

EXHIBIT B

No. 20-35582

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUN YU,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY,

Defendant-Appellee.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Idaho

No. 4:15-cv-00430-REB

Hon. Ronald E. Bush

**BRIEF OF NATIONAL LATINX PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, SOCIETY
OF INDIAN PSYCHOLOGISTS, ASSOCIATION OF BLACK PSYCHOLOGISTS,
AND ASIAN-AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF
APPELLANT JUN YU**

Lisa Hogan
Martha L. Fitzgerald
BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
SCHRECK, LLP
410 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2200
Denver, CO 80202
Telephone: (303) 223-1100

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Ninth Circuit Rule 26.1, counsel for National Latinx Psychological Association, Society of Indian Psychologists, Association of Black Psychologists, and Asian-American Psychological Association (collectively, “*Amici*”) hereby state that no party to this brief is a publicly held corporation, issues stock, or has a parent corporation.

Amici further state that neither party nor parties’ counsel authored this brief or contributed money to fund this brief’s preparation and submission. No entity other than the undersigned *Amici* funded the preparation and submission of this brief.

DATED this 16th day of December, 2020.

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER
SCHRECK, LLP

/s/ Lisa Hogan

Lisa Hogan, Esq.
Martha Fitzgerald, Esq.
410 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2200
Denver, CO 80202
Telephone: (303) 223-1100

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENTS OF INTEREST OF <i>AMICI</i>	3
ARGUMENT	4
I. UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, A PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM’S FAILURE TO FOLLOW ITS OWN PROCEDURE WHEN DISMISSING A STUDENT SHOULD PERMIT A STRONG INFERENCE OF DISCRIMINATION	4
A. A Professional Psychology Program’s Failure to Follow its Own Procedures when Dismissing a Student is a Violation of Psychologists’ Duty to Do No Harm.....	6
B. Under Title VI, Evidence of Pretext Is Crucial in a Student’s Claim of Intentional Discrimination.....	9
C. A Professional Psychology Program’s Failure to Follow Its Own Procedures when Dismissing a Student Demonstrates Pretext	11
1. Under Title VII discrimination cases, courts have used a company’s failure to follow its own policies as evidence of pretext	11
2. Psychologists contribute to the well-being of society and the success of psychologists begins with the understanding and application of the ethical standards that govern the psychology profession.....	12
3. Ambiguity in criteria and feedback creates higher chance of the presence of racial bias, and the district court failed to appreciate the evidence presented by Mr. Yu regarding ISU’s ambiguous feedback to him.....	14
CONCLUSION	20
APPENDIX	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Dartt v. Browning-Ferris Indus., Inc.</i> , 691 N.E.2d 526 (Mass.1998).....	11, 12
<i>Godwin v. Hunt Wesson, Inc.</i> , 150 F.3d 1217 (9th Cir. 1998)	10
<i>Gonzales v. Police Dept., City of San Jose, Cal.</i> , 901 F.2d 758 (9th Cir. 1990)	5, 11
<i>Jun Yu v. Idaho State University</i> , No. 4:15-CV-00430-REB, 2-ER-193	4, 4, 6
<i>Jun Yu v. Idaho State University</i> , No. 4:15-cv-00430-REB, 2019 WL 501457 (D. Idaho Feb. 8, 2019)	10
<i>Kouvchinov v. Parametric Tech. Corp.</i> , 537 F.3d 62 (1st Cir. 2008).....	11, 20
<i>McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green</i> , 411 U.S. 792 (1973).....	10
<i>Theidon v. Harvard Univ.</i> , 948 F.3d 477 (1st Cir. 2020).....	12, 13, 20
<i>Trustees of Health & Hosps. of City of Bos., Inc. v. Massachusetts Comm’n Against Discrimination</i> , 871 N.E.2d 444 (Mass. 2007).....	11
<i>United States Postal Services v. Aikens</i> , 460 U.S. 711 (1983).....	10
Statutes	
42 U.S.C. § 2000d.....	9
Ninth Circuit Rule 26.1	5

Civil Rights Act of 1964 Title VI4, 9, 10

Rule 29(b) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Circuit
Rule 29-B2

Other Authorities

A. Larson, Employment Discrimination §8.04, at 8-8112

American Psychological Association, *Accreditation Guidelines and
Principles*8

Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct4

Ethics Code at § 3.04(a)5

Ethics Code, at § 3.04(a), 5-ER-11356

*Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in
Professional Psychology*.....4

