

PO BOX 1679, UNIT 4550
Sacramento, CA 95812
(310)598-8398

FILED

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN
DIVISION

JOHN DOE (Safe-at-Home Participant),
Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY (headquartered in Chandler, Arizona);
AMERICAN INTERCONTINENTAL UNIVERSITY SYSTEM;
MELISSA NOYA, Psy.D.;
EVANGELINA ALONSO, Psy.D.; and
DOES 1-10,
Defendants.

Case No. _____

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

I. INTRODUCTION

This civil-rights and disability-discrimination action arises under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. § 794). Plaintiff, a qualified individual with a documented disability, brings this action to remedy California Southern University's systemic discrimination, retaliation, and misrepresentation. While publicly marketing its Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) program as licensure-track for California, CalSouthern and its administrators failed to provide reasonable ADA accommodations, obstructed required practicum and internship placements, and operated under an unlawful supervision structure that deprived Plaintiff of the professional experience necessary for state licensure.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action arises under the laws of the United States, including the ADA and Section 504. Supplemental jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1337 for related state-law claims.

Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) because the events and omissions giving rise to these claims occurred within Los Angeles County, California, where Plaintiff resides and where Defendants recruit, transact business, and caused the harm alleged herein.

2025 OCT -7 AM 11:02
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
BY: *[Signature]*

CV25-9549-HDV (SK)

III. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff **Samuel Dominicus Smith** (“John Doe” for Safe-at-Home confidentiality) is an honors-level PsyD candidate at California Southern University residing in Los Angeles County, California.
2. Defendant **California Southern University (CalSouthern)** is a private institution headquartered in **Chandler, Arizona**, and operating and recruiting students in California.
3. Defendant **American InterContinental University System (AIUS)** is the parent and controlling entity responsible for CalSouthern’s governance and compliance with federal law.
4. Defendant **Melissa Noya, Psy.D.** is/was Dean of Behavioral Sciences at CalSouthern, licensed in Florida but not California.
5. Defendant **Evangelina Alonso, Psy.D.** is/was Director of Clinical Training, licensed in Florida (No. PY6449) but not California.
6. **Doe Defendants 1–10** are individuals or entities responsible for ADA compliance, program oversight, and supervision policy, whose identities are presently unknown.

IV. NATURE OF THE CASE

This action seeks relief for systemic ADA discrimination, retaliation, and institutional negligence. CalSouthern’s leadership failed to ensure lawful California supervision under 16 C.C.R. § 1387, ignored Plaintiff’s documented accommodation requests, and misrepresented its program as compliant with California licensure standards.

Both Dean Noya and Dr. Alonso, licensed only in Florida, lacked California authorization to oversee clinical training and placements for California students. When Plaintiff—a Black, LGBTQ+, disabled doctoral candidate and primary caregiver for his medically fragile aunt—requested reasonable accommodations, Defendants retaliated by delaying or denying placement opportunities. These actions mirror documented patterns of discrimination in 2024-2025 national data for Black, LGBTQ+, and disabled PsyD students in private and online programs.

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff has a diagnosed Generalized Anxiety Disorder, a qualifying disability under the ADA. He provided medical documentation and requested reasonable accommodations for practicum and internship placement support. CalSouthern’s Disabilities Office, Dean Noya, and Dr. Alonso failed to engage in a good-faith interactive process and instead ignored or minimized his requests.

Defendants misrepresented the PsyD program as “licensure-track” for California students while lacking California-licensed supervisors or Board-approved waivers under § 1387. Plaintiff relied on these assurances and invested significant time and money toward licensure.

When Plaintiff requested remote supervision and flexibility due to his aunt's serious medical conditions (leukemia, dementia, scoliosis, heart failure, hypertension, aneurysm, hearing loss), Defendants refused and retaliated after he filed ADA grievances. As a result, Plaintiff lost a full training cycle, incurred substantial expenses (\$3,995 monthly rent plus transportation and caregiving costs), and suffered emotional and professional harm.

National 2024-2025 data confirm that Black, LGBTQ+, and disabled PsyD students in private/online programs face the highest rates of practicum denial and retaliation—trends CalSouthern's conduct directly mirrored.

VI. LEGAL CLAIMS

Count 1 – Violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.)

