



Educational Justice Journal

Coalition as Praxis: HBCU-HSIs, Racialized MSI Policy, and the Role of AABHE and AAHHE

Stacey Raina Speller
Howard University

Abstract

Nearly three decades after de Alva and West (1997) questioned the viability of Black and Brown alliances amidst systemic scarcity, dually designated Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HBCU-HSIs) serve as vital contemporary sites for exploring multiracial solidarity. Utilizing a critical phenomenological case-study design, this study examines how institutional leaders make sense of the racialized organizational identities of HBCU-HSIs and navigate the layered, often contradictory federal funding structures governing Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs). The study is grounded in an interlocking theoretical framework combining anti-colonial organizational identity, coloniality of power, and Black feminist theories of coalitional praxis. Semi-structured Zoom interviews conducted over a five-month period explored institutional sensemaking, policy navigation, student support for Latine and AfroLatine students, and coalition-building. The findings demonstrate that HBCU-HSIs challenge the binary logics embedded in federal policy, functioning as bellwethers for a multiracial future that demands a shift toward diasporic coalition. Ultimately, the study highlights the critical role of professional affinity organizations, such as the AABHE and AAHHE, as key policy actors capable of leveraging these institutional insights to drive coordinated advocacy and equitable reform across the MSI ecosystem.

Keywords: Higher Education, Black–Brown Coalitions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), Diasporic Solidarity

Introduction

In 1997, de Alva and West posed a question that still reverberates nearly three decades later: Are alliances possible? Their inquiry emerged amidst a landscape of racial tension, ideological distance, and institutionalized scarcity, where Black and Brown¹ communities were too often pitted against one another in the fight for power, funding, and equity. The term *Brown* is used here strategically alongside *Latine* to reflect its common usage in public and policy discourse; while it can signal political solidarity, it also risks flattening the racial heterogeneity within Latinidad, particularly AfroLatine and Indigenous identities (Busey & Silva, 2021; Naber, 2012; Sharma, 2020). Coalitional efforts between African American and Latine leaders are not new—spanning the 1968 Poor People’s Campaign to the Bradley coalition in Los Angeles—but they have often arisen under duress and been fractured by colorism, anti-Blackness, and racialized policymaking] (de Alva & West, 1997; Gardner, 2002). Yet, moments of solidarity—such as the Young Lords’ alliance with the Black Panthers—reveal the transformative potential of shared struggle (Ogbar, 2006; Arguello, 2019; Negrón-Muntaner, 2015).

In today’s post-affirmative action, anti-DEI, and racial retrenchment climate, the question is no longer whether Black-Brown coalitions are possible—but whether we can afford *not* to build and sustain them. This paper argues that HBCU-HSIs—Historically Black Colleges and Universities that also meet the eligibility criteria for Hispanic-Serving Institutions—offer a unique and underexamined site where diasporic coalition is already being enacted. Moreover, professional affinity organizations—namely, the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education (AABHE) and the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education (AAHHE)—are positioned to scale this emergent praxis beyond individual campuses and into broader policy and advocacy ecosystems.

Findings are grounded in qualitative data drawn from 15 semi-structured interviews with leaders across the HBCU and HSI ecosystem. Seven were internal administrators at dual-designated HBCU-HSIs; eight were external scholar-practitioners and leaders from national advocacy organizations, including the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), Thurgood Marshall College Fund (TMCf), Excelencia in Education, and the Hispanic Association for Colleges and Universities (HACU). This multi-level approach captures both institutional dynamics and broader policy discourses shaping the future of Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs).

From the researcher's unique vantage point as an AfroNuyorican scholar raised in The Bronx—a historic site of Afro-diasporic and Latine cultural production—this inquiry is informed by both experiential knowledge and academic inquiry (Lee, 2014; Denis-Rosario, 2012; Rivera, 2001; Steinitz, 2021). While not formally trained at an HSI, the researcher's educational formation occurred entirely at HBCUs, institutions that profoundly shaped their racial consciousness, affirmed Blackness as foundational, and instilled a commitment to racial justice and solidarity (Allen, 1992; Gasman & Commodore, 2014). While this paper centers AfroLatinidad and Black-Brown coalition, it also recognizes that Indigeneity is central to Latinidad as a sociopolitical identity and historical reality (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Hooker, 2009). However, given the author's AfroLatine standpoint, this paper does not speak for Indigenous experiences but rather gestures toward broader frameworks that honor the fullness of Latin American and Caribbean diasporas (Anzaldúa, 2004; Sandoval, 2013; Cohen, 1999; Reagon, 2015).

