



Developing a Short-Term, Experiential Learning Curriculum to Foster Social Engineer Skills in University Students: A Case Study from MubanChomBuengRajabhat University

^{1,*}Noppadol Thumchuea, ²Anurak Thanyacharoen, ³Nongrat Issaro,
⁴Peangporn Banyaphad

¹Faculty of Education, MubanChomBuengRajabhat University, Ratchaburi, Thailand

²Faculty of Science and Technology, MubanChomBuengRajabhat University, Ratchaburi, Thailand

³Department of Climate Change and Environment, Bangkok, Thailand

⁴Kanchanatchaburi, Thailand

Email: ¹tay_math@hotmail.com, ²anuraktha@mcr.u.ac.th, ³fon.nongrat@gmail.com, ⁴pengpornban@mcr.u.ac.th,

*Corresponding Author: Noppadol Thumchuea (Email: Tay_math@hotmail.com)

Abstract- This study aimed to develop a short-term curriculum designed to enhance four fundamental student attributes: (1) a constructive attitude toward the nation and society, (2) moral integrity and ethical reasoning, (3) employability through diligence, perseverance, and professional competence, and (4) responsible citizenship. The curriculum was structured around four core social engineering competencies—critical and creative thinking, effective communication, collaboration, and innovation. A qualitative research approach was employed to examine the needs, principles, and strategies for curriculum development among stakeholders engaged in social engineering education across 38 Rajabhat Universities in Thailand. Based on the findings, a draft curriculum was developed, reviewed by seven experts, refined according to their recommendations, and subsequently implemented with a cohort of 100 students. The curriculum's quality, effectiveness, and practicality were systematically evaluated. The finalized program comprises six modules totaling 18 hours: (1) Breaking the Ice—fostering trust and shared goals; (2) Heavenly Tools—applying analytical methods to address social issues; (3) Life Clock Management—enhancing reflective questioning and time awareness; (4) Development Timeline—analyzing the historical dimensions of problems; (5) Process Timeline—planning through the 4M framework (Man, Money, Materials, Management); and (6) M.I.C. Model Application—employing creative problem-solving strategies for social development. The study successfully established a structured, practical, and contextually relevant curriculum that promotes students' social engineering competencies while reinforcing ethical awareness, innovation, and civic responsibility within the framework of higher education.

Keywords: Social Engineering Education, Curriculum Development, Student Competencies, Employability, Civic Responsibility.

I. INTRODUCTION

The National Education Plan of Thailand (2017–2036) emphasizes the development of human potential across all age groups and the creation of a learning society. It aims to ensure that education plays a crucial role in developing individuals from early childhood to older adulthood, promoting lifelong learning and creating a society in which everyone has equitable access to educational opportunities. The plan's primary goal is to develop the potential of individuals across all stages of life, equipping them with knowledge, skills, and attributes that align with the country's needs, while fostering lifelong learning through diverse educational systems, including formal, non-formal, and informal education. Furthermore, it seeks to establish a learning society that supports skill development among the population and encourages collaborative learning. The implementation strategy begins with early childhood development, emphasizing high-quality care to build intellectual, emotional, and social foundations. It also focuses on improving the quality of basic education to equip children and youth with analytical thinking, innovation, and 21st-century skills. In addition, vocational and workforce skills are enhanced by aligning curricula with labor market demands, while programs for older adults are promoted to help them adapt to rapidly changing social contexts. Alternative learning opportunities, such as online and open-access education, are expanded to ensure accessibility. The expected outcome is that all Thai citizens, across all age groups, will have access to quality education aligned with their individual potential, creating a learning society that fosters innovation, a knowledge-based economy, and a workforce capable of responding to global changes. Rajabhat Universities serve as higher education institutions dedicated to local development, fostering knowledge and revitalizing learning while preserving local wisdom for sustainable progress (Rajabhat University Act, B.E. 2547, Section 7). Across the country, Rajabhat Universities are grouped according to their capacities and roles. MubanChomBuengRajabhat University, in particular, emphasizes local and community development, promoting education, research, and



innovation that respond to regional needs, and producing graduates with knowledge and skills applicable to local social and economic development. Curricula and competency-based teaching are adjusted to meet community requirements, positioning the university as a key institution for developing human resources and knowledge that support community growth.

