

MCCR Employment Discrimination Categories Analysis

On June 22nd, 2026, the Maryland Commission on Civil Rights (MCCR) published its brand new, beautiful framework for employment discrimination, which contains 35 possible categories. In celebration of this new framework, I am going to apply it to my case and rate its applicability using a scale from Does Not Apply (🚫 = 0) to 10 (★ = 1), with 10 being a perfect example of the category. Let's see if we can empirically validate it.

Note: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share-Alike 4.0 International License. To view this license, visit <https://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>. All for-profit use of this work has blanket approval. You can see more at TruthWrappedInMyth.com. This work has not been peer-reviewed, and it is not for peer-review.

Category 1 ♦ Hiring

Starting off right away with hiring is an elegant decision on the MCCR's part. It's also the perfect placement for one of my favorite quotes across the 18-month coordinated misconduct campaign. I met with my mentors [Brion Maher](#) and [Johannes Thrul](#) to discuss opportunities to stay at Johns Hopkins University because I loved being there so much for my first year. I *even* loved working with them. In that meeting, they revealed a new faculty position that opened in the Department of Mental Health ...and would you look at that, it was a perfect fit for my research program in implementation science.

Brion, Johannes, and [Nick Ialongo](#) (the search committee chair) were aware that I have the disabilities of ADHD and dysgraphia (specific learning disorder in written expression) because I discussed EPPP accommodations with Johannes. So, after they showed me the position, Brion recommended I set up a meeting with Nick *quickly*, and then Nick said I should apply *quickly* because they're already reviewing applications. So... it sent me spiraling through six days of misery trying to get this application in as fast as possible... but I did it. I submitted it.

Keep in mind, I had unprecedented academic accomplishments that I don't need to rehash here; I built a framework for my research program three months before Nora Volkow, the Director of the National Institute of Drug Abuse, published her [blog](#) on the same topic and direction. I aligned with the job description, almost as if it was written *just* for me.

So, I don't hear back about this job for five months. When I follow up, Nick tells me that they're still in the reviewing phase of the application process. I'm not... *quite* sure if Nick understood that this excuse made him look incompetent. So, I say okay, and then two more months go by, and I still don't hear anything *until* the day *after* I told Johannes I've joined the postdoc union leadership. Isn't that divine timing? Then, I see Nick himself in my inbox with a hand-crafted, Artisan rejection email *just* for my application... sent directly to me.

Given that I was an engaged and respectful trainee, I asked all three of them for feedback on my application. How can I improve it for the next application cycle? For some reason, no one ever responded to my request for feedback. So, I had Johannes complete a "supervision worksheet" with me in one of our usual one-on-one meetings, and you might be *stunned* to hear that he rated the alignment between me, the job posting, and Nora's blog as all 3/4 and 4/4 aligned. So, it makes you think: what could it have been that caused them to have such a *strange* and *bizarre* reaction to my job application?

Well... don't worry, because Johannes *did* tell us, in his exact own words. He said:

"Everyone knows you're qualified and have a lot of irons in the fire, so it comes down to strategy in the application process" and "Academic systems... are archaic and conservative, and if you want a job, you'll have to play by that system."

I didn't play along :/ We should just... stamp this quote as the defining description of my whole case.

Applicability: 8/10 – ★★★★★★★★

Category 2 ♦ Reasonable Accommodation

The answer to “Did they ever provide reasonable accommodation for my *actual* disabilities?” is no... nope. They inflamed them once as described above to serve their own needs, and as soon as it no longer served them, they forgot about them. So, the real story here is how were the accommodations for the false mental health “mania” narrative they pulled out of thin air for me? The answer is... *they sucked*.

Even if I did have Bipolar I Disorder (or, as they incorrectly referred to it, simply “mania,” and Johannes called it “manic ramblings,” because he did not know the correct term is “pressured speech”), the “accommodations” function as nothing more than tools of control. How do I know? Because I don’t actually have Bipolar I Disorder.

Anyway, about half they through they stopped trying to identify the mental illness they created for me and just started saying “based on your recent performance and our observation of your behavior” without noting ANY performance OR behavior. Isn’t that impressive? To be able to say so much without it meaning anything at all?

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 3 ♦ Religious Accommodation

This one doesn’t apply to me because I have no need for religious accommodations ...but what if I did? What if the “reason” for their coordinated misconduct campaign was because of my religion? What does that look like? It looks like religious *persecution*. Why would we treat mental health any differently? Yet... there is no Bipolar I Disorder, and there is no religion, so what is left? *Persecution*... and that’s what it felt like; that’s all I’m saying.

