Political Economy of Inequality and Redistribution
Public Policy 750.015

Charlotte Cavaillé (cavaille@umich.edu)
Ford School of Public Policy

Winter 2024

Time:	T and Th: 1:00 – 2:20 pm	**Classroom:**	1210
Office hours:	T and Th: 10:00 – 11:00 am (or by appointment, see Canvas)	**Office:**	4204

Overview

This course examines the politics of income distribution and redistribution in post-industrial democracies. With economic inequality rising, the questions of how political processes and institutions determine the distribution of resources in society and how economic and social inequalities affect politics have become a central concern. This course provides conceptual tools and empirical knowledge that help answer these questions.

More generally, this is a course on the relationship between *economic change* and *politics*. Economic change is a broad and amorphous concept. One way to make the study of economic change more tractable is to focus on one of its major "symptoms." In this course, we focus on (mostly) income inequality as one of these symptoms. Politics can be used to describe anything human beings do as a collective. In this course, we zoom in on policy outputs that affect how much income people receive, and how much income they get to "store" for future consumption (i.e., wealth). Questions covered include:

- What is inequality conceptually? What does it "look like" in practice?
- What are the main reasons behind long-term changes in the income distribution?
- Why has the distribution of income become more unequal since the 1980s?
- How do trends in income inequality differ from wealth inequality?
- Why are these trend worse in some countries than others?
- What explains changes in wealth inequality?
- Why do some countries redistribute more than others?
- What explains differences across individuals and across countries in levels of support for redistributive social policies?
- Does ethnic diversity and racial hierarchies undermine redistribution?

We will spend a great deal of time discussing the United States. This emphasis is only for expository purposes. The American case is exceptional only in comparison to other advanced democracies and class lectures and discussion will put a strong emphasis on cross-country comparisons.

Please be aware that this course only covers post-industrial democracies (mostly Western Europe and North America). As a result, we will not discuss the politics of inequality and redistribution in developing countries. We will also not cover the relationship between inequality, redistribution and economic growth. If you are interested in this latter issue, I suggest you check the course offering in

the economics department. One more topics did not make the final cut, namely inequality studied through the prism of America's racialized social and power structure. One reason is that Professor Mo Torres is teaching a course on this topic: if this is an issue area you are particularly interested in, you might want to switch to his course. Note that I currently have several sessions blocked for a topic of your choosing. If there is enough interest, I propose that we use it for a discussion of inequality, redistribution and gender. I am happy to consider other topics based on students' interest. We will discuss possible options during the first course.

Learning Objectives and Skill Acquisition

The main learning objective is to improve your understanding of big picture theorizing on the causes and consequences of economic inequality in post-industrial democracies. What do I mean by "improve your understanding"?

First, you will acquire substantive knowledge on this topics. I will share with you what I believe to be important facts and theories. At the end of the course, students will have acquired:

- Substantive knowledge on inequality (definitions, empirical measures, differences in levels of inequality over time and across countries)
- Substantive knowledge on redistribution (a good understanding of the bundle of social policies that constitute the welfare state, differences across countries in the extent and nature of income redistribution)
- Knowledge regarding the key assumptions and workhorse models that guide theories about inequality and redistribution
- An understanding of how (heated) debates about inequality connect to theoretical research

Second, students will learn to recognize and engage with the tension between 1) *why* we care about inequality and 2) *how* we study inequality. Indeed, there is a core tension between the concept of inequality (a concept shaped by political struggles and normative concerns) on the one hand, and the empirics of inequality on the other (the "objective" description of deviations from equality using quantitative data). The empirics of inequality tend to focus on *economic* inequality (income level, income security, wealth, etc.). The concept of inequality is much broader, and speaks to issue of social justice, dignity and recognition that often go beyond economic redistribution. As critical consumer of quantitative research on inequality needs to keep this tension in mind. We will practice doing so throughout the course.

Third, you will learn to engage with quantitative research. In this course, we will focus on the kind of theorizing that is commonly found in the positivist social sciences. This type of theorizing, which uses statistical analysis, can look daunting at first. But you have enough background in statistics to consume this research directly and we will practice doing so in this class (e.g., learning what to focus on, what to skip, how to makes sense of a regression table, etc.).