21st-century education focuses on enhancing competitiveness, requiring learners to acquire essential life and professional skills. At the core of educational reform is learner-centered education, necessitating the transformation of teaching and learning processes. Key interrelated components include instructors, teaching and learning processes, curricula, and assessment systems, all of which support high-quality learning and the development of competencies applicable to real-life contexts. Contemporary societal changes affect lifestyles, socio-cultural dynamics, economy, politics, and public health, making it imperative that education develops individuals capable of achieving quality of life within society. The implementation of educational projects is aligned with the mission of MubanChombuengRajabhat University, which includes producing graduates, conducting research, providing academic services, preserving arts and culture, strengthening teacher professional capacity, and promoting royal initiatives for local development. These initiatives align with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), ensuring inclusive, equitable, and quality education while promoting lifelong learning opportunities to enhance national workforce quality, encompassing both hard and soft skills. At the end of 2019, the Rajabhat University group launched the "Social Engineer" project, aimed at enhancing education quality and local development through the cultivation of 21st-century soft skills among students, in line with the royal educational initiatives of His Majesty King Rama X. The project's primary goal is to equip students with a positive and correct mindset, a stable life foundation, employability, and responsible citizenship. As noted by Issaro (2021), the Social Engineer project develops graduates with 21st-century competencies aligned with the university's role in local development, applying community analysis and knowledge enhancement. MubanChombuengRajabhat University has implemented this initiative by engaging students in activities that develop essential life and work skills, including analytical and critical thinking, effective communication for problem-solving, collaborative work without conflict, mobilization of resources, community innovation, and mindfulness for well-being. The program emphasizes multidisciplinary active learning (MAL) based on local community development (Social Lab Based), guided by faculty from various disciplines and local experts. Students from different faculties and disciplines collaborate to solve area-based problems independently, fostering experiential learning through analytical thinking, problem identification, and design thinking. The curriculum develops students as critical thinkers, communicators, coordinators, and community innovators, enabling them to understand and collaborate with local stakeholders and partners. The Social Engineer methodology integrates five tools: 1) "Heavenly Tools," 2) Life Clock, 3) Development Timeline, 4) Process Timeline, and 5) M.I.C. Model, combined with Mindfulness in Organization (MIO) programs, targeting the cultivation of graduates who are ethical, professionally competent, employable, and responsible citizens. This approach aligns with 21st-century skills, preparing students to address educational challenges in higher education while fostering practical, community-centered competencies. This study aims to develop a short-term curriculum designed to enhance four essential student attributes aligned with the Royal Educational Policy. Furthermore, the curriculum seeks to cultivate "social engineers" equipped with four core competencies: critical thinking, effective communication, collaborative coordination, and innovative problem-solving.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW/STUDY SITE

In this research study, the researcher examined the concepts and literature review related to the topic as follows:

Curriculum Development

Curriculum development refers to a systematic process of improving existing curricula or creating new ones to provide effective learning experiences for learners. It serves as a blueprint for organizing learning activities and achieving desired educational outcomes. Effective curriculum development requires collaboration among multiple stakeholders and the integration of diverse sources of information to ensure that the curriculum responds to learners' and societal needs.

According to Carl A. E. (2009), a good curriculum must be developed systematically and based on well-established principles. These include stakeholder participation, comprehensive background study, continuous improvement, expert validation, and consideration of up-to-date information. The



development process should be learner-centered, focusing primarily on the intended learning outcomes, instructional design, and assessment aligned with those objectives.