Applicability: 0/10 – Does Not Apply 🚫

Category 4 ♦ Wages

One of the most serious and consequential things Johns Hopkins University did to me was unmistakably when they retaliated by obstructing my completed RPPR and then telling me they “terminated” me while threatening me with legal action after [Gregory Kirk](#) fraudulently removed my *completed, compliant, federally funded* manuscript from OSF via a defamatory ethical complaint. **I lost all my income for seven months, my healthcare terminated, and the eviction notices started coming.** It was clear that all Johns Hopkins University wanted to do at this point, for some reason, was to inflict as much harm and suffering on me as possible, and so they did.

Applicability: 9/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 5 ♦ Benefits

This case has a *massive scale* and *scope*, which spans forged documentation, account lockout, policy fabrication, family harassment, false mental health narratives, hollow legal threats, sabotaging my income and healthcare, retaliatory stonewalling, and academic suppression all coordinated across at least a dozen individuals across departments and leadership levels for 18 months; that’s a *really big* scope. Not everything can make the cut.

So... yes, they *did* terminate my healthcare without notifying me, except the *one notice* they sent via snail mail a month after they terminated it without my knowledge. Yes... my case applies to this category, but destroying my healthcare was just one smaller aspect of a much larger, aggressive, and coordinated retaliation and discrimination pattern we observed in Johns Hopkins University. Let’s play this one conservatively.

Applicability: 6/10 – ★★★★★★★★

Category 6 ♦ Terms

This category is *genuinely* tricky because I’m not sure if it’s possible to see discrimination in terms when they never provided any terms at all, *ever*. They quite literally made them up as they went. It was *wild* to see, y’all.

They just do things and call it whatever they want with no forethought whatsoever beyond their immediate behavior. They fabricated policies such as “paid administrative leave,” “mandatory fitness-for-duty (FFD)

examinations for students,” and “termination”; none of these have *any* meaning at all; they never did. I was a student on *my own* fellowship funding. Hopkins was never my employer; they held my money and gave it to me. **They are best described as a piggy bank.** I was in good standing with the NIH *the entire time*, and I still am.

Not only could they not ever produce any policies across the 18 months, but they also never even had the right frame of reference. I’m sure they wanted me to be an at-will employee *desperately* at times... but I wasn’t, and so they just pretended I was an at-will employee and applied the most aggressive employment policies possible. Still, it’s possible they might *just* be that incompetent.

I mean... we have all seen Gregory Kirk’s email, so your guess is as good as mine.

Applicability: 8/10 – ★★★★★★★★

Category 7 ♦ Conditions

Johns Hopkins University has a beautiful campus. I think for most people, the conditions I was subjected to are unlike anything else we have ever seen. I mean... we truly watched the meltdown of the century. I question if my contribution to this category is even of value because... I can’t think of another case that has so many people across departments and leadership, for so long, doing so many severe and unjustified things, the same as what happened to me, so why bother even analyzing it? We know it fits; it’s obvious. Run down that list of misconduct... that was my environment for 18 months. They made *sure* it was, by coordinating it (poorly).

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 8 ♦ Privileges

We know that they sabotaged my healthcare, but this category is mostly about what they did *to my JHU institutional account*. First, they locked me out for no reason at all one random day. They never told me why they locked me out or restored access. Even their Information Technology (IT) never responded to my emails.

Still, if that wasn’t bad enough, after they locked me out, one day I sent an email to my JHU institutional account from another email account of mine, and what came back was... a bounce error message. Hmm... that’s strange. My JHU account should still be there. Immediate deletion of an entire institutional account is not standard practice, and certainly not so during active federal oversight investigations and pending legal pursuits.

Yet... according to all the metadata in that innocuous-seeming bounce message, my entire account was now missing – not redirected, not archived, nothing at all. The response from their internal server was “” literally nothing came back. This metadatum means that Hopkins deleted my entire institutional email account, and with it, my eRA Commons profile, all grant correspondence, federal data and manuscripts, payroll records, health benefits documentation, research files, paystubs, health records, and all compliance communications. Who knows what happened to all my credit hours over two years that the NIH paid for...

I bet if you asked them, they’ll deny ever knowing me... so, only time will tell what happened, and we’ll have to wait to see if they deleted it for sure... and by *time*, I mean *discovery*. We will find out there; *I’ll make sure of it*.

Applicability: 8/10 – ★★★★★★★★

Category 9 ♦ Promotion

You know the job application story by now. That faculty position was the only promotion I ever attempted because the first one caused *such an absolute meltdown* that I lost all interest in trying again completely.

