AAUP JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM
Back to Volume Sixteen Contents

Black Institutions, White Interests: The Dilemma of HBCUs, Academic Freedom, and Philanthropic Capture

J. R. Caldwell Jr.

Abstract

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) encounter critical academic freedom challenges due to increasing reliance on private funding. This dependency results from decades-long systematic state disinvestment that has underfunded these institutions by billions of dollars, despite federal legal requirements for equitable funding. This critical essay examines how donor stipulations function as curricular gatekeeping mechanisms, often suppressing racial justice engagement while providing essential resources. Drawing on Bell's interest convergence and Du Bois's double consciousness, I analyze how neoliberal austerity policies have intensified HBCU fiscal precarity. HBCUs exist both within and separate from mainstream higher education structures; this paradox means they train students for employment in anti-Black institutions while simultaneously cultivating them to dismantle these same systems. This creates what I term "philanthropic interest convergence," where financial dependency forces HBCUs to serve ideologically opposed systems. Finally, I propose strategies for helping HBCUs balance preparing students for professional success and maintaining their commitment to Black liberation through enhanced financial transparency, restored faculty governance, and reparative public investment.

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) have long existed in a precarious financial and ideological position, navigating the structural realities of racialized underfunding while serving as critical sites for Black intellectual development and political consciousness (Brown and Burnette 2014). Unlike their predominantly white institutional (PWI) counterparts, HBCUs have faced systematic state and federal disinvestment, forcing them to seek alternative financial resources (Gasman and Hilton 2012). This financial precarity has led to increased reliance on philanthropic contributions and corporate partnerships, a trend that scholars argue reflects a historical pattern in which white philanthropy has shaped Black education to align with elite interests rather than community empowerment (Freeman 2010; James-Gallaway 2019). This shift raises fundamental concerns about institutional autonomy and academic freedom, as philanthropic funding often comes with restrictions that privilege donor priorities over the historically rooted mission of Black liberation (Clerkin et al. 2023; Finley and Tiede 2025).

The growing reliance on corporate-aligned philanthropy and private funding mechanisms places HBCUs in a double bind: preparing students for professional success in white-dominated economic structures while cultivating a commitment to racial justice and systemic change (Du Bois 1903). This ideological contradiction reflects W. E. B. Du Bois's concept of double consciousness, wherein Black institutions must navigate both accommodation and resistance to the economic *white power* structures (Caldwell 2023).

This dual servitude role has become increasingly difficult to sustain as donor-imposed stipulations, such as STEM funding mandates that exclude race-conscious curricula or corporate partnerships that commercialize student data, operate as mechanisms of academic and philanthropic capture (Lachapelle et al. 2024). Empirical evidence demonstrates that STEM-focused funding disproportionately shapes institutional priorities at HBCUs, often sidelining humanities and social science programs that engage in critical race analysis (Deng et al. 2021; Gasman, Hines, and Henderson 2023). These funding constraints illustrate how philanthropic influence can act as a regulatory force, structuring HBCU governance in ways that subordinate radical intellectual inquiry to the demands of external financial actors (Gasman and Hilton 2012).

Defining Academic Capture in HBCUs

Academic capture, adapted from regulatory capture theory, describes the process by which external financial interests exert control over university governance, research, and intellectual production (Lachapelle et al. 2024). While all universities experience financial pressures, HBCUs, due to their intentional historic underfunding, are particularly vulnerable to *philanthropic capture*, where private donors dictate institutional policies under the guise of financial support (Clerkin et al. 2023). This process extends beyond financial leverage, influencing which research agendas receive funding, which faculty are hired, and how curriculum is structured to align with corporate and donor interests (Gasman and Hilton 2012). Empirical evidence from foundation-giving studies demonstrates that HBCUs receiving substantial corporate funding are often compelled to align their research priorities with industry-driven concerns, limiting opportunities for radical intellectual inquiry (Deng et al. 2021; Gasman, Hines, and Henderson 2023).

Research Questions and Argument

This critical essay examines the relationship between philanthropy, governance, and academic freedom at HBCUs, arguing that donor influence has increasingly eroded institutional autonomy, constrained intellectual freedom, and restructured governance mechanisms in ways that weaken the liberatory mission of these institutions. Three central questions guide this analysis:

1. How do philanthropic and corporate funding structures constrain academic freedom at HBCUs?
2. To what extent does donor-driven funding dictate institutional governance and curricular decisions?