Defendants denied Plaintiff reasonable modifications, effective communication, and equal access to essential practicum and internship opportunities required for California psychologist licensure.

Count 2 – Violation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. § 794)

CalSouthern, as a federally funded program, discriminated against Plaintiff and failed to provide reasonable accommodations and equal access to educational opportunities.

Count 3 – Retaliation (42 U.S.C. § 12203 and 29 U.S.C. § 794)

Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff for protected ADA/504 activity by imposing barriers and delays that blocked his academic progress.

Count 4 – Negligent Misrepresentation and Failure to Supervise (California Common Law)

Defendants falsely represented the program as California-compliant and failed to ensure qualified supervision, causing Plaintiff financial and professional harm.

Count 5 – Negligence Per Se – Violation of Cal. Code Regs. tit. 16 § 1387

Defendants violated state law by allowing non-licensed supervisors to oversee California clinical training.

Count 6 – Violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 51)

Defendants denied Plaintiff full and equal accommodations and privileges on the basis of disability and protected status.

Count 7 – Violation of the Disabled Persons Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 54–55.3)

Defendants failed to provide reasonable accommodations and equal access to the PsyD program.

Count 8 – Violation of FEHA (Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 et seq.)

Defendants denied accommodations and equal opportunity within an educational and professional-training pipeline to employment.

Count 9 – Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing (California Common Law)

Defendants frustrated Plaintiff's ability to complete required training after accepting tuition and representing licensure-track outcomes.

VII. DAMAGES

Plaintiff has suffered economic and non-economic losses exceeding **\$6,248,000**, including lost professional earnings, educational expenses, \$3,995 monthly rent, transportation and caregiving costs, and severe emotional distress, reputational damage, and loss of career opportunity. Defendants' conduct was willful, malicious, and in reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights.

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in his favor and against all Defendants, jointly and severally, and award:

- A. **Declaratory Relief** that Defendants violated the ADA, § 504, and California law;
- B. **Injunctive Relief** requiring Defendants to (1) provide ADA/§ 504-compliant practicum placements; (2) ensure California-lawful supervision by CA-licensed psychologists or Board-approved waivers; and (3) revise licensure and ADA policies;
- C. **Compensatory Damages** not less than **\$6,248,000** for lost earnings, delayed licensure, housing and caregiving costs, and emotional distress;
- D. **Punitive Damages** for willful and reckless misconduct;
- E. **Statutory Damages, Fees, and Costs** under federal and California law;
- F. **Pre- and Post-Judgment Interest** at the legal rate; and
- G. **Any further relief** the Court deems just and proper.

IX. JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

X. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in his favor, grant all appropriate relief, and retain jurisdiction for enforcement.

Dated: October 5, 2025
Respectfully submitted,

JOHN DOE (Safe-at-Home Participant)

Plaintiff, Pro Se

[Safe-at-Home substitute address on file with the Court]

John Doe October 5, 2025

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT C

Timeline of Internship Efforts & Denials

(Filed in Support of Complaint for Violations of the ADA and Section 504 — California Southern University)

Plaintiff: John Doe (*Participant, California Safe at Home Program*)

Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose

To demonstrate Plaintiff's ongoing, good-faith efforts to secure practicum and internship training required for California Board of Psychology licensure, and how Defendant's inaction and ADA noncompliance directly caused loss of clinical opportunities and professional delay.

Chronological Record (2024–2025)

Date	Site / Program	Outcome	Notes
Aug 15– Sept 12, 2024	Forward Recovery	Terminated	Placement failed due to lack of orientation, training, and supervision. Supervising Psy.D. (Dr. Solomon) absent; hours invalidated.
Fall 2024 (brief)	Ananda Treatment Center	Invalidated	Site operated under unlicensed director; supervising psychologist (Dr. Skarloto) licensed in another state, not present. No lawful supervision under 16 CCR §1387.
Mar 7, 2025	Wright Institute Los Angeles (WILA)	Denied	Application rejected; program requires APA-accredited enrollment. CalSouthern's HLC status disqualified eligibility.
Mid-2025	Reiss-Davis Child Study Center	Denied	Interview completed; later disqualified due to CalSouthern's non-APA accreditation.
Aug 2025	Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (LACDMH)	Denied	Written confirmation from Dr. Vanessa Vasquez-Perez shows site was willing to include HLC students, but CalSouthern refused to finalize required affiliation agreement.
Ongoing (2025– 2026)	Additional Attempts (IMCES, Vista Del Mar, WILA, etc.)	In Progress / Denied	Continuing denials based solely on accreditation status and lack of university participation.