*The Legal Exosystem: Risk Management in Addressing Student
Competence Problems in Professional Psychology Training, 2*9

Psychology: Science in Action, Science of Psychology (2013).....13

STATEMENTS OF INTEREST OF *AMICI*

Amici consist of prominent psychology organizations across the United States. The professional development of a psychologist is realized through the progression of a professional psychology program, and adherence within such a program to the obligatory ethical standards promulgated by the American Psychological Association (the “APA”) cannot be overstated. *Amici* have an interest that colleagues who are faculty of professional psychology programs uphold ethical standards adopted by the APA. Those standards by their very nature are based upon protocols that ensure implicit bias is recognized and addressed in the educational and clinical setting, and in all cases in which implicit bias may be at work. Failure to observe protocols and standards which incorporate a recognition of implicit bias results in educational and clinical experience, which shortchanges student psychologists, whether or not they are ultimately permitted to practice psychology. Even worse, such failure impedes or even prevents capable students from entering the practice of psychology. The latter occurred in this case. *Amici* thus possess a strong interest in protecting historically marginalized groups from systemic institutional discrimination due to lack of recognition of the forces of implicit bias.

ARGUMENT

I. UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, A PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM'S FAILURE TO FOLLOW ITS OWN PROCEDURE WHEN DISMISSING A STUDENT SHOULD PERMIT A STRONG INFERENCE OF DISCRIMINATION.

Appellant Jun Yu has requested that the Court reverse the ruling of the district court and remand the case back to the district court, as the district court failed to consider the uncontroverted evidence before it. Specifically, Mr. Yu presented evidence and trial testimony demonstrating that Appellee Idaho State University (“ISU”) departed from accepted academic norms, and the ethical code that psychologists are bound to follow, when dismissing Mr. Yu from its psychology program by failing to: (1) put Mr. Yu on notice of the risk of termination for any alleged unsatisfactory performance; and (2) provide Mr. Yu with a formal plan of remediation. *See* Dr. Gerald P. Koocher’s¹ and Dr. Shannon Chavez-Korell’s trial testimony, *Jun Yu v. Idaho State University*, No. 4:15-CV-00430-REB, 2-ER-193 p. 2-184; 2-ER-206 p. 2-234. Such norms are not only included in the APA’s *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* (hereinafter “*Ethics Code*”) and its *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of*

¹ Dr. Koocher was a trial expert for Mr. Yu. Because Dr. Koocher’s credentials are outlined in the Appellant’s Opening Brief (“AOB”), *see* AOB at 19–20, *amici curiae* will not burden the Court by reiterating these credentials. Unless otherwise stated, this brief will do the same for Mr. Yu’s other expert witnesses mentioned throughout this brief.

Programs in Professional Psychology (hereinafter “*Accreditation Guidelines and Principles*”), but also included in ISU’s Clinical Student Handbook (the “Handbook”).² See 5-ER-1129—53; 5-ER-1154—87; 6-ER-1335—36.

ISU’s departure from these important norms violates a bedrock ethical principle that governs the psychology profession: the duty to do no harm. See *Ethics Code* at § 3.04(a); 5-ER-1135. This *amici curiae* brief is intended to help the Court appreciate, from the perspective of psychologists, the significance of ISU’s failure to follow accepted practices and norms that resulted in such extensive harm to Mr. Yu (*i.e.*, dismissal from ISU’s program). It is difficult to overstate the importance of following accepted academic norms and procedures when dismissing a student from a professional psychology program, especially when those norms are regularly followed with non-Chinese students. That such failure gives rise to a strong inference of pretext in any graduate program is almost axiomatic. But the failure in this context is much worse because it also constitutes a violation of the duty to do no harm in professional psychology. Mr. Yu presented uncontroverted expert testimony delineating ISU’s failure, and the trial court’s disregard for or misunderstanding of the proffered expert testimony on this point rises to the level of clear error, requiring reversal and remand. See, *e.g.*,

² According to ISU’s Handbook, “ISU was first accredited by the Committee on Accreditation (CoA) of the [APA] in May 2001. The program’s full accreditation status was reaffirmed in 2004 and 2011.” 6-ER-1310.