3. What strategies can HBCUs adopt to resist external control while maintaining financial sustainability?

In answering these questions, this essay contends that HBCUs are subject to philanthropic capture, in which external funding subordinates intellectual production and governance to the interests of donors and corporate partners rather than faculty and students. While financial dependence on philanthropy is not new, contemporary manifestations of donor influence reflect broader trends in the neoliberal restructuring of higher education, where market-driven priorities dictate institutional policies at the expense of public accountability and intellectual autonomy. As HBCUs become further embedded in these marketized funding logics, their ability to serve as radical sites of Black intellectual and political resistance is diminished. Furthermore, this shift is exacerbated by federal and state policies that actively defund racial justice initiatives, such as recent legislative attacks on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) funding in higher education (Associated Press 2025).

Theoretical Frameworks

To analyze these tensions, this essay employs an interdisciplinary framework drawing from critical race theory, political economy, and higher education governance scholarship:

- **Academic capture** (Lachapelle et al. 2024): Adapted from regulatory capture, academic capture describes how financial dependency on donors results in the erosion of academic freedom and the reorientation of universities toward the interests of external funders (Finley and Tiede 2025). This is particularly relevant in the context of HBCUs, which, due to persistent underfunding, are often compelled to accept donor conditions that regulate the scope and content of research, faculty hiring, and administrative priorities. The impact of academic capture is evident in how donor-backed research initiatives at HBCUs often prioritize corporate interests over community-based knowledge production (Gasman and Hilton 2012).
- **Interest convergence** (Bell 1980): This theory asserts that Black progress is only tolerated when it aligns with white interests. Applied to HBCUs, this framework explains how donor investments in Black education are driven not by commitments to racial justice but by the potential for economic and political returns that sustain existing power structures (Williams et al. 2018; James-Gallaway 2019). This dynamic can be seen in how corporate funding disproportionately flows to STEM fields that align with labor market needs rather than disciplines that engage in structural critiques of systemic racism (Deng et al. 2021).
- **Double consciousness** (Du Bois 1903): This concept captures the ideological contradictions that define the mission of HBCUs: straddling a line between producing Black professionals to succeed in a white-dominated economy and cultivating racial justice leaders who challenge systemic inequities. The political economy of HBCU funding reflects this tension, as institutions must simultaneously appease donors while preserving a commitment to racial uplift and intellectual freedom.

By applying these frameworks, this essay demonstrates how philanthropic influence has reconfigured the governance and intellectual mission of HBCUs, not simply as a byproduct of financial necessity but as part of a broader strategy to subordinate Black education to elite-controlled knowledge regimes. The result is a pedagogical paradox, in which institutions ostensibly committed to Black advancement are structurally constrained in their ability to critique and challenge the very systems that necessitate their existence.

Contribution of This Critical Analysis

While existing scholarship has examined philanthropic funding in higher education (Mobley 2017; Williams et al. 2018), fewer critical essays have applied the framework of *philanthropic capture* to HBCUs specifically. This essay builds on that work by interrogating how donor influence restructures not just funding but also governance, research priorities, and curricular autonomy at HBCUs. By situating this analysis within the broader political economy of higher education, the essay provides a theoretically rigorous and socially engaged critique of the systemic threats facing HBCUs.

The Structural Conditions of HBCU Financial Precarity

Unlike their PWI counterparts, which have benefited from sustained state and federal investments, HBCUs have been structurally positioned to operate under conditions of scarcity. This is a fiscal reality shaped not by economic mismanagement but by systemic disinvestment and deliberate resource allocation. HBCU budgets have been repeatedly slashed under the guise of fiscal conservatism, while political and economic forces have undermined their ability to secure stable, long-term public funding (Archie 2023). This chronic economic marginalization has done more than constrain institutional capacity, it has also reconfigured the very governance structures of HBCUs, increasing their reliance on private capital and embedding external actors in their decision-making processes.

This section interrogates the economic forces that have entrenched financial precarity within HBCUs, highlighting how state disinvestment, financialization, and donor-controlled governance have weakened institutional autonomy. The consequences of these financial dependencies extend far beyond operational budgets, shaping the intellectual priorities of these institutions, dictating which research agendas receive funding, and reinforcing a model of higher education that prioritizes economic returns over transformative scholarship.

State Disinvestment and Racialized Public Funding Disparities

The economic fragility of HBCUs is not incidental; it is the result of state funding mechanisms that have disproportionately disadvantaged these institutions while reinforcing their dependency on private donors (Figueroa 2023; Gasman et al. 2023. Public HBCUs receive significantly less state funding per student than their PWI counterparts, despite serving a student body that often has greater financial need and can draw on less generational wealth (Brown and Burnette 2014).