Summary

- Plaintiff made multiple verified attempts to obtain qualifying clinical placements across 2024–2025.
- CalSouthern repeatedly failed to act, finalize agreements, or engage ADA accommodations despite notice of disability and DOR sponsorship.
- Plaintiff remains unable to complete the required **3,000 supervised hours (1,500 practicum + 1,500 internship)** mandated by the California Board of Psychology.
- The cumulative effect constitutes irreparable professional harm, financial loss, and delayed licensure eligibility caused directly by CalSouthern's negligence and misrepresentation.

Filed by: John Doe (Pro Se)

Safe at Home — Confidential Address on File with California Secretary of State

Date: October 5, 2025

John Doe

End of Exhibit C — Attach supporting email confirmations, denial letters, and university communications immediately following this cover page.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT – CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.: _____

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT E

DOR Funding & Communication Records

(Filed in Support of Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief — California Southern University)

Plaintiff: Samuel Dominicus Smith *AKA JOHN DOE*

Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose:

To demonstrate that Plaintiff's enrollment and training were supported through the **California Department of Rehabilitation (DOR)**, confirming that CalSouthern received or benefited from **state funding** connected to Plaintiff's education and licensure pathway, yet failed to include him in essential communications and program updates required under ADA §504 and Title II collaboration duties.

Contents (Summary):

- Copies of email correspondence between DOR representatives (e.g., Marilyn Ridgway) and CalSouthern administrators regarding funding, ADA support, and placement coordination.
- Proof that CalSouthern acknowledged DOR sponsorship of Plaintiff's education but excluded him from joint communications after he raised ADA concerns.
- Evidence that state funds were used for program support while Plaintiff was denied effective access to updates, placement options, and ADA accommodation processes.
- Any meeting summaries or email chains showing that CalSouthern declined to coordinate directly with DOR following Plaintiff's requests.

Filed by: Samuel Dominicus Smith (Pro Se) *AKA John Doe*
[Safe At Home — Confidential Address Handling Requested]

Date: October 5, 2025

Title of Filing: *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief*
Attachment: Exhibit E — DOR Funding & Communication Records

John Doe

U.S. DISTRICT COURT – CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.: _____

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS I–J

External Complaint Filings — OCR, DOJ, and CRD Submissions

(Filed in Support of Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief — California Southern University)

Plaintiff: Samuel Dominicus Smith *AKA John Doe (SAFE AT HOME Participant)*
Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose:

To establish that Plaintiff acted in good faith and exhausted all administrative remedies before seeking judicial relief.

These exhibits document official complaints and correspondence submitted to federal and state agencies—including the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (OCR), the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), and the California Civil Rights Department (CRD)—regarding ADA/§504 discrimination, retaliation, and accreditation-related misrepresentation by CalSouthern University.

Contents (Summary):

Exhibit I — Federal Administrative Filings (OCR & DOJ)

- Copy of the OCR complaint and acknowledgment (Case No. _____).
- Timeline of OCR correspondence and requested evidence (ADA/504 violations).
- DOJ Civil Rights Division intake or referral notice confirming parallel jurisdiction.
- Proof of submission dates demonstrating timeliness and due-process compliance.

Exhibit J — State Civil Rights Filings (CRD California)

- Formal complaint filed with the California Civil Rights Department citing disability, age, race, and LGBTQ+ discrimination.
- Acknowledgment or right-to-sue correspondence (if issued).
- Summary sheet showing identical facts later pled in federal complaint to ensure consistency and transparency.

- Statement confirming Plaintiff's participation in all non-judicial resolution opportunities prior to this action.