Assignments and Grading

		Due date
Class attendance and participation	20%	NA
Reviewing the evidence (part 1)	15%	February 11^{th}
Reviewing the evidence (part 2)	25%	March 17^{st}
Reviewing the evidence (part 3, group work)	40%	April 21^{st}

Class Attendance and Participation (20%)

The course is a mix of lectures and in-class discussions. Preparation, attendance, and active participation are mandatory. Most class sessions include discussions and activities that require that you have read the day's assigned readings. The reading list is pretty light so no real excuse to not do them. Your preparation for class should not be a passive process of absorbing facts from readings; rather, while reading, you should actively identify (and write down!) questions you have, possible avenues of discussion, and potential points of application of the readings to current events or other course themes.

In this class, getting an A for attendance and participation is very easy. Everyone starts with an A. For absences, I will deduct points as follow:

2 unexcused absences or less	No deduction
3 or 4 unexcused absences	Half a letter grade will be deducted
5 or 6 unexcused absences	A full letter grade will be deducted
7 or 8 unexcused absences	2 full letter grades will be deducted
9 or more unexcused absences	Automatic F for attendance and participation

An unexcused absence is an absence for which you do not check in with me first regarding an illness, a family emergency or a work-related emergency. I highly recommend you check in with me ahead of time if you know you will have to miss class more than twice in the semester.

With regards to participation, as long as you participate regularly (at least once a week), the A will stay an A. You can participate in many ways. For example, you can:

- ask clarification questions (or any type of questions) during lectures
- contribute to in-class conversations on readings [**ALL READINGS MENTIONED IN THE SYLLABUS ARE COMPULSORY READINGS**]
- actively participate in in-class exercises
- email questions or thoughts about the readings ahead of class [If you have issues participating in class PLEASE use this option]

If I feel like you are falling behind participation expectations, I will reach out to check in with you and propose solutions to boost your participation. Point deductions will only be as a last resort, that is, if participation does not improve over the semester.

Participation at least once in a given week	No deduction
Slow start but obvious improvement over the semester	No deduction
Rarely participates and no improvement	A full letter grade will be deducted
No participation	2 full letter grades will be deducted

Ultimately, this is an elective course and I do not expect attendance and participation to be an issue. I also have no interest in policing the classroom. So why such detailed attendance and participation guidelines? I have learned over the years that having clear guidelines has at least three positive consequences: 1) it gets students out of bed and into the classroom when it is cold outside, 2) it helps me identify students who face unexpected hurdles and 3) it encourages students to engage with complicated material in a public setting.

Reviewing the evidence (80%)

The course has one major goal besides learning about the politics of inequality and redistribution: ensuring students become more comfortable engaging with quantitative empirical research. We will work on achieving this goal through a three-part semester-long assignment. This assignment will help you:

- practice deciphering academic language
- build your confidence reading quantitative papers
- practice distinguishing between different types of studies based on the data used, the empirical strategy, the type of journal they were published in, citation counts, etc.
- learn how to draw conclusions from conflicting results
- learn how to identify normative commitments in positivist research

This assignment contributes to your multi-year training at Ford on how to best synthesize (and criticize) quantitative/positive knowledge. For more information on this assignment (including the rubric), see the designated folder on Canvas. Always remember that office hours are here for you to ask questions about the studies used in the assignment.

Part 1 (15%)

Description: The first part consists of a two-page (max) note on an empirical research paper. The list of papers to choose from is provided below. The note should be 40-60 % summary (research question, empirical predictions, empirical test, findings and implications) and 60-40 % discussion (you can also include suggestions for improvements or next steps). You will also be tasked with identifying the ethical and normative assumptions built into the research papers (if any).

Part 2 (25%)

Description: In the second part, you will be asked to review *two* empirical papers. I will provide you with pairs of papers to choose from (see below). The papers are again, challenging to read. Most importantly, they come to contrasting or even contradictory conclusions. Your role is to review these papers and come to your own conclusion regarding the evidence (4 pages max). The challenge is to provide an overview that does not misrepresent the results and helps make sense of the tensions between the papers. You will also be tasked with identifying the ethical and normative assumptions built into these studies.

Part 3 (40%, group work)

Description: In the third part, you will be asked to review *five* empirical papers. You will be working in groups of two. The overall format is similar to the one for part 2. The main difference is that you will have to discuss the papers with a peer and summarize your insights as a team.

Note on grading

If your work conveys that you have correctly understood the papers, then you will be guaranteed a B+. To get to an A- or an A, you need to go beyond summarizing and explaining (see rubrics). I use A+ sparsely but sometimes give such a grade when a student shares insights of exceptional quality (especially given the complexity of the topic). This latter point applies to both participation and written assignments.

