about a year later they were published, because the memos were about a year old.

SS: Okay, all right. Let's talk a little bit about how that worked, legacy admissions. You would contact the parents and let them know that their son or daughter would not be attending?

GB: Yes. Again, we've got to get beyond alumni here, because it involved also VIP-type folks. You're talking about legislators and so on. We did it and it was for a reason. It was this firewall so that the dean would not be receiving calls directly.

There were certain ones that we felt that if a child wasn't going to be admitted, we would call, generally, the day that the decision would be going in the mail, a number of years ago, and then more recently, going on the computer. Because decisions, before they went to computer-driven decisions, meaning that they notified applicants on computers, which is what they do today, there would be the letter. That's the old thick letter or thin letter.

This all started—and I believe we talked about this—when Frank Hereford had a child applying to the University. Some of Frank's best friends had children applying to the University. Some of Frank's best friends got blindsided. Frank himself got very annoyed by the fact that no one had told Frank that he was going to have friends calling him and telling him, "We're good friends. You could've at least called and told me that my kid wasn't going to get in, or my kid was going to get on the waiting list."

It wasn't so much the decision. It's never really been about the decision, ever. It's always about how the decision, whatever it is—yes, no, or waitlist—is delivered. It's how the message is delivered. The experience of Frank Hereford and what Gilly Sullivan had to go through, really, is what generated this Legacy Program.

SS: Interesting. I don't think we did talk about that.

GB: Well, that's how it all started. Frank had some friends whose kids had applied, and those kids were either denied or waitlisted, but absolutely no one called the president to let him know that that was going to happen to some of his closest friends. I'm talking about people he hunted with and spent a lot of time with, long-time friends. We decided after that happened that we needed to figure out a way to at least let the president, of all people, know that there were going to be some decisions made and he might want to let people know in advance that they weren't going to be positive decisions. If a student was going to get in, we just let it go. But if a student wasn't, it was important that we at least alert the person who was sponsoring that student.

Now, you can't do 500 phone calls or however many phone calls you have to make. So needless to say, we couldn't alert everyone. But, based on my forty-seven years at the University, we felt we knew the ones we needed to alert. I'm sure there are many who had wished we had called. I probably wish we could've called them too, but there gets to be a certain number where that's not possible.

SS: There are only so many hours in the day.

GB: You've got to remember, as times got tougher here, there were more calls to make. It's only natural, as you become more selective, you're going to have a lot more no's than you're going to have maybes or accepts.

SS: Right, and I assume the pressure has increased because you have the in-state, the out-of-state, the legacy, and the international.

GB: Which wasn't a factor back in the early nineties, but it became a significant factor, in terms of that percentage and how many internationals you're going to try to look for in your entering class.

SS: Do you think that there were a lot of cases where the fact that a student was a legacy helped them get into the University?

GB: When you say they were legacy, there's always the case that the out-of-state legacy had the greatest advantage, because they were going to be judged on the criteria that we used for in-state students. But the in-state legacy really didn't have as much an advantage, because if they were legacy and they were in-state, and if it was a close decision between a yes, a waitlist, and a no, that's where the in-state legacy might get some advantage, but nothing like the out-of-state legacy.

SS: Yes, interesting. That really put you in the hot seat.

GB: Oh, yes. I've been there. But you've got to remember, that hot seat started in 1975, went through '85 and then started again in 1990. It does not continue today, since I've now passed off those responsibilities. The firewall now belongs to Sean Jenkins.

SS: Well, that's good. That's a long time to be the firewall.

GB: The last two years, I no longer have served as the firewall.

SS: You were also dealing, as you mentioned, not just with alumni, but with legislators and governors, I assume?

GB: I wasn't dealing directly with them. I was letting the people who were responsible for legislative relations in Richmond deal with them. They would come to me. They would give me the list. They would let me know how each legislator had an interest and why they had an interest and so on. Then I would deal directly with them. I got to know some legislators to the extent that I felt I could pick up the phone and call them directly. That was not a problem, because they would call me directly, in terms of their interests. Generally, we had folks that were down in Richmond year-round and I would work through them.

It was no different from a development officer, who would be working with an alumnus or a friend of the University, who would call and say, "Look, they have a niece applying this year." "They have a son applying this year," whatever. It's just, as I said, that's how the process worked. That's why the dean has always felt very strongly about this being important. It has nothing to do with influencing the decision, never has, never will. As I said, the most important thing that comes out of this is not the decision. It's how the

decision is delivered, particularly since so many more now are turned down than accepted.

SS: Are there any stories you can share that stand out in your mind—either positive or negative—when you had to make a call?

GB: Well, there were just so many of them. There were hundreds of them. Every year, there were hundreds of them. I remember two of them. I remember one early on my career. I learned that you call people during the day in their office. Don't call them at home at night, because there's a chance they might have had a few pops when they got home. By the time you get them on the phone, it's probably not a great time. I did call one alumnus at home one night. This is when I learned my lesson. He was a little beside himself. I'll always remember, his quote was, "I hope the Lord lets me live long enough to get you."

SS: Oh dear.

GB: Then I can remember another one that I called, regarding a graduate student. We were on the phone and the father was yelling at me and using some profanity. His wife reminded him that it was Good Friday and that he shouldn't be doing that. He apologized, and said he really didn't mean to do that. When he quieted down, she got on the phone and started using similar words to what he was using. So those are the two that stand out in all the thousands of calls. They're the two that stand out.

SS: Well, that sounds stressful.

GB: Yes, it can be.

SS: Well, then, since 2000, it doesn't seem like there's been a lot of controversy in your area. Maybe I've missed something, but it seems like it was a building time, with the campaign and so on.

GB: Yes, it was. I think a lot has to do with the fact of the tenure of our leadership. John was now going into his second decade. He went from 1990 to 2000. We were surrounded by leaders that he had chosen. At this point in time John had already chosen some deans. Many he had chosen again, because sometimes deans only serve five years. So my point is that he had had an opportunity, along with appointing deans, to appoint vice presidents.

I think one of the reasons we were successful is because of our vice president for development, Bob Sweeney. We had just completed a campaign. We came into that 2000-year with a lot of momentum behind us. We were already starting to talk about another campaign. Bob was putting together an operation and staff that would be in a position to try to raise the \$3 billion. He was in some ways reinventing his organization.

I remember Bob talking about having read the book *Moneyball*, which later became a movie. I couldn't believe it, but it was up for a couple of Academy Awards, although it didn't get them. The fact is that it was basically reinventing the organization. It was

thinking outside the box. We thought about that. I go back to something that we haven't talked about that I think is absolutely critical at this point in time to discuss, because we're now at the year 2000 and moving forward.