Filed by: Samuel Dominicus Smith (Pro Se) *AKA JOHN DOE*
[Safe At Home — Confidential Address Handling Requested]
Date: October 5, 2025

Title of Filing: *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief*

Attachment: Exhibits I–J — External Complaint Filings (OCR, DOJ, CRD)

John Doe

Exhibit K Cover Page Text

Exhibit K – CalSouthern Misrepresentation vs. Published Program Data

This exhibit includes an excerpt from the **California Board of Psychology's official regulations page** (updated June 24, 2022) explaining that, under **Title 16 C.C.R. § 1387 and § 1387.1**, all supervised professional experience must be completed under a **California-licensed primary supervisor** with a signed **Supervision Agreement** executed before any hours accrue.

The Board explicitly warns that it may **deny any hours of supervised professional experience if a Supervision Agreement was not properly completed** or if the supervisor lacked required authorization.

Despite these public regulations, CalSouthern assigned **Dean Melissa Noya, Psy.D.** and **Dr. Evangelina Alonso, Psy.D.**—both licensed only in Florida and holding no California BOP waiver—to oversee Psy.D. practicum and internship training.

CalSouthern's website and catalog nevertheless represented that students would complete “**supervised professional experience**” qualifying for California licensure. The excerpt below, taken directly from the Board's website, demonstrates that such representation was false and misleading.

(Below that paragraph, paste the exact text you just copied from the CA.gov page—ideally as a PDF or screenshot, with the link “https://www.psychology.ca.gov/laws_regs/voe.shtml” cited.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

John Doe (*Safe at Home Participant*)

Plaintiff, Pro Se
Safe at Home — Confidential Address on File
Tel: (310) 598-8398

v.

California Southern University

333 South Placentia Avenue, Suite 100
Fullerton, California 92831
Main Campus: 2200 E. Germann Road, Suite 120
Chandler, Arizona 85286

Defendant.

EXHIBIT K

CALSOUTHERN MISREPRESENTATION VS. PUBLISHED PROGRAM DATA

(Filed in Support of Complaint and Ex Parte Application for Emergency ADA and § 504 Relief)

Exhibit Summary

This exhibit demonstrates that **California Southern University (CalSouthern)** misrepresented the eligibility of its **Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.)** program for **California licensure**. While CalSouthern publicly stated that its HLC-accredited Psy.D. degree prepared students for professional psychologist licensure in California, the **California Board of Psychology (BOP)** regulations (**Title 16 C.C.R. §§ 1387–1387.1**) make clear that:

1. All **supervised professional experience (SPE)** must be completed **under a California-licensed supervisor** with a signed **Supervision Agreement** before any hours begin; and

2. The BOP may deny hours accrued under unlicensed or unauthorized supervisors.

CalSouthern's administrators — **Dean Melissa Noya, Psy.D. and Dr. Evangelina Alonso, Psy.D.** — are licensed only in Florida and hold no California BOP license, waiver, or temporary authorization to supervise Psy.D. students in this state. Despite this, the University publicly represented that its faculty were licensed psychologists providing qualifying supervision.

These misrepresentations caused Plaintiff to rely to his detriment, resulting in loss of practicum and internship opportunities, denial of state licensure eligibility, and irreparable harm.

Filed by: John Doe (*Safe at Home Participant*) **Date:** October 2025

John Doe

After this page, insert your previously finalized **Exhibit K comparison table** and supporting BOP excerpt.

Would you like me to add your **case caption line** (e.g., *John Doe v. California Southern University, Case No. [space for clerk to fill]*) to the header so it looks identical to your other exhibits?

EXHIBIT K – CALSOUTHERN MISREPRESENTATION VS. PUBLISHED PROGRAM DATA

Source: Psy.D. Programs – California Southern University PsyD Program Review 2025:
Complete Online Doctorate Guide

Author: Ann Steele, Ph.D., Licensed Clinical Psychologist

Publication Date: Updated September 22, 2025

Overview

The official 2025 CalSouthern PsyD Program Review publicly presents the program as meeting California Board of Psychology (BOP) educational requirements and maintaining legitimate licensure pathways for graduates.

However, the University's actual practices and supervision structure contradict these representations.

This exhibit compares CalSouthern's published claims with documented experiences and verified facts, demonstrating patterns of misrepresentation, negligence, ADA noncompliance, and educational deception.

1. Accreditation & Licensure Implications

Published Claim:

CalSouthern's PsyD holds regional WSCUC accreditation and is "approved by the California Board of Psychology," providing a valid route to licensure.