This study explores how institutional leaders across HBCU-HSIs and national MSI advocacy organizations make sense of their dual identity and navigate the challenges and opportunities of building coalitions across racialized policy boundaries. Specifically, it asks:

How do internal and external leaders conceptualize the significance and tensions of HBCU-HSI designation? In what ways do they enact or resist diasporic coalition as a racialized organizational identity and policy orientation? Through this inquiry, the study offers new insight into how Black and Brown institutional leaders can transform the limitations of existing MSI structures and reimagine cross-racial servingness as a liberatory, coalitional praxis.

Conceptual Framework

This paper draws from three interlocking theoretical frameworks: anti-colonial organizational identity (Bradley & Tillis, 2025), coalitional praxis rooted in Black feminist and liberationist traditions (Cohen, 1999; Reagon, 2015), and coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). Together, these frameworks provide a critical lens to examine how HBCU-HSIs navigate racialized federal policy, resist institutional erasure, and cultivate diasporic solidarity across Black and Brown communities.

Bradley and Tillis's (2025) anti-colonial meso-relevant theory of organizational identity critiques how federal MSI frameworks—particularly those that tie legitimacy and funding to enrollment thresholds—obscure and devalue HBCUs' historic mission]. Their framework exposes how dual-designated institutions like HBCU-HSIs are expected to serve Latine students without proportional access to Title V funding, while simultaneously defending their legitimacy as Black institutions. This structural expectation reflects colonial logics of extraction: demanding service without resource investment and recognition without redistribution. Bradley and Tillis position HBCU-HSIs as sites of resistance—sacred spaces of Black education that carry generational missions of liberation, even as they are pressured to conform to enrollment-based definitions of “servingness.” In this paper, their framework helps illuminate how institutional

actors make sense of and push back against policies that racialize and commodify their dual designation.

To understand the broader systems shaping these dynamics, this paper turns to coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000)—a theory that reveals how race and knowledge are structured hierarchically through the legacies of Western colonialism. Within this schema, institutions like HBCUs are not simply underfunded; they are positioned as subordinate within a global ordering that privileges whiteness, Eurocentric knowledge systems, and capitalist metrics of legitimacy (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). Even MSI policy—crafted ostensibly to support minoritized students—operates within this colonial matrix by privileging quantifiable enrollment over historical purpose, and by disaggregating “minority” support in ways that reinforce scarcity and competition between Black and Brown communities. Coloniality thus provides the macro-level context for why HBCU-HSIs are constrained by contradictory mandates: to serve beyond their funded capacity, to claim dual identities without dual recognition, and to justify their legitimacy through white-adjacent metrics of institutional excellence.

While coloniality explains the structure of subjugation, this paper is ultimately animated by the liberatory possibilities of *coalitional praxis*—a tradition rooted in Black feminist and liberationist theory. As Barbara Smith, Bernice Johnson Reagon (2015), and Cathy Cohen (1999) have argued, coalition is not about shared identity alone, but about organizing across difference with honesty, accountability, and a commitment to shared struggle. It demands discomfort, not convenience, and clarity of purpose over sameness of experience. This paper draws from these theories of coalition to position HBCU-HSIs—and professional affinity organizations like AABHE and AAHHE—as institutional incubators of solidarity. Rather than flatten racial difference, coalitional praxis affirms AfroLatinidad, Black-Indigenous identity, and hybridity as

central to the work of racial and educational justice. Historical examples such as the Young Lords' alliance with the Black Panther Party (Ogbar, 2006; Arguello, 2019) and the transnational organizing of Schomburg, Bethune, and Du Bois (Preston, 2023; Denis-Rosario, 2012; Guridy, 2010) further demonstrate that diasporic coalition is not new—it is ancestral.

Together, these frameworks shift the analytical gaze: from institutions as neutral actors to racialized sites of struggle and possibility; from policy as benevolent support to a field of contested power; and from Black and Brown communities as fragmented to as capable of coalition. Through this lens, HBCU-HSIs are not merely statistical anomalies or policy oversights—they are living embodiments of what is possible when history, resistance, and solidarity converge.