Back between 1990 and 2000, we had this wonderful campaign executive committee, but it was primarily made up of folks who were in their late-fifties, sixties, and seventies. We had some younger people on it. But the predominant number, age-wise, would be middle-fifty and on. John started thinking in terms of: "We have to grow our own." We had a meeting. Like a good major league baseball team, you need to have a really strong minor league system, where your players continue to get better every year, and eventually they move up and play on the major league team.

So his idea was let's get young alumni, particularly at this point in time, since so many people were involved in the dot-com business. Let's get young alumni, who have shown success, in terms of what they do for a living, not necessarily just success in terms of wealth, but people who have a good track record at U.Va. as annual givers who seem to be very supportive of the University. Let's take them out and let's get them together for a long weekend at some place in this country. It was called the Virginia 2020 program.

I always thought of 2020 being clear sight vision. It had a lot to do with that, but it also had to do with the year 2020 being about the time that the University goes into its third century. That's a time for celebration, when we get there. John was already thinking

about a capital campaign for the University's anniversary, moving from the second to its third century of operation.

In doing that, what we did was bring these young folks together with their wives. We tried to make it a couple's weekend. We did about three or four of these a year, at different locations. We actually started these during the first campaign. We would get together and they would be facilitated by, in many cases, by Don Fry, who did the majority of them.

SS: What was his role?

GB: Don Fry was the facilitator. He was the one who would pose the questions. He's the one who would get everyone to try to think out of the box. Don Fry had been a professor who John Casteen had back when he was an undergraduate. His wife Joan works here in our office, as a senior assistant to the president. She's got a similar title as my own. We'd literally get out and think about where we wanted the University to go. John would say, "I want you to tell me where you want your university to be in the year 2020. What do you see? Where do you see it going?"

Many, many ideas that were implemented and being practiced today came from those 2020s. More importantly, the campaign executive committee for the \$3 billion campaign was made up almost entirely of people who attended the 2020s. So we did grow our own. It was an absolute genius move on the part of John.

SS: He just had the vision?

GB: The vision—very much so. It was a genius move. It worked beautifully. So all those people involved today in this campaign as volunteers were products of those 2020 sessions.

SS: Is Virginia 2020 the program that came up with the four areas of growth that the University is looking at implementing?

GB: Yes.

SS: Okay, I'm trying to remember the four components. Was it fine arts, public service, science, and an international focus?

GB: Yes. What happened is that John took those ideas and then came back here to the University with these ideas and put four commissions together, which were made up of faculty and administration. And then there were four reports that came out of those groups, which pretty much set the agenda for beyond 2000, for the last twelve years now, with Terry Sullivan here. But at least in John's last ten years, the vision had pretty much been established. That's what we were working toward.

So you had international, you had more outreach, which is what can the faculty and administration do beyond Charlottesville, nationwide and worldwide, to contribute, because we have all this talent here. You had the performing and the fine arts. Then you had the sciences, particularly the hard sciences. It was absolutely brilliant. It's where we are today. I'm surprised more schools haven't noticed, I might say, because it was a brilliant idea.

SS: Was Envision Athletics part of that?

GB: That came on a little later. Envision was—everything's branded—part of this. The athletic component came after the four major components. That was still part of it. Basically, that was trying to figure out where we wanted to go athletically. Where we wanted to be, where we could have success, and so on.

Again, you can see as a result of that, today, we're way ahead of where we've ever been. Well, we're certainly ahead in what they call non-revenue Olympic sports and our revenue sports are starting to win. I really think the golden era of Virginia athletics is still ahead of us. I don't think we've hit it yet. That is where we win in football, we win in basketball—men's and women's—and we win in all of our Olympic sports. And we actually end up winning the Learfield Cup, or whatever it will be called in those days, for having the best overall athletic program in the country.

That vision is one vision that came out of Envision. You know, Stanford is the school. They're there every year. Everybody wants to be a Stanford. Well, it's easy to say that. It's another thing to figure out how to get there. I think what came out of Envision was trying to figure out how to get there and I think we're getting there.

SS: Tell me more about that program. I ran across some information in the files about it.

GB: Are we talking about just the athletic part of this component?

SS: Was Envision larger than athletics?

GB: Oh, yes. Envision could be what came out of the commissions. Because it was over a period of time, the words 2020, clear vision, envision, anniversary, whatever. It all came down to the idea of growing your own.

SS: Taking the ideas to alumni and asking their opinions or getting feedback?

GB: Yes, but, but getting feedback and then making use of the feedback, so that they know their time away for that three or four day weekend wasn't wasted. We listened to them and took copious notes. Remember, all the discussion had nothing to do with fundraising. It all had to do with thinking out of the box and where you wanted your university to be. Even at the first one, which I remember was held in Arizona; it became

evident quickly. That's during the height of the dot-com success. This is before the dot-com bubble burst.

There was real concern among our younger alumni that degrees would be more computer-generated. Now, if you look, is certainly the case throughout the country. Because they were going to be computer-generated, the fact that the student might not have a chance to actually walk the Lawn or understand the honor system and live as part of it, that just could never work at U.Va. The on-Grounds experience at U.Va. was critical.

If the student wanted to go away for a semester to do international work that was also important. But they needed to have the on-Grounds experience. I mean, they were thinking so far out that they said even if the students end up finishing their degree by computer, the fact is they've got to be on-Grounds at least two years or three years, whatever that number might be. That's an experience that you can't substitute.

SS: So by computer-generated, you mean taking online courses?

GB: Yes, for credit.

SS: They saw that even then?

GB: Oh, yes. They saw that coming, which, of course, is the lifeblood of Kaplan University, Strayer, and so on. Again, they understood that the uniqueness of the University of Virginia was the undergraduate experience.

SS: Can you talk to me more about the uniqueness of the University of Virginia?

GB: It's the common bond. It's what holds everybody here together, which is basically the fact that everyone lived in an environment where there was trust. As I like to say today, we're not just talking about trust and the honor system. We're also talking about an environment that really promotes ethics. We've been teaching ethics University-wide long before other schools started making a commitment to do this. More importantly, we've been teaching ethics in the business school before they even knew how to spell ethics in the graduate business schools throughout the country.

Then hopefully there's a certain amount of integrity that you automatically understand by the fact of just being here as an undergraduate. So integrity, honor, ethics, those are three very important words. You can't really appreciate that and can't get that through a computer. You can only get that by walking the Grounds here and understanding the great history of the University and its founder. Really, truly, that was a concern, moving forward.

Needless to say, we're still requiring four years of the undergraduate experience to be on the Grounds of the University, again, with a semester or year away internationally, if that

be the student's choice. Who knows where we'll be twenty years from now or thirty years from now? The fact is they came up with the idea that even if a student finishes their degree through the computer, they need to have at least a two to three year experience on the Grounds to appreciate what the degree means.