Verified Reality:

- CalSouthern's Dean Melissa Noya (PsyD) and Dr. Evangelina Alonso (PsyD) are licensed only in Florida and possess no California BOP license or supervision waiver required under CCR § 1387.
- Without California-licensed supervisors, CalSouthern cannot lawfully oversee practicum or internship training within California.
- The University misled students and the Department of Rehabilitation (DOR) by implying full California BOP approval while omitting the critical supervision requirement.

Legal Relevance: False advertising and misrepresentation of licensure compliance under California law; supports claims of institutional negligence and fraudulent representation.

2. Clinical Training & Internship Structure

Published Claim:

Students "arrange practicum placements independently," and CalSouthern provides oversight and hour verification.

Verified Reality:

- Repeated requests for supervision approval (e.g., LACDMH) were ignored or delayed by faculty.
- No ADA accommodations were provided despite disclosed anxiety disorder.
- CalSouthern failed to execute affiliation agreements or supply BOP-qualified supervisors, rendering accrued hours non-countable toward licensure.

Legal Relevance: ADA discrimination, retaliation, and breach of academic duty; failure to provide reasonable accommodations and lawful supervision.

3. California Board of Psychology Approval Misstatement

Published Claim:

The program is "approved by the California Board of Psychology as meeting educational requirements for licensure."

Verified Reality:

- The claim is misleading: BOP “approval” refers only to curricular review, not institutional supervision authority.
- CalSouthern’s leadership lacked the required California licenses to administer training within the state.
- Students were misled into believing the program was fully recognized for California licensure eligibility.

Legal Relevance: Negligent misrepresentation and false advertising under California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 and 17500.

4. Department of Rehabilitation (DOR) Transparency Issues

Published Claim:

CalSouthern collaborates with students and funding partners to support educational success.

Verified Reality:

- DOR fully funded Samuel D. Smith’s PsyD program.
- Despite written authorization for information exchange, CalSouthern excluded him from direct communications and provided partial truths to DOR.
- These actions alienated the student from his own education and constitute a form of discrimination and retaliation.

Legal Relevance: Violations of ADA Title II and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act; institutional bias and exclusion from participation in a federally funded program.

5. Program Limitations & For-Profit Status

Published Claim:

Acknowledges “for-profit status” and “potential employer bias,” but frames them as minor considerations.

Verified Reality:

- These limitations materialized as systemic failures in academic support, faculty accountability, and ADA response.
- The for-profit model incentivized tuition collection without ensuring licensure pathway completion.

Legal Relevance: Evidence of educational negligence and bad-faith conduct by a for-profit institution.

6. Outcomes & Career Prospects

Published Claim:

CalSouthern graduates face “mixed results” and lower licensure exam performance but retain a “clear pathway for California residents.”

Verified Reality:

- The university’s internal failures in supervision and accommodation have denied qualified students that pathway.
- Students experience disproportionate barriers to internships, licensure, and employment outcomes.

Legal Relevance: Pattern and practice evidence supporting ADA discrimination and educational mismanagement under federal civil rights law.

Conclusion

“The discrepancies between CalSouthern’s public representations and actual operations demonstrate systemic violations of federal and state standards. These include misrepresentation of licensure eligibility, failure to provide ADA accommodation, and discriminatory exclusion from supervised training. The attached comparison corroborates Samuel D. Smith’s claims of ADA retaliation, institutional negligence, and false advertising and is submitted as Exhibit 9 to support Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application for Immediate Relief.”

Submitted by:

Samuel Dominicus Smith, PsyD Candidate *AKA John Doe*

Plaintiff Pro Se

California Southern University Plaintiff

Date Filed: _____

John Doe



Supervision Agreement/Verification of Experience Form

Below is a link to the Board's Supervision Agreement and Verification of Experience Form.

Effective October 1, 2017, California Code of Regulations, Title 16 sections [1387](#) and [1387.1](#) relating to supervision agreement, the verification of experience, and the responsibilities of the primary supervisor were amended.