Grounded in these theoretical orientations, this study employs a critical phenomenological approach to understand how institutional actors make sense of being both HBCU and HSI. These frameworks guided not only the research questions but also the design, sampling, and analytic process—ensuring that both the material conditions and the liberatory possibilities of HBCU-HSIs were centered. What follows is a methodological overview of how this study was constructed to amplify institutional insight and diasporic coalition-building across sectors. Taken together, these frameworks allow this study to move across structure, identity, and action, revealing how policy constrains HBCU-HSIs, how leaders interpret those constraints, and how coalition emerges as a strategic response rather than a rhetorical ideal.

Methodology

This study employed a critical phenomenological approach to explore how institutional leaders make sense of being both a Historically Black College and University (HBCU) and an eligible Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI)—a dual designation that is underexamined in higher

education literature and policy. Guided by anti-colonial organizational theory (Bradley & Tillis, 2025), coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000), and Black feminist theories of coalitional praxis (Cohen, 1999; Reagon, 2015), the methodology was intentionally designed to capture how dual-serving HBCUs navigate structural inequities, enact diasporic solidarity, and resist race-neutral federal funding mechanisms.

Research Design and Rationale

This study implemented a critical phenomenological case-study design (Vagle, 2014; Stilwell & Harman, 2021), in which the “case” is not a singular institution, but the racialized organizational identity of HBCU-HSIs. The research design assumes that phenomena shaped by race, power, and policy are best explored through the lived insights of those enmeshed within them. A critical phenomenological stance is essential for racialized policy analysis because it foregrounds how federal funding rules and classification regimes are experienced as power—making visible the structures of racialization that conventional phenomenology can inadvertently treat as context rather than constitutive force.

Co-creator/Collaborator Selection and Positionality

Participants (referred to as “co-creators” or “collaborators” interchangeably) were selected through purposeful and criterion-based sampling to ensure that each had firsthand knowledge of the phenomenon. Fifteen co-creators were interviewed: seven were internal leaders at dual-designated HBCU-HSIs (including senior and mid-level administrators), and eight were external leaders from national advocacy organizations, including the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), Thurgood Marshall College Fund (TMCf), Excelencia in Education, and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). This multi-level approach allowed the study

to explore both institutional sensemaking and broader discursive and federal funding ecosystems surrounding MSIs.

The researcher's AfroNuyorican identity and educational formation within HBCUs shaped the study's critical lens. As a product of HBCU undergraduate and graduate education, and as the founder of a nonprofit community-based initiative, HBCUorgullo™ committed to bridging AfroLatine/Latine communities with HBCUs, the researcher brought a deeply rooted understanding of Black and Latine diasporic traditions. This standpoint did not seek neutrality, but rather accountability—to the communities most impacted by racialized policy.

Data Collection

Data collection consisted of semi-structured interviews conducted via Zoom over a five-month period. Interviews ranged from 45 to 90 minutes and were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and returned to co-creators for member checking. Each interview followed a flexible guide with questions related to (1) institutional identity and sensemaking, (2) funding and policy navigation, (3) student support practices for AfroLatine and Latine students, and (4) coalition-building efforts.

The interview protocol was shaped by the conceptual frameworks guiding the study, particularly anti-colonial critiques of MSI funding structures, theories of racialized organizational behavior, and liberatory coalition practices. Co-creators were asked to reflect on tensions and synergies between Black and Brown student support; institutional, communal, and political responses to Title III Part B and Title V funding; and whether the dual designation fosters opportunities for solidarity or fragmentation.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed through a hybrid coding process using both deductive codes derived from the conceptual framework and inductive codes emergent from participant narratives. The researcher used Google Sheets to manually code transcripts, identifying major themes across both institutional and advocacy sectors. Codes were first grouped by level (micro, meso, macro), then synthesized into four core themes:

1. Protecting and Preserving the HBCU Designation and Identity
2. Navigating HBCU and HSI Tensions: Historical and Contemporary Dynamic
3. Intra-Framework Inequities in Title V Funding and the Credentialing of whiteness
4. The Emergence of an HBCU-HSI Coalition in a Shifting Political Climate

Throughout analysis, attention was paid to language, metaphor, and meaning-making practices. Reflexivity and memo writing were embedded throughout the process to track the researcher's evolving interpretations and maintain analytic transparency.