Applicability: 5/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 10 ♦ Discipline

Let’s do an experiment for this category. We have snapshots of them enacting (or at least, trying to) disciplinary actions and mental health concerns. Mental health concerns shouldn’t sound like discipline, right? Let’s see:

Discipline (Prior to the Failed FFD Move)

“We are scheduling a 4pm mandatory meeting for you tomorrow. We have additional information we would like to share.” – Michael Ward, Former Dean of Students

“I am reaching out to request a meeting with you as soon as possible to discuss a recent personnel matter. Until the meeting is held, we ask that you not engage in any work-related or programmatic meetings.” – Carlina Carter, Administrative Assistant

Mental Health (During the Failed FFD Move)

“Please note the letter specifies you should not be performing work duties at this time, including interactions with students and others related to your work, and you also need to attend the appointment on Monday in order to maintain your employment with JHU.” – Valeria Colluta, Former Dean of Postdocs

“This email serves reiterates the request for you to attend a mandatory fitness for duty evaluation. As noted in an earlier communication, failure to attend this appointment may result in disciplinary action, including termination.” – Pamela Collins, Chair of the Department of Mental Health

As you can see, they’re the same thing. This is not what mental health treatments or accommodations look like. It’s shocking I even have to say that. These are the people YOUR tax dollars are funding, by the way.

What this means is that *all the actions* in this arc were illegitimate or unofficial attempts to discipline me. If I don’t actually have Bipolar I Disorder, which according to their own clinicians I don’t, then all discipline, poorly disguised as mental health treatments, is just that: **discipline**.

The ultimate, hypocritical irony that is Johns Hopkins University is that they never *actually* used any official or formal disciplinary actions on me. There are whole processes for trainee conflict with the NIH. They never used any of them. Even within Hopkins, I was never on probation, on warning, or anything. All the formal disciplinary actions wouldn’t work because I’m so *annoyingly composed* and *productive*, so they never used them.

Applicability: 9/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 11 ♦ Demotion

God, I am trying my best to fit my case to this gorgeous framework, but Hopkins’ behavior is often *so incoherent* that I don’t even know if it applies here. Let me attempt: I went from my own F32 postdoctoral fellowship to a “paid administrative leave,” which is a demotion because they revoked my ability to do everything but meet with them. They explicitly prohibited me from all research, all events, and all contact with all people. Yet, the whole thing was fabricated and never official; they never produced any policy or responded to any of my requests, so the demotion never actually counted.

Their strategy literally generates paradoxes 🤔 I’ll just rate both possibilities.

The Demotion Was Real: 8/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

The Demotion Was Not Real: 4/10 – ★★★★★

...and take the average:

Applicability: 6/10 – ★★★★★★★★

Category 12 ♦ Discharge

I’ve told you about their pretend leave and failed attempt to turn their retaliatory obstruction of my completed RPPR into a “termination,” but let me tell you about *their capitulation*. That’s how I was actually “discharged.”

In November 2025, I asked them for *ONE* of *TWELVE* policies/justifications from the HR Director and then the other about 10 people directly involved in their *abysmal* coordinated misconduct campaign. That ask was,

apparently, *so impossible* that they instead chose to unilaterally relinquish my F32 award (without my involvement or notice) instead of providing *a single* justification or policy, all in front of the NIH and OIG. Therefore, although I *was* unfairly discharged, it was nothing more than their capitulation.

Applicability: 9/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 13 ♦ Constructive Discharge

I submitted at least twelve documented protected disclosures across NIH, OIG, HR, and public channels over the 18 months and several undocumented ones to be revealed at a later date. Hopkins was aware of all twelve documented ones. My first protected disclosure was my *pre-legal settlement offer* olive branch 🌿 in May 2025. It was *immediately* met with aggressive HIPAA violations and harassment to me and my emergency contacts.

So, I made another, then another, then another, hoping that, maybe, *just maybe*, they'll realize that what they are doing to me and countless others is not a good thing and that they should self-correct. They never self-corrected, and the reason why is that *they're incapable of self-correction*; it's the only explanation at this point.

Every protected disclosure was met with escalating, aggressive, and egregious retaliation, even while I *never* retaliated back and tried to just get back to doing my F32 research and mentoring my roughly eight mentees: FFD and imaginary “paid administrative leave” after the NIH disclosure, forged LOA after the HR complaint, RPPR obstruction after the first OIG complaint, account lockout and family harassment after the second OIG complaint, academic suppression and legal threats after involving the NIH directly. **The pattern is unmistakable.**

Any reasonable person would not continue to subject themselves to conditions created by such unreasonable and reasonless institutional actors. I *absolutely* would have left because of these conditions and their incapacity to self-correct... had they not secretly unilaterally relinquished my F32 award before I *even* had the chance.

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 14 ♦ Reinstatement

Ah, yes, another paradox emerging from Hopkins' strategy. Listen... I was *trying* to be elegant because this MCCR framework is gorgeous, but their incoherence is forcing my hand... *sigh*...