Supervision Agreement*	Verification of Experience
<p>Specifies that the supervision agreement must outline the structure and sequence of the planned program of supervision that guides trainee to accomplish the training goals and objectives of the supervised professional experience.</p> <p>Requires the supervision agreement to identify, in addition to existing requirements, how and when the supervisor will provide periodic assessments and feedback to the trainee as to whether the trainee is performing as expected.</p>	<p>Supervised professional experience will not count toward the licensure requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for any hours worked prior to the completion of the Supervision Agreement if the supervised professional experience is not consistent with the terms of the Supervision Agreement if the trainee did not demonstrate an overall performance at or above the expected level of competence
<p>Requires the Supervision Agreement to be submitted, along with the signed Verification of Experience form, at the time of application for licensure as a psychologist (unless it has already been provided).</p> <p>Removes the pre-approval requirement for the Supervision Agreement for psychological assistants who are accruing supervised professional experience in a private practice setting.</p>	<p>Requires the Verification of Experience (VOE) form(s) to be submitted by the applicant at the time of application for licensure as a psychologist.</p>

*The purpose of the Supervision Agreement is to ensure that both the supervisor and trainee understand and have a plan to comply with the laws and regulations related to the accrual of supervised professional experience (SPE).

Upon completion of the supervised professional experience as outlined in the Supervision Agreement, the primary supervisor is required to provide both the signed original Agreement and Verification of Experience form to the trainee in a sealed envelope, signed across the seal, for submission to the Board by the trainee along with his or her application.

If any hours of supervised professional experience were accrued prior to January 1, 2005, or if the hours were accrued outside of California, please complete both pages of the [verification of experience form](#).

The Board has the authority to deny any hours of supervised professional experience if a Supervision Agreement was not properly completed prior to the accrual of hours after January 1, 2005.

Note: [Click here for a checklist to assist both the supervisor and trainee to comply with the regulation changes relating to the Supervision Agreement and Verification of Experience forms](#). For your convenience, the Supervision Agreement and Verification of Experience forms are provided below to help you meet the requirements pursuant to CCR Section 1387.

[Supervision Agreement Form](#)

[Verification of Experience Form](#)

Effective October 1, 2017, California Code of Regulations, Title 16, sections 1387 and 1387.1 relating to the supervision agreement, verification of experience, and the responsibilities of the primary supervisor were amended. For more information regarding the specific changes, please click on the following link to review the Verification of Experience Form and Supervision Agreement Regulation Advisory on the Board's website. http://www.psychology.ca.gov/laws_regs/voe.shtml

A Supervision Agreement (SA) for supervised professional experience (SPE) must be an agreement outlining the goals and objectives of SPE and must be completed and signed prior to the start of the SPE. The SA must meet the requirements set forth in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1387(b)(10). Failure to complete and sign the agreement prior to the start of the experience will result in the Board's rejection of those hours. For individuals who intend for hours of SPE to count toward meeting the licensing requirements and applying for psychological assistant registrations, the SA must be submitted along with the application.

Updated June 24, 2022

[Back to Top](#) | [Conditions of Use](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Web Accessibility Certification](#)

Copyright © 2025 State of California

Board of Psychology
1625 North Market Blvd, Suite N-215
Sacramento, CA 95834

Office Main Line 916-574-7720
Toll Free 866-503-3221
[Contact the Board](#)

This web site contains PDF documents that require the most current version of Adobe Reader to view. To download click on the icon below.



EXHIBIT K – CALSOUTHERN MISREPRESENTATION VS. PUBLISHED PROGRAM DATA

(Filed in Support of Complaint and Ex Parte Application for Emergency ADA/§ 504 Relief)

Purpose:

To demonstrate that **California Southern University (CalSouthern)** knowingly misrepresented the eligibility of its Psy.D. program for **California psychologist licensure** and supervision compliance, in direct contradiction to the **California Board of Psychology (BOP)** regulations under **Title 16, California Code of Regulations §§ 1387–1387.1**.