Findings

The following themes emerged from critical phenomenological analysis of interviews with institutional leaders navigating the complex realities of dual HBCU-HSI designation. These findings reflect macro- and meso-level dynamics shaping institutional identity, coalition-building, and racialized policy landscapes. While Black, AfroLatine, and Latine student and staff experiences are crucial to understanding the full impact of these dynamics, this paper intentionally centers organizational and systemic perspectives—particularly as they relate to professional affinity organizations and federal policy discourse. Together, these findings illuminate how policy, identity, and servingness converge in racialized organizational life at the intersection of Black and Latine student success.

Theme 1: Protecting and Preserving the HBCU Designation and Identity

Across all seven internal institutional collaborators, there was a resounding affirmation that the HBCU identity is sacred, foundational, and non-negotiable. Leaders described their institutions' missions to serve Black students as central to their historical legacies and present practices. They underscored that any expansion of designation or enrollment should not come at the expense of this mission. As one administrator asserted, "We are an HBCU first. That is not up for debate. It's who we are and who we've always been. Anything else must come second to that." The sentiment reflects a deep commitment to protecting HBCU identity against potential dilution, particularly in an era where Latine student enrollments are increasing and federal incentives push toward HSI eligibility. Collaborators noted that the dual designation often feels less like a badge of honor and more like a policy-induced tension, where institutions must navigate new expectations without compromising their core commitments. This theme makes clear that preserving HBCU identity is not about resisting Latine inclusion, but rather about resisting frameworks that fail to honor HBCUs' distinct historical, racial, and pedagogical contexts.

Theme 2: Navigating HBCU and HSI Tensions: Historical and Contemporary Dynamics

Leaders described long-standing tensions between Black and Latine communities that are mirrored within their institutions, particularly in the context of scarce resources, racialized funding logics, and the flattening of racial categories within MSI policy frameworks. These tensions are not simply interpersonal, but systemic—rooted in the way federal and state policies pit racialized communities against each other in the competition for recognition, legitimacy, and financial support. Several collaborators highlighted that while their student populations increasingly reflect a mix of Black and Latine identities, their institutional infrastructure has not

kept pace. One leader from a Texas-based HBCU-HSI remarked, “Black and Brown students sit in the same classrooms, live in the same dorms, but are supported in entirely different ways—if at all.” This discrepancy speaks to an urgent need for capacity-building, culturally sustaining pedagogy, and staff training that does not isolate support services by racial/ethnic group but instead recognizes their intersection. Additionally, collaborators noted that many campus environments lack intentional spaces where both Black and Latine student experiences can be held together without one being subordinated to the other. This theme underscores the importance of investing in intersectional institutional frameworks that are responsive to demographic shifts and historically rooted in racial justice.

Theme 3: Intra-Framework Inequities in Title V Funding and the Credentialing of whiteness

This theme centers on the policy constraints embedded within the federal MSI system, particularly the exclusion of HBCUs from Title V HSI funding due to a statutory restriction known as the “special rule.” Collaborators—especially those representing advocacy organizations—voiced frustration at the racialized double standard this rule reinforces. While predominantly white institutions (PwIs)—with “white” intentionally not capitalized to signal its conceptualization as a socially constructed category lacking shared cultural bonds beyond histories of colonization and racial domination (Dumas, 2016; Roediger, 1994)—that reach 25% Latine undergraduate enrollment can qualify as HSIs and receive Title V funds, HBCUs with similar enrollments are disqualified if they are already receiving Title III Part B support. As one collaborator explained, “The policy isn’t just exclusionary—it legitimizes whiteness as neutral and universal, while Blackness remains niche, boxed-in, and underfunded.” Several participants noted that the federal designations, while appearing neutral, are embedded in

historical logics that privilege institutional whiteness, even within programs designed to support students of color. The current funding model effectively penalizes mission-driven Black institutions for serving Latine students, reinforcing a hierarchy of legitimacy that privileges enrollment over history and whiteness over racial justice. This theme affirms that resource allocation is never race-neutral and calls into question how equity is operationalized—or obstructed—within MSI policy structures.