Note on ChatGPT and other AI tools

Large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT have caused a stir. They might be a good thing, they might be a bad thing, they are likely a mix bag. In any case, they are here to stay and most people use them. I want you to use them well and this course is where you can practice doing that. This means you are welcome to use generative AI tools to assist you in your course work. When doing so, please be aware that these tools make errors and the work they produce rarely includes original thinking. Note also that if you use chatGPT to summarizes the papers you are asked to review, **I can guarantee you that the summaries will be too superficial to meet the criteria listed in the rubrics**. Most importantly, any content produced using a generative AI source must be noted/cited in your work, failure to do so will be treated as an instance of academic misconduct.

Readings

All readings will be made available as PDFs through Canvas.

How do assignment grades add up?

Assignment grade	Points	Final Grade
A+	4	more than 4
A+/A	4	NA
A	4	3.85 or more
A/A-	3.85	NA
A-	3.7	3.5 or more & less than 3.85
A-/B+	3.45	NA
B+	3.3	3.15 or more & less than 3.5
B+/B	3.15	NA
B	3.0	2.85 or more & less than 3.15
B/B-	2.85	NA
B-	2.7	2.5 or more & less than 2.85
B-/C+	2.50	NA
C+	2.3	2.15 or more & less than 2.5
C	2	less than 2.15

Course Schedule

Week 1

Introduction

- **Thursday January 11th**

  Come to class having read the syllabus.

Weeks 2

Should we care about inequality? What does it mean to redistribute?

There is little agreement on whether we should care about inequality and what types of inequality we should care about. We start by discussing these disagreements.

- **Tuesday January 16th**
  - Feldstein Martin. 1999, "Reducing Poverty, Not Inequality." *Public Interest*, pages 33-41.
- **Thursday January 18th**
  - Fraser Nancy. 1995. "From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Postsocialist' Age." *New Left Review*. 1/212

Week 3

A brief history of (in)equality: A few takeaways

This week provides a broad overview of changes in inequality across time. We discuss two main takeaways. First, if history is any guide, excessive economic inequality never goes down without a fight. Quite literally so: in the past, only mass warfare, a state collapse or catastrophic plagues have significantly altered the distribution of income and wealth. Second, while the period from 1914 to 1980 was one of general decline in income inequality, the period since is one of rising income inequality, especially in the United States.

- **Tuesday January 23rd**
  - Scheidel Walter, 2017. "The bloodstained leveler" , essay based on Scheidel Walter, *The great leveler: Violence and the history of inequality from the stone age to the twenty-first century.* Princeton University Press.
- **Thursday January 25th**

  No assigned readings. Use this time to work on assignment part 1.

Week 4

How do (most) economists explain the recent surge in income inequality?

This week covers economists' lead explanation for the growth in wage inequality starting in the 1980s. This explanation is often described under the umbrella term of "skill-biased technological change" (SBTC). We discuss how technological innovation and globalization affect different skill groups' ability to command a high wage. We also discuss their impact on wage-setting institutions (including the role of trade unions) and firm organization. These theories focus on labor income. Another side of the debate emphasizes capital income as different from labor income. Capital income is more unequally distributed than labor income, so a transfer from labor income to capital income will increase inequality. There is indeed evidence that, each year, a growing share of income is going not to people who work through wages but to owners of assets (housing, equity, bonds) in the form of capital income (rents, dividends and interests). What explains this transfer? The answer is complicated and we will come back to it when we discuss wealth inequality.

- **Tuesday January 30th**
  - Irwin Neil. 2017. "To Understand Rising Inequality, Consider the Janitors at Two Top Companies, Then and Now" *New York Times*, September 3rd 2017.
- **Thursday February 1rd**
  - Solow, R., 2014. "Thomas Piketty is right. Everything you need to know about capital in the twenty-first century." *New Republic*, 22.