SS: Are there other ideas that came out of Envision or Virginia 2020?

GB: Well, there were many, many others, but not necessarily ones that really resonated with me. Again, the commissions came out of that and those four ideas. It was something that was pretty extraordinary and was simply in John's mind and somehow just was one of the great moves or great ideas he ever had as president of the University of Virginia.

SS: Let's talk about some of those accomplishments in a moment. Shall we take a break?

GB: Let's do it.

SS: Okay.

(Off record)

SS: John Casteen's administration from 1990 to 2010 was incredibly successful.

GB: Very much so. When you think about it, this is something that isn't mentioned much. In the first campaign, for all intents and purposes, as I mentioned, we raised \$ 1.43 billion. And in the second campaign, before John retired, we had raised another \$2 billion-plus. So when you think about it, over that twenty-year period, \$3 billion, 400 million was raised. That resulted in 134 new buildings, which represent about 41,000 square feet of space, here at the University of Virginia.

That's just some idea of what that meant. We won't talk about professorships and fellowships and everything else that that money went toward. I think you could find that the numbers would be somewhat similar to the new buildings, in terms of looking at how many we had before the first campaign and where we are now, today, following at least the conclusion of this second campaign in the Casteen-Sullivan era. Again, it all started back in the late-seventies, early-eighties, with Frank Hereford's \$90 million campaign. I always look back and say that was the beginning of it all. It's been fun.

SS: You talked earlier today some about the first campaign of John's administration. Were there specific reasons to start the second campaign?

GB: The specific reasons were the fact that, again, we understood where we were, as a university, in terms of our relationship with the state and what little money we would see coming from the state over a period of time. It all gets down to need. Basically, if you take all the schools and see what their needs are, when you put it all together, which is

now called a case statement in development lingo, we had about \$3 billion worth of needs. We might have had more than \$3 billion worth of needs.

But at that point in time, \$3 billion was more money than had ever been raised in a public institution—not a private institution—but a public institution. That’s a lot of money. We had the need. It was time to run another campaign. That’s what colleges and universities do today. They run a campaign. They successfully complete them. They take a two or three year respite to re-staff and do what they have to do. As I said, in the case of Bob Sweeney, he reinvented his office and got them ready to go out and raise \$3 billion.

There was never a question about the fact that we would be running another campaign. The question was just a matter of when. John made the decision that it would begin about eight years ago, because you always have the quiet phase and then the public phase, and hopefully it would’ve finished this past December. But, again, with the economy being what it was, that just wasn’t going to happen.

What is interesting is that the first campaign that John was part of was a campaign that gave us great momentum for believing that we certainly had the resources available and the prospects available to run the second campaign. Because of the success of the first campaign we built a very large prospect list, which included many who we never got to in the first campaign, that we have not gotten to in the second campaign, but have made significant contributions to the University.

So it's ongoing. Our next campaign—and I won't be here for it—is going to be somewhere around the year 2017-18. Now, will it be run the same way? That's not my decision. I don't know. I have no idea. But there will be a campaign of some type that will be in conjunction with that anniversary.

SS: Interesting. Can you tell me why John was so good at raising money?

GB: Well, he wasn't afraid to ask. Good fundraisers are folks who aren't afraid to ask for the gift. I've always liked to say you can cultivate someone to death and some people really do like the dance. They're afraid if they give you a gift early on that you'll leave them as a wallflower, sitting over by the sideline. So, therefore, they're going to hold off as long as they can, because they really do enjoy the dance that goes with it. One thing that is critical in a campaign is what we call stewardship. So we try not to leave anybody sitting on the wall, once they've danced the dance. We like to keep them dancing.

So that's all part of it. The fact is that he was not afraid to ask for the gift. He had the ability, when he was one-on-one or in any conversation, of being knowledgeable in just about any area that the donor could have an interest in. I mean, well beyond just University of Virginia. They could talk art; they could talk architecture; they could talk medicine.

This man was extraordinary in his ability to have knowledge in great depth, in many cases, about every area of any university's interest, whatever those might be, but also

beyond that. There was never a conversation he couldn't carry on with the donor about whatever area of interest that donor might have, be it university related or not university related.

SS: That's really amazing. I've read some articles about it and they talk about his philosophy, or the campaign's philosophy, that money is only part of what you're asking for.

GB: I think what you're talking about, at least as I interpret that comment, the key goes beyond money. It's participation. When you get people who are participating with you and they're part of this, then the money is going to come with that participation. Now it doesn't mean everybody's that way, because some people just don't have time to be involved. The idea is that you hopefully can find a way that your donors feel that they can contribute to the University, but be part of it—before they make that contribution or after they make that contribution.

That's why you have a number of foundations out there and why you have a number of alumni or friends sitting on those foundations. That's why you have a Parents Committee, because you want to provide opportunities where your alumni feel that they can be beneficial and participate. That's the reason we have as many foundations as we have and the reason we have two or three different Parents Committees, as opposed to just one. The key is really the buy-in and generally you buy in through participating in an organization. I think that's very important.

Also, when a person makes a gift, you want them to feel good about their gift. That gets back into the stewardship, which has to do with letting them know the significance of the gift: What the University was able to accomplish because of what they did. If that's buildings then you can see the buildings. If it's professorships and graduate fellowships and so on, you can't see that, per se.

You might be able to see the name of the professor. You might even meet the professor. Hopefully, if you've given one, you have met the professor who sits in the chair of your named professorship. But at the same time, it's harder for them to see than it is if they give you the money to build a building. You build the building and their name sits on it. That is a little easier to see because it's standing there in front of you. It's what you accomplished, and I think in the long run, those that give to bricks and mortar are very pleased with what the ultimate result is.

That doesn't diminish those who give to professorships and graduate fellowships and other areas of the University. Because if we do a good job of stewardship, they are going to be able to see just what the benefits were and to see how people have been able to have success beyond what they would have, had we not had an opportunity to attract them to come here with the fellowship or the professorship. Anyhow, it goes all the way down to your student athletes, who come here on scholarships, or your AccessUVa kids. I believe that's a longwinded answer to a fairly short question.

SS: That was good. Speaking about buildings, in our last interview you said—about building projects—if one school has it, then another school would have to have a better version of it. You said you would tell me more about that during the Casteen era. I’m reminding you of that statement.

GB: That statement specifically relates to athletics. You build science labs because you need science labs. You don’t necessarily build them bigger or better. You try to make them as good, so if you’re trying to recruit a scientist, you’re playing from a level playing field. It’s in athletics that it seems that every time something is built, another school then has to build it and try to make it a little bigger and better.

SS: A stadium?