They never offered me reinstatement. They never mentioned it. I attempted to return to work as usual after my pre-legal settlement offer, and Hopkins leadership launched a surprise mandatory, unspecified meeting with them and barred me from all work activities and contacts until we met without *any* policy or justification.

So, I met with leadership; nothing came from it as expected. They clearly had no plan; then, I tried to return to work. I show up to the next lab meeting, and I present my research agenda like I always do. Everything was fine. Then, three days later, out of nowhere, Hopkins leadership demanded that I complete an FFD exam without any justification. I *politely declined* pending their providing *any* legitimate documentation, policy, or justification.

I always set the bar *as low as possible* for them, and they still couldn't ever clear it. Instead of providing this documented justification, they fabricated a “paid administrative leave” to continue to obstruct me from my federally funded research. Here's where the paradox emerges.

After they failed to provide any legitimate reason for the FFD, they never offered me reinstatement for their “paid administrative leave.” However, they could *not* offer me reinstatement because they fabricated the leave policy; I was *always* in good standing with an active F32 award. The NIH and I ended on excellent terms.

I think the resolution for the paradox in this category involves playing along with their fantasy policies and procedures, because that's the framework they operated in, and hoped *so desperately* that I would too, so I will.

Verdict: They never offered me reinstatement.

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 15 ♦ Qualifications

Throughout this whole arc, one of the *defining characteristics* and *signatures* of Hopkins' strategies and communications was **absolute vagueness**, which allowed them to do whatever they want. That strategy worked well; it has for decades, but it has one little *chink* in its armor: **asking for a single specific justification or policy**.

So, when it comes to the qualifications of the faculty position that I applied for, the qualifications were essentially unspecified; it was just kind of a handful of bureaucratic, academic words strung together in sentences like much of what they produced in this arc, except this one was *actually* coherent, and it happened to align with my research program *uncannily* well. Almost... as if it was written *just* for me.

So, I spoke to my mentors; I spoke to the search committee chair. Everything is aligned; it's all good, right? I submit my application early due to their manufactured, discriminatory, false-pressure timeline, and hear nothing. Mind you, I didn't even want the job. I stopped wanting the job in December of 2024, which is why it took me five and seven months to follow up when I never heard back from them. Then, I did hear back the day after I revealed I was in postdoc union leadership via Nick's customized, Artisan rejection email.

I asked Brion, Johannes, and Nick for feedback; they all ignored it for as long as possible. Then, I asked Johannes to respond to my email in the middle of the lab meeting in front of everyone 🤔🤔🤔, and I think it kind of forced him to produce a reason that honestly, it was truly *so unintelligible* that I cannot even remember what it said.

As you know, I eventually got confirmation that I was aligned with the job, the Director of NIDA, and the qualifications for it. I went through the whole thing, only for Johannes to say the quiet part out loud when he thought no one was watching: that the *real* qualifications are playing along in an "archaic and conservative" system. Isn't that just *so pathetic*?

So, the interesting thing about this category is that, I think the MCCR assumes that there *are* preferred qualifications written down and that then the qualifications *move*. However, given Hopkins' *defining characteristic* and *signature move* of **absolute vagueness**, there were no qualifications listed for the position, other than having a PhD and doing research in implantation science.

However, the defining Johannes quote for this case was the actual goal post that shifted. It was not just their evasion. It was not just the deflection in Nick's personalized, Artisan rejection email (that was supposed to come from his administrative assistant, but it didn't because my application was not in the same pile).

The goalpost shifted *far away* from academic achievements and alignment, to performing the conservative traditions, or whatever it was Johannes was trying to say. Still.... even Johannes's quote is so vague that it's *truly* so hard to tell where the goalposts ever were. I don't even know if they knew. They never really acted like they had a plan or end goal across all 18 months. It was just one catastrophe after the other for no *apparent* reason.

What I will say, though, is that there were *two* identical positions available for this faculty application advertisement, which is already unusual. So, I'm just strolling along, seeing who they hired instead, and the answer is as damning as it is hilarious. They hired one person who, if you stack our CVs next to each other, it wasn't even a close call; most of his publications come from group efforts, big labs, the ones Hopkins loves where putting everyone's name on everything by default and contributing is optional if you're senior faculty.

So, in that sense, they *did* hire someone with fewer qualifications than me. Yet... the true nuclear detail is that *they did not hire two people*. They chose to hire one person and then not give me the other position.

They really looked at my application, looked at each other, and then said, "We would rather have *NO ONE* than Dr. Stone." They saw an empty chair... and then they saw me... and they all thought to themselves, "Oh thank God. The empty chair isn't threatening. Let's choose that one."