Historical and Theoretical Perspectives on Curriculum Development

Tyler, R. W. (1949): Ralph W. Tyler, an American educator, developed the “Objective Model” in 1949. Ralph W. Tyler introduced the Objective Model, which emphasizes alignment between educational objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation. Tyler proposed a linear process consisting of four key questions: (1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? (2) What educational experiences can be provided to attain these purposes? (3) How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? and (4) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (Tyler, 1949). This “means-ends” model underscores the necessity of defining measurable objectives derived from both societal needs and learners’ characteristics, selecting suitable learning experiences, organizing them effectively, and using valid and reliable assessment methods to evaluate outcomes.

Taba, H. (1962): Hilda Taba proposed a “grassroots” approach to curriculum development, emphasizing the teacher’s essential role as a curriculum designer. Taba (1962) outlined seven sequential steps: diagnosing learners’ needs, formulating objectives, selecting and organizing content, selecting and organizing learning experiences, and determining what and how to evaluate. Her model stresses that curriculum design should begin with the analysis of learners’ needs and should foster critical and analytical thinking rather than rote learning.

Oliva, P. F. (2009): Paul F. Oliva developed a comprehensive model integrating educational philosophy, institutional mission and vision, needs assessment, goal setting, curriculum objectives, instructional strategies, implementation, and evaluation. Oliva (2009) emphasized the cyclical nature of curriculum development, ensuring coherence between philosophy, goals, learning experiences, and assessment. His model provides a flexible framework that supports both instructional and curriculum-level evaluation to maintain quality and relevance.

Synthesis of Curriculum Development Steps

Synthesizing insights from Tyler (1949), Taba (1962), Oliva (2009), and Carl (2009), the curriculum development process can be structured into four major stages:

Studying Fundamental Information

Curriculum development begins with a thorough analysis of educational philosophy, developmental psychology, sociology, economics, politics, culture, and technology to ensure that the curriculum aligns with learners’ needs and the societal context. The fundamental information to consider includes:

- **Educational Philosophy**– refers to the beliefs and values of education that serve as a guideline for setting objectives, content, learning processes, and assessment methods.
- **Social Sciences, Economics, Politics, Governance, Arts, and Culture** – provide essential background information for curriculum development.
- **Educational and Developmental Psychology** – these concepts help ensure that curriculum development and learning management are suitable for learners’ developmental stages.
- **Advancements in Technology** – information and communication technology, both current and future, play a crucial role due to rapid changes and innovations.

Drafting the Curriculum

This stage involves formulating goals and objectives, selecting an appropriate curriculum model, identifying content, designing learning activities, and developing assessment instruments. Draft documents should be reviewed by experts to ensure internal consistency and validity before implementation. It includes:

- **Studying and Analyzing Fundamental Information** to provide a foundation for decision-making in curriculum development. The purpose is to obtain accurate, up-to-date, and useful information for determining curriculum goals, objectives, content, learning activities, and assessment methods.
- **Determining the Curriculum Model** selecting an appropriate curriculum model based on the analysis of fundamental information. There are various models, and a suitable combination should be chosen to align with the context of each curriculum.



- **Preparing Curriculum Documents** quality curriculum documents must ensure consistency among objectives, content, learning activities, and evaluation. The documentation should be supported by data obtained from the analysis stage and prepared by a competent curriculum development committee.
- **Curriculum Critique** experts review the curriculum to ensure it can be effectively and efficiently implemented.
- **Curriculum Draft Approval** the school committee approves the draft curriculum to finalize it for practical implementation.

Implementing the Curriculum

Implementation translates the curriculum into practice through instructional planning, resource preparation, teacher training, and stakeholder involvement. Effective implementation requires alignment among objectives, content, and pedagogy, as well as continuous support for educators.

Guidelines for implementation include:

- **Studying Curriculum Details** understanding the content thoroughly and analyzing it for classroom application, including explaining its use to all stakeholders.
- **Planning Curriculum Implementation** organizing steps, assigning responsibilities, preparing locations, learning materials, and equipment to ensure smooth execution and minimize potential negative impacts on learners.
- **Continuous Application** curriculum effectiveness should be observed over time; thus, continuous and complete implementation is necessary.
- **Monitoring Curriculum Implementation** collecting feedback from all stakeholders, evaluating preliminary outcomes, recording strengths and limitations, reporting issues to authorities, and using information to improve and refine curriculum implementation.
- **Stakeholder Involvement** allowing school committees and relevant personnel to participate in curriculum management and review evaluation results for informed decision-making.
- **Enhancing Personnel Capacity** providing training and skill development for teachers and staff to effectively apply learning strategies in classroom activities.