GB: A stadium, John Paul Jones Arena, Carl Smith Center, Scott Stadium, David Harrison Field, and the new track being built right now. These are needs that we have. It isn’t like you’re building something that’s not needed. These are critical needs. It’s just that when building it, many times, you have the idea in mind that you want it to be just a little bigger and a little better than what your competition has, because when you’re recruiting kids, that’s critical.

The real emphasis at the moment, as you and I sit here, is on the indoor football facility that we want to start construction on this spring. We are one of the few schools in the ACC that doesn’t have one. So it’s really important that we build it. Now, whether it’s

going to be bigger and better, I don't know, because there is a cost involved to make it bigger or better. The fact is it's critical we have the facility, itself, which also allows other sports to practice in there too. It isn't just football, but it's primarily for football.

That really was the reason for my comment. I know when Carl Smith gave us the money for the Carl Smith Center—primarily for the rebuilding of Scott Stadium—someone asked us, “Well, did you do a feasibility study?” We said, “We didn't have to.” They said, “Well, why?” I said, “Because the fact is that Carl made it very clear that he wanted at least 100 more seats in his stadium than North Carolina had in theirs.” So we did it. We built it and we put in 100 more seats than Carolina had in theirs. Then Carolina decided they had to come back and renovate their stadium, add more seats than what Scott Stadium had. It's never-ending. But that's just the way it is in college athletics today. Like I said, we do it because of the need factor, not necessarily just because it looks attractive and you want to put it up.

SS: That's a good story, though.

In our first interview, you talked about being with John Casteen during his time in admissions, your first dog and pony show, and the traveling you did together. You told me some good stories about traveling all night and things like that. I wonder if you have any to share about these later campaigns, once you were in his office.

GB: Well, we traveled very differently once we were together in the president's office. First, we had an airplane. So those late-night car rides were no longer. We started with a King Air 90. Tommy Worrell gave us that plane back in the late seventies, early eighties. Anyhow, King Air 90 and then I guess the last ten years or so we traveled in our small Citation.

The point is that it changed our travel pattern a great deal. If we didn't have a plane, we couldn't do the things that we did. Many of our trips, particularly with alumni groups, consisted of going out and having a lunch in one city, and then having a dinner in another city, and then moving on to another city, where we would have a lunch and then another city. We would be out for a week and literally do two events a day. And we would do some individual appointments in between those events.

Without a plane, you can't do that. I don't know how you would run a successful capital campaign where you've set a significant goal, if your school doesn't have use of a plane. That changed a great deal of how we traveled and what we did. The greatest thing for me, personally, that changed was that I didn't have to room with John Casteen anymore in the same room. (Laughter.) In fact, I told him when I came back I wouldn't come back unless he can guarantee me the fact that we could have two separate hotel rooms.

When he and I traveled back in the seventies, because we didn't have the funds available, we always ended up having to be roommates. We'd both added a few years to our life at that point in time, so this time we got our own rooms. More importantly, it had to do

with the transportation, how you got there and how you could set up your programs and how you could maximize your president's use of time. That was a significant change.

You were talking about John as a fundraiser—I think one of the great stories of John Casteen was a story of John and his good friend David Harrison. David had been involved with the University and had given some money to the University. When John came in to be president, he and David struck up a friendship that was very unique. John had similar relationships with some other donors, too, but this one was very unique. David felt very comfortable with John.

Because of that friendship, David Harrison gave a sizeable sum of money to the University over the duration of his life with John. The total probably was close to \$135 to \$150 million. David passed away while John was president. But in the Law School we now have the Harrison Law Grounds. We have the Harrison Undergraduate Research Awards. It was the first undergraduate research scholarship program set up, I believe. In my mind, it was the first one certainly set up at a public university in this country. There are a lot of undergraduate scholarship programs that are now out there, but I think the result of that was more so because of what David did.

We also have the Harrison Field at Scott Stadium. I think the other significant gifts to the University, in a more quiet way, were sizeable sums of money given to the medical school for medical research. The last gift from David was to build the Harrison Institute. Then we built a separate wing to house the Flowerdew Collection, which David had

committed his life to, of course, with his wife, Mary. But during the John Casteen president era, David was a widower for the majority of that time.

The two of them struck up a very close friendship. David had great faith and trust in John, and he asked, “What do you need?” That’s what David’s question would always be to John. John said, “Well, David, these are our most recent needs.” We wouldn’t have completed the first campaign, probably, without David Harrison and folks like that, who were incredibly generous. I just make mention of that one particular friendship and what it meant to the University of Virginia. The Harrison family, all the members of the family, are very philanthropic and very generous to the University—continuing in their father’s footsteps—through ultimately what was that friendship, they continue to be incredibly generous.

SS: Well, thank you. I appreciate you getting that on the record.

GB: Well, when we’re talking about fundraising, that’s that relationship. It’s very important. It went way beyond just the giving of the money. John made sure David was aware of, included in, and participated in anything he gave to. I remember vividly my taking David over to see his football contribution. It is called the Harrison Field and then the Harrison President’s Box, which houses 360 seats from end line to end line.

I remember taking David over every week when he would visit here. Later in his life, he loved to come to Charlottesville. It was his favorite place. He’d come up from Hopewell

every week and then it became two days a week and then it became three days a week. We'd go over and watch the stadium being built. Then later, we would watch his library being built. It was a real joy to go over with him. Through my friendship with John, therefore, I became a friend of David's, because he loved athletics and because of my passion for athletics, needless to say, we hit it off in a wonderful way. It's just a great story.

SS: That is a nice story. I guess all the fundraising made it possible for U.Va. to become a world-class university. What I understand is, in 1990, it was a good university, and now it's always listed in the top one or two position as a public university.

GB: It sure did. Again, it all happened because John had this vision we talked about earlier, with 2020. His vision was way beyond anyone else's here. You know, the day-to-day operation, basically fell in the hands of Leonard Sandridge. John had this ability to be able to see well beyond what any of us could see—in terms of where this university should go and where it should be in the year 2020—which basically was not just the vision of our young alumni that he was growing, but also his own vision. Much of it related to where we are today and what we're doing and why we do it.

SS: I'm just curious, can you take me through a sample day? That's twenty years, so you probably had different days as your role evolved.

GB: Well, it depends. If I was in Charlottesville, the sample day would be to probably interview four students, maybe five, and then to do other parts of my job, which had to do with the fundraising part. I'm talking about in Charlottesville, sitting behind a desk. Primarily, my sample day would involve either students who were applying to the University, meeting them and their parents, or students who were attending the University.

I've always had—and still continue today—to have students come in on a regular basis, just so I can catch up with them to see how they're doing, if there's any way I can help them or anything of that nature. Then, on the other end, I've spent a lot of time over the last twenty-two years on the telephone when I'm in Charlottesville talking to alumni and friends. Again, it has to do with the continuing of the relationships that had previously been built. That would be a sample day within Charlottesville.