Gonzales v. Police Dept., City of San Jose, Cal., 901 F.2d 758, 759 (9th Cir. 1990) (concluding that the district court’s failure to consider a police department’s repeated violations of its own affirmative action procedures when promoting a police officer constituted clear error that warranted remand).

A. A Professional Psychology Program’s Failure to Follow its Own Procedures when Dismissing a Student is a Violation of Psychologists’ Duty to Do No Harm.

Psychologists in the United States, through their major professional organization, the APA, have adopted a set of ethical standards. These standards serve to affirm “the importance of clearly stated standards of ethical conduct that can provide [the APA’s] members with sufficient due notice of the ethical behaviors required and prohibited by the APA” CELIA B. FISHER, *DECODING THE ETHICS CODE: A PRACTICAL GUIDE FOR PSYCHOLOGISTS*, 9 (4TH ED. 2016). These ethical standards apply not only to the interactions between psychologists and patients, but also to the relationships between professional psychology programs and their students. *Id.* at 7.

Paramount among these ethical standards is the duty to do no harm, a principle that is axiomatic for psychologists to follow: “Psychologists take reasonable steps to avoid harming their clients/patients, *students*, supervisees, research participants, organizational clients, and others with whom they work, and to minimize harm where it is foreseeable and unavoidable.” *Ethics Code*, at

§ 3.04(a), 5-ER-1135. The duty to do no harm governs the way in which professional psychology professors are required to educate and interact with their students.

Particularly, when evaluating and/or remediating a psychology student's performance in a program, the duty to do no harm mandates the creation and application of standard procedures that supervisors must follow. Those procedures ensure that the programs provide regular feedback to students, as required by the APA. *Id.* at §7.06(a) (“In academic and supervisory relationships, psychologists establish a timely and specific process for providing feedback to students and supervisees.”). As mandated by the APA in its *Accreditation Guidelines and Principles*, at §III(A), Domain E (2013), this feedback should include:

- (a) Timely, written notification of all problems that have been noted and the opportunity to discuss them;
- (b) Guidance regarding steps to remediate all problems (if remediable); and
- (c) Substantive, written feedback on the extent to which corrective actions are or are not successful in addressing the issues of concern. 5-ER-1167-68.

In fact, the APA sets forth a template to provide psychology students with a formal remediation plan if they are falling below the competency standards.³ The purpose of a formal remediation plan is to give psychology students every opportunity to improve and to ensure some level of fairness by not subjecting students to the “ultimate sanction” of dismissal without an opportunity to remediate their shortcomings. *See also* Dr. Koocher’s trial testimony, 2-ER-191 pp. 2-175–2-176 (It is an accepted academic norm for students to be put on notice when they are facing academic challenges in a program: “Ideally, it should be communicated to the student in writing, a remedial plan should be put in place with a time frame, and there should be documentation of the student’s progress through and completion of the remedial plan.”).

The requisite feedback should start as early as the student’s admittance into a given psychology program, and the student should, on clear terms, know what is expected to maintain good standing in the program, as well as the procedures for dismissal. American Psychological Association, *Accreditation Guidelines and Principles*, at §III(A), Domain E (2013) (“At the time of admission, the program provides the students with written policies and procedures regarding program and institution requirements and expectations regarding students’ performance and continuance in the program and procedures for the termination of students.”); *see*

³ A word version of the APA’s remediation template is available at <https://www.apa.org/ed/graduate/competency-remediation-template.doc>.

also Nathalie Gilfoyle, *The Legal Exosystem: Risk Management in Addressing Student Competence Problems in Professional Psychology Training*, 2 TRAINING AND EDUC. IN PROF'L PSYCHOLOGY 202, 205 (2008) (explaining that “[a]n additional risk [of not following procedures for dismissal] is that different standards for different students (outside the sphere of reasonable accommodation for established disabilities, . . .) set up potential claims of discrimination or unfairness from other students who were held to the published standards or procedures.”).

B. Under Title VI, Evidence of Pretext Is Crucial in a Student’s Claim of Intentional Discrimination.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides that “[n]o person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” 42 U.S.C. § 2000d. Title VI is the primary legal mechanism that protects individuals in education programs or activities from discrimination based on race, national origin, or color. Thus, programs that receive federal financial assistance are covered by Title VI, and students enrolled in those programs are afforded protection from discrimination based on race, national origin, or color.