Evaluating the Curriculum

Evaluation is a continuous and systematic process of assessing the curriculum's effectiveness, relevance, and alignment with learning objectives. Feedback from stakeholders and outcome assessments are used to refine and improve the curriculum to ensure its ongoing suitability for learners and society.

The reviewed literature collectively underscores that curriculum development must be systematic, participatory, and learner-centered. It should integrate philosophical, psychological, and sociocultural foundations to ensure relevance, coherence, and sustainability. Evaluation serves as a vital mechanism for ongoing improvement.

These theoretical underpinnings—particularly those of Tyler (1949), Taba (1962), and Oliva (2009)—provide a strong conceptual foundation for developing a short-term, experiential learning curriculum aimed at fostering social engineering skills among university students. The experiential learning approach emphasizes authentic, real-world applications that engage learners actively in social interaction, collaboration, and reflection. Consequently, the curriculum in this study aims to enhance students' problem-solving, communication, and adaptive social competencies in alignment with 21st-century skill frameworks.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS/METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a Research and Development (R&D) design, aiming to develop and validate a short-term experiential learning curriculum to foster social engineer skills among university students. The R&D process followed five systematic stages adapted from Borg and Gall (1989), including: needs assessment, curriculum design and development, curriculum validation by experts, implementation and training, and evaluation and revision. The study was conducted at MubanChomBuengRajabhat University, which serves as the pilot site for developing social engineers under the Rajabhat University mission to serve local and national development.



Population and Sample

The target population comprised stakeholders involved in social engineer education, including university administrators, lecturers, and students. Samples were divided into three groups:

- **Stakeholders for needs assessment:** 15 participants selected through purposive sampling, including program directors, faculty members, and local development partners.
- **Experts for curriculum validation:** 7 experts in curriculum design, higher education, and social innovation.
- **Student participants for implementation:** 100 undergraduate students enrolled in the social engineer development program.

Research Instruments

Five main instruments were used in this study:

- **In-depth Interview Form** – to collect data on needs and expectations regarding the short-term social engineer curriculum.
- **Curriculum Draft Framework** – designed based on experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984) and competency-based education principles.
- **Focus Group Discussion Record Form** – for gathering expert feedback on curriculum validity.
- **Social Engineer Skill Assessment Form** – to measure students' competencies in four areas: critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation.
- **Curriculum Evaluation Form** – to assess the curriculum's quality, relevance, and effectiveness from users' perspectives.

All instruments were validated by three experts for content validity, and reliability was tested using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient, yielding acceptable values above 0.80.

Data Collection Procedures

The research was implemented in five major phases:

- **Needs Assessment:** Conducted in-depth interviews with stakeholders to identify essential competencies and curriculum requirements.
- **Curriculum Development:** Designed and structured the short-term experiential curriculum based on the needs assessment results and relevant theories.
- **Expert Validation:** Organized a focus group of seven experts to evaluate the curriculum's content, structure, and suitability.
- **Implementation:** Delivered the curriculum to 100 students through experiential learning activities emphasizing real-world problem solving and teamwork.
- **Evaluation:** Collected feedback and performance data through assessment tools and user evaluation forms.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative methods:

- Qualitative data from interviews and focus groups were analyzed through content analysis, identifying key themes and patterns related to curriculum needs and improvement.
- Quantitative data from the skill assessments and evaluation forms were analyzed using descriptive statistics—frequency, mean, standard deviation—and t-test to compare students' skills before and after the program.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the study on developing a short-term curriculum designed to foster four essential competencies in university students according to the Royal Educational Initiative, as well as to cultivate social engineers with the four skills: critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation.