Side-by-Side Comparison Table

CalSouthern Representations (Website, Catalog, Admissions)	Actual Published Data & Regulatory Facts
“Our Psy.D. program prepares graduates for professional psychologist licensure in California and other jurisdictions.”	False / Misleading: The California Board of Psychology states that only APA-accredited doctoral programs qualify for California licensure. CalSouthern is HLC-accredited , not APA-accredited. (<i>Sources: BOP Licensure Requirements; APA Accreditation Directory</i>)
“Students complete practicum and internship training in qualified settings approved by the University.”	False: Under 16 C.C.R. § 1387 , each trainee must complete a Supervision Agreement with a California-licensed primary supervisor <i>before any hours begin</i> . CalSouthern has no approved California practicum sites or executed agreements.
“Faculty supervisors are licensed psychologists providing mentorship and oversight.”	False: Dean Melissa Noya, Psy.D. and Dr. Evangelina Alonso, Psy.D. are licensed only in Florida and hold no California Board of Psychology license or supervision waiver , making them ineligible under § 1387 to supervise any California-based SPE.
“Our Psy.D. degree meets state educational requirements for licensure.”	False: The California Board of Psychology expressly warns that it may <i>deny any supervised professional experience if a Supervision Agreement was not properly completed prior to accrual of hours</i> or if supervision was not by a qualified California licensee. (<i>Source: BOP Website – “Supervision Agreement / Verification of Experience,” updated June 24, 2022</i>)

Supporting Authority Excerpt (CA Board of Psychology Website – Updated June 24, 2022):

“A Supervision Agreement for supervised professional experience (SPE) must be completed and signed prior to the start of the SPE. The Supervision Agreement must outline the structure and sequence of the planned program of supervision that guides the trainee to accomplish the training goals and objectives of the supervised professional experience.

The Board has the authority to deny any hours of supervised professional experience if a Supervision Agreement was not properly completed prior to the accrual of hours.”

(California Board of Psychology – Verification of Experience and Supervision Agreement Regulations, https://www.psychology.ca.gov/laws_regs/voe.shtml)

Summary:

CalSouthern’s public statements claiming that its Psy.D. program leads to California licensure and includes valid supervised professional experience are **false and misleading**. Under **16 C.C.R. § 1387**, only California-licensed supervisors with properly executed supervision agreements may authorize supervised professional experience. CalSouthern’s use of **unlicensed, out-of-state administrators** (Dean Noya and Dr. Alonso) violates these state requirements and directly caused Plaintiff’s loss of all practicum and internship opportunities necessary for licensure.

Footer:

Source: California Board of Psychology – “Verification of Experience and Supervision Agreement Regulations” (Updated June 24, 2022). Printed from CA.gov: http://www.psychology.ca.gov/laws_regs/voe.shtml

U.S. DISTRICT COURT – CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.: _____

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT K

CalSouthern Misrepresentation vs. Published Data

(Filed in Support of Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief — California Southern University)

Plaintiff: Samuel Dominicus Smith *AKA John Doe (SAFE AT HOME Participant)*
Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose:

To document that CalSouthern University made **materially false or misleading representations** about its accreditation, practicum support, and licensure readiness. This exhibit compares CalSouthern's own public statements, catalogs, and program disclosures with official external data from the California Board of Psychology, Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and U.S. Department of Education, showing that the university's published claims misled students—including the Plaintiff—regarding eligibility for California psychologist licensure and APA-equivalent pathways.

Contents (Summary):

- Side-by-side chart contrasting CalSouthern's website, catalog, and admissions claims (e.g., “Meets California licensure requirements”) against verified regulatory data.
- Copies of CalSouthern marketing pages, program brochures, and student handbooks citing HLC accreditation as “fully qualifying.”
- Screenshots or excerpts from official HLC and CA Board of Psychology sources clarifying that HLC accreditation **does not substitute for APA approval** under 16 CCR § 1387.
- Email or portal communications showing CalSouthern's awareness of these discrepancies yet continued misrepresentation.
- Summary paragraph concluding that the institution's statements constitute **consumer and educational misrepresentation** under both ADA § 504 implementing regulations and California Education Code § 94897.

Filed by: Samuel Dominicus Smith (Pro Se) *AKA John Doe (SAFE AT HOME Participant)*
[Safe At Home — Confidential Address Handling Requested]
Date: October 5, 2025

Title of Filing: *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief*

Attachment: Exhibit K — CalSouthern Misrepresentation vs. Published Data

John Doe

End of Cover Page — Attach side-by-side comparison tables, screenshots of CalSouthern materials, and official agency records immediately after this page.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT – CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.: _____

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT L

Doctor's Confirmation of Disability (Anxiety Disorder)

(Filed in Support of Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief — California Southern University)

Plaintiff: John Doe

Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose:

To verify through medical documentation that Plaintiff has a **diagnosed and treated anxiety disorder** substantially limiting concentration, focus, and social functioning—qualifying him as an individual with a disability under **Title III of the ADA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act**.