Transition

In week 4, we have discussed the "return of income inequality" in post-industrial democracies. Should we expect more inequality to lead to more redistribution? For many social scientists, this seems reasonable: as resources concentrate in the hands of a minority, it becomes increasingly advantageous for the poorer majority to redistribute income by taxing the richer minority to fund transfers and public goods. As a result, support for income redistribution is expected to increase with income inequality. Pundits and commentators make similar predictions though, in their case, the motive they impute

to voters is rarely economic self-interest. While left-leaning pundits point to voters' moral outrage in the face of "unfair" income differences, right-leaning commentators tie growing support for income redistribution to envy and resentment. Whether due to voters' material self-interest, moral outrage or envy, expectations converge: greater wealth and income inequality should lead to greater demand for an egalitarian policy response. So why doesn't rising inequality appear to benefit an egalitarian redistributive agenda? Answering this question will be the focus of weeks 6 through 8. But before we get there, we need a precise definition of "egalitarian redistributive agenda," something we take up in week 5.

Week 5

Defining redistribution: concepts, measurement and stylized facts

This week, we unpack the concept of redistribution and how to measure it. Progressive income taxation is a well-known policy tool to achieve redistribution, but it is far from the only one. We examine the bundle of redistributive policies that is the welfare state and how this bundle varies across countries (Esping-Andersen).

- **Tuesday February 6th**
  - Esping-Andersen Gosta, 1990, *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Princeton University Press, chapter 1 [start on page 34, stop at page 52]. Those unfamiliar with Esping-Andersen's work may find it helpful to consult: Bowman. *Capitalisms Compared: Welfare, Work, and Business*, 2014, pp. 8-20
- **Thursday February 8th**
  - Atkinson, A.B., 2014. "After Piketty?." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 65(4), pp.619-638.

Reminder: Assignment part 1 is due at the end of Week 5.

Week 6

Support for redistribution in the age of inequality (1)

From Aristotle to Madison to modern political economists, many have long believed that democratic political processes and institutions have an equalizing effect. As a result, many researchers and pundits expect that inequality will be self-correcting in democracies. In weeks 6 and 7, we discuss possible reasons why this is not the case, focusing on voters and their preferences for more or less redistribution. One possibility is that voters don't care about inequality and redistribution but about risk and insurance against these risks (which can have redistributive consequences). Another possibility is that citizens' lack of information about how government policies affect inequality is to blame. A third possibility is that fairness concerns get in the way: no everyone interpret an increase in income inequality as something worthy of correction.

- **Tuesday February 13rd**
  - Ansell, B. 2014. The political economy of ownership: Housing markets and the welfare state. *American Political Science Review*, 108(2), 383-402.
- **Thursday February 15th**

  - Sands ML, de Kadt D. "Local exposure to inequality raises support of people of low wealth for taxing the wealthy." *Nature*. 2020 Oct 8;586(7828):257-61.
  - Bartels, L.M., 2005. "Homer gets a tax cut: Inequality and public policy in the American mind." *Perspectives on Politics*, 3(1), pp.15-31.

Week 7

Support for redistribution in the age of inequality (2)

- **Tuesday February 20th NO CLASS [I have to be in Chicago]**
- **Thursday February 22rd**
  - Cramer Walsh, Katherine., 2012. "Putting inequality in its place: Rural consciousness and the power of perspective." *American Political Science Review*, 106(3), pp.517-532.
  - Morten Nyborg Støstad, 2023. "Fairness Beliefs Affect Perceived Economic Inequality." Working Paper.

Week 8. WINTER BREAK

Week 9

The supply-side of redistributive politics: what types of redistribution do voters get to choose from?

After discussing the "demand-side" of redistributive politics, we turn to the "supply side." For democracy to have equalizing effects, the commitment to implementing more redistribution needs to be part of the political platform of at least one major party (i.e., voters need to be able to vote for redistribution). Is this basic condition met today? We discuss the emergence and the continuing importance of 'non-economic' cleavages in electoral politics. We also discuss evidence that left-wing parties only advocate for redistributive policies with limited egalitarian implications.

- **Tuesday March 5th**
  - John Roemer, "Why the poor do not expropriate the rich: an old argument in new garb." *Journal of Public Economics* 70 (1998), 399-424. **[Read pp. 399-403 and 414-417 to get the intuition and results – try to grasp the basic idea of the model, if you find this too complicated, do not worry; the lecture will cover this.]**
  - Hall, P.A., 1993. "Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: the case of economic policymaking in Britain." *Comparative politics*, pp.275-296.
- **Thursday March 7th**
  - Schechter Asher. 2018. "Why Democracy Fails to Reduce Inequality: Blame the Brahmin Left." *Promarket*. April 17, 2018. https://www.promarket.org/2018/04/17/democracy-fails-reduce-inequality-blame-brahmin-left/

Transition

In weeks 10 through 12, we continue discussing the disconnect between rising inequality and redistribution with an eye to explaining the United States' outlier status (at least compared to other countries): why does the American Welfare State redistribute so little? Why is the increase in inequality so large relative to other post-industrial countries? Why have policymakers done so little to address it? We discuss reasons why American might be "exceptional" on that front (or not).