If I was on the road, I've already mentioned it would be simply a matter of getting in the plane and flying wherever we were going those days. Unless it was in-state and then we'd drive. If it was out-of-state, primarily flying to wherever we would go, doing a lunch, moving on, doing a dinner, in between, doing some individual appointments with the president. We would usually go out two and three days at a time and do that. In any given week, the president would probably have six events that would be lined up. That would be a lunch and a dinner, probably three successive days, maybe only two, just depending on where and how far we went. That would be a day outside of Charlottesville.

SS: I hope you never had another propeller drop.

GB: Well, it didn't drop, remember. The engine just stopped.

SS: All your other flights were successful?

GB: We had some fun flights, but they were not under those conditions.

SS: That's good. Well, are there other accomplishments that you'd like to mention here on record?

GB: I don't think so. I think in my case, what I'm most proud of are the relationships. That's what my whole life's been about here at the University of Virginia—the joy of representing an institution that people feel really strongly about, have a great passion for. I noticed when I was at Maryland those two years that there were some alumni who were very passionate about the University of Maryland, but there were so many alumni who weren't. They might have been passionate about sports and I got to deal with them that way, but they just weren't that passionate about their institution. But here, you seldom meet someone who doesn't have some passion for their institution, no matter what their undergraduate or graduate experience might have been.

Needless to say, over the years, the Law School was on the Grounds and the business school was on the Grounds. Now they're up north. They're separated from the Grounds. Most likely, the law students that come today and the business students, if they didn't go here for undergraduate school, really don't have a chance to truly understand what the undergraduate experience is about. They're separated from the Grounds. It used to be that the graduates of those schools, because we were right in the middle of the Grounds, they somehow, through osmosis and other reasons, came to appreciate the University in total.

It's interesting. We really work hard, as do those schools that are separated from the Grounds, to try and inculcate the same sense of values that we do for our undergraduates and our graduate divisions, particularly in the professional schools which aren't exposed to the Central Grounds every day, particularly law and business. I think we've had some real success in that. I give the schools all the credit in the world for trying to keep the tie that binds, so to speak.

I see that as something that we do and do well. In some ways, it's too bad we still can't keep those students—even though they come from elsewhere—graduate students in those professional schools on the Central Grounds. We just can't do it. We don't have the space. It would sure be nice to be able to have them have to walk the Central Grounds everyday on their way to and away from class. But it's not to be.

SS: The Grounds are special.

GB: Yes. I'm not one for individual accomplishments. I'm one for accomplishing everything as a team. I think anything that's done at the University is done that way. You know, it's interesting, there's something I try to tell fundraisers and something I preach, and that is the fact that there might be a large gift that is given during a campaign. There might be a number of large gifts that are given during a campaign, be it the Batten gift or the Harrison gift or the Goodwin gift or whatever it might be. What I try to remind development officers is to understand that maybe they were involved in that gift when that gift was finally given at that significant number, at whatever that number might be. But what went before them and the people and the effort and the time that was put in before them to establish those relationships, to keep those people involved in the University, that's what people truly have to appreciate.

I've always seen myself as someone who has, hopefully, built these relationships that are long lasting. So that when I retire, those that come after me, the culmination of those relationships might ultimately be a significant gift to the University in a campaign, whenever that might be. I know so well that those gifts that I've been involved with during the three campaigns at the University, particularly the last two, that there were many who should get credit for that. For having kept the David Harrisons of the world involved over the years. John, and we at the University, are the beneficiaries of that. But there were a number of people involved in keeping David involved in University activities. I think that's really, to me, the bottom line.

So whether I've had success or haven't had success, I do believe that what happens down the road might well determine that. I can't really measure that. I can just measure the fact that my time here has been one of great pleasure and commitment. And I've been rewarded to have been part of this for what goes back forty-seven years, minus the two years at Maryland. Forty-five official working years here, but I've been part of that for that period of time. It's a very fulfilling feeling.

SS: I imagine. Not many people today spend that long at an institution.

GB: Well, it's been fun.

SS: Do you have a date set for your retirement?

GB: Yes, it will be this June.

SS: June 2012?

GB: June 2012. There's a discussion ongoing, as you and I speak, about the possibility of my traveling with President Sullivan for another year, just doing alumni and development work with her for another year, whenever she goes out to do that. If that happens, then that would be a nice way to step down, because that would enable me to maintain so many of those relationships that I have. The one thing that happens when you retire—

and I've watched others retire—is that it's very difficult when you're not here to maintain so many relationships.

SS: Well, do you have regrets or do you feel like you had to make certain sacrifices?

GB: No, there are no regrets, none whatsoever. Sacrifices—very much so—it's just part of the job. A lot of it probably had to do with me not understanding balance early in my life and thinking that the University was the end-all and the be-all of life, and believing that I couldn't live if I wasn't sitting here at my desk or out on the road representing the University. That has always been something I've preached to all the younger folks around here. It has to do with balance, having not been able to do a very good job of that myself early on.

It's interesting. When you look over my career, the only thing that I maybe would have liked to have done that I never fully pursued—and I might have mentioned this to you earlier—was to be an athletic director. I always thought I would make a successful athletic director. Whether I would or wouldn't, and I don't have any idea because I never really pursued that.

As I mentioned to you earlier, I went off to Maryland with the idea that I would get closer to that goal. And had John Casteen not become president of the University of Virginia, there's no doubt in my mind coming out of the Maryland experience, I would not have

been coming back to U.Va. I would have been pursuing an AD position in the early-nineties. But once I came back here, that was it.

SS: Are there other suggestions you give to your successors? You mentioned the one about balance.

GB: Yes. This particularly has to do with those in development fundraising. And that is to understand when you build these relationships, they primarily are built, without question, on the fact that you are working at the University of Virginia, the institution that these folks love. Or in the case of non-alumni, it is the institution where their children are attending or attended. Do not allow yourself to begin to think these are your best friends. That's not the case. Understand that when you leave the University of Virginia, everything changes.

I guess the one advantage I've had—having been around for forty-five years—is that a number of these relationships built because of the time factor have turned out to be some very nice friendships, too, to go along with it. But, generally, development officers do not stay at one institution for forty-plus years. They'll keep some friendships, as I did at the University of Maryland. I would say, as a result of those two years there, I still have about four or five University of Maryland alumni that I have stayed in touch with over the last twenty-two years. But the fact is, again, that was only five, as opposed to whatever that number might be here, having officially worked here forty-five years.

SS: How was it that you were able to stay so long in the position?