This evidence establishes that CalSouthern had timely notice of the disability yet failed to provide reasonable or effective accommodations.

Contents (Summary):

- **Physician's Letter or Medical Note** (from Dr. David Kawashiri or primary care provider, dated 2019 – 2025) confirming:
 - Diagnosis: *Generalized Anxiety Disorder* (GAD) — treated and ongoing.
 - Functional limitations in focus, task completion, and social interaction under stress.
 - Advised avoidance of environments with vaping or respiratory irritants due to compromised immune system.
 - Statement that symptoms can be exacerbated by stress and environmental triggers.
- Optional summary letter or email verification to the university disabilities office showing submission of this documentation.
- Any follow-up notes or provider communication confirming ongoing treatment and need for accommodation.

Filed by: Samuel Dominicus Smith (Pro Se) *AKA John Doe (SAFE AT HOME Participant)*
[Safe At Home — Confidential Address Handling Requested]
Date: October 5, 2025

Title of Filing: *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief*

Attachment: Exhibit L — Doctor's Confirmation of Disability (Anxiety Disorder)

John Doe

U.S. DISTRICT COURT – CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.: _____

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT M

Proof of Caregiving Role — IHSS Documentation and Medical Correspondence (Filed in Support of *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief — California Southern University*)

Plaintiff: John Doe (*Participant, California Safe at Home Program*)

Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose:

To verify Plaintiff's role as a **primary caregiver** under California's **In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS)** program for his elderly aunt, who suffers from **CML leukemia, dementia, scoliosis, heart failure, and hearing loss**.

This documentation demonstrates the financial and caregiving burdens CalSouthern's ADA/§ 504 non-compliance has worsened and supports the request for immediate equitable relief.

Contents (Summary):

- IHSS authorization letters or pay stubs showing active caregiver status.
- Physician letters or medical summaries confirming the aunt's conditions and dependence on Plaintiff for daily care.
- Declaration from her physician confirming John Doe as primary caregiver and medical transport provider.
- Correspondence with IHSS or county case manager establishing caregiver relationship.
- Statement of financial impact and time constraints resulting from caregiving duties.

Filed by: John Doe (Pro Se)

[Safe at Home — Confidential Address Handling Requested]

Date: October 5, 2025

Title of Filing: *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief*

Attachment: Exhibit M — Proof of Caregiving Role (IHSS and Medical Records)

End of Cover Page — Attach IHSS documentation, medical letters, and supporting records immediately after this page.

John Doe

U.S. DISTRICT COURT – CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.: _____

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT N

Financial Statements and Receipts Demonstrating Hardship

(Filed in Support of Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief — California Southern University)

Plaintiff: John Doe (Participant, California Safe at Home Program)

Defendant: California Southern University

Purpose:

To provide financial documentation substantiating ongoing **economic hardship** resulting from CalSouthern University's ADA and §504 noncompliance, misrepresentation, and failure to secure an accessible practicum placement.

These records illustrate how the loss of licensure progress and denial of equal opportunity caused sustained financial strain on Plaintiff and his dependent relative.

Contents (Summary):

- **Lease and rent statements** showing \$3,995 monthly payment for residence accommodating Plaintiff's disabled aunt.
- **IHSS income records** (approx. \$800 monthly) and current savings balance under \$2,000.
- **Medical expense receipts** for treatment, prescriptions, and transportation costs related to caregiving duties.
- **Bank summaries** showing limited reserves and recurring expenses.
- **Transportation receipts or repair invoices** for vehicle used for medical transport.
- Declaration summarizing the financial impact and demonstrating need for injunctive relief.

Filed by: John Doe (Pro Se)

[Safe at Home — Confidential Address Handling Requested]

Date: October 5, 2025

Title of Filing: *Ex Parte Application for Temporary Relief*

Attachment: Exhibit N — Financial Statements and Receipts Demonstrating Hardship

End of Cover Page — Attach rent statements, IHSS income proof, medical/transportation receipts, and bank summaries immediately after this page.

John Doe