Needs Assessment for the Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum The needs assessment was conducted with 15 key stakeholders related to social engineer education at MubanChomBuengRajabhat University, including: 1 policy maker in social engineer education,



4 participants who completed the Train-the-Trainer program in social engineer skills development, 5 trainers of social engineer skills, and 5 students who had previously developed social engineer skills. Data were collected through in-depth interviews to explore the requirements and expectations for the short-term curriculum. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Needs Assessment Results for Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum

Study Focus	Findings
Curriculum Development Guidelines	The curriculum should address: 21st-century skills development for students - Integration of interdisciplinary knowledge - Community and societal needs, ensuring practical application for social problem solving
Curriculum Development Needs	Developing a short-term curriculum to train students in social engineer processes is essential in addressing complex social issues at local, national, and global levels. Key needs include: - Enhancing 21st-century skills (critical thinking, communication, collaboration, innovation) - Alignment with national and university policies (BCG Economy, SDGs, Active Citizenship) - Developing the “new student” with practical roles and problem-solving capacity - Filling gaps in current curricula regarding soft skills and community engagement - Preparing students before fieldwork with knowledge and teamwork skills
Curriculum Development Steps	Recommended steps include: - Needs and context analysis (policy review, skill requirements, stakeholder survey) - Defining learning outcomes and learner attributes (4 core competencies) - Designing curriculum structure (content, time allocation, activities such as lectures, workshops, mini-projects) - Developing content and supporting materials (guides, tools like M.I.C. Model, Design Thinking, stakeholder analysis) - Pilot testing (preparing and training target student groups, collecting feedback) - Evaluation and improvement (pre/post-test, behavioral change, community impact, revision based on feedback)
Curriculum Components	- Objectives: Enhance soft skills, foster 4 competencies, instill public awareness and community participation - Target Groups: Undergraduate students, especially those engaging in community-based learning or service-learning projects - Content: Social engineer concepts, tools, 4-skills workshops, experiential activities (simulation, fieldwork, mini-projects), reflection - Duration: 12–30 hours (2–5 days) - Learning Modes: On-site, online, blended learning - Expected Outcomes: Students can use social engineer tools, develop 21st-century skills, collaborate with community partners, and innovate solutions - Assessment: Pre/post-tests, reflective journals, group project presentations, 4-skills assessment by instructors, peers, and community
Implementation Guidelines	- Promotion and student recruitment - Experiential learning activities and fieldwork - Collaborative learning and case studies - Evaluation of learning outcomes and community impact - Post-course support and networking - Curriculum revision and continuous improvement

The findings indicate that the short-term social engineer curriculum effectively addresses gaps in traditional academic programs by integrating experiential learning, soft skills development, and community engagement. The curriculum design emphasizes the four competencies—critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation—which are consistent with the university’s mission and



national educational policies. Stakeholders highlighted that students need not only knowledge but also practical tools and real-world experience to become effective social engineers. The curriculum's structure, which combines theoretical knowledge, hands-on workshops, fieldwork, and reflection activities, aligns with modern educational frameworks emphasizing 21st-century skills and active citizenship. Pilot implementation and feedback suggest that the curriculum can enhance student readiness for community-based projects and foster leadership qualities necessary for sustainable development initiatives. Continuous evaluation and iterative improvements are crucial for ensuring that the curriculum remains relevant, impactful, and aligned with evolving societal needs.

Draft of Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum

The draft curriculum was developed based on the needs assessment of stakeholders regarding social engineer skills development. The curriculum focuses on fostering 21st-century skills and the four core competencies: critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation.