GB: I think that, again, it's such a great university. I think the fact that Charlottesville, itself, is a very special place. Talk about quality of life—it doesn't get a whole lot better than Charlottesville, Virginia. Raising your children here, in itself, is good reason to stay. I know we keep faculty members and administrators here many times who could make more money elsewhere, just because of the fact that at least until their children are out of the house and in college, they don't want to leave. It's a great place to raise a family. That's been very helpful, in many ways, for the University of Virginia, because people take less in order to stay here and do just that. This is not an easy place to leave.

I loved Annapolis, Maryland, in my two years there, with a house and boat sitting outside the house, right on the water. I could've lived there the rest of my life and probably been very happy. But I didn't have to raise children up there. By the time we moved up there, our children were out of the house. I didn't have to worry about school districts. I didn't have to worry about private schools. I didn't have to worry about where I was or what I was.

The fact is that it made my life in Annapolis so much easier, because it was just my wife and me and the house and the boat and the water, and all the good things that we really enjoyed. I mentioned to you earlier that was a tough decision, to leave that environment to come back here. Again, the University is, and has been—I hate to use the word

mistress—but it's been my mistress during my entire working life. That's it, in a nutshell.

SS: You also mentioned your relationship with John Casteen was what brought you back.

GB: It was the reason for bringing me back, yes. As I said, if it hadn't been for John Casteen, I wouldn't have been coming back. I would have probably been pursuing that one goal that I guess you could say I wanted to achieve in my life and never did, but never really fully pursued, and that was to become an athletic director. The difference was 1990 was a critical year in my life. Also, once I committed to come back, I knew I would never leave, until I retired.

SS: Oh, really? You knew that?

GB: Yes. There was never a question. I was coming back to stay here, not leave. Had John, for whatever reason, decided to take another presidency ten years into his presidency here, I would still be in Charlottesville, Virginia. And, I suspect, still finding something here at the University of Virginia where I would be working. I suspect it would still be development, in some way, shape or form. I made the commitment to come back and in my own mind and my wife's mind, we made the commitment to come back and stay in Charlottesville, from then on. We'll continue now, well beyond, retirement years.

SS: What is it that allowed John Casteen to stay president for twenty years? That's almost unprecedented.

GB: I think John's twenty years is a testimony to his leadership, his ability to raise money, and his love for the University of Virginia. The great thing about John is John has three degrees from the University. This is where he started in 1961, I believe. He got his undergraduate degree in '65 and PhD '70. The University of Virginia is in his blood. It's in his fabric.

I didn't go here as an undergraduate, because I just flat out couldn't get in. I mentioned where I went, Springfield College, and why I went there. But in John's case, having three degrees from the University, having come back and served the University as its dean of admissions, it's just a testimony to what he stands for. The fact is he stands for all that is good and wholesome about this university. I think people—at least alumni—really appreciated the fact that he was one of their own.

He also is a Virginian. That's important in the minds of a lot of folks. The fact he grew up here, went to public school in the state of Virginia, and then came on to the public university. I just think it was a great marriage between John and the University of Virginia, probably from the day he entered as a first year student, but certainly from the time he came back to be its leader.

SS: That's nice. Now you're working for the eighth president.

GB: I am. She's doing a great job. She's surrounded herself with an A team. Leonard retired and Michael Strine has taken Leonard's place. Tim Garson was the provost and she has now hired John Simon to be her provost. The future is in excellent hands with the three of them, but particularly with her. She's been a lot of fun to travel with, great personality, great sense of humor. She's very warm.

She loves athletics, and I mean as a fan. Therefore, she doesn't have to go to the athletic events she attends, but she goes to them and enjoys them, whether it's wrestling or women's lacrosse or basketball. It doesn't matter what the sport is, she'll be there. If she's in town, she'll be there and show her support for the young people—be it male or female—who are playing those sports. She's very visible, in terms of attendance at these events. She also is a strong leader, and has a wonderful background. I think the University has made an excellent choice in who they chose to be their eighth president.

SS: In the talk you gave me, which is a talk you give to alumni groups or a variation on a talk you give to alumni groups, you said there were three great events in the history of the University. What are they again?

GB: Coeducation, which was the most significant event in the history of this university, because the University would never be a nationally ranked university had we not gone in that direction. Of course, we're a public university, so we were going to go in that direction at some point anyhow. My point is that it was a change for the positive that was

just above and beyond anything or anyone could ever think could happen here and another reason why it's gotten so competitive to get in.

Another important event is the athletic program and Frank Hereford's presidency, in the late-seventies and early-eighties, with Ralph Sampson and George Welsh. Then, I think the third significant change is Terry Sullivan coming in as the eighth president, hiring Michael, hiring John, and the fact that they are now going to fund the University in a different way. The deans are now going to be responsible for their own budgets. It's going to be basically a bottom-up operation, rather than top-down, although the top-down operated beautifully for many, many years.

But, looking out to the future, this probably should be maybe the change that needs to be made. So why not bring in people who have functioned under that type of operation in the past, so that they can implement it here in the future? It will be fun to watch it. I won't probably be here when it ultimately is complete—that change—since it will be phased in. It will be fun to watch it from afar and see how it works.

SS: Are there other changes you see on the horizon for the University?

GB: There will be another capital campaign, as I mentioned to you earlier. I see the provost position, with this new funding model, having more strength in dealing with the deans than any provost that has had the opportunity to fill that position here at the University. I think that the fact that the provost will handle the academic funding—as opposed to it

coming from, in this case, Michael's office, before that, Leonard's office—puts the provost in a position of strength, which means that that will be a change here. It isn't that the provost has operated in a position of a weakness, per se. It's just that the provost hasn't had the opportunity to run the academic budget under their umbrella. I think the real change there is going to be in the provost position.

SS: Interesting. Are you looking forward to anything in retirement, specifically?

GB: I'm a pretty simple man with pretty simple interests. One is golf. If my body holds up, I'll try to be as good as I can possibly be. I don't have many years left to get better, so I'm not sure how that works. I've always exercised, my entire life. We talked about that earlier. I will continue to do that and be able to do it in a more leisurely way, as opposed to trying to get it in at six in the morning, so I can be at work by seven-thirty, eight o'clock. The third thing is we'll travel. It's something we want to do. We'll chase grandchildren. That's the big thing. So that's what we're really going to do.

SS: That sounds good.

GB: Three things. We'll continue to live in Charlottesville. This will be our anchor. Maybe we'll go somewhere for some winter months and so on, but Charlottesville will always be our anchor.

SS: Any last thoughts?

GB: I appreciate your taking the time to go through this. It will be fun to see how all this comes out.

SS: It's been a pleasure.

GB: Yes. I'm looking forward to seeing the written copy and even beyond that.

SS: Thank you.

GB: Thanks, Sheree.