As the district court correctly concluded, the success of a student’s claim for intentional discrimination under Title VI is first analyzed under the framework established by the United States Supreme Court in *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792 (1973). *See Jun Yu v. Idaho State University*, No. 4:15-cv-00430-REB, 2019 WL 501457, at *1 (D. Idaho Feb. 8, 2019) (citing *Rashdan v. Geissberger*, 1182 (9th Cir. 2014) (holding that the *McDonnell Douglas* burden-shifting framework applies to Title VI disparate treatment claims)).

However, the Supreme Court of the United States made clear that the burden-shifting scheme articulated in *McDonnell-Douglas* falls away at the trial stage. *United States Postal Services v. Aikens*, 460 U.S. 711 (1983). Once the defendant “responds to the plaintiff’s proof by offering evidence of the reason for the plaintiff’s rejection, the fact finder must then decide whether the rejection was discriminatory within the meaning of Title VII. At this stage, the *McDonnell-Burdine* presumption ‘drops from the case.’” 460 U.S. at 714-715 (citing *Tex. Dep’t of Cmty. Affairs v. Burdine*, 450 U.S. 248, at 255, n. 10 (1981)).

A student can prove pretext “either directly by persuading the court that a discriminatory reason more likely motivated the employer or indirectly by showing that the employer’s proffered explanation is unworthy of credence.” *Godwin v. Hunt Wesson, Inc.*, 150 F.3d 1217, 1220 (9th Cir. 1998) (quoting *Burdine*, 450 U.S. at 256). Without direct evidence of discrimination, the student’s claim boils

down to whether the student can show that the program's stated reason for dismissal is pretext for unlawful discrimination. Here, Jun Yu and the expert psychologists who testified made clear that ISU's proffered reasons are unworthy of credence and the district court's strained interpretation of that testimony cannot stand.

C. A Professional Psychology Program's Failure to Follow Its Own Procedures when Dismissing a Student Demonstrates Pretext.

1. Under Title VII discrimination cases, courts have used a company's failure to follow its own policies as evidence of pretext.

In the context of Title VII employment discrimination claims, courts have consistently held that an employer's failure to follow its own procedures may demonstrate pretext. *See, e.g., Gonzales*, 901 F.2d at 760–71; *Kouvchinov v. Parametric Tech. Corp.*, 537 F.3d 62, 68 (1st Cir. 2008) (“We agree with the plaintiff that pretext can be demonstrated through a showing that an employer has deviated inexplicably from one of its standard business practices.”); *Trustees of Health & Hosps. of City of Bos., Inc. v. Massachusetts Comm’n Against Discrimination*, 871 N.E.2d 444, 453 (Mass. 2007) (“The fact finder readily could conclude that there was a discriminatory hierarchy in who would be spared from the layoff procedure, with white males at the top, women below them, and African–American women at the bottom.”); *Dartt v. Browning-Ferris Indus., Inc.*, 691 N.E.2d 526, 536 (Mass.1998) (“[E]vidence that BFI may have deviated from

its normal management procedures when it summarily terminated *Dartt* could support a reasonable inference that BFI had terminated *Dartt* because of his perceived handicap.”); *see also* A. Larson, *Employment Discrimination* §8.04, at 8-81 to 8-82 (rev. ed. 2015) (“[P]retext can be shown by demonstrating . . . irregularities in . . . the procedures for discharge.”).

The rationale behind this principle is simple: “[I]f an employer has a policy or procedure that governs a specific situation but fails to adhere to the same in taking an adverse employment action, then it might be inferred that the reason articulated for taking the adverse employment action against the employee was not true.” *Theidon v. Harvard Univ.*, 948 F.3d 477, 499 (1st Cir. 2020) (alterations omitted).

2. Psychologists contribute to the well-being of society and the success of psychologists begins with the understanding and application of the ethical standards that govern the psychology profession.

The applicability of the principle permitting a showing of pretext by a failure to follow institutional procedure is even more compelling when assessing allegations of pretext within the field of psychology. Psychologists have their own framework for training future psychologists, which must be followed under the APA’s guidelines. Deviations from these guidelines, without clear justification, should serve as particularly strong evidence of pretext in the clinical/academic

sphere, even more so than in the context of employment discrimination actions. *Theidon*, 948 F.3d at 499 (explaining the rationale behind this legal principle).