Applicability: 9/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 16 ♦ Testing (Adverse Impact)

You might assume that I'm going to say that this one is applicable because of their botched FFD exam move that failed spectacularly. However, to qualify for this category, according to the MCCR, the employee has to take the test, and then something bad happens to them based on the test findings. However, I never went to the FFD exam. Instead, I asked for a *single* policy, document, or justification for it, and it was *just far too much* for them to provide, so I just never went.

Still, the reason this category applies is because of Hopkins' *creativity* and *efficiency*. I did not have to take the FFD exam for there to be an adverse impact because Hopkins didn't need the test results to do what they wanted. Instead of waiting for the test results to justify their discriminatory punishment of me, they just... did it anyway: fabricated "paid administrative leave," "termination," RPPR obstruction, account lockout, family harassment, sabotaging my income and healthcare, all done without the test findings. They essentially said, "Fuck the test findings. Let's discriminate against him and punish him anyway *right now*," and so they did.

Applicability: 6/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 17 ♦ Testing (Disparate Treatment)

Even though the FFD never actually happened, I *did* participate in the testing process when I asked for documentation. They said I needed to do an FFD exam. I said, "Bet. Why?" and that's as far as I got in the process because, after that, they just started spiraling out of control. So, for adverse impact, there were no test results; however, I *did* participate in the testing process, so when it comes to desperate treatment, it's very clear what would've happened had I gone through with it like they wanted, so desperately, me to do.

...and the reason is that I was a *student* on my own *fellowship* who does not qualify for FFD exams. Also, there was *no mental illness*. They have never treated another student this way *because they can't*. I am probably the *only student* in Hopkins' history that they tried to make do an FFD. I sure hope so, at least, because if not, then there're bigger problems at Hopkins. I'm only going to speak about my case and let the OIG take care of the rest.

There was no mental illness. I did not qualify. They couldn't justify it. Then, they punished me without it anyway. The *only* logical conclusion is that the FFD was designed for me to justify their false mental health narrative. When the FFD failed, they discriminated against me anyway; that's why it's desperate treatment.

Applicability: 9/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 18 ♦ Training

This category isn't about the quality of my training, which *kind of sucked* because I was already doing everything on my own while my mentors watched, then tried to sabotage, but it is about *future* training opportunities.

The F32 award is a training grant. The purpose of the F32 award is to provide time to develop skills and publications before you apply for a faculty position and future NIH funding. One of the *tiny* details that has not made it into this story yet is that my F32 award application actually got a bad rating, probably for the same reasons that you're seeing everything else happen in this story, but the NIH overruled the reviewers and gave it to me anyway. The NIH wanted me trained at Hopkins with these people they trusted.

I was doing *just that* before their meltdown started, and I was trying to continue to do that, which is why I completed my RPPR myself. Usually, the institution takes care of the RPPR, but when I went to see what they were doing, they had fabricated this narrative that I had done nothing at all my first year. So, I completed it myself. I was supposed to do a second year of training. I applied for two; the NIH gave me two, and the only thing stopping me from completing that second year was Hopkins' retaliatory obstruction of my completed RPPR, then their unilateral relinquishment of the award, so the second year of training never happened.

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 19 ♦ Apprenticeship

Technically, the position I had was *not* an apprenticeship, but this category speaks to something crucial that the others don't cover – the dynamic between my F32 mentors and me. It was supposed to be an apprenticeship; that's the model that academia uses, whether through a formal F32 or not: you work with someone who's more established than you, they teach you how to do it, and then you go do it on your own.

I would say that Johannes and Brion *did* show me a few tips and tricks about academic publishing, networking, and funding. Like I said, I did learn quite a bit in my first year. However, I think the real value of the apprenticeship comes from all the lessons I learned from them about what *not* to do as a professional.

1. I learned that you should not send emails you cannot explain or justify later.
2. I learned that you should not try to make people go see your colleagues in a medical setting.
3. I learned that you should not suddenly vanish without a trace for over a year.
4. I learned that you should probably document everything because you never know who's going to snap.
5. I learned that you should not have leadership and other people fight for you when you tap out. I mean, it must be nice for them to watch Hopkins leadership try and fail to clean up the mess they started.
6. I learned that looking like a good mentor is not enough to be a good mentor.
7. I learned that some people's egos are very sensitive... like *very* sensitive.

Ultimately, I think the greatest lesson they ever taught me is: **don't pick fights with people who outmatch you.**

Applicability: 7/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 20 ♦ Job Classification

It's honestly so annoying to have to keep saying this repeatedly, but it is important. If you just look at my track record at the time of Hopkins' meltdown, I had 40+ publications, most of them first and solo author, in the top peer-reviewed substance use journals. I published in the top substance use journal three times as a solo author, all empirical, multiple samples; then I did it again with colleagues as the first author. I had over \$250K in internal and external funding. I was an editor on three peer-reviewed journal boards. I had 50+ conference presentations and 50+ posters. All of this happened before holding any faculty positions.

