Amplifying the Whole Person: An Ignatian Architecture for AI in Business Education

Generative AI accelerates production. Whether it reflects understanding is a separate question. Autor and Thompson (2025) distinguish tools that automate easy parts of a task from those that automate the hard parts and displace the expertise. Unscaffolded student use tilts toward the second case: the cognitive work that produces durable knowledge is the first thing offloaded. What gets offloaded is what the *Inspirational Paradigm for Jesuit Business Education* (IAJU, 2020) names as the work of the Jesuit business educator: formation of the whole person.

This paper proposes that when student AI use is scaffolded through the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm (IPP), with its five phases of Context, Experience, Reflection, Action, and Evaluation, students develop a deeper understanding than under unscaffolded AI or pre-AI instruction. The argument rests on artifacts and adjacent literature, not controlled within-course measurement. Reibe (2025), studying 96 students across seven disciplines at a Jesuit university, found that generative AI succeeded in surface learning but failed to deepen understanding, and called for systematic IPP-driven integration. This paper is a worked instantiation across one doctoral seminar and three undergraduate courses. The invariant is an IPP-shaped workflow closed by required oral articulation. Coaching intensity, team structure, project type, and tooling vary.

In ISBA 4715 (Developing Business Applications Using SQL), undergraduates build data pipelines, knowledge-base wikis, and dashboards using *Superpowers* (Vincent, 2025), an open-source skill framework for the AI coding agent Claude Code. Superpowers guides each task through five phases: brainstorming a specification (Context), engaging real data and tools (Experience), writing an implementation plan before code runs (Reflection), executing under a two-stage review (Action), and committing to a portfolio repository whose history is the Evaluation artifact. In a quasi-experimental trial (n=36, 3 weeks), Cordova et al. (2025) tested a structurally analogous Explain-Predict-Reflect-Revise scaffold against a minimally prompted ChatGPT in an undergraduate computer science course. Scaffolded students scored 92.7 vs. 74.3 ($d > 1.0$).

In both ISBA 4715 and BCOR 3750 (Operations and Supply Chain Analytics), undergraduates select a real, currently-posted job and build the semester's work around it: Context becomes the student's career discernment. In DBAD 7098 (AI Research and Practice), technical backgrounds vary widely, reflecting the work each student does and the tools they use. The course's second half shifts three of the six weeks to one-on-one coaching tied to each student's dissertation or day job, with an AI-conducted workflow audit that maps tasks to the easy and hard parts. Across both cohorts, *cura personalis* names how the architecture adjusts to each student's starting point.

In ISBA 4797 (Capstone), undergraduate teams carry their own projects through three sprints, each with a Product Requirements Document and a dedicated repository, and work with a real stakeholder to validate their work. Webster (2026) finds that AI, anchored in experiential projects, shifts from a crutch to a collaborative partner.

Across the four courses, the most consistent practice is required oral articulation: a simulated job interview in ISBA 4715 and BCOR 3750; a formal presentation in ISBA 4797; and a live workflow demo in DBAD 7098 that supports the student's dissertation or day job. ISBA 4715 and 4797 add practice-recording self-evaluation before grading. Reher et al. (2018) found that adding self-reflection to video-recorded practice raised dental students' final marks from 63.3% (video alone) to 79.6%, isolating self-reflection as the load-bearing step. Specifications, plans, and commit histories make *Reflection* visible as decisions captured alongside the work. Oral articulation does not prevent upstream AI use. It makes student ownership of the reasoning observable in ways written submissions cannot.

The paper contributes three things: a worked instantiation of Reibe's (2025) call; evidence that an IPP-shaped workflow closed by required oral articulation admits both undergraduate and doctoral cohorts under local adaptation; and oral articulation as a low-cost mechanism for operationalizing Evaluation across course types. Colleagues worry that generative AI makes formation harder. In these four courses, the pattern points the other way: scaffolding through IPP makes the formation work more visible, not less.

References

Autor, D., & Thompson, N. (2025). Expertise. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 23*(4), 1203. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvaf023

Cordova, L. P., Mendoza, T., Holmes, S., Megginson, K., Webster, B., & Gregory, D. (2025). Not all chatbots teach: Evidence for pedagogical design in AI-assisted technical education. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Conference on Information Technology Education (SIGCITE '25).* ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3769694.3771107

International Association of Jesuit Universities. (2020). *An inspirational paradigm for Jesuit business education.* IAJU. https://iaju.org/sj_files/2023/11/An-Inspirational-Paradigm-for-Jesuit-Business-Education_English.pdf

Reher, V., Rehbein, G., & Reher, P. (2018). Integrating video recording and self-reflection to enhance communication skills training for dental students. *IFMBE Proceedings.* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-5859-3_120

Reibe, N. (2025). Generative AI and the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm. *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal, 14*(2). https://doi.org/10.15365/2164-7666.1520

Vincent, J. (2025). *Superpowers: An agentic skills framework and software development methodology* [Computer software]. GitHub. https://github.com/obra/superpowers

Webster, E. (2026). Integrating generative AI with experiential learning in the digital marketing classroom. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 26*(1). https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v26i1.8086