This funding gap manifests in restricted faculty hiring, diminished student-support services, deteriorating infrastructure, and limited research investment.

Rather than addressing these disparities, austerity-driven higher education policies have exacerbated financial precarity under the pretense of fiscal responsibility. Since the 1980s, public investment in higher education has declined, compelling universities to seek alternative revenue streams, a shift that has institutionalized corporate-aligned governance models. This restructuring has disproportionately affected HBCUs, narrowing their financial options and making them more susceptible to external control. The systematic withdrawal of public funding has been neither neutral nor apolitical; rather, it has reinforced a racialized hierarchy in higher education, where access to resources is contingent upon ideological compliance with donor priorities.

State disinvestment has also functioned as a coercive tool to regulate the ideological scope of HBCUs. Recent political efforts to defund DEI programs exemplify this tactic (Singh 2025). Conservative legislators have actively sought to strip funding from institutions that engage in racial justice education, deploying "antiwoke" narratives as justification. Although DEI defunding campaigns have broadly targeted higher education, HBCUs—already underfunded and politically marginalized—face disproportionate consequences. Unlike well-resourced PWIs, which can offset financial losses through diversified funding sources, HBCUs rely more heavily on external grants, making them uniquely vulnerable to political coercion.

The Neoliberalization and Financialization of HBCUs

Beyond state withdrawal, HBCUs have been systematically embedded within the financial logics of neoliberal capitalism, which have transformed them from publicly supported institutions into quasi-market entities dependent on private capital (Brocato 2023). The financialization of higher education, whereby universities are expected to function as revenue-generating enterprises, has led to an increasing reliance on corporate sponsorships and philanthropic contributions (Lachapelle et al. 2024). This shift has profound consequences, as donors and corporate entities wield substantial influence over academic priorities, governance structures, and faculty research agendas.

A central dimension of this financialization is the alignment of research with corporate priorities, as funding allocation is dictated by market demands rather than faculty expertise. This dynamic is particularly evident in the rise of STEM-focused philanthropy, where financial support is often contingent upon maintaining "neutral" curricula that exclude race-conscious inquiry (Williams et al. 2018). Additionally, corporate partnerships, such as those with Amazon, demonstrate how philanthropy is leveraged to align HBCU research agendas with private industry rather than community priorities (Deng et al. 2021). These partnerships further illustrate the extent to which financial survival is contingent on serving external economic interests rather than fulfilling the historical mission of HBCUs as sites of Black intellectual and political empowerment.

The increasing dependence on donor-controlled revenue streams also exposes HBCUs to academic capture, where institutional governance decisions are dictated by the financial prerogatives of external funders rather than faculty and student needs (Clerkin et al. 2023). Faculty governance structures have been progressively weakened as donor influence extends beyond financial control into hiring decisions and research priorities (Gasman et al. 2023). The market-driven restructuring of HBCUs has led to the marginalization of disciplines that critique racial capitalism, such as Black studies and social justice education, while privileging programs that align with corporate workforce demands (Williams et al. 2018). As a result, HBCUs are forced to negotiate an untenable position in which their economic sustainability depends on appeasing financial gatekeepers who often seek to neutralize their radical intellectual traditions.

Philanthropy as a Mechanism of Financial Control

Although private philanthropy is often presented as a solution to HBCU financial instability, it increasingly serves as a mechanism of institutional governance and intellectual regulation. Large-scale donations from corporate foundations and high-net-worth individuals frequently include stipulations regarding faculty hiring, research focus, and curriculum development (Clerkin et al. 2023). In this context, philanthropy is not simply a financial resource but also a vehicle for restructuring HBCU priorities to align with external donor interests.

One of the most insidious forms of philanthropic capture is the imposition of curricular constraints, particularly in STEM and business education (Williams et al. 2018). Corporate-backed STEM grants frequently require institutions to adopt “apolitical” curricula, effectively erasing critical discussions of race, power, and inequality from scientific disciplines. This reflects a broader pattern of interest convergence, where financial investment in Black education is only extended when it serves the economic and ideological interests of dominant groups (Bell 1980).

Academic Capture and Curricular Gatekeeping

As HBCUs become increasingly dependent on external funders, their ability to exercise curricular autonomy and protect faculty agency is progressively undermined. A direct consequence of this financial dependency is the rise of curricular gatekeeping, where funding structures dictate institutional priorities. At HBCUs, this process is most visible in the disproportionate funding of STEM fields, the erosion of race-conscious curricula, and the growing influence of corporate partnerships in shaping research and governance structures (Freeman 2010).