Table 2: Draft of Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum

Curriculum Component	Details
Course Objectives	The specific objectives of the short-term curriculum in developing soft skills through the social engineer process are to: ▪ Build awareness and correctly apply social engineer processes to enhance soft skills. ▪ Recognize the value of social engineer tools and use them for effective problem-solving.
Target Groups	▪ Undergraduate students of all disciplines, especially those engaged in community-based learning. ▪ Students participating in fieldwork or service-learning projects. ▪ Student leaders or clubs involved in youth/community development activities.
Content Duration and Structure	Module 1 Relationship Building (3 hours): Develop trust, mutual respect, and collaborative learning motivation. Module 2 Fahprathan Tool Practice (3 hours): Apply the Fahprathan tool to separate facts from feelings, analyze issues, and respect differing opinions. Module 3 Life Clock Management (3 hours): Practice questioning techniques to collect accurate information and use the Life Clock tool to plan appropriate working times. Module 4 Development Timeline Mastery (3 hours): Apply the Development Timeline tool to study problem histories from past to present and collaboratively plan solutions. Module 5 Process Timeline Planning (3 hours): Use the Process Timeline tool and 4M analysis (Man, Money, Materials, Management) to plan step-by-step project implementation. Module 6 M.I.C. Model Application (3 hours): Collaboratively solve problems using the M.I.C. Model (Modify, Improve, Create) and present solutions in project format.
Learning Activities	The curriculum is delivered as a practical workshop, following the university's Student-Based Outcome framework. Activities include: On-site / In-class group activities, Blended learning for flexibility Module 1 Relationship Building: Ice-breaking, establishing group agreements (e.g., no phones, punctuality), brain-stimulating activities, motivational videos, reflection notes. Module 2 Fahprathan Tool Practice: Individual and group analysis of facts vs. feelings, problem-solving exercises, cause-and-effect analysis using fishbone diagrams, group discussion. Module 3 Life Clock Management: Apply Life Clock tool for planning, 5W1H questioning exercises, recording individual and group schedules. Module 4 Development Timeline Mastery: Study past-to-present issues via 9-frame storytelling, apply the Development Timeline, plan future actions collaboratively. Module 5 Process Timeline Planning: Simulate process steps (e.g., stepwise noodle preparation), apply 4M analysis to plan tasks, summarize lessons learned. Module 6 M.I.C. Model Application: Analyze and improve processes using Modify, Improve, Create, develop project proposals, present group solutions.
Assessment Methods	▪ Group behavior observation ▪ Peer evaluation



Curriculum Component	Details
	- Individual and group work products - Complete project submission - Group project presentations - Presentation scoring by instructors and peer representatives

The development of the short-term Social Engineer curriculum successfully addressed the needs identified from the stakeholder analysis. The curriculum is designed to enhance students' 21st-century skills and the four essential competencies of social engineers: critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation. The six modules provide structured experiential learning opportunities, integrating practical activities, reflective exercises, and community engagement to ensure students not only understand theoretical concepts but can also apply them in real-world contexts. By focusing on soft skills development, problem-solving tools, and collaborative learning, the curriculum equips students with the capabilities to engage effectively with communities and contribute to sustainable social development. Furthermore, the modular design allows flexibility in delivery, accommodating on-site, online, and blended learning formats, thus enhancing accessibility and adaptability across diverse student groups.

Expert Review of the Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum

The draft short-term social engineer curriculum was presented to a total of seven experts for evaluation through a series of focus group discussions. Meeting minutes were recorded using a standardized template for reviewing the curriculum. The outcomes of the expert review are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Expert Review of the Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum

Review Focus	Process Details	Identified Strengths	Recommendations for Improvement
1. Surveying Problems and Needs	A questionnaire was used to analyze the needs of students and faculty.	Data collection was based on real field information and relevant learners.	- Incorporate additional tools, such as in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. - Summarize competency gaps as an overview to serve as a foundation for curriculum development.
2. Problem Analysis and Development Needs	The needs data were linked with social engineer competencies.	The curriculum aligns with graduate attributes and community work.	- Develop a competency table specifying expected behaviors for each soft skill (e.g., communication, teamwork) and strategies for development.
3. Curriculum Structure Design	Content was divided into modules covering experiential learning steps.	The structure is clear and consistent with actual thinking and working processes.	- Define systematic learning outcomes for each module.
4. Training Schedule	The duration was appropriate (3 days), with alternating activities and well-structured timing.	Activities included both relaxation phases and intensive workshops.	- Introduce pre-learning activities (online or flipped content) to reduce in-class time.
5. Learning Management	A variety of techniques were employed, including games, role-playing, and video clips.	Active Learning and Cooperative Learning strategies were integrated.	- Explicitly link the design of each activity to the soft skills being developed.
6. Assessment and Evaluation	Multiple assessment tools were used, including observation, presentations, and self-assessments.	The evaluation covers both outcomes and processes.	- Add peer review or group feedback mechanisms. - Include both short-term (during training) and long-term (after community implementation) outcome evaluations.