Theme 4: The Emergence of an HBCU-HSI Coalition in a Shifting Political Climate

Despite the tensions and structural inequities detailed above, a fourth theme emerged that signals possibility: the formation of a coalition-oriented consciousness among institutional leaders, faculty, and advocacy organizations. Several collaborators highlighted growing partnerships between national organizations—such as HACU, Excelencia, TMCF, and UNCF—as well as localized efforts on individual campuses. These coalitions are not yet fully realized but represent an emergent praxis grounded in shared experiences of racialization, resource exclusion, and community-based servingness. A co-creator noted, “The dual designation forces us to ask hard questions—who are we serving, how, and why. But it also opens the door to answer those questions together.” This sense of mutual inquiry reflects a nascent but powerful shift in how institutional leaders view coalition—not merely as a response to demographic change, but as a strategy for collective liberation. While formal infrastructure remains underdeveloped, there is momentum toward bridging HBCU and HSI communities through joint programming, research, policy advocacy, and cultural affirmation. HBCU-HSIs, therefore, are not only sites of complexity but also of creative resistance—where cross-racial collaboration is seeded and grown in spite of structural barriers. This theme captures the radical possibility of a “both/and”

approach to MSI identity that centers AfroLatinidad and diasporic solidarity as a future-facing imperative.

Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

The findings of this study reveal both urgent challenges and transformative possibilities for reimagining equity in higher education. As student populations increasingly reflect the racial, cultural, and linguistic complexities of the African and Latin American diasporas, siloed institutional designations and racially reductive policy frameworks risk undermining rather than advancing equity. HBCU-HSIs—those institutions dually situated within the federal classifications of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs)—do not represent anomalies in the MSI landscape. Instead, they serve as bellwethers for a multiracial future in which institutions are tasked with navigating layered identities, historical responsibilities, and contradictory funding structures. Their very existence challenges binary logics embedded in federal policy and invites a shift toward diasporic coalition as both necessity and praxis (Bradley & Tillis, 2025). In this context, professional affinity organizations such as the American Association of Blacks in Higher Education (AABHE), alongside the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education (AAHHE), function as critical policy actors capable of translating institutional insight into coordinated advocacy, research, and agenda-setting across the MSI ecosystem.

Policy: Disrupting Structural Silos

The findings call for an urgent reassessment of federal MSI funding policies—particularly the mutually exclusive provisions of Title III (Part B) and Title V under the Higher Education Act. The “special rule” that prohibits HBCUs from accessing Title V funds—despite qualifying as HSIs by enrollment—reproduces a racialized hierarchy in which white-serving

institutions that enroll Latine students are rewarded, while Black-led institutions are structurally excluded (Hegji, 2017; Speller, 2025). This rule undermines efforts to equitably support institutions that serve multiracial student bodies and disproportionately impacts AfroLatine students whose identities straddle federal classification systems. As one collaborator noted, “We are serving everybody, but the policies are only written for one of us.”

In tandem, federal and institutional data systems must be restructured to capture the racial heterogeneity within Latinidad. AfroLatine students remain statistically invisible due to the limitations of current reporting frameworks, which treat Latines as a monolith (UCLA Latino Policy & Politics Institute, 2024). This invisibility obstructs the development of targeted policies, funding models, and support services that affirm racialized experiences within Latine communities. A federal commitment to disaggregated data is essential not only for accountability, but for justice.

Practice: Centering Intra-Group Servingness

For HBCU-HSIs and their leaders, the call to “serve” must move beyond monolithic racial categories and toward a praxis of intra-group servingness—one that recognizes the internal diversity within Black and Latine populations and affirms their overlapping histories, identities, and struggles. Bradley and Tillis’s (2025) anti-colonial meso-relevant theory of organizational identity offer critical blueprints for resisting both assimilationist pressures and policy logics that treat Latine students as interchangeable across institutional types. The institutional leaders in this study advocated for practices that affirm AfroLatine identity, preserve the sacred mission of HBCUs, and critically interrogate how anti-Blackness and anti-Latinidad show up within and across campus communities.

This requires investing in culturally sustaining pedagogies, hiring diverse faculty and staff, offering multilingual services, and developing programming that bridges racial and ethnic differences without erasing them. It also means fostering critical consciousness among institutional actors who may have been trained to view MSI work through narrow compliance frameworks. Beyond campus borders, national affinity organizations such as AABHE and AAHHE are well-positioned to operationalize coalition at scale—co-hosting convenings, advancing shared policy platforms, and supporting the leadership development of AfroLatine students, faculty, and administrators.