[End of Interview]

INDEX

A

AccessUVa, 98–99, 123
Alumni Parents Committee, 2, 47, 122–123
Annapolis, Maryland, 137–139
Arena, Bruce, as soccer coach at Virginia, University of, 17, 69, 70
Atlantic Coast Conference, 17, 18, 61, 75, 124
Ayers, Ed, 51

B

Batten gift, 133
Beek, Harry van, 69–70
Bias, Lenny, death of, 72
Bice, Ray, 51
Blackburn, Jack
 as dean of admissions, 95, 100
 Legacy Program and, 103
Blue, Bill, 40
Burris, Gordon C.
 biographical statement of, 2
 birth of, 3
 children of, 37, 72
 as director of development and major gifts, 69
 draft and, 21
 at DuPont, Alexis I., High School, 4, 6
 early childhood of, 3
 father of, 3, 5
 first marriage of, 21
 friendship with Casteen, John, and, 75–76, 126–127, 138–139
 at Graves Mountain Lodge, 21
 Harris, Mr. and, 8–9
 Jefferson Scholarship Program and, 2, 48
 life in Annapolis, 137–139
 life in Charlottesville, 142
 at Maryland, University of, 26, 71–73, 134, 135, 136, 137
 mother of, 3–4
 part-time work of, during college, 6–7
 Sebo, Steve, and, 13–15
 as special assistant to Casteen, John, 2
 at Springfield College, 4–5, 6–7, 139
 stamina of, 57
 as starter and golf marshal at DuPont Country Club, 7
 step brothers of, 3
 stepfather of, 3
 Vietnam War and, 8, 12–13, 21

- at Virginia, University of, 8–9
 - as acting vice president for development, 82
 - as assistant athletic director, 69
 - as assistant dean of admissions, 21–22, 23–24, 63, 97
 - as assistant track coach, 10
 - in athletic department, 52–53
 - driving of state cars and, 29–30
 - as golf coach, 18, 27–28
 - interest in communication, 24–25
 - legacy student recruitment at, 33–34
 - majoring of, in physical education, 10–11
 - professional ambitions of, 20–21
 - recruitment and, 14, 16–17, 19–20
 - retirement of, 142–143
 - as soccer coach at, 13, 16, 18–19, 29, 30–31, 32–33
 - as special assistant to the president, 2, 3
 - teaching of Service Physical Education, 9–10, 13–15
 - as tennis coach, 13, 18–19
 - work in Alumni Association, 18, 26, 28, 32, 33–34, 40–44, 46–47, 52, 79
- work with Onesty, Lou, 15–16, 19–20
- work with West, Jim, 15
- YMCA and, 5, 6
- Butcher, Bob, 77

C

- Campaign Executive Committee, 83
- Casteen, John, 141
 - appointment of Burris as acting vice president for development, 82
 - at Connecticut, University of, 73, 75
 - as dean of admissions, 25–26, 34–36, 46, 50, 51, 79, 100, 125
 - degrees of, from Virginia, University of, 139
 - friendship between Burris and, 75–76, 126–127, 138–139
 - as fundraiser, 127
 - Harrison, David and, 127
 - as Jeffersonian scholar, 38
 - predicting future for, 35–36
 - as president of Virginia, University of, 2, 73–76, 79–81, 84–85, 110, 118–124, 135–136, 139
 - as Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth, 95
 - support for AccessUVa, 99
 - support for Legacy Admission program, 103–104
 - transition program under, 61
 - vision of, 129
 - as Washingtonian scholar, 38
- Casteen, Lotta, 36
- Cavalier Daily*, 101–102, 104
- Charlottesville, Virginia, 142

Charlottesville Ten Miler, 97
Coeducation, 11–12, 140–141
Connecticut, University of, 73, 74
Copeland, Jim, 53, 90
Corrigan, Gene
 as lacrosse coach at Virginia, University of, 16
 as soccer coach at Virginia, University of, 16
Corrigan Report, 60, 61, 66

D

Darden, Josh, 77, 82–83
Davenport, Ted, 89
Development fundraising, 136
dot-com business, 111, 116
Dudley, Bill, 38
Duke University, 8
 philanthropy and, 102
DuPoint, Alex I, High School, 4, 6
DuPont Country Club, Burris as starter and golf marshall at, 7

E

Elson, Ed, 77
Envision Athletics, 114–116, 118
Ern, Ernie, as dean of admissions, 18, 21–22, 23–24, 25, 60
Ewing, Patrick, 67–68

F

Falconer, Ian, as soccer coach at Virginia, University of, 17
Faulconer, Hunter, 20
"Feathering" the prop, 64
Flowerdew Collection, 127–128
Fry, Don, 112
Fry, Joan, 112

G

Garson, Tim, 140
Geiger, Andy, as athletic director at Maryland, 73
Gilliam, Sandy, 63–64, 74
Glass ceiling, 3
Glide ratio, 64
Goldey-Bedacom Junior College, 4
Goodwin gift, 133
Gordonsville, Virginia, 69

Graves, Jimmy, 21
Graves Mountain Lodge (Syria, Virginia), 21

H

Halsey, Bull, 38
Harris, Hank, 28
Harris, Mr., as head of the Department of Politics, 8–9
Harrison, David, 127–129, 133
 friendship with Casteen, John, and, 127
Harrison, Mary, 128
Harrison Field, 124, 127, 128
Harrison gift, 133
Harrison Institute, 127
Harrison Law Grounds, 127
Harrison President's Box, 128
Harrison Undergraduate Research Awards, 127
Hartley, Harry, 73
Heidloff, Raymond, 9
Hereford, Ann, 36, 65–66
Hereford, Frank
 capital campaign and, 39, 63, 65–66, 105–106, 119
 as president of Virginia, University of, 36, 38, 40, 60–61, 141
Hillsborough, North Carolina, 30
Holland, Terry, 90
 recruitment of Sampson, Ralph, by, 67
Hopewell, 128–129
Hunt, Ray, 26
Hutchinson, Pem, 40

I

Institutional control, 88

J

Jefferson Scholarship Program, 2, 48
Jenkins, Sean, 107–108
Jones, John Paul, Arena, 124

K

Kaplan University, 117
Kentucky, University of, 66–67
King Air, 64, 126
Klöckner Pentaplast, 69
Klöckner Studium, 69, 70

2, 52
Kramer, Ed (step brother), 3
Kramer, Ed (stepfather), 3
Kramer, Jim (step brother), 3

L
Learfield Cup, 114
Legacy admissions, 33–34, 40–45, 94, 96, 100, 103–104, 103–109
Lewis, Richard, as soccer coach at Virginia, University of, 17
Luck, Mack, 47
Ludwig, Lawrence, 9