The STEM Industrial Complex and the Marginalization of Critical Pedagogy

The dominance of STEM-focused investments at HBCUs reflects a broader restructuring of higher education, in which funding is channeled toward disciplines that serve corporate workforce demands rather than those that cultivate critical analysis and political consciousness. While STEM expansion is frequently presented as an effort to increase Black access to high-paying industries, it simultaneously functions as a tool of curricular containment, limiting the institutional presence of disciplines that engage with race, power, and systemic critique (James-Gallaway 2019).

Historically, philanthropic intervention in Black education has reinforced this dynamic. Gasman and Hilton (2012) document how early philanthropic efforts prioritized vocational training over intellectual engagement, ensuring that Black educational institutions aligned with economic productivity rather than self-determined knowledge production. Contemporary STEM philanthropy operates in a similar vein, as many corporate-backed grants explicitly require institutions to adopt "apolitical" curricula, erasing discussions of systemic inequity from scientific and technological disciplines (Williams et al. 2018).

Rather than expanding intellectual freedom, STEM-centered investment strategies reinforce a model of Black education that prioritizes corporate integration over political transformation (Freeman 2010). As a result, the radical intellectual traditions that have historically defined Black higher education are structurally weakened within HBCUs, even as these institutions are simultaneously held up as pillars of Black academic excellence.

Donor-Driven Research Agendas and the Commodification of Knowledge

Beyond restructuring disciplinary hierarchies, donor influence has also transformed the research landscape of HBCUs, determining which projects receive financial backing and which inquiries are deemed institutionally viable (Gasman et al. 2023). As external funding becomes the dominant source of research support, faculty are increasingly pressured to align their scholarship with the interests of corporate sponsors and philanthropic donors rather than the intellectual and social justice priorities of Black communities (Williams et al. 2018).

A striking example of this donor-imposed research hierarchy can be seen in the role of corporate-backed think tanks and industry-sponsored research partnerships. The Koch Foundation's investments in HBCU economic research, for instance, have prioritized free market ideology while discouraging engagement with critiques of capitalism, racial inequality, and structural violence (Deng et al. 2021). This exemplifies academic interest convergence, wherein financial support is provided only when it serves the ideological and economic priorities of dominant institutions rather than the emancipatory goals of Black education (Bell 1980).

The implications of this donor-controlled research funding include

- increased funding for research aligned with corporate and state interests, such as workforce development, financial technology, and "race-neutral" policy analysis;
- the defunding or systematic exclusion of projects that interrogate systemic racism, reparations, or Black radical intellectual traditions; and
- the expansion of industry partnerships that commodify student labor and faculty expertise for private sector gain while offering minimal long-term benefits to HBCUs themselves.

Corporate Partnerships, Surveillance, and the Expansion of Donor-Controlled Governance

The influence of corporate donors is not confined to curricula and research funding, it extends into the governance structures of HBCUs themselves, embedding private industry within institutional decision-making, student data collection, and administrative oversight. One of the most concerning manifestations of this entanglement is the increasing role of surveillance-oriented tech corporations in shaping campus infrastructure. This raises urgent ethical concerns about data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the commodification of Black student populations for corporate experimentation.

Corporate partnerships with HBCUs frequently include agreements that grant tech companies access to institutional data, student demographics, and employment pipelines. While marketed as diversity initiatives, these arrangements often serve as mechanisms for talent extraction, integrating HBCU graduates into corporate structures while offering minimal long-term investment in Black institutional sustainability (Williams et al. 2018). More troublingly, these partnerships contribute to the normalization of surveillance technologies on Black campuses, reinforcing concerns about racial profiling and the expansion of algorithmic policing within predominantly Black educational spaces (Clerkin et al. 2023).

Moreover, the impact of corporate partnerships and donor influence is not uniform across all HBCUs, as institutional positioning within the academic hierarchy creates disparate vulnerabilities to academic capture. Private HBCUs with substantial endowments, such as Howard, Spelman, and Morehouse, maintain greater leverage in negotiating the terms of corporate engagement, while smaller public or private HBCUs with limited financial reserves face more coercive pressures to accept restrictive donor conditions (Gasman et al. 2022; Peeples 2010). This stratification reflects a broader pattern in which resource disparities within Black institutions reproduce the very hierarchies they were established to challenge. Institutions serving predominantly low-income, first-generation students, those most directly connected to Black communities, often face the most restrictive donor stipulations, limiting their capacity to engage in politically transformative education. The differentiated impact of philanthropic capture thus reinforces existing inequities within Black higher education, creating a tiered system where institutional autonomy is increasingly determined by preexisting access to financial resources rather than commitment to liberatory education.