The field of psychology is a multifaceted discipline focusing on the human mind and behavior. American Psychological Association, *Psychology: Science in Action*, Science of Psychology (2013), <https://www.apa.org/action/science>. “Using empirical methods, psychologists . . . collect and interpret data to better understand and solve some of society’s most challenging problems.” *Id.* According to the APA, “[i]t’s difficult, if not impossible, to think of a facet of life where psychology is not involved.” *Id.* Needless to say, psychologists play a vital role in our society, and their success starts with the integrity of the program in which psychology students are enrolled.

Program administrators and faculty know or should know the importance of following procedures when evaluating and/or remediating a student’s performance in a program. Indeed, ISU acknowledges the importance of adhering to the ethical responsibilities required by psychologists. *See* ISU’s Handbook, 6-ER-1338 (“Developing an attitude consistent with ethical responsibilities is an important quality of a professional psychologist.”); *see also id.* (“Students in the clinical training program at ISU adhere to the [*Ethics Code*] published by the APA, June 2003”). And, ISU has followed the aforementioned procedures with other non-

Chinese students in its program by implementing formal plans of remediation. *See e.g.*, Student 37's formal Plan of Remediation provided by ISU, 5-ER-1270–72.

Accordingly, following the APA's ethical principles is tantamount to preserving integrity within the psychological profession. This is especially true within the context of graduate programs, in which students are learning to be responsible psychologists who will in turn learn how to ethically treat other psychologists and their patients. FISHER, *supra* at 7; REBECCA A. SCHWARTZ-METTE, CHALLENGES IN ADDRESSING GRADUATE STUDENT IMPAIRMENT IN ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMS, 1 (2009) (“[G]raduate training is the first major stage of professional development for psychologists. . .”).

3. Ambiguity in criteria and feedback creates a higher chance of the presence of racial bias, and the district court failed to appreciate the evidence presented by Mr. Yu regarding ISU's ambiguous feedback to him.

The record in this case is replete with examples detailing ISU's deviation from its own standards, as well as the standards that it must follow to comply with the APA's *Ethics Code*. *See* Dr. Koocher's trial testimony, 2-ER-191 pp. 2-175–2-176 (noting that, “[t]here were a number of instances in which Mr. Yu was not put on notice, where a written remedial plan was not provided, or when there was no follow-up on any remedial plan.”); Dr. Shannon Chavez-Korell's trial testimony, 2-ER-205 p. 2-231 (testifying that, “. . .when I look across these missed

opportunities, that is one of the trends is that, you know, not only the cultural incompetence but the lack of formal, appropriate remediation”).

Yet, the district court did not make the connection between violations of psychologists’ code of ethics and accreditation standards and the invidious racial bias that necessarily permeates the actions taken in violation of those standards—let alone appreciate that such violations are strong evidence of pretext. In short, both the code of ethics and the accreditation standards promulgated by the APA are **designed** to thwart racial bias. As such, violations of the code of ethics and accreditation standards should be considered persuasive and weighty evidence of pretext in dismissing a psychology graduate student.

To reiterate, the APA code of ethics exists to provide a mechanism whereby psychologists can govern and regulate themselves. Importantly, as noted above, the code of ethics mandates that psychologists: (1) do no harm, and (2) provide regular feedback to graduate students.

The relevant professional guidelines that govern accreditation of psychology programs in the United States also explicitly lay out standards for providing feedback to diverse students. *See American Psychological Association, supra* at §III(A), Domain E (explaining that psychology programs must show “respect for cultural and individual diversity among their students by treating them in accord with the principles contained” within the guidelines), 5-ER-1168. Specifically, the

accreditation guidelines state that the program must engage “in actions that indicate respect for and understanding of cultural and individual diversity[,]” have “nondiscriminatory policies and operating conditions,” and “**avoid[] any actions** that would restrict program access or **completion** on grounds that are irrelevant to success in graduate training or the profession.” *Id.* at Domain A 5-ER-1163 (emphasis added). Thus, both the feedback requirements mandated by the ethical guidelines, and the diversity requirements and goals outlined in the accreditation standards work in tandem to combat aversive racism.