M
Mark, Joe, 89
Mary Baldwin, 95, 97
Maryland, University of, 52–53, 75
 Bull Roast at, 48
 Burris, Gordon C. at, 71–73, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137
 Geiger, Andy, as athletic director, 73
 Maryland Education Foundation at the, 2
Maryland Education Foundation at the University of Maryland, 2
Maryland Terrapins, 71
McCue Center, 2, 52, 69, 70, 87
McKnight, Tom, 27
Merion Cricket Club, 51
Minority students, recruitment of, 25–26, 51
Mitchell, Ed, 83
Moneyball, 110–111

N
Naval Academy, 67
NCAA
 basketball violations and, 92
 football violations, 87–88
 institutional control and, 88
 under Schultz, Dick, 90
New York Generals, 14
New York Jets, 14
Nichols School (Buffalo, NY), 3
Non-Alumni Parents Committee, 47
Non-revenue sports, 15, 114
North Carolina, University of, 66–67

O

Olympic sports, 15, 114
O'Neil, Bob, as president of Virginia, University of, 36, 76–77
One-strike system, 44
Onesty, Lou, as coach, 2, 10, 13, 15–16, 19–20
Out-of-state legacy, 107

P

Partridge, David, 27–28
Peach Bowl, 67
Peavey, Marion, as director of development, 63–64
Penn State, 8
Pennsylvania, University of, Sebo, Steve, at, 14
Perkins, Lew, 73
Philanthropy, 86, 102
 importance of, at colleges and universities, 39

R

Rayburn, Jean, 95–96
Relationship building, 81, 93–94
Richmond, University of, Ayers, Ed, as president of, 51
Rinetti, Doc, 58–60
Robb, Chuck, 34, 95
Rohman, Red, 20

S

Sampson, Ralph, recruitment of, 60, 66–68, 141
Sandridge, Leonard, 4, 12, 26, 32, 74, 85, 93, 129, 140, 142
Saunders, Tom, 83
Schultz, Dick, 52, 53, 69, 90
Scott Stadium, 124, 125
Sebo, Steve, 13–15
 at New York Jets (Generals), 14
 at Pennsylvania, University of, 14
 at Virginia, University at, 14–15
Self-governance, 44
Service Physical Education, teaching of, at Virginia, University of, 9–10, 13–15
Shannon, Edgar, as president of Virginia, University of, 24, 61
Sharp, Bayard, 40
Smith, Carl, 125
Smith, Carl, Center, 124, 125
SMU, 90
Spies, Emerson, 51
Sports

- non-revenue, 15, 114
- Olympic, 15, 114
- Sports Illustrated*, 67
- Springfield College, 4–5, 139
- Stanford University, 73, 115
- State cars, driving of, at Virginia, University of, 29–30
- Stony Creek, 3
- Strayer, 117
- Strine, Michael, 4, 140, 141, 142
- Sullivan, Gilly, 2
 - Burris and, 35–36
 - creation of Legacy Admissions Program, 34, 105
 - as director of Alumni Association, 34, 40, 47, 48, 94
 - Rinetti, Doc and, 58–60
 - as undergraduate, 46
 - vignettes of, 53–56
- Sullivan, Terry, 81, 113
 - as president of Virginia, University of, 2, 134, 139–140, 141
- Sweeney, Bob, 74, 102–103
 - capital campaign of, 82–84, 120
 - as vice president for development, 82, 110–111

T

- Terrapin Club, 71
- Three-strike system, 44
- Turner, Todd, 73
- Two-strike system, 44

V

- Vietnam War, 8, 12–13
- Virginia, governors of, 85–86
 - Robb, Chuck, 34, 95
 - Wilder, Douglas as, 85
- Virginia, University of
 - AccessUVa at, 98–99, 123
 - admissions at
 - under Blackburn, Jack, 95, 100
 - under Casteen, John, 25–26, 34–36, 40, 46, 50, 51, 79, 100, 125
 - under Ern, Ernie, 18, 21–22, 23–24, 25, 60
 - under, Burris, as assistant dean, 21–22, 23–24
 - Alumni Association at, 39, 49, 94–95, 96
 - Burris as assistant dean
 - 18, 26, 28, 32, 33–34, 40–44, 46–47, 52, 79t
 - Sullivan, Gilly, as director of, 34, 40, 47, 48, 94
 - Alumni Hall, 94–95

athletics at, 124, 141
Arena, Bruce as soccer coach, 17, 69, 70
Burris, Gordon C., as coach at, 8, 18–19
Corrigan, Gene, as soccer coach at, 16
Falconer, Ian, as soccer coach at, 17
football program at, 31–32
Lewis, Richard, as soccer coach at, 17
West, Jim, as head baseball coach at, 15
Board of Visitors at, 77, 99
bringing minority students in, 25–26
capital campaign at, 38–39, 63, 65–66, 70, 82–84, 82–86, 105–106, 119, 120, 141–142
Central Grounds at, 132–133
coeducation at, 11–12, 140–141
College of Arts and Sciences at, 11
Curry School in, 9, 22
Envision Athletics at, 114–116, 118
fundraising at, 129–131
Jefferson Scholarship Program at, 48
lack of merit scholarships at, 49
Law School at
Harrison Law Grounds at, 127
Legacy Admission Program at, 33–34, 40–45, 94, 96, 100, 103–104, 103–109
Memorial Gymnasium at, 10
national exposure for, 68
NCAA basketball violations at, 92
NCAA football violations, 87–88
Onesty, Lou at, 15–16
Onesty Hall at, 10
on-Grounds experience at, 116, 117–118
philanthropy at, 40–41, 86
physical education classes at, 10
physical fitness test at, 11
presidents of
Casteen, John T., as, 2, 73–76, 79–81, 84–85, 110, 118–124, 135–136, 139
Hereford, Frank, as, 36, 38, 40, 60–61, 141
O'Neil, Bob, as, 36, 76–77
Shannon, Edgar, as, 24, 61
Sullivan, Terry, as, 2, 134, 139–140, 141
raising of money at, 32
recruitment of Sampson, Ralph and, 60, 66–68, 141
recruitment of women at, 21–22
recruitment of minority students for, 51
recruitment tours for, 50
suggestion to reduce goals, 85–86
teaching of Service Physical Education at, 9–10, 13–15
tuition at, 85–86

Virginia 2020 program at, 2, 111–114, 118, 129
Virginia 2020 program, 2, 111–114, 118, 129
Virginia Athletic Foundation, 39, 52
Virginia Student Aid Foundation, 39, 47, 52, 69, 89, 90

W

Warrington, Virginia, 51, 56
Washington, Mary, College (now University), 30, 41
Welsh, George, 67, 141
West, James (Jim) O., 9, 15, 89
Whitaker, Melbin, 92
Wilder, Douglas, 85
Wilmington, Delaware
 birth of Burris, Gordon C. in, 3
 returning home to, 7
Wilmington Club, 36
Worrell, Tommy, 126
Wright, Jimmy, 48

Y

YMCA work, 4–6