

From: [Skyler Johnson](#)
To: [Office of the Assemblies](#)
Cc: [Committee for Campus-Constituency-Elected Trustees](#)
Subject: Re: Notification of Challenge
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2026 1:14:52 PM

Dear Office of the Assemblies and Committee Members,

I object to treating Kimberly McMillian's September 24 filing as a new, independent challenge. It identifies no additional campaign communication or conduct beyond the September 11 email already challenged by Rachel Davis. Its central argument is a disagreement with my September 15 response. I ask the Committee to decline to treat this duplicative filing as a separate challenge, or to consider its arguments within the existing challenge while applying Section VIII's filing and response requirements. The purpose of a challenge within the rules is to report potential violations of conduct, not to give other candidates a chance to respond to previous allegations.

The recipient's possible ineligibility is also already in the record: Ms. Davis's original challenge described him as a postdoctoral fellow who could not vote. When I identified him, his publicly accessible Cornell CALS profile described him as a PhD student; it still does. I did not know that designation might be stale. A mistaken understanding of his eligibility does not establish that I used a prohibited list or distribution channel. I once again reaffirm that I did not, and that this email was to an individually identified recipient through publicly available information.

I did not use contact information collected from nomination petitions. The Committee's guidance about petition signers addressed information supplied for signature verification. Sections V(9) and V(10) do not state that a candidate must have a prior relationship with each recipient or that the substance of each email be different or unique. My earlier reference to the Committee's guidance on campaign timing was evidence of my good-faith understanding, not a claim of express approval of every outreach method.

I ask the Committee to decide the pending challenge on the documented conduct and the Procedures, rather than treat a rebuttal to my response as a new, independent challenge.

Respectfully,

On Thu, Sep 24, 2026 at 12:11 PM Office of the Assemblies <assembly@cornell.edu> wrote:

Dear Skyler –

A second challenge against you has been filed in the Office of Assemblies. A copy of the challenge and any supporting documents are attached to this email and posted to the Student-Elected Trustee election [website](#). Pursuant to the [Student- and Employee-Elected Trustee Procedures](#), Section VIII, Subsection 7, a challenged candidate, "shall have 24 hours from receipt of the challenge to submit a response to the OA in writing."

As such, please be notified that your response to this challenge must be received as a “reply-all” to this email by Friday, September 25, 2026, at 12:15 p.m. The Committee for Campus-Constituency-Elected Trustees will accept only one response.

Thank you,

Jessica

Jessica Withers (she/her)

Director, Office of the Assemblies

Cornell University

109 Day Hall

[144 Feeney Way](#)

[Ithaca, NY 14853](#)

[607-255-8045](#)

<https://assembly.cornell.edu/>

--

Skyler Johnson

J.D. Candidate, Class of 2028 | *Cornell Law School*

Vice President, *Cornell Law Student Association*

SQJ2@cornell.edu | (631) 478-3681 | [Linkedin](#)

This message may pertain to legal representation and contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message and any attachments without retaining a copy.