The expert review of the short-term social engineer curriculum demonstrated that the curriculum is well-structured, comprehensive, and aligned with both the university's mission and national educational policies. Experts highlighted the curriculum's strengths, including its clear modular design, integration of experiential learning, active and cooperative learning strategies, and a variety of assessment tools that



cover both process and outcome evaluation. The review also identified areas for improvement. Experts recommended incorporating diverse data collection methods, such as in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, to better understand students' and stakeholders' needs. The curriculum would benefit from a detailed mapping of soft skills competencies, systematic learning outcomes for each module, and enhanced pre-learning activities to optimize in-class time. Additionally, implementing peer review and long-term impact evaluations could further strengthen the curriculum's effectiveness in developing social engineer competencies. Overall, the expert feedback affirms that the curriculum has strong potential to cultivate critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation skills among students. Continuous evaluation and iterative refinement are essential to ensure the curriculum remains relevant, effective, and responsive to evolving societal and community needs.

Evaluation of the Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum by Users The short-term social engineer curriculum was evaluated by users using a structured assessment tool, focusing on the curriculum's learning process, course structure, and assessment methods. The results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Evaluation Results of the Short-Term Social Engineer Curriculum

Evaluation Aspect	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	SD	Interpretation
Learning Schedule Structure			
Clear timing of activities	2.95	0.22	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Activity names with duration	2.98	0.14	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Exercises linked appropriately	2.85	0.48	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Total course hours consistent	2.87	0.34	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Clear learning hours for each session	2.85	0.48	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Assessment criteria per activity	2.90	0.33	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Course Structure			
Activity descriptions covering knowledge, skills, attitudes, and 4 core competencies	2.90	0.33	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Activities sequenced appropriately	2.85	0.48	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Core knowledge of 4 competencies analyzed and summarized in activities	2.95	0.22	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Activity titles reflect key content and engage learners	2.98	0.14	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Activities aligned with 4 social engineer competencies	2.98	0.14	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Learning units cover all 4 competencies	2.98	0.14	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Diverse and clear assessment tools	2.87	0.34	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Clear assessment criteria for all 4 competencies	2.87	0.34	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate
Assessment aligns with 4 competencies	2.87	0.34	Complete, accurate, coherent, and appropriate

The evaluation results indicate that the short-term Social Engineer curriculum has a clear, comprehensive, and appropriate structure in terms of learning time and course design. This includes well-defined activity schedules, logical sequencing of modules, and activity titles that reflect the core focus of each training component. The curriculum effectively integrates the four key soft skills of a social engineer: critical thinking, communication, coordination, and innovation. Participants rated highly in areas such as activity design aligned with competencies, completeness of learning units, use of diverse assessment tools, and clarity of evaluation criteria, allowing for assessment of both processes and outcomes. These findings demonstrate that the curriculum is suitable for developing students' competencies and equipping them with practical skills for community-based work. In summary, the



short-term Social Engineer curriculum is of high quality, covering content and hands-on activities that align with the goals of developing students' soft skills. It serves as an effective tool for fostering students' readiness to engage in social work and active citizenship in a meaningful and practical way.

V. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to develop and examine a model for applying social engineer skills to enhance the quality of life of elderly populations in communities surrounding MubanChombuengRajabhat University, Ratchaburi Province. The implementation of the short-term social engineer curriculum clearly aligned with the research objectives, demonstrating that the developed model is both appropriate and practically applicable. The curriculum design adhered to the principles of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and Experiential Learning Theory, emphasizing tangible learning outcomes and direct experience (Kolb, 1984).