With the job classification category, the idea is that other people were given titles and salaries doing the same activities as me. The difference between what I was doing and what junior faculty would do in the position I applied for is essentially the same because I was operating at and above a junior-faculty level. There were no junior faculty publishing me. Johannes was a junior faculty member at the time, and I gave him an *Addiction* article that an *Addiction* editor commissioned me to write.

We've already been over the facts of the job application; it's clear that there was disparate treatment because it wasn't my qualifications or alignment. It was as if Johannes, as a junior faculty member, one who couldn't get a commissioned article by *Addiction* *quite* on his own, would turn around a handful of weeks later and tell me it was because academic systems are archaic and conservative. Apparently, me excelling was not archaic or conservative. These are the *same people* who praise scholarship outwardly to you, mind you.

Applicability: 7/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 21 ♦ Layoff

If Hopkins had the opportunity to lay me off, I am confident they would've done it as soon as possible. 🤔🤔🤔 Laying me off would've been *such* an easy solution to their 18-month catastrophe. Even though they treated me as an employee for the FFD, imaginary paid administrative leave, the "termination" they tried, they did not try to lay me off. It makes you wonder *why* they didn't try to lay me off, if they were treating me like an employee everywhere else. The reason is obvious: there is no process to lay me off because I was a student. They must have known that because now they're selectively using different employment mechanisms for me.

Oh, can you imagine the joy on their faces if they got the chance to write me a layoff letter? Oh, here is what it would probably say, using their *defining characteristic* and *signature move* of **absolute vagueness**:

“Dr. Stone, we are sorry to announce that, based on recent changes at the university
[WITHOUT NAMING ANY], we, unfortunately, must lay you off.”

Man... it must've been such a headache for them that I was a *student* on my own *fellowship* and not an at-will employee. Honestly, I'm kind of getting exasperated trying to figure out how to apply their botched, fabricated policies to this stunning framework. I feel like... **I need to apologize to the MCCR**. I'm really trying my best right now to work with what Hopkins gave me. Do we call the fabricated paid administrative leave a layoff or not? I'm going to be conservative here and say not, since they never actually use those words.

Applicability: 3/10 – ★★☆☆

Category 22 ♦ Recall

This category is supposed to be about being called back to work. It's true that Hopkins never recalled me back to work because the whole “paid administrative leave” was nothing more than their own egotistical fanfiction, so they couldn't. Yet... this category goes a little deeper than that. Not only did Hopkins *not* recall me, but if you look at what they *did* do, you'll see that they slowly pushed me away until I fell straight out of the university.

Instead of recalling me, or even trying to, they 1) obstructed my completed RPPR, blocking the second year of funds; 2) locked me out of the institutional account, so that I couldn't get back in; 3) unilaterally relinquished my F32 award, and so it was no longer with them; then 4) deleted my account, leaving no trace of me.

I am assuming the MCCR assumed that the employer *did* or *did not* recall someone back, but Hopkins, instead of providing a *single* justification, document, or policy, slowly ran away from the fire one by one, piece by piece, until recall was not even an option.

...and I honestly think that's just so creative of them. I've just never heard of something like that happening. Have you? Usually, the employee or person is given a reason, or a notice, or something; **all Hopkins did was tiptoe out of the room** until they were completely gone, and I was just left there standing with my F32 award.

Applicability: 8/10 – ★★★★★★

Category 23 ♦ Seniority

This category is harder for me to pin down because, throughout my time at Hopkins, especially towards the end, I wasn't *really* paying attention to my comparisons to the postdocs, undergrads, and graduate students around me. Sure... I kind of had it in mind, but I was mentoring so many towards the end and just focusing on them and their success. That's why I loved working with them so much, giving them first-author opportunities, doing research on whatever they wanted, all before it was derailed by Hopkins' meltdown.

So, when others succeeded around me, I felt like *I* was succeeding too. I loved celebrating them. I didn't really see them as competition. So, I honestly have a hard time recalling how seniority played a role because I just wasn't paying attention to how other people's seniority affected the treatment.

The other thing about this category is that the reason all they did all this to me was *not* because of seniority. Although when Hopkins started to lose control over themselves, I *was* the most senior, I think it's pretty clear that if I was mediocre, or average, or even *slightly* above average, but *not too much* above average, because they couldn't tolerate too much, my seniority would not have caused the meltdown that we are now seeing.

It really is **such a shame how many students' projects and mentorship got derailed** because Hopkins leadership just could not tolerate me getting back to work. I think it really shows what their priorities are, and student success does not appear to be one of them, at least not the primary one like they tell everyone.