Research: Toward Decolonial, Diasporic Inquiry

This study also affirms the need for continued research that centers diasporic identities and employs decolonial methodologies capable of capturing the complexities of race, ethnicity, and institutional identity. Scholarship must move beyond comparative binaries between HBCUs and HSIs to examine the lived realities of those who traverse both spaces—particularly AfroLatine students, staff, and faculty. Central questions remain: How do students navigate institutional spaces that affirm one part of their identity but not the other? How do HBCUs sustain their historic mission while adapting to new demographic realities? What does servingness look like in spaces where racial and ethnic identities are not easily parsed?

Future research should adopt collaborative, community-engaged approaches that prioritize relational accountability over extractive methods (Paris & Winn, 2014). Positionality must also be foregrounded—particularly when examining AfroLatinidad and coalition work across racialized communities. Coalition, as emphasized in this study, is not forged in sameness but in struggle, discomfort, and shared vision (Cohen, 1999; Reagon, 2015). To move toward

liberatory futures, researchers must document not only what is, but also what could be, when Black and Brown communities build in concert rather than in competition.

A Closing Call

To borrow from Audre Lorde, “*There is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives.*” The institutional leaders at the heart of this study embody that truth. Their stories remind us that coalition is not abstract—it lives in the daily work of navigating policy, identity, and racialized funding. It lives in the refusal to be boxed into either Black or Latine frameworks. And it lives in the commitment to build, despite scarcity, exclusion, or policy mechanisms rooted in division.

We must name the moment we are in.

In 2025, the federal government eliminated \$350 million in discretionary grants to Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), signaling a profound shift in how MSI funding is conceptualized and allocated ([BestColleges, 2025](#); [U.S. DOE, 2025](#)). These cuts were framed as a response to race-conscious eligibility, with federal agencies refusing to defend the constitutionality of HSI programs in court ([CBS News, 2025](#)). Simultaneously, funding to HBCUs increased—a move that many institutions rightfully celebrated after decades of chronic underfunding and structural exclusion.

Let’s be clear: this is not coincidence—it’s strategy. It is racial wedging—an intentional division of Black and Brown communities through differential resourcing and competing survival. The excitement surrounding increased HBCU funding is justified and necessary. But it cannot go unchecked when it comes at the death of HSI funding, particularly for under-resourced, mission-driven institutions that serve first-generation, working-class Latine and AfroLatine students.

Not all HSIs are the same. While some are elite, resource-rich institutions leveraging HSI status for federal dollars they do not need, many others operate under financial precarity, serving the same communities HBCUs were built for. These HSIs are being defunded alongside their Black counterparts—and in many cases, are punished for serving students who hold both identities.

This moment demands more than celebration or critique. It demands coalition—fierce, strategic, and rooted in clarity. It requires us to disaggregate MSI categories, distinguish between mission-driven and enrollment-driven institutions, and build alliances among those committed to racial equity. It calls on national affinity organizations—like AABHE and AAHHE—to reject the bait of scarcity politics and instead co-author a future where Black and Brown educational institutions rise *together*, not at one another's expense.

HBCU-HSIs show us that this is possible. They are not anomalies or exceptions—they are portals. Portals into a world where equity is not parsed out by designation, but practiced across diaspora. In the face of legal challenges, policy rollbacks, and funding cuts, coalition is no longer optional—it is the only path forward.

References

- Allen, W. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 26-45.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2004). Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza. In *Feminist Studies* (pp. 653-662). Routledge.

- Arguello, M. M. (2019). We joined others who were poor: The Young Lords, the Black freedom struggle, and the “original” rainbow coalition. *Journal of African American Studies*, 23(4), 435–454.
- BestColleges. (2025, February 3). *Trump administration ends grants for Minority-Serving Institutions*. Retrieved October 1, 2025, from <https://www.bestcolleges.com/news/trump-admin-ends-grants-minority-serving-institutions/>
- Bradley, D., & Tillis, G. (2025, January). Hispanic-serving HBCUs: Towards an anti-colonial meso-relevant theory of organizational identity in sacred spaces of Black education. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1416255. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1416255>
- Busey, C. L., & Silva, C. (2021). Troubling the essentialist discourse of Brown in education: The anti-Black sociopolitical and sociohistorical etymology of Latinxs as a Brown monolith. *Educational Researcher*, 50(3), 176-186
- CBS News. (2025, August 26). *Justice Department declines to defend Hispanic-Serving Institutions program in federal court*. Retrieved October 1, 2025, from <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/justice-department-hispanic-colleges-grants-unconstitutional/>
- Cohen, C. J. (1999). *The boundaries of blackness: AIDS and the breakdown of black politics*. University of Chicago Press.
- de Alva, J. J. K., & West, C. (1997). Black-Brown relations: are alliances possible?. *Social Justice*, 24(2 (68), 65-83.
- Denis-Rosario, M. (2012). Following their footsteps: Tracing Puerto Ricans’ sociopolitical activism in New York City from an Afro-centric perspective. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 5(4), 112–130.

