ASABE Arkansas Section Annual Meeting 2026 Agenda

Venue: Don Tyson Building, University of Arkansas
Address: 1371 W Altheimer Dr, Fayetteville, AR 72704
Date: October 2, 2026

8:00 – 9:00 Check-in, Breakfast, and Networking

9:00 – 9:30 Welcome and Introductions

- ***Dr. Benjamin Runkle,*** *ASABE AR Section President*
- ***Dr. Terry Howell,*** *Department Head, Biological & Agricultural Engineering, Univ of Arkansas*

9:30 – 10:45 New Faculty Voices from Biological & Agricultural Engineering, Univ of Arkansas
(Moderated By: Dr. Kaushik Luthra, ASABE AR Section Vice-President)

- ***Dr. Diana Vanegas****: Advancing Biosensors for Environmental and Agricultural Applications: Research, Teaching, and Program Development at the University of Arkansas*
- ***Dr. Eric McLamore:*** *Biosensors for data-driven decision support*
- ***Dr. Kendrick Hardaway:*** *Evaluating tradeoffs of emerging technology for agricultural, environmental, and infrastructure systems*

10:45 – 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:00 Poster Session (Appendix A for poster titles, Appendix B for Poster Competition Rubric and Voting Guidelines)

12:00 – 12:30 Lunch Break

12:30 – 13:00 ASABE AR Section Annual Business Meeting & Awards Presentation
(Moderated By: Dr. Kaushik Luthra, ASABE AR Section Vice-President)

13:00 – 14:00 Engineering the Future of Agriculture: Panel Session with Department Heads
(Moderated By: Dr. Terry Howell, Department Head, Biological & Agricultural Engineering)

- ***Dr. Mary Savin,*** *Department Head, Horticulture, University of Arkansas*
- ***Dr. Lanier Nalley,*** *Department Head, Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness, University of Arkansas*
- ***Dr. Craig Bacon,*** *Department Head, Food Science, University of Arkansas*

14:00 – Adjourn

Appendix A: Poster List

Index	Name	Title
G1	Kabi Raj Khatiwada	Unlocking the complexities of greenhouse gas sources and sinks in forested wetlands
G2	Taiwo Osoko	Measuring GHGs in Arkansas Rice Fields: effects of different water management practices and soil texture gradient
G3	Josiah Ojeniran	Experimental and CFD Modeling of Ozone Transport in a Deep Grain Bed
G4	Sofia Solis Naranjo	Drivers of diurnal variability in methane emissions in Flooded Rice Fields of Arkansas.
G5	Utshah Manandhar	Ozone Treatment for Enhancing Seed and Grain Quality During Post-Harvest Storage.
G6	Parvej Hasan Jon	Degradation and mineralization of glyphosate and its metabolites using cold plasma technology
G7	Parvej Hasan Jon	Enhancing the mechanical and barrier properties of starch: PVP film using plasma-activated water as a fabricating solvent.
G8	Md Kashem Ali Tahsan	Improving Protein Separation Efficiency in Triboelectric Systems by Modulating the Surface Charge of Rice Protein
G9	Fatemeh Taghvaei	Environmental Impacts of U.S. Dairy Goat Milk Production and Diet-Based Mitigation: A Life Cycle Assessment
G10	Avisekh Tripathy	Development of a Low-Cost Handheld Spectral Sensor for Non-Destructive Fruit Quality Assessment.
G11	Olumide Olubiyo	Enzymatic Liquefaction of Rice Kernels for Sustainable Mycoprotein Production via *Neurospora crassa* Fermentation
G12	Amirreza Devar	GRIPS: Grasping and Release with Imitation Policies in Simulation Toward Sim-to-Real Imitation Learning for Contact-Rich Manipulation of Deformable Objects
U1	Lacandyce O. Lee	Assessing the Impact of Cover Crop (Winter Wheat) on Soil Moisture And Agro-Hydrology
U2	Kylie Rhodes	How Water Application Method Would Affect Soybean Yield And Crop Water Productivity: A Comparison of Furrow and Surface Drip Irrigation (SDI) Method
U3	Charles Boyd	Flooding and Climate Resilience in Desha County, Arkansas: Understanding our Changing Landscape and Protecting our Shared Home
U4	Andre Shelby	Development of a Multi-Ion Selective Electrode Configuration Array (M-ISE CA) for the purposes of ionic activity in solution - for implementations in Agriculture, Industrial, Environmental, and Civilian water quality purposes.