Applicability: 4/10 – ★★★★★

Category 24 ♦ Tenure

Tenure was not an *official* part of this case, but that does not mean it's not relevant. It is relevant because the circumstances are not the focus of the discrimination as much as their behavior. Let's talk about that behavior.

The behavior across all these individuals serves one goal: to stop my career from progressing. That's why they did all of what they did; it was to either derail me or my progress. So, the point of the question is not "Did they deny me for tenure?" It's "Would they have denied me tenure if I was in that position?" The answer is obviously yes, but... I think that this category can go deeper than even that application.

If we look at the folks in this arc that *do* have tenure, we see a striking pattern emerge. We have Gregory, Brion, Nick, Valeria, Michael, and Pamela; all these people are tenured. You must also remember that a tenured faculty position is the most secure position possible in academia. I mean, they still need to get NIH funding, ...and good luck with that after this situation, but they won't lose their job for pretty much any reason, which is why they're still working there right now, even though some of them have been demoted out of leadership.

You would *think* that in a position so secure, where there's really nothing that can threaten you, these people would not be threatened by young professionals and budding talent. Yet, their behavior reveals that they are still unmistakably, deeply insecure, which is one of the primary drivers of their meltdown.

Therefore, tenure, according to their behaviors, must not be everything it is made out to be. You can have the most secure and robust position in all of academia and still be threatened by a postdoc who gets along with others and does good work. It is clear that *even tenure* cannot fill the void of genuine self-esteem and self-efficacy these individuals demonstrated. Think about how insecure you have to be for it to overpower all the actual external security features of your job, and it's the most possible in your industry; that's the true tragedy.

Applicability: 3/10 – ★★☆☆

Category 25 ♦ Retirement

Hopkins was faaarrrr too impatient to retaliate on my retirement. They saw my job application and thought "Ah hell naw" and proceeded to spiral out of control for the next 18 months. *If* they could have ruined my cherished, final days, they would have, because that's what they've done time and time again. It's who they are.

Applicability: 0/10 – Does Not Apply 🚫

Category 26 ♦ Harassment (Hostile Environment)

Hopkins created the most hostile work environment possible, and they tag-teamed it. I, personally, am far more occupied with important things in my life, like my work and values, but for them, this whole thing was a huge deal. They must have spent so much time trying to figure out how to deal with me. I know it doesn't look like it, given how belligerent and disorganized they were, but I truly believe that this was the best they could produce.

If you really look at the list of misconduct, the list endorsed by their HR Director, [Cynthia Payne](#), and later through silence, their General Counsel and President's Office via [Tiffany Wright](#), I think they were going for breaking pretty much every law they could in order to create an environment as hostile as imaginable.

...and so, this is the primary category of the whole meltdown. They teamed up with faculty, staff, leadership, HR, Student Well-Being, and the Office of Institutional Equity to create the most hostile environment imaginable: fostering work conflicts, burying my job applications, blackballing, oh, I haven't even told you about how I caught them blackballing me from CPDD through a likely coordination via Hopkins faculty and close Johannes collaborator [Kelly Dunn](#), president of CPDD; eh... it's in the documentation. You can just email me for it.

Then, there was terminating my healthcare, sabotaging my income, obstructing my RPPR, the make-believe paid administrative leave, FFD for students, and the fact that they spent \$400 sending the same FFD letter through the mail, snail mail, and FedEx overnight almost a dozen times instead of providing a single policy or justification.

The whole point was to create an environment as hostile as possible, and they *did* succeed in it. The environment Hopkins subjected me to repeatedly **without any accountability at all** is unlike anything I have ever heard. We have never seen such an environment. They turned the hostility up to 10 and passed it to 11 ...and so I will too.

Applicability: 11/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

Category 27 ♦ Harassment (Quid Pro Quo)

This category is, essentially, “do this thing and we will stop making your life miserable.” This category reveals just how absurd it was to interact with Hopkins over this 18-month meltdown. The best characterization is:

“Please let us discredit you. All we wanna do is discredit you. Can you just please let us discredit you with this false mental health narrative? That’s all we wanna do. C’mon... it doesn’t need to be a big deal. Please pleeeasseeeee just let us. Why won’t you let us? 🙄🙄”

That’s what it was like. 18 months. Different people. Different strategies. Always the same goal.

Do you know how annoying that was?

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

Category 28 ♦ Sexual Harassment (Hostile Environment)

Category 29 ♦ Sexual Harassment (Quid Pro Quo)

These employment discrimination categories are incredibly significant and valuable. They are not relevant to my case, but they are relevant to many.