Reclaiming Institutional Autonomy Through Resistance and Transformation

An essential step in reclaiming institutional agency is dismantling the assumption that corporate philanthropy is the only viable financial pathway for HBCUs. Framing philanthropy as a lifeline obscures the reality that donor funding often comes with explicit constraints on academic freedom and curricular structures. To challenge this hegemony, HBCUs must initiate a radical shift in financial transparency and accountability. University leaders should be required to publicly disclose donor agreements, ensuring that faculty and students understand how financial dependencies shape academic priorities. Where feasible, HBCUs should strategically refuse donor agreements that compromise academic freedom, prioritizing partnerships that align with their institutional mission. More broadly, shifting the discourse from philanthropic necessity to public accountability is essential; federal and state policymakers must be pressured to fulfill their historical financial obligations to Black higher education.

Reducing financial dependency alone is insufficient without restoring internal governance structures that have been eroded by corporate-aligned trustees and administrators (Green-Powell and Hilton 2025). Faculty governance must be reinstated as the foundation of institutional decision-making, with professors having primary authority over curriculum development, tenure processes, and research funding allocations (Brocato 2023). Greater faculty representation on boards of trustees would serve as a necessary counterweight to donor-appointed administrators. Institutional protections for student activism must be formalized, as students have historically played a pivotal role in holding universities accountable (Mobley 2017). Another critical step is reversing the shift toward an adjunct-heavy faculty model, which has left professors financially precarious and vulnerable to donor-imposed restrictions (Gasman et al. 2023).

To break free from donor-controlled governance, HBCUs must establish financial models that center public investment, reparative justice, and community-driven funding initiatives (Clerkin et al. 2023). HBCUs should push for federal and state reparative investment to correct funding disparities with predominantly white institutions (Darity and Mullen 2020). Additionally, HBCUs should explore financial models that reduce dependence on corporate funding by strengthening Black-led community investments. This transition is not without obstacles, as the immediate realities of operational funding create tensions between principled resistance and pragmatic survival. HBCUs must navigate a paradoxical space where they simultaneously accept philanthropic support while organizing against the structures that necessitate such dependency. This requires what Du Bois (1903) might recognize as institutional double consciousness—operating within systems of philanthropic constraint while working to dismantle them.

The financial entanglement of HBCUs within donor-controlled governance structures is not merely a funding crisis but also a political struggle over the function of Black higher education. As Frantz Fanon (1952) contends, colonial subjugation extends beyond physical domination to the internalization of imposed structures that constrain Black self-definition. HBCUs, positioned within a system that conditions their survival on adherence to donor-imposed limitations, face a choice: continue adapting to external dictates or reclaim their legacy as institutions of Black intellectualism and political transformation. Reclaiming institutional autonomy is not merely an economic necessity but also an act of epistemic resistance against forces that seek to neutralize HBCUs' transformative potential.

J. R. Caldwell Jr. is assistant professor at Xavier University of Louisiana. He studies anti-Blackness in public education.

References

Archie, Ayana. 2023. "State-Run, Land-Grant HBCUs Are Owed More than $13 Billion, the White House Says." *NPR*, September 18. https://www.npr.org/2023/09/18/1200230948/land-grant-hbcus-funding.

Associated Press. 2025. "Trump Administration Gives Schools Deadline to Cut DEI or Lose Federal Funds." *The Guardian*, February 18. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/18/trump-administration-schools-dei-programs-deadline.

Bell, Derrick A. 1980. "*Brown v. Board of Education* and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review* 93, no. 3: 518–33. https://doi.org/10.2307/1340546.

Brocato, Billy R. 2023. "Academic Capitalism And Historically Black Colleges And Universities: Institutional Conflict." *Journal of Public and Professional Sociology* 15, no. 1. https://doi.org/10.62915/2154-8935.1178.

Brown, Walter A., and Daarel Burnette. 2014. "Public HBCUs' Financial Resource Distribution Disparities in Capital Spending." *Journal of Negro Education* 83, no. 2: 173. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.83.2.0173.