Week 10

The inegalitarian implications of American capitalism

In week 10, we consider arguments that there are durable varieties of capitalism and ask whether the American variety is particularly prone to turning technological change, globalization and other macro-economic factors into unequal economic outcomes.

- **Tuesday March 12th**
  - Bowman, J. (2014). *Capitalisms compared.* SAGE Publications, Chapters 5 and 6.
- **Thursday March 14th**
  - Korpi Walter and Joakim Palme, 1998,"The Paradox of Redistribution and Strategies of Equality: Welfare State Institutions, Inequality, and Poverty in the Western Countries", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 63, No. 5, pp. 661-687

Reminder: Assignment part 2 is due at the end of Week 10

Week 11

The fragmented, territorial and ultimately inegalitarian nature of American political institutions

In week 11, we discuss how American political institutions appear "designed" for more inequality, not less.

- **Tuesday March 19th**
  - Rodden Jonathan. 2019. *Why Cities Lose: The Deep Roots of the Urban-Rural Political Divide.* Introduction (if interested, read also Chap. 5).
- **Thursday March 21st**
  - Hacker, Hertel-Fernandez, Pierson, and Thelen,"Introduction," in *The American Political Economy: Politics, Markets, Power*, 2021
  - During your commute or walks, I recommend you listen to the podcast *Nice White Parents*, focus on episodes 1, and 3 (and episode 5 assuming you have time).

Week 12

Race and redistribution in the United States and beyond

Next, we discuss the role of race and slavery in explaining why the US is a "welfare laggard." We briefly turn our attention to Europe and ask if immigration-induced diversity means that the European Welfare state is in danger of being "Americanized."

- **Tuesday March 26th**
  - Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chap 6 pp 133-182
- **Thursday March 28th**
  - Cavaillé, C. and Van Der Straeten, K., 2023. "Immigration and support for redistribution: lessons from Europe." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 61(3), pp.958-976.

Transition

In weeks 13 and 14, we return to the issue of capital income, wealth inequality and the policies designed to limit (or enhance) wealth accumulation (and consequently, the inequality of capital income). Wealth is a complicated beast to study both conceptually and empirically. We start by discussing conceptual issues and measurement concerns before turning to the politics of wealth taxation.

Week 13

Why is wealth inequality always way worse than income inequality?

- **Tuesday April 2rd**
  - Katharina Pistor. 2019. *The Code of Capital*. Chap. 1.
  - Imanol Arrieta-Ibarra et al. 2018. "Should We Treat Data As Labor? Let's Open Up the Discussion.'"
- **Thursday April 4th**
  - Bonnet Odran, Pierre-Henri Bono, Guillaume Chapelle, Etienne Wasmer, 2014, "Does housing capital contribute to inequality? A comment on Thomas Piketty's Capital in the 21st Century." *Sciences Po Economics Discussion Papers*, Discussion paper 2014-07.

Week 14.

The politics of wealth taxation

- **Tuesday April 9th**
  - Saez, E. and Zucman, G., 2022, May. "Wealth taxation: lessons from history and recent developments." In *AEA Papers and Proceedings* (Vol. 112, pp. 58-62)
- **Thursday April 11th**
  - Liam Stanley, Tom McGrath and Tom Hunt (2023) "The social meaning of wealth taxes," *Economy and Society*, 52:4, 579-601

Week 15. TBD

- **Tuesday April 16th**
- **Thursday April 18th**

Reminder: Assignment part 3 is due at the end of Week 15.

Week 16

The future of inequality

In our last session, we discuss how big data (the data collected through smart phones, credit card purchases, administrative registries, etc,. as well as the data used to train large language models) might or might not affect inequality going forward.

- **Tuesday April 22nd**

- Iversen, T. and Rehm, P., 2021. *Big Data and the Welfare State. How the Information Revolution Threatens Solidarity*. Chap TBD.
- Murdoch, J. 2023. "Here's what we know about generative AI's impact on white-collar work." *The Financial Times*, November 13.