Applicability: 0/10 – Does Not Apply 🚫

Category 30 ♦ Retaliation

So... now we get to what happens when I wouldn’t just let them discredit me. Have you ever seen like, I don’t know, a 2.5-year-old want something, and then you don’t give it to them, and then they throw a temper tantrum? They say all these crazy things. They make threats everyone knows mean nothing. They stomp their feet and act out. That’s basically *exactly* what happened at Hopkins when I wouldn’t accept the false mental health narrative, ableist discrimination they kept trying to force on me. That’s exactly what it felt like too.

In all seriousness, beyond the clear and obvious discrimination, this case built on retaliation after protective disclosures throughout the 18 months. I made at least 12 known protected disclosures. Most of these protected disclosures were for this exact discrimination.

So, the best way for me to describe it is like... hmm... it was like we were playing ping-pong ball. I would make a protective disclosure and pass the ball over to them. They would retaliate more aggressively and belligerently and pass it back to me. Then, I would make another protective disclosure and pass it back to them, and so forth, back and forth, for 18 months, until they eventually *capitulated* with a unilateral relinquishment.

They never sent the ball back to my side.

Applicability: 10/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

Category 31 ♦ Unfavorable Reference

Believe it or not, I keep Hopkins on my CV and résumé because I don’t care if anyone contacts them and asks them about me. I’m not afraid of what they would say about me because, I mean, have you heard their story? In those moments when they aren’t *evasively silent*, what they produce is *comically incoherent*. Also, I have everything documented 🤔🤔🤔 As I’ve said before, if someone contacts Hopkins about me, I’m confident they’re going to pretend I was never a student because they deleted my institutional account and I haven’t heard from most of them for over a year. Now... that doesn’t cover the unfavorable references they *tried* to do.

There were other unfavorable reference moments. For example, the false mental health narrative, which happened a bunch of times. There was an unfavorable reference when the mysterious, yet-to-be-identified-themselves-but-discovery-will Hopkins leader requested that the crisis support team break HIPAA repeatedly to harass me and my emergency contacts. It happened when Johannes tried to get me to go see his colleague and friend [Dean MacKinnon](#) at the School of Medicine for medical care.

It happened when the three Hopkins ringleaders made an unfavorable reference to Hopkins HR for the FFD; Unfavorable references were the name of their game. They were just really, *really* bad at them.

Another example of them being bad at unfavorable references was when Gregory defrauded OSF by defaming me about my ethical practices to get my *completed, compliant, federally funded* deliverable fraudulently removed from the platform. He never justified his actions, or provided a policy, or any documentation.

He stopped responding to me completely, actually... ya know, are we all sure that Gregory is okay? It would be kind of weird for him to just disappear like that, wouldn't it? Has anyone heard from Gregory? I think someone should check in on Gregory. Such a disappearance sounds like Avoidant Personality Disorder, doesn't it?

Applicability: 9/10 – ★★★★★★★★★★

Category 32 ♦ Advertising

Category 33 ♦ Reasonable Accommodation Discrimination in Pregnancy or Childbirth

Category 34 ♦ Genetic Testing

Category 35 ♦ Genetic Testing (Complainant Refusal)

The rest of these don't apply to my case at all, so let's just say they're *probably future directions* for Hopkins.

Applicability: 0/10 – Does Not Apply 🚫

Conclusion

As you are aware, this whole thing is just my opinion, and *of course*, it's all to the best of my knowledge. As you can see, there are so many events, so many people, happening for so long; it's *so much* to track, so this is what we're working with. Now, just because it's my opinion doesn't mean we can't do some data analysis here. I have this incredibly utilitarian MCCR framework, and now its empirical application, so let's see if it works, shall we?

Across all these ratings, we can transform them into numerical values, turn the "Does Not Apply 🚫" categories into zeros, and conduct a one-sample *t*-test to determine if the MCCR framework detected the discrimination in my case, and the probability that Hopkins discriminated against me. Let's run it and see what it says:

$$M = 6.09, SD = 3.91, 95\% CI [4.74, 7.43]$$
$$t(34) = 9.22, p < 0.00000000001, \text{Cohen's } d = 1.56$$

...and then we can compare it to only rating the discrimination that occurred, which was 27/35 (77%) categories.

$$M = 7.89, SD = 2.28, 95\% CI [6.99, 8.79]$$
$$t(26) = 18.01, p < 0.000000000000000222, \text{Cohen's } d = 3.47$$

Ah, yes. Just as expected. The statistical analysis suggests that the probability of Hopkins discriminating against me is essentially 100%, which is very consistent with my eyes and observations. For reference, we consider something a large effect at Cohen's *d* = 0.8. **The MCCR's brand-new framework now has empirical support.**

In conclusion, I used the MCCR's brand-new June 22nd, 2026, framework to analyze the Stone versus Johns Hopkins University, 2026 discrimination case. The evidence suggests that I was discriminated against, and it was a large effect... **and the story says the same thing, but you can feel it in your bones...**