Caldwell, J. R., Jr. 2023. "All Education Is Political: Critical Race Theory, White Power, and the Killing of Black Academic Freedom." *Journal of Academic Freedom* 14. https://www.aaup.org/JAF14/all-education-is-political.

Clerkin, Cathleen, David Wolcheck, Grace Sato, Guy Mika, Michell Speight, and Sarina Dayal. 2023. "Philanthropy and HBCUs: Foundation Funding to Historically Black Colleges and Universities." ABFE—A Philanthropic Partnership for Black Communities. https://doi.org/10.15868/socialsector.41808.

Darity, William A., Jr., and Andrea Kirsten Mullen. 2022. *From Here to Equality: Reparations for Black Americans in the Twenty-First Century*. 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Deng, Shuyi, Yufeng Lai, Samuel L. Myers, and Man Xu. 2021. "Foundation Giving and Economics Research Productivity at HBCUs: Empirical Evidence from the Koch Foundation." *Journal of Economics, Race, and Policy* 4, no. 4: 215–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41996-020-00063-0.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. A. C. McClurg. https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300195828/the-souls-of-black-folk/.

Fanon, Frantz. 1952. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Reprint, Pluto, 2002. http://www.dawsonera.com/depp/reader/protected/external/AbstractView/S9781849644532.

Figueroa, Ariana. 2023. “White House: Louisiana Has Shortchanged Southern $1.12 Billion over 30 Years.” *Louisiana Illuminator*, September 18. https://lailluminator.com/2023/09/18/land-grant-hbcus/.

Finley, Ashley P., and Hans-Joerg Tiede. 2025. “Academic Freedom and Civil Discourse in Higher Education: A National Study of Faculty Attitudes and Perceptions.” American Association of Colleges and Universities. https://www.aacu.org/research/academic-freedom-and-civil-discourse-in-higher-education-a-national-study-of-faculty-attitudes-and-perceptions.

Freeman, Tyrone McKinley. 2010. “Beyond Hegemony: Reappraising the History of Philanthropy and African-American Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century.” *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 10, no. 3: 148–65. https://doi.org/10.1057/ijea.2010.15.

Gasman, Marybeth, and Adriel Hilton. 2012. “Mixed Motivations, Mixed Results: A History of Law, Legislation, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Interest Convergence.” *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education* 114, no. 7: 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811211400705.

Gasman, Marybeth, Leslie Ekpe, Alice C. Ginsberg, Amanda Washington Lockett, and Andrés Castro Samayoa. 2023. “Why Aspiring Leaders Choose to Lead Historically Black Colleges and Universities.” *Innovative Higher Education* 48: 637–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-023-09702-1.

Green-Powell, Patricia, and Adriel Hilton. 2025. “HBCUs and the Post-Election Landscape: Charting a Path Forward.” *Issues In Higher Education*, February 3. https://www.diverseeducation.com/opinion/article/15736547/hbcus-and-the-postelection-landscape-charting-a-path-forward.

James-Gallaway, ArCasia. 2019. “All Money Ain’t Good Money: The Interest Convergence Principle, White Philanthropy, and Black Education of the Past and Present.” *Mid-Western Educational Researcher* 31, no. 3: 348–74.

Lachapelle, Paul, Patrick Belmont, Marco Grasso, Roslynn McCann, Dawn H. Gouge, Jerri Husch, Cheryl De Boer, et al. 2024. “Academic Capture in the Anthropocene: A Framework to Assess Climate Action in Higher Education.” *Climatic Change* 177, no. 3: 40. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-024-03696-4.

Mobley, Steve D. 2017. “Seeking Sanctuary: (Re)Claiming the Power of Historically Black Colleges and Universities as Places of Black Refuge.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 30, no. 10: 1036–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1312593.

Peeples, Yarbrah T. 2010. “Philanthropy and the Curriculum: The Role of Philanthropy in the

Development of Curriculum at Spelman College." *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 10, no. 3: 245–60. https://doi.org/10.1057/ijea.2010.21.

Singh, Kanishka. 2025. "Trump Administration Warns of Funding Cuts to Universities over DEI." Reuters, February 18. https://www.reuters.com/world/us/trump-administration-warns-funding-cuts-universities-over-dei-2025-02-17/.

Williams, Krystal L., Brian A. Burt, Kevin L. Clay, and Brian K. Bridges. 2018. "Stories Untold: Counter-Narratives to Anti-Blackness and Deficit-Oriented Discourse Concerning HBCUs." *American Educational Research Journal* 56, no. 2: 556–99. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218802776.