Ford School Inclusivity Statement Members of the Ford School community represent a rich variety of backgrounds and perspectives. We are committed to providing an atmosphere for learning that respects diversity. While working together to build this community we ask all members to:

- share their unique experiences, values and beliefs
- be open to the views of others
- honor the uniqueness of their colleagues
- appreciate the opportunity that we have to learn from each other in this community
- value one another's opinions and communicate in a respectful manner
- keep confidential discussions that the community has of a personal (or professional) nature
- use this opportunity together to discuss ways in which we can create an inclusive environment in Ford classes and across the UM community

Ford School Public Health Protection Policy In order to participate in any in-person aspects of this course–including meeting with other students to study or work on a team project–you must follow all the public health safety measures and policies put in place by the State of Michigan, Washtenaw County, the University of Michigan, and the Ford School. Up to date information on U-M policies can be found here. It is expected that you will protect and enhance the health of everyone in the Ford School community by staying home and following self-isolation guidelines if you are experiencing any symptoms of COVID-19

Student Mental Health and Wellbeing The University of Michigan is committed to advancing the mental health and wellbeing of its students. We acknowledge that a variety of issues, both those relating to the pandemic and other issues such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, and depression, can directly impact students' academic performance and overall wellbeing. If you or someone you know is feeling overwhelmed, depressed, and/or in need of support, services are available.

You may access the Ford School's embedded counselor Paige Ziegler (contact information TBD) and/or counselors and urgent services at Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and/or University Health Service (UHS). Students may also use the Crisis Text Line (text '4UMICH' to 741741) to be connected to a trained crisis volunteer. You can find additional resources both on and off campus through the University Health Service and through CAPS.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities The University of Michigan recognizes disability as an integral part of diversity and is committed to creating an inclusive and equitable educational environment for students with disabilities. Students who are experiencing a disability-related barrier should contact Services for Students with Disabilities https://ssd.umich.edu/; 734-763-3000 or ssdoffice@umich.edu). For students who are connected with SSD, accommodation requests can be made in Accommodate. If you have any questions or concerns please contact your SSD Coordinator or visit SSD's Current Student webpage. SSD considers aspects of the course design, course learning objects and the individual academic and course barriers experienced by the student. Further conversation with SSD, instructors, and the student may be warranted to ensure an accessible course experience.

Academic Integrity The Ford School academic community, like all communities, functions best when its members treat one another with honesty, fairness, respect, and trust. We hold all members of our community to high standards of scholarship and integrity. To accomplish its mission of providing an optimal educational environment and developing leaders of society, the Ford School promotes the

assumption of personal responsibility and integrity and prohibits all forms of academic dishonesty, plagiarism and misconduct. Academic dishonesty may be understood as any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage for oneself or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member or members of the academic community. Plagiarism involves representing the words, ideas, or work of others as one's own in writing or presentations, and failing to give full and proper credit to the original source. Conduct, without regard to motive, that violates the academic integrity and ethical standards will result in serious consequences and disciplinary action. The Ford School's policy of academic integrity can be found in the MPP BA, and PhD Program handbooks. Additional information regarding academic dishonesty, plagiarism and misconduct and their consequences is available here.

Links to documents mentioned:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/wuq2jfmbpflm4f2/FINAL%202023%20Masters%20Handbook.pdf?dl=0

https://www.dropbox.com/s/06x1tzt1e32pjjw/FINAL%202023%20PHD%20Handbook.pdf?dl=0

https://rackham.umich.edu/academic-policies/section8/#112

Use of Technology Students should follow instructions from their instructor as to acceptable use of technology in the classroom, including laptops, in each course. All course materials (including slides, assignments, handouts, pre-recorded lectures or recordings of class) are to be considered confidential material and are not to be shared in full or part with anyone outside of the course participants. Likewise, your own personal recording (audio or video) of your classes or office hour sessions is allowed only with the express written permission of your instructor. If you wish to post course materials or photographs/videos of classmates or your instructor to third-party sites (e.g. social media), you must first have informed consent. **Without explicit permission from the instructor and in some cases your classmates, the public distribution or posting of any photos, audio/video recordings or pre-recordings from class, discussion section or office hours, even if you have permission to record, is not allowed and could be considered academic misconduct**.

Please review additional information and policies regarding academic expectations and resources at the Ford School of Public Policy:

https://intranet.fordschool.umich.edu/academic-expectations