Without these standards and goals, ambiguity would surely arise, thereby creating circumstances that are ripe for aversive racism to occur. Indeed, as Dr. Leslie W. Zorwick noted in her expert testimony, when there is a lack of clear criteria for faculty and students to follow, it increases the chances that aversive racism will be expressed. Dr. Zorwick’s trial testimony, 2-ER-215 pp. 2-273–2-274. Specifically, Dr. Zorwick testified that there are five characteristic hallmarks that tend to present in the case of aversive racism, one of which is “the presence of lots of ambiguity surrounding decision making.” *Id.* at 2-ER-213 p. 2-265. Dr. Zorwick went on to explain that “if someone’s in a position where making a choice will clearly make them look prejudiced, they won’t make that choice. But if there’s ambiguity, it tends to invite racial bias to influence decision-making a little

bit more.” *Id.* So, “the more ambiguity there is, the more likely we are to see aversive racism.” *Id.*

Dr. Zorwick testified that Mr. Yu experienced intentional aversive racism in the ever-shifting standards that he had to meet for his English proficiency. *Id.* at 2-ER-215–16. These shifting standards as to Mr. Yu’s English proficiency are outlined in the Opening Brief and need not be repeated again at length here. AOB at 35–36. Suffice it to say, Mr. Yu received inconsistent feedback throughout his time in the psychology program. *See id.*; *see also* Dr. Zorwick’s trial testimony, 2-ER-215–16.

If ISU had provided consistent feedback and methods for improvement to Mr. Yu, consistent with the ethics code and accreditation standards, then he would not have been blind-sided and could have been more focused on the areas noted. Instead, ISU opted to provide inconsistent feedback and then dismissed Mr. Yu from the program, even though the faculty at ISU had stated that he was meeting expectations as to his English proficiency. This alone should raise a red flag for the Court. To be sure, ISU deviated from the accreditation standards by which it must abide, and the faculty violated their ethical duties as psychologists by failing to provide consistent feedback to Mr. Yu. Such deviations gave rise to the ability of aversive racism to rear its head and perhaps even fostered the existence of the aversive racism that permeated the decision to remove Mr. Yu from the program.

Consequently, such deviations from these requirements act as strong evidence to support a finding of pretext in the dismissal of Mr. Yu. ISU did not follow the standards by which it is bound; therefore, its post hoc rationalization of Mr. Yu's dismissal should not be given credence by this Court.

When evaluating Dr. Zorwick's testimony, the district court made several erroneous conclusions. First, it found that Dr. Zorwick "did not say what ISU should have done differently so as to avoid engaging in aversive racism." District Court's Trial Decision, With Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, 1-ER-56. But this finding misses the thrust of Dr. Zorwick's testimony. Dr. Zorwick did testify that there should have been consistent feedback to Mr. Yu regarding how his English proficiency could be improved.

Moreover, the district court mischaracterized Dr. Zorwick's testimony with regard to the intentionality of aversive racism. Indeed, the district court found that Dr. Zorwick testimony indicated that aversive racism shares a "common thread" with unconscious or implicit bias: "a lack of awareness on the part of the person who carries such an unconscious bias" *Id.* at 1-ER-58. The court then concluded that the aversive racism ISU exhibited toward Mr. Yu did "not rise to the level of intentionality." *Id.* at 1-ER-59. This characterization of Dr. Zorwick's testimony also misses the mark.

While Dr. Zorwick acknowledged that the literature on aversive racism will sometimes describe race-based attitudes as implicit or unconscious, she explicitly stated that such descriptions “connote the wrong thing to people.” Dr. Zorwick’s trial testimony, 2-ER-213 p. 2-262. She went on to testify that “it’s not that we could never be aware of these attitudes we have about race. Rather, we have to be paying attention and asking ourselves questions to understand why we are having the reactions we have.” *Id.* at pp. 2-262 and 2-263. Ultimately, in providing her expert opinion on ISU’s treatment of Mr. Yu, Dr. Zorwick testified that “Mr. Yu’s race and international status impacted the way he was treated by the faculty” at ISU, which occurred “through a pattern of intentional repeated choices made by those faculty.” *Id.* at 2-ER-215 p. 2-273. And “some of these [faculty] decisions” that displayed the hallmarks of aversive racism, Dr. Zorwick testified, “deviate[d] from professional norms.” *Id.* Thus, Dr. Zorwick made clear in her testimony that ISU faculty’s deviations from the standards and procedures by which psychologists are bound were a product of intentional aversive racism toward Mr. Yu.