Appendix B: ASABE Arkansas Section Poster Competition Rubric and Voting Guidelines

1. Competition Categories

Posters will be evaluated in two separate categories:

A. Undergraduate Student Posters
B. Graduate Student Posters

First-, second-, and third-place winners will be selected in each category.

Non-students (e.g. technicians, postdocs, industry professionals) are welcome to bring posters but will not be evaluated or considered eligible for awards.

2. Awards

Placement	Undergraduate	Graduate
First Place	$100	$100
Second Place	$75	$75
Third Place	$50	$50

3. Eligible Voters

All participants except undergraduate and graduate student presenters.

4. Voting Procedure

Each eligible voter will receive two sticky notes of different colors during registration:

- One color designated for undergraduate posters
- One color designated for graduate posters

Voters should:

1. Review the posters and, when possible, speak with the presenters.
2. Evaluate each poster using the rubric below.
3. Write the number of **one** selected undergraduate poster on the sticky note designated for the undergraduate category.
4. Write the number of **one** selected graduate poster on the sticky note designated for the graduate category.
5. Use each sticky note only for its designated category.

Sticky notes may not be transferred to another voter or changed after they have been submitted.

5. Poster Evaluation Rubric

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement
Importance and Objectives	Clearly explains the problem, its relevance to agricultural and	The problem and objectives are understandable, but	The problem, significance, or

	biological engineering, and specific project objectives.	their importance or scope could be clearer.	objectives are difficult to identify.
Technical or Scientific Quality	Uses appropriate methods; presents sound analysis or design; and supports conclusions with convincing evidence.	Methods and findings are generally appropriate, with minor gaps in explanation or evidence.	Methods, analysis, or conclusions contain substantial gaps or are not adequately supported.
Results, Conclusions, and Impact	Results are clearly presented; conclusions follow from the work; and potential applications or impacts are meaningful.	Results and conclusions are understandable, but the practical significance or supporting evidence is limited.	Results are unclear, conclusions are unsupported, or potential impact is not explained.
Poster Organization and Visual Quality	The poster is attractive, readable, logically organized, and uses figures, tables, and text effectively.	The poster is generally clear but has minor issues with readability, organization, or visual balance.	The poster is difficult to follow because of excessive text, small print, weak organization, or unclear graphics.
Oral Presentation and Responses	The presenter explains the work clearly, concisely, and confidently and answers questions accurately.	The presenter communicates the main ideas but occasionally lacks clarity, detail, or confidence.	The explanation is difficult to follow, or the presenter cannot adequately address questions about the work.
Creative Use of Prototypes, or Demonstrations	When appropriate, creatively and effectively uses prototypes, physical models, or demonstrations to strengthen understanding and engagement.	Uses supporting materials or demonstrations appropriately, but their contribution to the presentation is limited or could be better integrated.	Supporting materials or demonstrations, when relevant, are unclear, ineffective, distracting, or not meaningfully connected to the project.

The rubric should guide each voter's overall judgment. No numerical score needs to be submitted.

6. Determination of Winners

After voting closes, competition officials will count the valid stickers received by each poster within its category.

- The poster receiving the most votes will receive first place.
- The poster receiving the second-highest number of votes will receive second place.

- The poster receiving the third-highest number of votes will receive third place.
- If two or more posters receive the same number of votes, they will share the same placement and each will receive the corresponding award amount. No additional tie-breaking evaluation will be conducted. For example, if two posters tie for second place, both will be recognized as second-place winners, and each will receive the $75 second-place award. In this situation, no third-place award will be presented

7. Voting Integrity

Competition officials may invalidate votes that:

- Are submitted on the wrong colored sticky note for the student category
- Include more than one poster number on a sticky note
- Exceed the permitted number of votes from one voter
- Are submitted after the announced voting deadline
- Are illegible or otherwise violate the competition rules

Decisions by competition officials regarding vote validity and final placement are final.