The short-term curriculum fostered the development of four essential social engineer competencies—Critical Thinking, Communication, Coordination, and Innovation—as outlined in national educational policies. The course structure, including time allocation, content sequencing, and assessment tools, was comprehensive, accurate, consistent, and suitable for skill development. Post-training evaluations indicated measurable improvements in all four competencies, consistent with Kolb's experiential learning cycle, which emphasizes Concrete Experience, Reflective Observation, Abstract Conceptualization, and Active Experimentation (Kolb, 1984). The curriculum's experiential activities enabled deep learning, allowing students to apply knowledge in real community contexts rather than merely acquiring theoretical understanding.

Moreover, linking the curriculum to the university's social engineer strategy promoted sustainability, ensuring that student skill development contributed meaningfully to local community advancement. The curriculum facilitated both student and community engagement, creating networks and collaborative problem-solving opportunities, in line with participatory development approaches (Chambers, 1997; Pretty, 1995). Tools such as the Giftedness Framework, Life Clock, Development Timeline, Process Timeline, and M.I.C. Model effectively supported the acquisition of analytical, communication, coordination, and innovation skills in real-world settings, echoing findings by Sangarwut&Polsuwan (2023) regarding soft skill enhancement through active learning.

The results underscore the curriculum's value in integrating Soft Skills, Design Thinking, and Community-Based Learning to produce socially responsible graduates capable of addressing community challenges. While the curriculum successfully enhanced student competencies and community outcomes, future iterations should incorporate long-term tracking of skill sustainability and controlled comparisons to further strengthen empirical validity. Overall, the short-term social engineer curriculum represents a robust and replicable model for cultivating practical skills, fostering community engagement, and promoting sustainable development.

VI. ETHICAL APPROVAL

We obtained ethical approval for this study from The Human Research Ethics Committee, Rangsit University, and Ethical Approval Number: RSU-ERB2022/018.0102

VII. GRANT /FUNDING

Science, Research, and Innovation Promotion Fund (TSRI), Activity Type: Research and Innovation Promotion and Support, Fiscal Year 2024, National Research Council of Thailand (NRCT), Amount: 800,000 THB

REFERENCES

Reference to a journal publication:

- [1] Pretty, J. N. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, 23(8), 1247–1263.
- [2] Sangarwut, S., & Polsuwan, R. (2023). Developing soft skills through active learning in community-based education. *Journal of Higher Education and Community Engagement*, 10(2), 45–63.
- [3] Van der Geer J, Hanraads JAJ, Lupton RA. The art of writing a scientific article. *J SciCommun* 2010;163:51–9.

Reference to a book:

- [1] Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction* (5th ed.). Longman.



- [2] Carl, A. E. (2009). Teacher empowerment through curriculum development: Theory into practice (3rd ed.). Juta& Company Ltd.
- [3] Chambers, R. (1997). Whose reality counts? Putting the first last. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- [4] Issaro, N. (2021). The Social Engineer project: Developing 21st-century competencies in Rajabhat University students. Bangkok, Thailand.
- [5] King Rama X of Thailand. (2019). Royal initiatives in education for graduate and local development. Bangkok, Thailand.
- [6] Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.
- [7] Ministry of Education Thailand. (2017). National Education Plan 2017–2036. Bangkok, Thailand: Office of the Education Council.
- [8] Office of the Council of State. (2004). Rajabhat University Act B.E. 2547. Bangkok, Thailand: Government Gazette. Retrieved from <http://www.ratchakitcha.soc.go.th>
- [9] Oliva, P. F. (2009). Developing the curriculum (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn& Bacon.
- [10] Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues (8th ed.). Pearson.
- [11] Taba, H. (1962). Curriculum development: Theory and practice. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- [12] Tyler, R. W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- [13] Yongyut, W. (2024). Application of social engineering skills and Mindfulness in Organization (MIO) in student development. Nonthaburi, Thailand.