In sum, psychologists hold themselves to a high standard—they should do no harm, foster cultural inclusivity, communicate clear standards to the students, and seek to ensure that people of all backgrounds are provided the tools that they need to successfully complete graduate programs in the field. This is mandated by the ethics code, and by the accreditation standards, and dismissals that result from

deviations from these standards should be automatically suspect. *See, e.g., Theidon*, 948 F.3d at 499; *Earl*, 658 F.3d at 1117; *Kouvchinov*, 537 F.3d at 68.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the district court committed clear error by disregarding and misconstruing the undisputed expert testimony presented by Mr. Yu. Contrary to the district court's erroneous conclusion, this expert testimony established that ISU's departure from accepted academic norms and the ethics code that psychologists are bound to follow permits a strong inference of discrimination. Because the district court committed clear error, *Amici* respectfully request that this Court reverse the ruling and remand this matter back to the district court.

DATED this 16th day of December, 2020.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Lisa Hogan

Lisa Hogan, Esq.

Martha Fitzgerald, Esq.

Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP

410 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2200

Denver, CO 80202

Telephone: (303) 223-1100

Counsel for Amici Curiae

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

Form 8. Certificate of Compliance for Briefs

Instructions for this form: <http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/form08instructions.pdf>

9th Cir. Case Number(s) 20-35582

I am the attorney or self-represented party.

This brief contains 3,935 words, excluding the items exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f). The brief's type size and typeface comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and (6).

I certify that this brief (*select only one*):

complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 32-1.

is a **cross-appeal** brief and complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 28.1-1.

is an **amicus** brief and complies with the word limit of Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5), Cir. R. 29-2(c)(2), or Cir. R. 29-2(c)(3).

is for a **death penalty** case and complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 32-4.

complies with the longer length limit permitted by Cir. R. 32-2(b) because (*select only one*):

it is a joint brief submitted by separately represented parties;

a party or parties are filing a single brief in response to multiple briefs; or

a party or parties are filing a single brief in response to a longer joint brief.

complies with the length limit designated by court order dated _____.

is accompanied by a motion to file a longer brief pursuant to Cir. R. 32-2(a).

Signature /s/ *Lisa Hogan*

Date **December 18, 2020**

APPENDIX

List of Amici Curiae

The **National Latinx Psychological Association** (“NLPA”), which formally reorganized in 2002, is a national organization of mental health professionals, academics, researchers, and students whose objective is to generate and advance psychological knowledge and foster its effective application for the benefit of the Latinx population. Its members’ goal is to see a physical, psychological, and social environment for Latinxs in the USA that reflect the ideals of respect for mental health, dignity, and human and civil rights. NLPA, which has been actively involved in responding to various injustices perpetrated against the Latinx community, is committed to the fair and equitable treatment of all individuals, and as such is swift to speak out against any and all actions taken against those whose voices go unheard.

The **Society of Indian Psychologists** (“SIP”) is an organization for Native American Indigenous people advocating for the mental well-being of Native peoples by increasing the knowledge and awareness of issues impacting Native mental health. SIP’s primary goal is to come together as Native psychologists who work in support of professionals, researchers, graduate students, and undergraduate students. SIP recognizes the diversity and worth of all individuals and groups, and stands in opposition to discrimination based on factors including race, color and national origin.

The **Association of Black Psychologists** (“ABPsi”) was founded in 1968 by several black psychologists and psychology graduate students from across the country. They united to actively address the serious problems facing black psychologists and the larger black community. The ABPsi is organized to promote and advance the profession of African psychology, influence, and effect social change, and develop programs whereby black psychologists can assist in solving problems of black communities and other ethnic groups. The ABPsi has grown from a handful of concerned professionals into an independent organization of over 1,400 members. As the first ethnic psychological association in the USA, the ABPsi has been a pioneer in the psychology field in terms of cultural competence, including social justice and racial/ethnic identity.

The **Asian-American Psychological Association** (“AAPA”), founded in December 1972 by a group of Asian-American psychologists and other mental health professionals, is vitally interested in Asian-American psychology and mental health issues, in the training and education of Asian-American mental health professionals, and in collaborating and networking with peers. Today, the AAPA has over 600 members who are psychologists, psychology students, master’s-level practitioners and others interested in Asian-American research and practice. Since its inception, the AAPA has advocated on behalf of Asian Americans as well as advancing Asian American psychology. The AAPA leads and guides other professional organizations on Asian American psychology and is in the forefront of the multicultural psychology movement.