- Gasman, M., & Commodore, F. (Eds.). (2014). Opportunities and challenges at historically black colleges and universities.
- Guridy, F. A. (2010). *Forging diaspora: Afro-Cubans and African Americans in a world of empire and Jim Crow*. Univ of North Carolina Press.
- Hegji, A. (2017). (rep.). Programs for minority-serving institutions under the Higher Education Act. *Congressional Research Service*.
<https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R43237/15>.
- Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. (2025, September 5). *Cutting \$350 million in federal grants to Hispanic-Serving Institutions erases decades of progress*. Retrieved October 1, 2025, from <https://hacu.net/cutting-350m-in-federal-grants-to-hispanic-serving-institutions-erases-decades-of-progress-and-hurts-millions-of-students-says-latinojustice/>
- Hooker, J. (2009). Afro-descendant struggles for collective rights in Latin America. In *New Social Movements in the African Diaspora: Challenging Global Apartheid* (pp. 139-153). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.PLC.
- Lee, S. S. H. (2014). *Building a Latino civil rights movement: Puerto Ricans, African Americans, and the pursuit of racial justice in New York City*. UNC Press Books.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Crossing Press.
- Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Naber, N. (2012). Arab America: Gender, cultural politics, and activism. In *Arab America*. New York University Press.xx

- Negrón-Muntaner, F. (2015). The look of sovereignty: Style and politics in the Young Lords. *Centro Journal*, 27(1), 4–29.
- Nguyen, M. H., Ramirez, J. J., & Laderman, S. (2023). What counts as a minority-serving institution? Toward the utilization of a standardized and uniform definition and typology. *Educational Researcher*, 52(3), 174–179. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X23116123>
- Ogbar, J. O. (2006). Puerto Rico en mi corazón: The Young Lords, Black Power, and Puerto Rican nationalism in the U.S., 1966–1972. *Centro Journal*, 18(1), 148–169.
- Paris, D., & Winn, M. T. (Eds.). (2013). *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*. Sage Publications.
- Preston, A. R. (2023). *Mary McLeod Bethune the Pan-Africanist*. University Press of Florida.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International sociology*, 15(2), 215–232.
- Reagon, B. J. (2015). Coalition politics: Turning the century. *Feministische Studien*, 33(1), 115–123.
- Rivera, R. Z. (2001). Hip-hop, Puerto Ricans, and ethnoracial identities in New York. In A. Flores (Ed.), *Mambo Montage: The Latinization of New York* (pp. 235–262). Columbia University Press.
- Sandoval, C. (2013). *Methodology of the Oppressed* (Vol. 18). U of Minnesota Press.
- Sharma, N. (2020). Home rule: National sovereignty and the separation of natives and migrants.
- Speller, S. R. (2025). *Somos Dos: Institutional Leaders' Sensemaking of Being a Racialized Dually Designated Historically Black College and University–Hispanic-Serving Institution (HBCU-HSI)* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Howard University).

- Steinitz, M. (2021). “We got Latin soul!”: Transbarrio dialogs and Afro-Latin identity formation in New York’s Puerto Rican community during the age of Black Power (1966–1972). In K. Young & M. Corrales (Eds.), *Human Rights in the Americas* (pp. 243–262). Routledge
- Stilwell, P., & Harman, K. (2021). Phenomenological research needs to be renewed: Time to integrate enactivism as a flexible resource. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 16094069219952
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- UCLA Latino Policy & Politics Institute. (2024, May 2). *Understanding Afro-Latinx experiences through data disaggregation* [Webinar]. UCLA LPPI.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2025, January 15). *Department of Education ends funding for racially discriminatory discretionary grant programs for Minority-Serving Institutions* [Press release]. Retrieved October 1, 2025, from <https://www.ed.gov/about/news/press-release/us-department-of-education-ends-funding-racially-discriminatory-discretionary-grant-programs-minority-serving-institutions>